

The background of the entire page is a photograph of a large, multi-story brick building with a series of white columns, likely a part of Lincoln Memorial University. The scene is heavily framed by out-of-focus autumn leaves in shades of yellow, orange, and brown, which are in the foreground, creating a sense of depth and seasonal atmosphere. The sky is a pale, clear blue.

LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY

Quality Enhancement Plan

2009 – 2014

LINC – on

Learning is Now Connected

**Submitted to the
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
January 2009**

Values · Education · Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	1
II.	Lincoln Memorial University: Its Heritage and Mission	2
III.	QEP Selection Process Leading to the Topic of Information Literacy Topic Selection	4
IV.	Information Literacy: A Historical Perspective The Information Revolution Educating Students to be Information Literate	6
V.	Information Literacy: LMU Assessment Analysis Information Literacy at LMU	11
VI.	From Topic to Plan: QEP Infrastructure The QEP Leadership Committee University Approvals	15
VII.	Quality Enhancement Plan: LINC-on The KISSES Pilot Project LINC—on: QEP Description QEP Curriculum Plan LINC—on QEP: Goals and Objectives Curricular Integration: Theoretical Foundation for the Plan’s Matrix of Learning Outcomes	17
VIII.	Engaging the Campus Community in the QEP Campus Conversations Timeline for Generating Awareness of the QEP	32
IX.	QEP Assessment and Evaluation Rationale for Selection of Assessment Measures Assessment Instruments Justification Conceptual Considerations QEP Goals and Objectives Aligned with Assessment Strategies Assessment Timeline	35
X.	Institutional Capability for the Initiation and Continuation of the Plan Faculty and Staff Development Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence Personnel Project Administration	54
XI.	Finance Five-Year QEP Budget	60
XII.	Conclusion	63
XIII.	References	65

XIV. Appendices**67**

Appendix A: LMU SEWS Paper Assessment (2000-2008)	68
Appendix B: Carnegie Vincent Library Information Literacy Pre-test (2001)	72
Appendix C: National Survey of Student Satisfaction (2007)	75
Appendix D: LibQUAL+ Survey (2008)	77
Appendix E: SEWS Information Literacy Rubric	78
Appendix F: QEP Promotional Mass E-mail (example)	80
Appendix G: QEP Program Assessment Rubric	81
Appendix H: Project SAILS Skill Sets	82
Appendix I: iSkills Fit with ACRL Standards	88
Appendix J: Job Description: Director of Information Literacy Program	90

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document describes Lincoln Memorial University’s “LINC—on” Quality Enhancement Plan (“Learning Is Now Connected”) developed as a strategic quality initiative designed to improve student learning as part of the University’s reaffirmation of accreditation by the Commission on Colleges (COC) of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The topic of information literacy was selected after two years of University-wide discussions, rigorous data and needs analysis and deliberate institutional reflection. The Lincoln Memorial University (LMU) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) represents an institutional commitment to improve the essential information literacy skills that will empower students to participate actively in a rapidly evolving culture of information.

QEP TOPIC: INFORMATION LITERACY: Information literacy is, arguably, the crucial, distinguishing feature of education in the twenty-first century university (Rockman, 2003). A synthesis of diverse technical and analytical skills, *information literacy* is defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) (2008) as the ability to recognize when and to what extent information is required, to locate its sources, determine its value, and use and communicate this knowledge purposively, effectively, and ethically. These skills are indispensable for success in every academic discipline at LMU and at all levels of education in the wider University community.

As an end in itself, the accumulation of information is meaningless. Information literacy education provides, instead, a context for ideas. It fosters abilities, however, that are not solely cognitive, but are also affective, attached to values, emotions and behaviors that promote habits of flexibility and persistence, and a disposition to independent and purposeful inquiry. Information literacy is, according to Hughes and Shapiro (1996), a liberal art, a particular way of constructing knowledge and meaning. It is a catalyst for continued learning and the foundation for personal and professional empowerment and productivity in a technologically sophisticated global society.

QEP PROJECT: The LMU QEP involves the implementation of a tiered, fully course-integrated information literacy and developmental research skills program. The plan will move the University’s information literacy instruction efforts away from the current stand-alone course (INFL 100) in a

direction that will entail much greater curricular integration, starting in the general education courses required of every undergraduate student and continuing into upper- and graduate-level courses. It will be introduced in five stages and, ultimately, at all educational levels of the University, though it's principal focus will be on the school's baccalaureate programs. Goals and objectives for the plan will validate students' progress toward informational literacy fluency and faculty pedagogical skills.

The overarching object of any QEP is the improvement of student learning. For the purposes of this plan, *student learning* will be defined here as the ability to connect new ideas to previous knowledge, to draw analogies from among different disciplines and—beyond the immediate directives of a particular assignment—to make broadly applicable use of evidence, inquiry and evaluation in increasingly complex ways in order to recognize and solve novel problems.

QEP ASSESSMENT: To advance the ends described above, multiple measures and performance data from a variety of sources will be used to assess the identified student learning outcomes outlined in the plan and will inform the University's determination of the actions necessary to ensure continuous improvement of each of the plan's initiatives. The University's institutional capabilities have been a crucial consideration in the plan's development. A detailed budget is provided to demonstrate support and sustainability for the plan. LMU is fully committed to providing the resources necessary to successfully implement and sustain this plan.

II. LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY: ITS HERITAGE AND MISSION

Lincoln Memorial University is a values-based learning community dedicated to providing educational experiences in the liberal arts and professional studies. The University strives to give students a foundation for a more productive life by upholding the principles of Abraham Lincoln's life: a dedication to individual liberty, responsibility, and improvement; a respect for citizenship; recognition of the intrinsic value of high moral and ethical standards; and a belief in a personal God.

The University is committed to teaching, research, and service. The University's curriculum and commitment to quality instruction at every level are based on the beliefs that graduates must be able to communicate clearly and effectively in an era of rapidly and continuously expanding communication technology, must have an appreciable depth of learning in a field of knowledge, must appreciate and understand the various ways by which we come to know ourselves and the world around us, and must be able to exercise informed judgments.

The University believes that one of the major cornerstones of meaningful existence is service to humanity. By making educational and research opportunities available to students where they live and through various recreational and cultural events open to the community, Lincoln Memorial University seeks to advance life in the Cumberland Gap area and throughout the region through its teaching, research, and service mission (Mission and Purpose, approved by LMU Board of Trustees, May 5, 2006).

Lincoln Memorial University honors the name, values and spirit of Abraham Lincoln. According to the recollection of General O. O. Howard, a Union army officer, Lincoln, in 1863, expressed the hope that Howard would organize a college for the people of the Cumberland Gap region in recognition of their loyalty to the Union in the Civil War. Unfortunately, events intervened, postponing the founding of such a college. However, Howard's commitment to Lincoln's request was finally realized nearly forty years later, and in commemoration of Lincoln's birthday, the institution was chartered as Lincoln Memorial University by the state of Tennessee on February 12, 1897.

Today, the University has a student population of over 3300, and offers degrees in thirty-nine disciplines at eleven extended sites in addition to the main campus in Harrogate, TN. As it attempts to fulfill the mandate of its original charter, the University continues to expand. In December 2006, in a milestone event in the University's history, LMU was approved by SACS as a Level V institution. The first doctoral students were admitted to the inaugural class of the DeBusk College of Osteopathic Medicine in August 2007.

LMU's mission emphasizes a commitment to teaching and research: "The University's curriculum and commitment to quality instruction at every level are based on the beliefs that graduates must be able to communicate clearly and effectively in an era of rapidly and continuously expanding communication technology, must have an appreciable depth of learning in a field of knowledge, must appreciate and understand the various ways by which we come to know ourselves and the world around us, and must be able to exercise informed judgments." At precisely the cultural moment when the standardized, centralized and hierarchical information bureaucracy of the not-so-distant past has been radically decentralized and democratized, information literacy education has become indispensable to the University's aspirations for its students. Uniquely comprehensive in its scope, the content of information

literacy instruction is concerned with everything from locating a simple fact, such as the date of Lincoln's assassination, to developing higher order critical thinking skills that require analysis and interpretation of already existing knowledge, like determining the assassination's impact on the post-war South, and then communicating the results through effective writing. Indeed, by definition, information literacy is a multidisciplinary endeavor. Fully integrated, innovative learning environments characteristic of information literacy instruction will necessitate, therefore, the active collaboration of faculty, staff and administration throughout the University in order to excel in its stated mission to graduate students who "...communicate clearly and effectively, appreciate and understand the various ways by which we come to know ourselves and the world around us and exercise informed judgments."

III. QEP SELECTION PROCESS LEADING TO THE TOPIC OF INFORMATION LITERACY

Topic Selection

In October 2006, at an early stage of LMU's preparation for re-accreditation, the SACS Leadership Team charged the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Committee with developing a process for securing institution-wide participation in the selection of a QEP topic. At a series of meetings held in November and December, the IE Committee began to consider strategies for encouraging the collaboration of all constituencies of the university community in the topic selection process. Following these discussions, in January of 2007, the committee directed each of the academic deans to initiate, in their respective schools, a broad-based dialogue aimed at eliciting topics of potential relevance for a QEP. Reports by the deans at the February IE Committee meeting indicated that this dialogue had begun, and the SACS Leadership Team, encouraged by the response of faculty and staff, moved at its February 2007 meeting to develop a standard format for the presentation of QEP proposals. A call for QEP topics was circulated to the entire University community with a submission deadline to the school deans of June 2007.

Four proposals, representing the contributions of faculty, students and staff, were ultimately submitted. The proposals were reviewed by the SACS Leadership Team and forwarded to the Office of Institutional Research for presentation and discussion at the annual strategic planning retreat on July 10-11, 2007. The proposed topics included recommendations for the following:

1. A three-dimensional *Virtual Classroom System* for immersive distance learning.
2. The adoption of an assessment plan utilizing the *Reasoning about Current Issues (RCI)* test as a method of measuring post-formal reasoning and reflective judgment.
3. The establishment of an undergraduate honors college.
4. The improvement of student research and information-seeking skills through the development and implementation of a University-wide, fully integrated information literacy curriculum with an intensive focus on baccalaureate programs.

While the SACS Leadership Team retained responsibility for final approval of the QEP topic, it sought, at every stage of the selection process, to give full consideration to the recommendations of the larger campus community. Since participants at each year's strategic planning retreat include LMU trustees and representatives of all of the University's academic and administrative departments, including the J. Frank White Academy (a college preparatory school for grades 5 through 12), the leadership team regarded the retreat as a crucial opportunity for broad consultation in the determination of a QEP topic. To solicit even wider participation in the process, representation at the 2007 strategic planning retreat was extended to leaders of student government, athletics, the intrafraternity council, and members of the entering class of the DeBusk College of Osteopathic Medicine.

QEP topic presentations were made by the lead authors of the four proposals, followed by a two-hour session for discussion among all of the July retreat's sixty-two participants. Each of the proposals was seen to have considerable merit, but it was evident that there was strong consensus for selection of the information literacy topic. As was later confirmed by a post-retreat survey, participants were persuaded that the perceived need for enhanced information literacy instruction had emerged from careful institutional assessment. The proposal was seen, moreover, as both fully consistent with LMU's mission and as a viable and systematic opportunity for significant improvement of student learning at every educational level of the University. While its scope was ambitious, participants did not think that the proposal would overextend the University's financial, physical and human resources.

Specifically, the post-retreat survey showed that 90% of respondents *mostly or totally agreed* that the information literacy proposal *described a carefully designed and focused course of action to address a well-defined topic or issue(s) relative to enhancing student learning*. Ninety-six percent (96%) of respondents *mostly or totally agreed* that the information literacy proposal *complement[ed] LMU's ongoing institutional planning and evaluation process*, and 91% *mostly or totally agreed* that the proposal would *lead to a coherent plan for increasing the effectiveness of some aspect (significant) of the institution's educational program related to student learning*. Finally, 91% of survey participants *mostly or totally agreed* that the information literacy proposal *would be supported by key constituent groups across the LMU community for its potential to result in significant improvements in the quality of student learning*.

These survey results were significantly more positive than those received for the other proposed topics, and in August 2007, the information literacy proposal was presented for full development at the University's Faculty and Staff Conference. Additional survey results were obtained from participants of the conference and showed strong satisfaction with both the QEP topic and the opportunity for engagement in the QEP development process.

In response to the prompt, *The QEP session provided important information about the QEP development process, and progress on selecting a QEP topic focused on improving student learning at LMU*, 87% of respondents *generally or strongly agreed*. Importantly, 90% of respondents *generally or strongly agreed* that the *QEP session provided the entire University community an opportunity to have input concerning LMU's QEP and to become engaged in the QEP development process*.

IV. INFORMATION LITERACY: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Information Revolution

A fundamental change in information technology is transforming not only access to, but the very concept of knowledge. Information is now, in a real sense, endless, available through electronic transmission to anyone, in any place, at any time. In spite of the obvious benefits, these technological advances have also had enormously destabilizing effects and the pace of change has been breathtaking.

Until recently, it was safe for faculty to assume that students understood the rudiments of the research process and how to use library resources to gather authoritative information. Indeed, for most of the first half of the twentieth century, the organization and retrieval of information was relatively straight-forward. Libraries stored information almost entirely in linearly printed texts, such as books and periodicals. Cataloguing occurred at a high level—author and subject indexes—rather than in detail, and related material, ordered into standard categories, was organized by physical proximity: the library’s biology holdings were often shelved in one section of the building, its literature holdings in another. With the virtualization of content made possible by the computing and communications revolution, information has become both less hierarchical and more voluminous, dispersed and distributed among many radically different formats and media, and duplicated in innumerable physical locations (Reddy, 1999).

Twenty years ago, it was estimated that more information had been generated between 1959 and 1989 than during the previous 5,000 years (Wurman, 1989). In the United States alone, more than 140,000 books are published annually, and close to a million, internationally. However, the tens of thousands of books, newspapers, magazines, scholarly journals, and trade periodicals produced each year account for less than 1% of all new information (Lyman & Varian, 2003).

The migration of scholarly communication towards an electronic format has undoubtedly democratized and decentralized knowledge. This same profusion of information has also had disorienting consequences. Indeed, one of the ironies of the information explosion is that although there is more information available than ever before, there is also a disproportionately higher amount of misinformation. While the information environment has rapidly and radically changed, our pedagogical models have not.

LMU is by no means alone in facing these challenges. The situation reflects a disturbing trend endemic to universities across the country. Many students are entering higher education with little knowledge of the research process and lack the ability to locate, evaluate and utilize the information necessary to construct and support a rigorous argument or conduct a scientific experiment. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly evident that a high level of information proficiency will be necessary for graduates

entering the workforce or continuing their education in post-baccalaureate programs. This will not merely be a matter of acquiring new technical abilities, but one also of improved training in the utilization of sophisticated analytical skills necessary to make sense of the transformed information landscape.

Typically, students have only a tenuous understanding of how to use and evaluate electronic research tools and resources. Preliminary findings of the Educational Testing Service's 2006 Information and Computer Technology (ICT) Literacy Assessment show that, among the 6300 high school seniors and college students tested, most did not demonstrate basic information literacy skills. Only 49% of test-takers were able to correctly evaluate the "objectivity, authority and timeliness" of websites. Asked to minimize irrelevant results when searching large databases, only 50% of test-takers successfully employed an effective search strategy. Given these findings, it is not surprising that an earlier report in 2002 by the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) in the *OCLC White Paper on the Information Habits of College Students* estimated that while 42% of student respondents use search engines for research, nearly half of these searches are unsuccessful.

Educating Students to be Information Literate

Although substantial transformations in the culture and the bureaucratic organization of libraries date from at least the mid-19th century, when the first library schools were established and collections became standardized after the creation of the Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress Classification Systems, general library instruction has, by contrast, been slow to develop. In fact, it wasn't until the mid-20th century that most universities began to offer courses on library use (Gilton, n.d.). One important precursor of the trend towards more widely available bibliographic instruction was Henne's *Standards for School Library Programs* (1960). There, Henne advocated the integration of library skills instruction and classroom content with the aim of achieving the "synthesis of information, the extension of knowledge, the analysis and solution of problems, thinking [and] reflection" (pp. 18-19).

The first conflation of the terms *information* and *literacy* occurred in 1974 in an address by the then-president of the Information Industry Association (IIA), Zurkowski (Johnston & Webber, 2000). By information literacy, Zurkowski meant to refer to the abilities that he believed would be required for

professional workers to effectively orient themselves in the emerging information landscape. Confronted by similar challenges, however, educators and librarians began to consider how to respond to the fundamental problem of organizing the proliferating volume and diffusion of information. In 1976, at a library symposium convened to address this topic, Burchinal introduced a set of competencies that would later shape the most widely accepted definitions of information literacy. “To be information literate,” Burchinal insisted, “requires a new set of skills. These include how to locate and use information needed for problem-solving and decision-making efficiently and effectively” (as cited in Behrens, 1994, p. 310).

The bibliographic instruction movement of the 1970s and 1980s was a response to the increasing complexity of libraries (Eisenberg, Lowe, & Spitzer, 1998). Indeed, the emphasis of much of this instruction was on research methods for the retrieval and evaluation of information. In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s landmark report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, linked the criticality of the management of information in electronic and digital forms to the national need for a competitive workforce. At the same time, a distinction was beginning to be more sharply drawn between computer literacy—that is, between the purely technological and utilitarian aspects of information retrieval—and a more capacious concept of information literacy. “Information literacy as opposed to computer literacy,” Horton wrote at the time (1983, p. 16), “means raising the level of awareness of individuals and enterprises to the knowledge explosion and how machine-aided handling systems can help to identify access and obtain data, documents and literature needed for problem-solving and decision-making.”

In 1987, the establishment of an American Library Association Presidential Committee on Information Literacy was crucial to the development of a coherent concept of information literacy (Eisenberg, et al., 1998). Two years later, in 1989, the committee’s *Final Report* offered a comprehensive definition of information literacy that has served as the basis for almost all subsequent refinements and elaborations of the term. By this time, information literacy had become a relevant topic even outside the discipline of library science.

The transition from printed to electronic information only intensified in the 1990s, and bibliographic instruction was eventually absorbed by distinct information literacy pedagogy. What differentiates information literacy from bibliographic instruction is the former's goal of "transforming a library-based program into a cross-campus enterprise with wider ownership . . . leadership and engagement beyond the walls of the library" (Hutchins, Fister, & MacPherson, 2002, pp. 4-5). More than this, information literacy also depends "on collaborative pedagogy, embedding research competencies in individual courses and throughout the curriculum, and integrating skills developmentally into the entire learning process with the aim of creating informed and critical lifelong learners" (Hutchins, et al., p. 5). Courses structured in such a way create student-centered learning environments where inquiry is the norm, problem solving becomes the focus, and thinking critically is part of the process.

The pedagogical shift towards information literacy instruction culminated in January, 2000, with the approval by the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) of a comprehensive set of information literacy competency standards and performance indicators for higher education. One of the chief virtues of the five standards and twenty-two performance indicators outlined by the ACRL has been their high adaptability to different student needs across particular disciplines and in the broader context of an institution's unique mission. In every case, however, the abilities which characterize information literacy should not be considered, according to the ACRL (2008, Information literacy and pedagogy section, para. 3), as "extraneous to the curriculum, but . . . woven into the curriculum's content, structure, and sequence." For writing and information literacy competencies to be effectively inculcated into students' intellectual development, continual, focused application of the core skills at strategic points across the entire curriculum is required. Indeed, "[m]any of the competencies are likely to be performed recursively, in that the reflective and evaluative aspects included within each standard will require the student to return to an earlier point in the process, revise the information-seeking approach, and repeat the same steps" (ACRL).

V. INFORMATION LITERACY: LMU ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

Information Literacy at LMU

The need for information literacy education is particularly acute in rural and poor communities, where the digital divide separating the disadvantaged from the computerized is greatest. The large rural region served by LMU includes some of the most isolated, impoverished and undereducated counties and communities in the United States. Within the student body, over 30% are first generation college students and nearly 60% come from low income families. Claiborne County, where the main LMU campus is geographically situated, has been rated a *Persistent Poverty County* by the Economic Research Service department of the United States Department of Agriculture (2004). This designation signifies that 20% of the population has lived below the poverty level for the last four census periods, beginning in 1959. The University's one hundred mile service area includes thirty counties in three states designated as *Persistent Poverty* counties. State spending for the 2005-2006 school year per pupil in the Tennessee school system averaged approximately \$6883; in Kentucky schools average spending was \$7662, and in Virginia, \$9447. State spending per pupil in Tennessee and Kentucky falls nearly \$1500 below the national average of \$9138 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). These state figures are quite low. However, in the LMU service area, school spending figures are even lower, considerably so in Virginia, where highly funded public schools in the wealthy suburbs surrounding the Washington D.C. area inflate what would otherwise be an even more reduced state spending average.

Educational demographics also reaffirm the need for LMU's continued effort to provide opportunities for prospective students. The U.S. Census Bureau (2006) reports that, in Claiborne County, only 60% of persons twenty-five and older have a high school diploma. This is 20% below the national average. In addition, only 8.9% of residents in the same age category have completed college compared to 24.4% percent of the country as a whole.

University assessments of incoming and graduating students, including:

- preliminary Sequenced Enhancement of Writing Skills (SEWS) program data (Spring 2008) (See Appendix A)
- the Carnegie Vincent Library's 2001 information literacy pre-test (See Appendix B)

- the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Spring 2007) (See Appendix C)
- the LibQUAL+ Survey (Spring 2006 and 2008) (See Appendix D)
- and the Institutional Effectiveness Zoomerang Survey (Summer 2007)

have consistently pointed to the need for providing educational opportunities at LMU that will enhance students' ability to use and evaluate electronic information resources.

Analysis of information literacy pre-test data from a sample of freshmen in 2001 revealed that the majority of these students had difficulty identifying a scholarly journal, were unable to identify a classic novel as a primary source, and unable to identify Boolean operators and truncation symbols.

In response to specific questions posed in the LibQUAL+ survey, which estimates shareholders' perceived levels of library service quality, the results related to information literacy outcomes for both graduate and undergraduate students indicate only minimum mean scores in 2006 for this category of services. On a scale with levels of general satisfaction from 1-9, with 1 being *strongly disagree* and 9 representing *strongly agree*, respondents to the survey rated the prompt, *The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work*, at a 7.30 level of satisfaction. The prompt, *The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information*, was rated at a satisfaction level of only 6.95. Indirect survey data captured from NSSE in 2007 suggests that first year undergraduate students perceive the level of academic challenge and collaborative learning to be slightly below average compared with the top 50% of peer institutions. These two areas of the NSSE have specific questions related to information literacy and allow for an estimate of the performance of an average student in relation to the average student attending two different institutional peer groups for their high levels of student engagement.

Preliminary data from a March 2008 review of a stratified random sampling of SEWS papers written from Fall 2000 to Fall 2007 shows greatly varying degrees of competencies in critical thinking skills, as defined by Bloom's Taxonomy, across departments and disciplines. The SEWS program is specifically designed to use the existing curriculum at LMU to exercise students' writing skills and establishes a baseline writing requirement for each year of the traditional four-year degree. In the freshman and sophomore years, the SEWS requirement is satisfied by one source-based paper in both English 110 and

210. In the junior and senior years, the SEWS requirement is satisfied by one source-based report or analysis of around 1000 words written in the student's major program and deemed information literate and satisfactory by the instructor. The data derived from a review of the SEWS provides persuasive evidence for the necessity of an enhanced information literacy program at LMU. However, before the SEWS findings are discussed below, it is necessary to observe that several limitations to this analysis have been taken into account by the QEP Committee. For one thing, inter-rater reliability has not, to this point, been measured. Further, the SEWS program was created in 1998, before the necessity for information literacy instruction was widely recognized at the University, and achieving information literacy was not one of its stated goals. Finally, many instructors did not submit the course-specific SEWS guidelines they distributed to students, although they were required to do so. As a result, the raters had no idea of the number of sources instructors required.

And yet, even with these qualifications, it is evident that sample papers, on average, failed to demonstrate passable research and information skills, properly cite sources and adhere to discipline-appropriate standards of documentation. Just 22.9% of upper-level education, business, and natural sciences papers and 30% of upper-level humanities papers demonstrated acceptable research skills, when measured against the rubric designed to assess the source-based paper. Only eight percent of upper-level education, business, and natural sciences papers demonstrated critical thinking skills at the higher end of Bloom's Taxonomy. These results convinced members of the SEWS Review Subcommittee that faculty in many programs do not develop SEWS assignments designed to elicit the sort of critical thought and information literacy and research skills necessary for professional success in the 21st century.

A second stratified random sample of SEWS papers from Fall 2003 to Fall 2007 (N = 172) was evaluated as an element of the Knowledge Is Source Selection, Evaluation and Synthesis (KISSES) QEP pilot program, employing a separately developed rubric (See Appendix E) designed to measure student performance exclusively on the basis of information literacy. Since slightly more than half of the sample papers were produced after the incorporation of an introductory, stand-alone information literacy course

into the University's general education curriculum, the second review was to some extent also an indirect measure of the effectiveness of this specific approach to information literacy instruction.

On the most basic level, raters evaluated the sample papers' titles and thesis statements. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the sample was found to have relevant titles. However, only 35% of the sample papers had titles that, while relevant, were considered to be sufficiently focused, and just 39% of the papers had a clearly articulated thesis statement. Assessing students' ability to evaluate information sources, the raters judged that 64% of the sample papers used relevant sources to provide support for the thesis. However, a significantly smaller percentage of papers—42%—demonstrated the writer's ability to draw conclusions from their sources, and in only 24% of the papers did students attempt to make an original interpretation of the source material.

The SEWS papers were also evaluated on the basis of citations and plagiarism. The raters found that just 28% of the sample papers had the correct title page format and a similar number—29% of the sample—had correctly formatted reference pages. Moreover, according to the raters, only 22% of the sample had proper in-text citation and 34% of the sample showed no evidence of plagiarism.

The raters also counted the number of sources that each paper used and the type of source (i.e. website, scholarly journal, newspaper, etc.). The mean number of sources used for all sample papers was 6.13. The percentage of papers that included scholarly journal articles was 56%. The percentage of papers that used websites was 46%, slightly lower than the 51% that cited books with only 1% being reference books. The breakdown of website type was: government pages (.gov) = 25%; organization pages (.org) = 51%; educational pages (.edu) = 37%; .com pages = 62%; and finally other websites (i.e. .net) = 16%. Only 3% of the sample used newspapers and magazines. These figures show a heavy dependence on Web sources, which, when considered in the context of students' inability either to evaluate information sources critically or to synthesize selected information to support their own ideas, indicate an urgent need for intensive information literacy instruction at both the basic and more advanced research levels.

LMU faculty and administrators have also indicated in survey results a fundamental insecurity about the level of their own information literacy competence and preparation. Zoomerang survey results from

the 2007 Institutional Effectiveness Strategic Planning Retreat indicated that approximately half of the one hundred and fifty participants were *neutral, mostly uncomfortable, or very uncomfortable* in their ability to search for information using library resources, i.e., library catalog, databases, indexes, etc. Eighty-five of the respondents reported that they did not or only *occasionally* retrieve scientific research articles and resources.

VI. FROM TOPIC TO PLAN: QEP INFRASTRUCTURE

The QEP Leadership Committee

Following the selection of the QEP topic and its announcement to the University community, President Nancy B. Moody, under the advisement of the SACS Leadership Team, formed a new committee in Fall 2007, the QEP Leadership Committee, which was given the responsibility of developing the **LINC—on** Quality Enhancement Plan. This committee, chaired by Dr. Jacques Debrot, began its work in Spring 2008, recruiting representatives from the student body, faculty, staff and the Board of Trustees. Members of the committee also serve on one of three subcommittees: the Assessment Subcommittee, chaired by Dr. Connie England; the Curriculum Integration and Development Subcommittee chaired by Dr. Pat Murphree; and the Plan Effectiveness Subcommittee, chaired by Dr. Jacques Debrot. Dr. Sherilyn Emberton, the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, and Dr. Clayton Hess, Director of Institutional Research, serve as at-large members of the committee. Dr. Christy Cowan is the QEP committee's assistant chair. Committee members meet regularly at both subcommittee and general committee meetings and collaborate online at the committee's Blackboard site. In addition to facilitating discussion among committee representatives, the site archives the minutes and agendas of all committee and subcommittee meetings and provides links to electronic documents and websites relevant to the committee's work. Committee membership includes the following:

Lincoln Memorial University QEP Committee (2007-2008)

Jacques Debrot, Chair (Arts & Sciences faculty)
Christy Cowan, Assistant Chair (Arts & Sciences faculty)
Sherilyn Emberton, at-large member (Vice-President of Academic Affairs)
Clayton Hess, at-large member (Director of Institutional Research)

Assessment Subcommittee

Connie England, Chair (Education faculty)
Mary Allen (LMU Board of Trustees)
Jennifer Bohinc (LMU graduate student)
Benjamin Goins (DCOM student)
Jessica Mead (information literacy librarian, 2007)
Laurie Rodgers (Institutional Research and Accreditation staff)
Roy Wilcox (Arts & Sciences faculty)
Philip Smith (information literacy librarian, 2008)

Curriculum Integration and Development Subcommittee

Patricia Murphree, Chair (Education faculty)
Rhonda Armstrong (Director of the Library)
Dan DeBord (Arts & Sciences faculty)
Mary Hatfield (Allied Health faculty)
Jonathan Leo (DCOM faculty)
Haley Lewis (JFWA student)
Sylvia Lynch (Principal of JFWA)
Jack McCann (Business faculty)
Mary Anne Modrcin (Nursing faculty and Dean)
Debra Moyers (Information Services staff)

Plan Effectiveness Subcommittee

Jacques Debrot, Chair (Arts & Sciences faculty)
Christy Cowan (Arts & Sciences faculty)
Pauline Lipscomb (Director of Research, Grants, and Sponsored Programs)
Debra Moyers (Information Services staff) liaison to the Curriculum
Integration and Development Subcommittee
Phillip Smith (Library staff) liaison to the Assessment subcommittee
Larry Thacker (Student Services staff)

University Approvals

As described in Section VI, the QEP topic selection process was initiated at the 2007 Summer Institutional Effectiveness Strategic Planning Retreat. The topic was presented and affirmed by the Academic Council, University faculty, President's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees in the fall of 2007. Throughout the spring and summer of 2008, the QEP leadership consulted closely on the evolving draft of the QEP document with the SACS Leadership Team, the Academic Council, and other University faculty, student and staff constituencies.

The QEP Leadership Team presented the plan's scope and focus, as well as its goals, objectives and assessment strategies at the summer 2008 strategic planning retreat. After incorporating suggestions for revisions, the plan was presented at the 2008 Fall Faculty-Staff Conference. The plan was approved by

the Academic Council and University faculty in the fall of 2008. The budget for the QEP was presented to and approved by the LMU Board of Trustees at the December 2008 board meeting.

VII. QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN: LINC—on**A Tiered Course-integrated Information Literacy and Developmental Research Skills Program****The KISSES (Knowledge is Source Selection Evaluation and Synthesis) Pilot Project**

The KISSES project was originally conceived by LMU librarians and faculty as a grant proposal topic at the Appalachian College Association (ACA) Teaching and Learning Institute in the summer of 2007. Because the University's efforts toward reaffirmation of accreditation were already widely known, one factor in the team's decision to make information literacy the subject of their proposal was its viability as a possible QEP topic. If accepted, the grant would provide an opportunity for a focused consideration of the necessity for (as well as a wider integration of) information literacy instruction at LMU. The team's grant proposal was ultimately successful and the maximum amount of \$3,500.00 was awarded by the ACA.

The original goals of the grant were as follows:

1. Completion of a literature review to investigate methods of integrating information literacy into the curriculum;
2. Integration of information literacy skills in the general education requirement courses: English 110, English 210, and English 310, with the expectation being that students would then utilize this foundation in their discipline-specific senior-level courses;
3. Raised awareness by the university community of the relevance of information literacy and critical thinking skills for all students, regardless of discipline;
4. Development, by all academic departments, of information literacy learning goals and objectives for incorporation in appropriate syllabi;
5. Design of rubrics establishing basic, intermediate, and advanced Information Literacy skills within each discipline; and
6. Measurable improvement in students' ability to conduct original, scholarly research.

After the selection of information literacy as the LMU QEP topic, the KISSES grant project became the pilot program for the QEP. Since KISSES had, until this time, been an independent undertaking, some modification of the project's original goals and objectives was considered necessary. However, the goals of the original grant, though not as far-reaching, closely corresponded to those subsequently adopted by the QEP committee. In short, the pilot's amended goals have been more sharply focused to establish a specific progression of research skills throughout courses and assessment of research papers, and to provide embedded assessment of information literacy skills within individual courses and programs.

The revised goals of the KISSES grant are listed below:

- Goal 1: To strategically integrate information literacy into the academic curriculum.
- Goal 2: To create effective information literacy rubrics for ENGL 210 and PSYC 480.
- Goal 3: To create assignments in both ENGL 210 and PSYC 480 emphasizing information literacy in conducting scholarly research.
- Goal 4: To conduct workshops that will enhance the quality of information literacy instruction.
- Goal 5: To improve the quality of student research.

To prepare for the pilot project's implementation in the fall of 2008, an information literacy workshop was held on June 27. Participants included four faculty members from the English, Psychology, and Education departments and four librarians. The workshop leaders, both affiliated with the Appalachian Colleges Association (ACA), were Sheila Delacroix, Director of the Bowen Central Library of Appalachia, and Dr. Lori Miller, Postdoctoral Fellow in Scholarly Information Resources.

In the morning session, participants were given an overview of the history of information literacy in higher education and discussed assessment strategies and best practices for teaching information literacy. During the afternoon session, workshop participants began to develop the goals, activities, and assessments necessary for the two courses that are part of the KISSES pilot study in the fall, English 210 and Psychology 480. Since then, instructors and librarians have met several more times throughout the fall semester to complete their preparation for these courses and monitor their progress.

At the workshop's wrap-up session, future plans for the KISSES project were discussed. Topics included: 1) continuation of course redesign, 2) coordination of course schedules with available librarians, 3) identification of information literacy content for each course, 4) faculty training on new technologies and forms of information delivery such as the recent EBSCO*host* database updates, 5) use of assessment instruments, and 6) the introduction of innovative learning activities.

Throughout the two sessions, the KISSES project's utility for the development of the QEP was a constant consideration. Indeed, the workshop itself will serve as a model for an annual Information Literacy Summer Institute to be held for faculty and staff during the five years of the QEP's implementation.

LINC-on: QEP Description

After two years of curricular preparation, the **LINC—on** QEP, a tiered course-integrated information literacy and developmental research program, will be introduced in 2009-2010, as detailed in the timeline included below, and fully realized over the next five years. Each phase of the plan will focus on the implementation of information literacy at different course levels in the curriculum and in the various schools and extended sites comprising the University's diverse learning community. The plan places a special emphasis on undergraduate baccalaureate information literacy instruction.

- QEP Preparation: Stage One (2007-2008). The focus of the preparation year has been to lay the groundwork for the sustained success of the University's information literacy program. At the University's strategic planning retreat, as well as at general and departmental faculty and staff meetings, the LMU community has been kept apprised of the progress of the plan's development. A QEP committee Blackboard site was developed and an initial draft of the QEP document was completed. Information literacy goals and objectives were developed by faculty and the library staff that are consistent with the University's Mission and Purpose Statements. Curriculum goals and objectives were aligned with desired student learning outcomes and specific courses targeted for the implementation of intensified information literacy instruction. An information literacy glossary was compiled and a University syllabus template with an information literacy section

was adopted and introduced in the fall of 2008. In addition, LMU librarians and faculty collaboratively developed and revised goals, activities and assessments for the KISSES information literacy pilot project and a workshop, as described in more detail earlier in the KISSES section of this document, was conducted for the administrators and instructors of the pilot. Throughout the year, the progress of the KISSES pilot was assessed by the QEP subcommittees with an eye to expedite the successful implementation of the QEP starting in 2009-2010.

- QEP Preparation: Stage Two (2008-2009). In the fall of 2008, an enhanced information literacy curriculum created cooperatively by librarians and faculty was embedded into selected ENGL 210 and PSYCH 480 courses. At the end of the semester, students will meet in focus groups with QEP administrators to discuss the usefulness of the information literacy instruction they received. Using this information and, following a review of the embedded assessment in these classes, student learning outcomes will be realigned as needed. The initial draft of the QEP document was distributed to all members of the QEP committee and other University constituencies for discussion and revision. Following this review, a final version was completed before the January deadline for submission to SACS and after receiving feedback from two outside evaluators: a) Dr. Linda Salane, executive director of the Leadership Institute and special assistant to the president at Columbia College, S.C. and b) Dr. Joanna Burkhardt, head librarian, Providence and Narragansett Bay Campuses, chair, Technical Services Department, Rhode Island University Library, Kingston. To publicize the **LINC—on** QEP, various promotional efforts have been, and will continue to be, undertaken, including an award, given at the spring convocation, to the winner of a QEP logo contest. The contest will be open to LMU students, faculty and staff, and members of the QEP committee will select the winning logo. A website with links to important QEP documents and other features related to the publication of the University's information literacy initiatives will be promoted on the LMU homepage. An information literacy program director will be hired prior to Year One of the plan. The director will replace the QEP committee

chair. However, the QEP committee will remain in existence and the QEP subcommittee chairs will continue to play a significant role in the plan's implementation and assessment. Information literacy tutorials and other material will be produced for the Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence. This material will be continuously reviewed and refined as the plan develops. In order to prepare faculty and staff for the information literacy content that will be embedded in selected J. Frank White Academy classes and in all ENG 110, 210/220 and LNCN 300 courses in fall 2009, the first Information Literacy Summer Institute will be inaugurated in June of 2009. Participating faculty will receive stipends for their participation. The institute will build on the work accomplished at the 2008 June workshop.

- Year One (2009-2010). In the fall of 2009, a tiered information literacy curriculum will be introduced at the J. Frank White Academy and at LMU in ENG 110. Librarians will teach the information literacy content added to all sections of this course. Prizes will be awarded to the best student research papers in ENG 110. These essays will be collected and published in the form of a journal to be distributed to the LMU community, and also as a perfect-bound book prominently displayed in the library. Prize-winning essays will necessarily demonstrate the research and evaluation skills characteristic of relatively advanced information literacy. Students entering LMU as freshmen in the fall of 2009 will, that summer, be assigned a common reading of a text related to the social, political, historical and/or ideological significance of information and the ways it is communicated. At August's New Student Survival Weekend, selected chapters of the assigned reading will be discussed in freshman seminars led by faculty and staff. During the term itself, this discussion will continue with faculty and librarians in ENG 110 classes. In partnership with Student Support Services (SSS), an information literacy peer tutors program will be developed by the information literacy librarian and modeled on similar student tutoring programs successfully administered by SSS. Information literacy tutorials and other material will be accessible to students and staff at the University's Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence. In order to prepare faculty and staff for the information literacy content that will be

embedded in ENG 210, LNCN 300 courses in fall 2010, instructors will be required to attend the June 2009 summer institute. Participating faculty will receive stipends for their participation. ENG 110 faculty will receive an additional stipend for introducing information literacy into their curricula. Student learning outcomes will be reviewed by faculty and librarians and realigned, as needed, contingent on the results of embedded and other assessment measures.

- Year Two (2010-2011). During this year of the plan, information literacy curriculum will be introduced into ENG 210 and 220 (the honor's English section) and in LNCN 300 for transfer students who have fulfilled their freshman and sophomore composition requirements before entering LMU and who have not previously had information literacy instruction. For these students, an information literacy module will be added to the syllabus covering material otherwise taught in ENG 110 and 210/220. Librarians will teach the information literacy content added to all sections of these courses. Prizes will be awarded to the best student research papers in ENG 110 and 210/220 courses. These essays will be collected and published in the form of a journal to be distributed to the LMU community, and also as a perfect-bound book prominently displayed in the library. Prize-winning papers will demonstrate the research and evaluation skills characteristic of advanced information literacy. To prepare faculty and staff for the information literacy content that will be embedded in SEWS 300-level and selected Graduate MEd, MBA, MSN and PA courses in the fall of 2011, instructors will be required in June to attend the Information Literacy Summer Institute. Participating faculty will receive stipends for their participation. ENG 210/220 faculty will receive an additional stipend for introducing information literacy into their curricula. Student learning outcomes will be reviewed by faculty and librarians and realigned, as needed, contingent on the results of embedded and other assessment measures.
- Year Three (2011-2012). Through the consultation of library staff and faculty, an information literacy curriculum will be introduced into SEWS 300-level and selected Graduate MEd, MBA, MSN and PA courses in the fall of 2011. Librarians will be available to assist with the instruction of these courses if the need arises. The peer tutoring program, the Virtual Center for Teaching

and Learning Excellence information literacy initiatives and other aspects of the plan that have been initiated in previous years will continue. To prepare faculty and staff for the information literacy content that will be embedded in SEWS 400-level and selected EdS, EdD, DO (medical) and JD (law) courses in fall 2012, instructors will be required in June to attend the Information Literacy Summer Institute. Participating faculty will receive stipends in compensation for their participation. SEWS 300-level faculty will receive an additional stipend for introducing information literacy into their curricula. Student learning outcomes will be reviewed by faculty and librarians and realigned, as needed, contingent on the results of embedded and other assessment measures.

- Year Four (2012-2013). An information literacy curriculum will be introduced in SEWS 400-level and selected EdS, EdD, DO and JD courses. Librarians will continue to be available as information literacy specialists to assist with the instruction of these courses. The peer tutoring program, the Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence information literacy initiatives and other aspects of the plan that have been initiated in previous years will continue. SEWS 400-level faculty will receive a stipend for introducing information literacy into their curricula. Student learning outcomes will be reviewed by faculty and librarians and realigned, as needed, contingent on the results of embedded and other assessment measures.
- Year Five (2013-2014). By the fall of 2013, information literacy will have been embedded at all course levels in all of the University's various schools and extended sites. The final year of the plan will focus, therefore, on a comprehensive review and evaluation of curriculum strengths and weaknesses as supported by student learning outcome assessments. The future development and administration of the plan beyond the initial five years will be guided by the recommendations arising from the review. By this time, it is expected that information literacy will have become a deeply integrated feature of the culture of the University.

QEP Curriculum Plan

- 2007-2008
(QEP
Preparation:
Stage One)
- Communicate Information Literacy Plan to the LMU community.
 - Develop goals consistent with the LMU mission.
 - Identify curriculum goals and objectives congruent with cognitive and affective student learning outcomes.
 - Develop glossary.
 - Adopt University syllabus template.
 - Identify targeted courses for implementation.
 - Refine KISSES Pilot project.
 - Conduct KISSES information literacy workshop for faculty and staff.
 - Complete first draft of QEP document.
- 2008-2009
(QEP
Preparation:
Stage Two)
- As part of KISSES Pilot, embed information literacy into selected ENG 210 and PSYC 480 courses.
 - Identify intended student learning outcomes.
 - Complete QEP document.
 - Publicize **LINC—on** QEP (website, logo contest, etc.).
 - Conduct focus-group discussions with students in ENG 210 and PSYC 480 information literacy enriched courses.
 - Hire a QEP director.
 - Inaugurate Information Literacy Summer Institute.
 - Prepare for start-up of information literacy peer mentors program.
 - Hire and train peer mentors.
- 2009-2010
(Year One)
- Tier instruction to additional courses; ENG 110, J. Frank White Academy.
 - Offer prizes for best student research papers in ENG 210/220.
 - Assign common reading to incoming freshmen to be discussed at seminars during orientation and in ENG 110 classes.
 - Begin information literacy peer tutors program.
 - Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed.
- 2010-2011
(Year Two)
- Tier instruction to additional courses: ENG 210/220 and targeted transfer students in LNCN 300.
 - Continue Information Literacy Summer Institute.
 - Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed.
- 2011-2012
(Year Three)
- Tier instruction to additional courses: SEWS 300-level, Graduate MEd, MBA, MSN, PA courses.
 - Continue Information Literacy Summer Institute
 - Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed.
- 2012-2013
(Year Four)
- Tier instruction to additional courses: SEWS 400-level, EdS, EdD, DO and JD classes.
 - Continue Information Literacy Summer Institute.

- Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed.

2012-2013
(Year Five)

- Review and evaluate curriculum strengths and weakness by student learning outcome assessment.
- Continue Information Literacy Summer Institute.

LINC—on QEP: Goals and Objectives

The goals, objectives and instructional strategies of the LMU QEP have been adapted from the Association of College and Research Libraries Best Practices Initiative to conform to the university’s unique Mission. The learning community at LMU will foster a shared sense of purpose and collaborative effort until the desired curricular and pedagogical results described in the QEP are achieved. A curriculum plan for engagement and management will be coherently and systematically implemented, guided by educational objectives and outcomes structured from Bloom’s *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* and assessed through classroom applications and standardized assessments.

Curricular Goals	Specific Curricular Objectives	Expected Outcome
<p>Goal 1 Student Learning: Students will acquire information literacy competencies and skills at both the basic and more advanced research levels.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1: Students will be able to ascertain the extent of information needed.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.1.A. identify acceptable content, process, and product for designing research-based assignments.</p> <p>1.1.B. explore information sources to establish and increase topic familiarity in developing a writing concept.</p> <p>1.1.C. modify information into a manageable but comprehensive focus when working with new information.</p> <p>1.1.D. demonstrate an understanding of appropriate vocabulary in developing the content of discourse.</p> <p>1.1.E. analyze the validity of new information with regards to its inclusion in discourse.</p> <p>1.1.F. demonstrate an understanding of the process of integrating researched information with original thought.</p>

	Objective 1.2: Students will be able to execute appropriate and efficient information searches.	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.2.A. select efficient and effective investigative methods for researching information.</p> <p>1.2.B. identify keywords, synonyms and appropriate terms for streamlining the investigation of information.</p> <p>1.2.C. construct appropriate search strategies with proper retrieval source when gathering information.</p>
	Objective 1.3: Students will be able to evaluate information sources critically.	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.3.A. analyze the validity, reliability and accuracy of sources and material(s).</p> <p>1.3.B. recognize the context of inaccuracy, deception, prejudice and manipulation with regard to evaluating information sources.</p>
	Objective 1.4: Students will be able to synthesize selected information to support their own ideas.	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.4.A. ascertain the relationship, congruence, and implication among multiple sources.</p> <p>1.4.B. construct new abstracts or ideas from investigative material.</p> <p>1.4.C. relate new evidence to support prior knowledge.</p>
	Objective 1.5: Students will be able to use information to achieve specific, desired ends.	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.5.A. draw valid and reliable conclusions from the analysis of new data or investigative research.</p> <p>1.5.B. apply discipline-appropriate techniques when evaluating material or resources for inclusion in core content areas.</p> <p>1.5.C. articulate knowledge and skills of the topic which has undergone investigative research.</p>
	Objective 1.6: Students will have an appreciation of the social and political questions concerning the uses of information.	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.6.A. demonstrate an understanding of privacy and security in both printed and electronic environments.</p> <p>1.6.B. communicate clearly for an intended audience.</p> <p>1.6.C. use the appropriate process to attain information.</p>

		1.6.D. produce a final product that best supports the purpose of the investigation.
	Objective 1.7: Students will search for and make use of information ethically and legally.	The student will: 1.7.A. demonstrate under-standing of intellectual property and its ethical use. 1.7 B. comply with legal and ethical use of electronic systems and paper searches. 1.7.C. demonstrate proper documentation of investigative materials.
Goal 2 Curriculum Development and Integration: The LMU information literacy program will have a clearly articulated and progressively more sophisticated course-integrated curriculum that will communicate its goals to, and—by extending opportunities for professional development and collaboration—solicit the participation of the entire University learning community.	Objective 2.1: The program will support and encourage the development of diverse and effective teaching methods that give emphasis to student-centered learning.	2.1.A. Faculty in identified courses will integrate instructional strategies that incorporates individual learning styles when teaching information literacy skills. 2.1.B. Faculty in identified courses will incorporate research-based best practices for teaching information literacy. 2.1.C. The Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence will develop workshops to promote faculty development in the use of research-based practices and differentiated instructional strategies.
	Objective 2.2: The program will coordinate the integration of information literacy competencies at all disciplinary levels and in the curriculum of every academic program and school.	2.2.A. Course curriculum will be designed to promote innovation and excellence in teaching through collaboration between faculty and students. 2.2.B. Faculty will develop a tiered curriculum guide that defines the standards, objectives, activities, rubrics and assessments appropriate for each tier and discipline. 2.2.C. Faculty will create a glossary of informational literacy terms for implementation where appropriate at academic discipline levels.
	Objective 2.3: The program will assist faculty in developing curriculum for both basic and advanced, discipline-specific information literacy and research skills.	2.3.A. Professional development workshops, seminars, institutes, and conferences will be developed on a continuous timeline for faculty use in integrating information literacy classroom techniques. 2.3.B. Discipline and level specific training modules will be developed to assist faculty with

		<p>specific information literacy needs for course inclusion.</p> <p>2.3.C. Faculty will develop, where appropriate, a list of informational literacy resources for inclusion in course syllabi.</p> <p>2.3.D. Faculty will develop scaffolded instructional units from basic to advance for inclusion where appropriate in course curriculum.</p>
	<p>Objective 2.4: The program will develop web-based information tutorials and other resources for general and specific use.</p>	<p>2.4. A. The Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence will facilitate opportunities for faculty development in the area of information literacy.</p>
	<p>Objective 2.5: Program opportunities will support cross-disciplinary efforts for collaboration in support of student learning.</p>	<p>2.5.A. Faculty and library staff will collaborate to design embedded units of information literacy instruction within course assignments.</p> <p>2.5.B. Academic major program faculty will partner with general education faculty to ensure discipline-specific information literacy skills are incorporated into freshman and sophomore level courses within the Lincoln Liberal Arts Core.</p>
<p>Goal 3 Program Assessment and Evaluation: Comprehensive and ongoing assessments of the effectiveness of the LMU information literacy program will be used to advise and direct the improvement of curriculum, and the development of diverse instructional methods to achieve successful student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Objective 3.1: The program will construct a systematic process of assessment for the purposes of planning and continual improvement.</p>	<p>3.1.A. Identified courses in each curriculum phase will incorporate information literacy assessments to determine student learning at the course level, department and school levels.</p> <p>3.1.B. The plan will integrate an assessment timeline that allows for reflection and plan modification.</p>
	<p>Objective 3.2: The program will measure progress towards its goals and objectives.</p>	<p>3.2.A. The assessment plan will include periodic reviews of student outcomes to determine the effectiveness of information literacy course strategies.</p> <p>3.2.B. Program administrators and faculty teaching identified courses will review performance indicators and student outcomes to determine adequate progress toward goals and</p>

	<p>Objective 3.3: The program will use multiple methods of assessment.</p>	<p>objectives.</p> <p>3.3.A. The assessment plan for the QEP will include individual course assignment rubrics for use in measuring student progress in the area of developing information literacy skills.</p> <p>3.3.B. The assessment plan for the QEP will include the administration of standardized information literacy assessments to random samples of students at various points in the assessment timeline.</p> <p>3.3.C. University faculty, staff, and students will be asked to provide feedback on QEP progress and activities through survey instruments and other informal data-gathering opportunities.</p>
<p>Goal 4 Collaboration and Outreach: The University will facilitate communication among students, disciplinary faculty, librarians, staff and administrators to promote, through an intentional and collaborative focus of commitment, continual progress towards the information literacy program’s goals and objectives.</p>	<p>Objective 4.1: The program will articulate and disseminate a coherent statement describing its purposes, values and goals.</p>	<p>4.1.A. The QEP will be addressed in multiple communication venues involving students, faculty and staff to reiterate program purpose and focus.</p> <p>4.1.B. The complete QEP will be made available to all campus constituents as an electronic document and posted on the University website.</p>
	<p>Objective 4.2: The program will encourage a sustained university-wide discussion of issues relating to the cultural, social and political forces that shape, and are shaped by, information.</p>	<p>4.2.A. Activities in identified courses will be designed to promote ongoing communication of the importance of information literacy in formulating contemporary thought.</p> <p>4.2.B. University faculty and staff will participate in campus conversations relating to role of information literacy in dialogue.</p>
	<p>Objective 4.3: The program will be collaborative and will encourage the widest participation by students, administrators, librarians, and faculty and staff members to expedite its success.</p>	<p>4.3.A. The QEP goals, objectives and activities will involve students at all levels of the university academic programs.</p> <p>4.3.B. University faculty and staff will participate in multiple opportunities for QEP involvement at the program, departmental and school levels.</p>

Curricular Integration: Theoretical Foundation for the Matrix of Learning Outcomes

While Bloom’s “Taxonomy of Educational Objectives” (1956) has fundamentally informed the development of the curriculum structure of the LINC—on QEP, it is important to note that the educational objectives described by Bloom are not necessarily linear or sequential in application and implementation. In the taxonomy, the crucial domain of affective learning encompasses emotional and motivational attitudes, values, interests, appreciation and feelings that tend to share an inherently unsettled character. As a result, changes in behavior and learning outcomes will be subject to fluctuation. Student skill levels in the psychomotor domain may also deviate from the outcomes anticipated by classification systems, and will be dependent on many variable and relatively indeterminate factors. For these reasons, even the best classification system cannot always accurately project the progress or degree of student learning. Nonetheless, within these limits, Bloom’s taxonomy has been shown to yield significant insight and predictability.

Throughout the plan’s implementation an emphasis will be placed on instructors’ flexibility to accommodate diverse learning styles. The necessity of this emphasis is supported by Gardner’s (1991, 1996) important work on the development of human cognitive capacities, in which the identification of multiple intelligences suggests the need for both a curriculum and a set of pedagogical practices sufficiently versatile to encourage the wide variety of abilities each student uniquely possesses. By adapting measurable learning outcomes guided by comprehensive professional development, LMU will focus on optimal learning for every student. Gardner’s further recognition of the multicultural nature of intelligence makes it equally crucial to develop a process at LMU for collaboratively acquiring, evaluating, and applying the information through which real issues are identified, and problems are solved for the advancement of all stakeholders.

LMU’s commitment to information literacy instruction is not new. Since 2006, INFL 100, the University’s stand-alone information literacy course, has been a graduation requirement for all students. However, current scholarship strongly indicates that successful teaching and learning occurs most

effectively in an integrated curriculum, and in authentic contexts, rather than in the relatively compartmentalized environment of stand-alone classes. As Rockman (2003, p.17) writes, “Including information literacy in general education courses is a key strategy for closing the gap across curricular boundaries, because general education courses form the foundation of a common learning experience for all students. Such courses help students to make intellectual connections between disciplines, solve problems, and think deeply, independently, and critically outside of their major areas of study.” Indeed, the integration of information literacy throughout the curriculum provides clarity about the purposes and priorities of results-based assignments conceived in close coordination with, and in support of, the efforts of colleagues. At the same time, instructors, through the conceptual lenses of exploration, interpretation, application and synthesis, will be able to assess student learning within the close focus of individual courses.

Curriculum has always been the hothouse of pedagogical reform. In recent years, nothing less than a paradigm shift in curriculum design has occurred as traditional higher education methodology increasingly evolves in the direction of an integrated approach (Jensen, 2000). Central to this new educational philosophy are the following foundational premises: 1) the purpose of education is to perpetuate democracy; 2) reality-based curriculum is more effective than traditional, abstract models; and 3) curricula should be based on exploration, discovery, and application of real-world concepts (Levin, 1996). Significantly, in most universities and colleges these premises have led to the development of information literacy integration into specific courses. The stand-alone course, while by no means ineffective, allows limited opportunity to develop and reinforce increasingly more complex research and information literacy skills. The embedded curriculum, by contrast, attaches information literacy instruction, semester after semester, to real-world application.

Information literacy, at the most basic level, is the ability to find, evaluate, and use the best information from an ever-increasingly chaotic array of sources. The most efficacious venue for fostering students’ improving abilities is the content-area classroom within a structured framework of targeted skills and competencies that have been individualized for specific educational levels and different types of

courses (O’Leary, 1997). Such an approach avoids the pitfalls of redundant or uneven instruction. Moreover, as students acquire more sophisticated information literacy skills, they will do so in the context of the content area of their chosen majors, providing opportunities for the application of these skills in self-evidently meaningful ways.

The LMU QEP will, therefore, evince a pedagogical philosophy that promotes a system of integrated knowledge and leadership development, with the expectation that educators will take the initiative to define the information literacy needs of their disciplines, set achievable learning goals and deadlines, develop meaningful tasks, encourage frank dialogue, and value the efforts of students and colleagues. The type of progressive curriculum mapping approach used to implement the QEP will rely on the willingness of all constituents to reach across professional and disciplinary boundaries to ensure that information literacy develops into an organic feature of the university’s learning culture. Ultimately, every aspect of the QEP’s implementation will emanate from this hub of intra-institutional collaboration.

The **LINC—on** QEP proposes the implementation of a comprehensive course-integrated informational literacy and developmental research skills program characterized by sound pedagogical practices and sustained by collaboration among disciplinary faculty, librarians, staff and administrators. As LMU prepares to implement its information literacy QEP, the learning community recognizes its role in guiding, facilitating, and motivating learners. Because effective teaching requires professional training and commitment, the types of planning, implementing and assessing components that will be employed will be evaluated through a continual or cyclical process that increases the quality of instruction and promotes engaged and active student learning. The goals and resources adopted to facilitate information literacy standards will be continually scrutinized and improved as recommended by a close analysis of assessment results.

VIII. Engaging the Campus Community in the QEP

Campus Conversations

Although both formal and informal discussions among QEP committee members and the broader University community had occurred during much of the previous year, an organized campaign to advance

campus awareness of the QEP was launched in October, 2008. Promotional posters and mass e-mails (See Appendix F) were widely distributed to motivate interest in the University's QEP, and information literacy contests and student projects were planned for the fall and spring semesters. Concurrently, QEP committee members initiated a series of question and answer sessions with some of LMU's most important and significantly representative constituencies.

Starting on October 21, QEP committee members met with the LMU Faculty Senate and, later in the evening, with student representatives of the University's fraternities and sororities. Subsequent meetings, following the same, or a closely similar, agenda occurred on October 27, 2008, between QEP committee members and the Student Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC); on November 5, 2008, with both the University's Lincoln Ambassadors and with Student Senate and Student Government representatives; and on November 13, 2008, with members of the Staff Senate.

At these meetings, committee members took questions and solicited advice on a wide range of issues concerning the progress of the plan, and discussed ways to increase student and faculty engagement with the educational aims of the University's information literacy efforts. Additional meetings were scheduled in November and December with the J. Frank White Academy Student Council and Student Government representatives of the DeBusk College of Osteopathic Medicine.

As a result of these meetings, several of the above groups have undertaken independent information literacy projects. For example, the Lincoln Ambassadors, an honor society of student leaders who, in coordination with the Office of Student Support Services (SSS), provide service leadership to the University and local community, have begun to collect material for the development of their own Wikipedia page. Other groups have volunteered to support the various initiatives of the QEP's on-going promotional activities by contributing text for the committee's mass e-mails or assisting with the organization of contests and special events. A timeline of the committee's promotional initiatives appears below. Please note that the timeline only lists activities occurring prior to the SACS on-site visit on February 17-19, 2009; however, the committee's QEP publicity campaign will continue throughout the

plan's five-year tenure. Awareness of the meaning and significance of the QEP by all of the University's constituencies will be a critical factor for its eventual success.

Timeline for Generating Awareness of the QEP (Prior to SACS on-site visit Feb 17-19, 2009)

October 1-12, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st phase of poster campaign begins. Introduce the acronym, "QEP". • Poster(s) sent in mass e-mailing to all students, faculty and staff. • Posters displayed on LMU closed circuit television.
October 13-27, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd phase of poster campaign begins. Introduce the term, "Quality Enhancement Plan" to all LMU students and faculty. Connect this term to the concept of information. • Poster(s) sent in mass e-mailing to all students, faculty and staff. • Posters displayed on LMU closed circuit television. • First of regular, continuing QEP supplements to the CampusLinc (in which QEP can be explained in more detail). • QEP haiku on message board near LMU ballpark. • Put up QEP FaceBook and MySpace pages. • Meet with University's Director of Marketing and Public Relations to discuss and plan future initiatives.
October 27-November 10, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd phase of poster campaign begins. Introduce the term, "Information Literacy". • Announce and publicize \$200 LINC—on logo contest. • Begin Q&A sessions with student groups. • Continue mass e-mailings, closed circuit television exposure, CampusLinc supplements.
November 10-21, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4th phase of poster campaign begins. Introduce the information literacy program title: "LINC—on: Learning Is Now Connected". Reinforce connection between information literacy and QEP. • Introduce Information Literacy "On-line Scavenger Hunt". Students will search on web for answers to questions posed by the QEP Committee and respond via a QEP e-mail address. Gift certificates will be awarded to randomly selected students with the correct answers. • Begin QEP t-shirt and baseball cap giveaways in cafeteria, etc. With giveaway, provide QEP literature. • Continue Q&A sessions with student groups. • Continue mass e-mailings, closed circuit television exposure, CampusLinc supplements, LINC—on logo contest publicity.
November 30-December 13, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5th phase of poster campaign begins. Continue to reinforce connection between information literacy and QEP. Continue

	<p>gift certificate awards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue mass e-mailings, closed circuit television exposure, CampusLinc supplements, On-line Scavenger Hunt, LINC—on logo contest publicity, t-shirt giveaways, Q&A sessions with student groups.
January 5-19, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6th phase of poster campaign begins. Continue to reinforce connection between information literacy and QEP. Continue gift certificate awards. • Continue mass e-mailings, closed circuit television exposure, CampusLinc supplements, On-line Scavenger Hunt, LINC—on logo contest publicity, t-shirt giveaways, Q&A sessions with student groups.
Feb 3, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logo Prize Winner announced at Convocation.
January 19-Feb 19, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th phase of poster campaign begins. Continue to reinforce connection between information literacy and QEP. Continue gift certificate awards. • Continue mass e-mailings, closed circuit television exposure, CampusLinc supplements, On-line Scavenger Hunt, LINC—on logo contest publicity, t-shirt giveaways, Q&A sessions with student groups. • Introduce new LINC—on logo on promotional items.

IX. QEP ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Comprehensive and ongoing assessments of the effectiveness of the LMU information literacy program will be used to advise and direct the improvement of curriculum, and the development of diverse instructional methods to achieve successful student learning outcomes. Central to the plan is the development of information literacy initiatives that impact student learning both directly through curricular and program refinements, and indirectly, through faculty, staff and community involvement within a culture of information literacy. Assessment occurs at every level of the plan, but, as part of an effort to promote the QEP’s widespread acceptance, it is structured in such a way that it avoids the kind of excessive rigidity that would tend to stifle individual faculty initiative. Indeed the plan’s successful implementation will depend on the independent and informed professional judgment of instructors and library staff.

The QEP assessment plan will provide direct evidence of student learning outcomes through qualitative and quantitative course-embedded measures, and will include the use of standardized instruments to measure cumulative information literacy knowledge. Indirect learning outcomes will focus on analysis of existing methods of acquiring survey data that gathers reflections about information literacy learning or secondary evidence of its existence. These outcomes will provide data to support refinements in information literacy initiatives. A cadre of students will be followed via the iSkills, and other assessment measures, throughout their college careers. For example, the comparison of SEWS results from freshman year and senior year for the class of 2013 will be an important indicator of overall student learning outcomes specific to the LMU QEP. Finally, assessments of learning will need to align with the major, as well as to the students' educational level, and the development of specific school and departmental assessments will be an important activity supported by the Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence.

A second critical area of focus will be program-level assessment. Program assessment provides an on-going process of systematic analyses of assessment data. Not only will it determine the degree to which the QEP is progressing against a schedule specified by participating faculty, it will also provide for a review of assessment data at the department or program level and inform a determination of the appropriate actions necessary to attain successful outcomes. (See Appendix G).

Throughout the plan's implementation, student learning outcomes will be reviewed and realigned as needed. Evidence for curricular adjustments based on results derived from the various assessment measures will be considered periodically during the school year, and will receive particularly close attention from the faculty and staff participants of the annual summer institute. Periodic summary reports of the progress of the program's implementation will be distributed to the campus community. As the QEP proceeds, the accumulated data derived from student learning and program assessment will provide baseline information for subsequent comparisons and identify the best practices for enhancing information literacy instruction across the curriculum.

Primary responsibility for the assessment component of the **LINC—on** QEP will be delegated, during the plan’s development, to the QEP committee chair and, starting in the summer of 2009, to the QEP director. Important assessment responsibilities will also be shared by the chair of the assessment subcommittee. The director and staff of the Department of Institutional Research will assist, as required, with data collection, analysis and report activities. Administrative coordination of QEP assessment activities and support for budget expenditures associated with research and assessment will belong to the Office of Academic Affairs.

Rationale for Selection of Assessment Measures

As identified in the American Association for Higher Education’s (AAHEA) *Nine Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning* (1992), assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multi-dimensional, integrated, and revealed performance over time. The assessment subcommittee carefully investigated existing University information literacy data and began a process of determining how best to collect, assess, and interpret these data to make improvements in student learning.

Planning and needs-assessment data were obtained through analysis of extant institutional data and provided support for the implementation of an information literacy program at LMU. These data were gleaned from a variety of existing University assessments including preliminary SEWS program data, the Carnegie Vincent Library’s information literacy pre-test (Fall 2001), the National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Spring 2006), the LibQUAL+ Survey (Spring 2006), and the Institutional Effectiveness Zoomerang Survey (Summer 2007). Additional support for the QEP information literacy initiative is articulated in the KISSES project program rationale.

Assessment Instruments

- LibQual will be used to solicit, track, understand, and act upon users' opinions of service quality. These services are offered to the library community by the Association of College and Research Libraries. The program's centerpiece is a rigorously tested Web-based survey bundled with training that helps libraries assess and improve library services, change organizational culture, and market the library.
- The National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE) obtains, on an annual basis, information from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development.
- The Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) was developed, and continues to be maintained, by Kent State University in Ohio in collaboration with the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). This instrument is appropriate for the assessment of the QEP's expected learning outcomes as both have been developed using the ACRL standards as a paradigm. In fact, the QEP's learning outcomes can easily be mapped to the "Skill Sets" assessed in the test because the latter have been directly regrouped from the ACRL's information literacy objectives and their numbering refers to the ACRL document, "Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction: A Model Statement for Academic Libraries": "the first digit is the ACRL standard, the second is the ACRL performance indicator, the third is the ACRL outcome, and the fourth is the ACRL objective" (Radcliff et al., 2007, para. 2). Results from the following "SAILS Skill Sets" are used to assess expected QEP learning outcomes: DEVELOPING A RESEARCH STRATEGY; SELECTING FINDING TOOLS; SEARCHING; USING FINDING TOOL FEATURES; RETRIEVING SOURCES; EVALUATING SOURCES; DOCUMENTING SOURCES; UNDERSTANDING ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES. (See Appendix H for how the domain assessed by SAILS conforms to the ACRL Standards.)
- iSkills (formerly ICT Literacy Assessment) from the Educational Testing Service, measures students' ability to navigate, critically evaluate and make sense of the proliferation of information available through digital technology and helps identify where further curriculum development may be needed. It is closely aligned with the ACRL Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education from which the QEP's learning outcomes are also derived. Results from the following "iSkills Areas" are used to assess expected QEP learning outcomes: DEFINE: Understand and articulate the scope of an information problem in order to facilitate the electronic search for information; ACCESS: Collect and/or retrieve information in digital environments. Information sources might be web pages, databases, discussion groups, e-mail or online descriptions of print media; EVALUATE: Judge whether information satisfies an information problem by determining authority, bias, timeliness, relevance and other aspects of materials; MANAGE: Organize information to help you or others find it later; INTEGRATE: Interpret and integrate information (e.g., by using digital tools) to synthesize, summarize, compare and contrast information from multiple sources; CREATE: Adapt, apply design or construct information in digital environments; COMMUNICATE: Disseminate information tailored to a particular audience in an effective digital format (ETS, 2007). Sub-scores for each of these proficiencies is included in the iSkills report and may be compared with the overall scores and sub-scores of other test-takers from the same test administration. (See Appendix I for how the domain assessed by iSkills aligns with the ACRL standards.)

- Zoomerang is a survey program used by the University to administer various surveys assessing opinions regarding needs and the effectiveness of services and programs provided.
- Turnitin Originality Checking will identify online plagiarism and students' use of proper citation.
- A standardized SEWs paper rubric was designed by the KISSES project participants and is being piloted this semester. (See Appendix E).
- Publicity data will be acquired through analysis of solicited and unsolicited electronic responses.
- Q&A, town hall and focus group discussions will encourage University-wide participation in, and response to, the QEP.
- Rubrics to assess peer mentors, the agendas of the summer institutes, and embedded class assessment will be developed by shareholders.

Justification

By identifying existing information or processes that support assessment and that are aligned with the QEP program mission, goal and learning outcomes, the assessment subcommittee recognized the need for additional direct, formative and summative data on information literacy student learning. Although indirect information literacy assessment data had been collected through LibQUAL+ and NSSE and direct information literacy assessment data collected through the SEWS program, there appeared to be a further need for a comprehensive standards-based evaluation of student learning.

Conceptual Considerations

Following their analyses of the aforementioned findings, the assessment subcommittee discussed how best to collect, interpret and assess information literacy data for continual improvements in program decisions directly influencing student learning. Through careful review of commercially available assessment instruments, and with particular attention given to the nine guidelines delineated by the AAHEA, the assessment subcommittee recommended the adoption of two psychometrically sound standardized information literacy instruments. The subcommittee also reviewed current course assessment strategies and recommended the incorporation of embedded information literacy measures within individual courses and programs. In every case, research-based best practices will guide instruction in individual classes.

A consideration of the overall purpose of the QEP information literacy assessment program influenced the choice of instruments selected for piloting. As noted above, one such instrument is the iSkills standardized assessment. This instrument is case-based and provides extensive assessment of information literacy skills. The format captures the depth and breadth of information literacy and treats it as a broad set of skills that contribute to outcome analysis across curriculum and discipline. iSkills conforms precisely to the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, from which the **LINC—on** QEP’s learning outcomes were also derived, and provides a detailed summary of findings. Because of the costs of time and resources necessary to collect and analyze these data, a random sample of first-time freshman—approximately 35%—will be assessed throughout their undergraduate program. Relevant student learning outcome data will be utilized to identify strengths and challenges facing the information literacy initiative.

Also selected for use as an assessment instrument is the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) made available from Kent State University. Like iSkills, it is based on the ACRL standards, conveniently aligning it with the LMU QEP’s expected learning outcomes. In addition to the qualities described above in the “Assessment Instruments” section, SAILS is standardized, easily administered, and has been shown to be valid and reliable. It uses a multiple choice format designed to provide data for internal assessment or benchmark data.

As noted in the SEWS paper review, the major challenges to the full implementation of a comprehensive assessment plan is the utilization of data to affect student learning through informed and systematic program decisions. By implementing direct standardized assessment procedures, however, information literacy student learning baseline data will be usefully obtained.

Of particular importance will be the adoption of the SEWS rubric, described above, for all subject areas with the understanding that additional content and/or course specific goals and objectives would be required as part of the assessment process. The assessment loop will be closed between curricular goals and objectives when specific assessment data (i.e., the results of benchmark assessment) are incorporated into the QEP planning process. An electronic link connecting the SEWS rubric (already located on the

“Faculty Tools” page of the LMU website) to an Excel file with identified benchmarks—as well as additional data from iSkills and SAILS—will be made available to information literacy instructors. As measured by the SEWS research rubric (see Appendix E) and content-specific research rubrics, the benchmarks will be set according to the following standards of competency (conforming, here, specifically, to a response of either: *Agree* or *Strongly Agree* on the rubric).

- J. Frank White Seniors: 65% competency level.
- LMU Freshmen: 70% competency level.
- LMU Sophomores: 75% competency level.
- LMU Juniors: 80% competency level.
- LMU Seniors: 85% competency level.
- LMU Graduate Students: 90% competency level.

Additional assessment data will be collected through embedded measures connected to information literacy student learning goals and objectives. Information collected from the KISSES pilot program will be used to monitor QEP progress and will serve as a model for integration of embedded assessment across academic programs and disciplines. Baseline data will be documented through the use of Zoomerang, LibQual, NSSE, iSkills, SAILS and SEWS. Finally, a program rubric has been developed to assess the success of the QEP itself (See Appendix G).

QEP Goals and Objectives Aligned with Assessment Strategies

Curricular Goals	Specific Objectives	Expected Outcome	Assessment Method/Benchmark
<p>Goal 1 Student Learning: Students will acquire information literacy competencies and skills at both the basic and more advanced research levels.</p>	<p>Objective 1.1: Students will be able to ascertain the extent of information needed.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.1.A. identify acceptable content, process, and product for designing research-based assignments.</p> <p>1.1.B. explore information sources to establish and increase topic familiarity in developing a writing concept.</p> <p>1.1.C. modify information into a manageable but comprehensive focus when working with new information.</p> <p>1.1.D. demonstrate an understanding of appropriate vocabulary in developing the content of discourse.</p> <p>1.1.E. analyze the validity of new information with regards to its inclusion in discourse.</p> <p>1.1.F. demonstrate an understanding of the process of integrating researched information with original thought.</p>	<p>Standardized rubric (see Appendix E) evaluation of SEWS papers adapted for content specialties. Applications: 1.1 A-F. (See SEWS rubric questions 2, 3 and reference check list.)</p> <p>Standardized assessment of all incoming Freshmen using the SAILS assessment instrument. SAILS results provide data for internal assessment and benchmark data. Applications: 1.1 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Develop a Research Strategy” Skill Set. 1.1 B,D,E: SAILS Results for items in the “Select Finding Tools” Skill Set. 1.1 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Searching” Skill Set. 1.1 A,B: SAILS Results for items in the “Using Finding Tools” Skill Set. 1.1 A,B,E,F: SAILS Results for items in the “Evaluating Sources” Skill Set. 1.1 F: SAILS Results for items in the “Documenting Sources” Skill Set. 1.1 F: SAILS Results for items in the “Understanding Economic, Legal and Social Issues” Skill Set.</p> <p>Standardized assessment of 35% of incoming Freshman using the iSkills assessment instrument. A random sample of first-time freshman will be assessed and followed throughout their undergraduate program. iSkills results allow for item analysis. Applications: 1.1 A-C: Results for items in the “Define” iSkills Area. 1.1 B-D: Results for Items in the “Access” iSkills Area. 1.1 B-E: Results for items in the “Evaluate” iSkills Area. 1.1 C: Results for items in the “Manage” iSkills Area. 1.1 E,F: Results for items in the “Integrate” iSkills</p>

			<p>Area.</p> <p>Instructor-designed, course embedded assessments. To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • practicum in the library • quizzes • written evaluation assignments • collaborative in-class learning assignments
	<p>Objective 1.2: Students will be able to execute appropriate and efficient information searches.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.2.A. select efficient and effective investigative methods for researching information.</p> <p>1.2.B. identify keywords, synonyms and appropriate terms for streamlining the investigation of information.</p> <p>1.2.C. construct appropriate search strategies with proper retrieval source when gathering information.</p>	<p>Standardized rubric evaluation of SEWS papers adapted for content specialties. Applications: 1.2 A-C. (See SEWS rubric questions 2, 3 and reference check list.)</p> <p>Standardized assessment of all incoming Freshmen using the SAILS assessment instrument. SAILS results will provide data for internal assessment and benchmark data. Applications: 1.2 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Develop a Research Strategy” Skill Set. 1.2 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Select Finding Tools” Skill Set. 1.2 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Searching” Skill Set. 1.2 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Using Finding Tools” Skill Set.</p> <p>Standardized assessment of 35% of incoming Freshman using the iSkills assessment instrument. A random sample of first-time freshman will be assessed and followed throughout their undergraduate program. iSkills results allow item analysis. Applications: 1.2 A-C: Results for items in the “Define” iSkills Area. 1.2 A-C: Results for items in the “Access” iSkills Area.</p> <p>Instructor-designed, course embedded assessments. To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • practicum in the library • quizzes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written evaluation assignments • collaborative in-class learning assignments • research journal/portfolio • annotated bibliography with information about the search strategy
	<p>Objective 1.3: Students will be able to evaluate information sources critically.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.3.A. analyze the validity, reliability and accuracy of sources and material(s).</p> <p>1.3.B. recognize the context of inaccuracy, deception, prejudice and manipulation with regard to evaluating information sources.</p>	<p>Standardized rubric evaluation of SEWS papers adapted for content specialties. Applications: 1.3 A-B: (See SEWS rubric questions 2, 3 and reference check list.)</p> <p>Standardized assessment of all incoming Freshmen using the SAILS assessment instrument. SAILS results will provide data for internal assessment and benchmark data. Applications: 1.3 A-B: SAILS Results for items in the “Evaluating Sources” Skill Set.</p> <p>Standardized assessment of 35% of incoming Freshman using the iSkills assessment instrument. A random sample of first-time freshman will be assessed and followed throughout their undergraduate program. iSkills results allow item analysis. Applications: 1.3 A-B: Results for items in the “Evaluate” iSkills Area.</p> <p>Instructor-designed course embedded assessments. To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written evaluation assignments • collaborative in-class learning assignments • practical exercises
	<p>Objective 1.4: Students will be able to synthesize selected information to support their own ideas.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.4.A. ascertain the relationship, congruence, and implication among multiple sources.</p> <p>1.4.B. construct new abstracts or ideas from investigative material.</p> <p>1.4.C. relate new evidence to support</p>	<p>Standardized rubric evaluation of SEWS papers adapted for content specialties. Applications: 1.4 A-C: (See SEWS rubric questions 2, 3 and reference check list.)</p> <p>Standardized assessment of all incoming Freshmen using the SAILS assessment instrument. SAILS results will provide data for internal assessment and benchmark data. Applications: 1.4 A: Results for items in the SAILS Results for</p>

		<p>prior knowledge.</p>	<p>“Evaluating Sources” Skill Set.</p> <p>Standardized assessment of 35% of incoming Freshman using the iSkills assessment instrument. A random sample of first-time freshman will be assessed and followed throughout their undergraduate program. Applications: 1.4 A-C: Results for items in the “Evaluate” iSkills Area. 1.4 A-C: “Integrate” iSkills Area Results.</p> <p>Instructor-designed course embedded assessments. To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written evaluation assignments • collaborative in-class learning assignments • practical exercises • research journal/portfolio
	<p>Objective 1.5: Students will be able to use information to achieve specific, desired ends.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.5.A. draw valid and reliable conclusions from the analysis of new data or investigative research.</p> <p>1.5.B. apply discipline-appropriate techniques when evaluating material or resources for inclusion in core content areas.</p> <p>1.5.C. articulate knowledge and skills of the topic which has undergone investigative research.</p>	<p>Standardized rubric evaluation of SEWS papers adapted for content specialties. Applications: 1.5 A-C: (See SEWS rubric questions 2, 3 and reference check list.)</p> <p>Standardized assessment of all incoming Freshmen using the SAILS assessment instrument. SAILS results will provide data for internal assessment and benchmark data. Applications: 1.5 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Evaluating Sources” Skill Set.</p> <p>Standardized assessment of 35% of incoming Freshman using the iSkills assessment instrument. A random sample of first-time freshman will be assessed and followed throughout their undergraduate program. Applications: 1.5 A-C: Results for items in the “Evaluate” iSkills Area. 1.5 A-C: Results for items in the “Integrate” iSkills Area.</p> <p>Instructor-designed course embedded assessments. To include:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written evaluation assignments • collaborative in-class learning assignments • practical exercises • research journal/portfolio • SEWS paper proposal
	<p>Objective 1.6: Students will have an appreciation of the social and political questions concerning the uses of information.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.6.A. demonstrate an understanding of privacy and security in both printed and electronic environments.</p> <p>1.6.B. communicate clearly for an intended audience.</p> <p>1.6.C. use the appropriate process to attain information.</p> <p>1.6.D. produce a final product that best supports the purpose of the investigation.</p>	<p>Standardized assessment of all incoming Freshmen using the SAILS assessment instrument. SAILS results will provide data for internal assessment and benchmark data. Applications: 1.6 A,C: SAILS Results for items in the “Retrieving Sources” Skill Set.</p> <p>Standardized assessment of 35% of incoming Freshman using the iSkills assessment instrument. A random sample of first-time freshman will be assessed and followed throughout their undergraduate program. Applications: 1.6 D: Results for items in the “Communicate” iSkills Area.</p> <p>Instructor-designed course embedded assessments. To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written evaluation assignments • collaborative in-class learning assignments • practical exercises • research journal/portfolio • SEWS paper proposal
	<p>Objective 1.7: Students will search for and make use of information ethically and legally.</p>	<p>The student will:</p> <p>1.7.A. demonstrate understanding of intellectual property and its ethical use.</p> <p>1.7.B. comply with legal and ethical use of electronic systems and paper searches.</p> <p>1.7.C. demonstrate proper documentation of investigative materials.</p>	<p>Standardized rubric (see Appendix E) evaluation of SEWS papers adapted for content specialties. Applications: 1.7 A-C: (See SEWS rubric question 4.)</p> <p>Standardized assessment of all incoming Freshmen using the SAILS assessment instrument. SAILS results will provide data for internal assessment and benchmark data. Applications: 1.7 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Documenting Sources” Skill Set. 1.7 A-C: SAILS Results for items in the “Understanding Economic, Legal and Social Issues” Skill Set.</p>

			<p>1.7 A-C: Certificate of authorship affirming students’ ethical and legal use of information</p> <p>1.7 A-C: Review of Turnitin Originality Checking to identify online plagiarism and use of proper citation. Instructor-designed, course embedded assessments. To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written evaluation assignments • collaborative in-class learning assignments • practical exercises • research journal/portfolio
<p>Goal 2 Curriculum Development and Integration: The LMU information literacy program will have a clearly articulated and progressively more sophisticated course-integrated curriculum that will communicate its goals to, and—by extending opportunities for professional development and collaboration—solicit the participation of the entire University learning community.</p>	<p>Objective 2.1: The program will support and encourage the development of diverse and effective teaching methods that give emphasis to student-centered learning.</p>	<p>2.1.A. Faculty in identified courses will integrate instructional strategies that incorporates individual learning styles when teaching information literacy skills.</p> <p>2.1.B. Faculty in identified courses will incorporate research-based best practices for teaching information literacy.</p> <p>2.1.C. The Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence will develop workshops to promote faculty development in the use of research-based practices and differentiated instructional strategies.</p>	<p>2.1 A-C: Evaluation of SEWS papers using a standardized rubric.</p> <p>2.1 A-C: Standardized direct assessments such as SAILS.</p> <p>2.1 A-C: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang survey (Zoomerang surveys will be developed specifically for this purpose.)</p> <p>2.1 A-C: Review of the results of instructor-made assessments.</p> <p>2.1.C: Survey evaluations of workshop participants.</p>

	<p>Objective 2.2: The program will coordinate the integration of information literacy competencies at all disciplinary levels and in the curriculum of every academic program and school.</p>	<p>2.2.A . Course curriculum will be designed to promote innovation and excellence in teaching through collaboration between faculty and students.</p> <p>2.2.B. Faculty will develop a tiered curriculum guide that defines the standards, objectives, activities, rubrics and assessments appropriate for each tier and discipline.</p> <p>2.2.C. Faculty will create a glossary of informational literacy terms for implementation where appropriate at academic discipline levels.</p>	<p>2.2 A-B: Evaluation of SEWS papers using a standardized rubric.</p> <p>2.2 A-B: Standardized direct assessments such as SAILS, iSkills.</p> <p>2.2 A-B: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang survey.</p> <p>Review of instructor-made assessments and syllabi.</p> <p>Review and evaluation of curriculum guide.</p>
	<p>Objective 2.3: The program will assist faculty in developing curriculum for both basic and advanced, discipline-specific information literacy and research skills.</p>	<p>2.3.A. Professional development workshops, seminars, institutes, and conferences will be developed on a continuous timeline for faculty use in integrating information literacy classroom techniques.</p> <p>2.3.B. Discipline and level specific training modules will be developed to assist faculty with specific information literacy needs for course inclusion.</p> <p>2.3.C. Faculty will develop where appropriate a list of informational literacy resources for inclusion in course syllabi.</p> <p>2.3.D. Faculty will develop scaffolded instructional units from basic to advance for inclusion where appropriate in course curriculum.</p>	<p>2.3 A-B: Evaluation of SEWS papers using a standardized rubric.</p> <p>2.3 A-B: Standardized direct assessments such as SAILS, iSkills.</p> <p>2.3 A-B,D: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang survey.</p> <p>Results of instructor-made assessments.</p> <p>2.3 A: Evaluations of workshops, seminars, institutes, and conferences.</p> <p>2.3 C-D: Review of course syllabi.</p>
	<p>Objective 2.4: The program will develop web-based information tutorials and other</p>	<p>2.4.A. The Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence will facilitate opportunities for faculty development in the area of information literacy.</p>	<p>2.4 A: Evaluation of SEWS papers using a standardized rubric: 2.4 A.</p> <p>2.4.A:Standardized direct assessments including</p>

	resources for general and specific use.		<p>SAILS, iSkills.</p> <p>2.4 A: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang survey.</p> <p>Results of instructor-made assessments.</p>
	Objective 2.5: Program opportunities will support cross-disciplinary efforts for collaboration in support of student learning.	<p>2.5.A. Faculty and library staff will collaborate to design embedded units of information literacy instruction within course assignments.</p> <p>2.5.B. Academic major program faculty will partner with general education faculty to ensure discipline-specific information literacy skills are incorporated into freshman and sophomore level courses within the Lincoln Liberal Arts Core.</p>	<p>2.5 A-B: Evaluation of SEWS papers using a standardized rubric.</p> <p>2.5 A-B: Standardized direct assessments including as SAILS, iSkills.</p> <p>2.5 A-B: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang survey.</p> <p>Results of instructor-made assessments.</p>
Goal 3 Program Assessment and Evaluation: Comprehensive and ongoing assessments of the effectiveness of the LMU information literacy program will be used to advise and direct the improvement of curriculum, and the development of diverse instructional methods to achieve successful student learning outcomes.	Objective 3.1: The program will construct a systematic process of assessment for the purposes of planning and continual improvement.	<p>3.1.A. Identified courses in each curriculum phase will incorporate information literacy assessments to determine student learning at the course level, department and school levels.</p> <p>3.1.B. The plan will integrate an assessment timeline that allows for reflection and plan modification.</p>	<p>3.1 A-B: Standardized rubric for SEWS papers; Excel Spreadsheet will collect data from SEWS rubric: http://www.lmunet.edu/factools/bb/index.html.</p> <p>3.1 A-B: Standardized direct assessments including SAILS and iSkills.</p> <p>3.1 A-B: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as the LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang surveys.</p>
	Objective 3.2: The program will measure progress towards its goals	3.2.A. The assessment plan will include periodic reviews of student outcomes to determine the	3.2 A-B: Standardized rubric for SEWS papers; Excel Spreadsheet will collect data from SEWS rubric: http://www.lmunet.edu/factools/bb/index.html .

	and objectives.	effectiveness of information literacy course strategies. 3.2.B. Program administrators and faculty teaching identified courses will review performance indicators and student outcomes to determine adequate progress toward goals and objectives.	3.2 A-B: Standardized direct assessments including SAILS and iSkills. 3.2 A-B: Analyses of standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as the LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang surveys.
	Objective 3.3: The program will use multiple methods of assessment.	3.3.A. The assessment plan for the QEP will include individual course assignment rubrics for use in measuring student progress in the area of developing information literacy skills. 3.3.B. The assessment plan for the QEP will include the administration of standardized information literacy assessments to random samples of students at various points in the assessment timeline. 3.3.C. University faculty, staff, and students will be asked to provide feedback on QEP progress and activities through survey instruments and other informal data-gathering opportunities.	3.3 A-C: Standardized rubric for SEWS papers; Excel Spreadsheet will collect data from SEWS rubric: http://www.lmunet.edu/factools/bb/index.html . 3.3 A-C: Standardized direct assessments including SAILS and iSkills. 3.3 A-C: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as the LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang surveys.
Goal 4 Collaboration and Outreach: The University will facilitate communication among students, disciplinary faculty, librarians, staff and administrators to promote, through an intentional and collaborative focus of commitment, continual	Objective 4.1: The program will articulate and disseminate a coherent statement describing its purposes, values and goals.	4.1.A. The QEP will be addressed in multiple communication venues involving students, faculty and staff to reiterate program purpose and focus. 4.1.B. The complete QEP will be made available to all campus constituents as an electronic document and posted on the University website.	Evaluation of on-going promotional efforts will be derived from: 4.1 A-B: E-mail and other solicited and unsolicited responses to the QEP publicity campaign. 4.1 A-B: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang. 4.1 A-B: Focus group conversations with students, faculty and staff.

<p>progress towards the information literacy program's goals and objectives.</p>			<p>4.1 A-B: Survey evaluations of Town hall meetings and Q&A sessions with various University constituencies.</p>
	<p>Objective 4.2: The program will encourage a sustained university-wide discussion of issues relating to the cultural, social and political forces that shape, and are shaped by, information.</p>	<p>4.2.A. Activities in identified courses will be designed to promote ongoing communication of the importance of information literacy in formulating contemporary thought.</p> <p>4.2.B. University faculty and staff will participate in campus conversations relating to role of information literacy in dialogue.</p>	<p>Evaluation of on-going promotional efforts will be derived from:</p> <p>4.2 A-B E-mail and other solicited and unsolicited responses to the QEP publicity campaign.</p> <p>4.2 A-B: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang.</p> <p>4.2 A-B: Focus group conversations with students, faculty and staff.</p> <p>4.2 A-B: Survey evaluations of Town hall meetings and Q&A sessions with various University constituencies.</p>
	<p>Objective 4.3: The program will be collaborative and will encourage the widest participation by students, administrators, librarians, and faculty and staff members to expedite its success.</p>	<p>4.3.A. The QEP goals, objectives and activities will involve students at all levels of the university academic programs.</p> <p>4.3.B. University faculty and staff will participate in multiple opportunities for QEP involvement at the program, departmental and school levels.</p>	<p>Evaluation of on-going promotional efforts will be derived from:</p> <p>4.3 A-B: E-mail and other solicited and unsolicited responses to the QEP publicity campaign.</p> <p>4.3 A-B: Standardized and institutionally developed indirect assessments such as LibQual, NSSE and Zoomerang.</p> <p>4.3 A-B: Focus group conversations with students, faculty and staff.</p> <p>Survey evaluations of Town hall meetings and Q&A sessions with various University constituencies.</p>

Assessment Timeline

- 2007-2008
(QEP
Preparation:
Stage One)
- Conduct needs assessment through examination of current University information literacy data (NSSE, LibQual, Zoomerang). Principal Responsibility: Department of Institutional Effectiveness; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee.
 - Construct a systematic process of assessment for the purposes of planning and continual improvement. Principal Responsibility: QEP chair; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee.
 - Explore direct assessment methods for both formative and summative information literacy learner outcomes. Principal Responsibility: assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee.
 - Develop a glossary of assessment terms. Principal Responsibility: assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee.
 - Assess summer workshop through participants' responses. Principal Responsibility: QEP chair; assessment subcommittee chair.
- 2008-2009
(QEP
Preparation:
Stage Two)
- Pilot standardized assessments iSkills and SAILS within KISSES pilot classes. Principal Responsibility: assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; KISSES lead author and project participants.
 - Incorporate information literacy standards into syllabus template. Principal Responsibility: Course instructors.
 - As part of KISSES Pilot, assessment of information literacy through systematic use of information literacy rubric for SEWS papers in selected ENG 210 and PSYC 480 courses. Principal Responsibility: assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; KISSES lead author and project participants; course instructors.
 - Analyze success of publicity through student, faculty, staff feedback. Principal Responsibility: QEP committee chair.
 - Analyze results of standardized assessments from selected KISSES pilot. Principal Responsibility: KISSES lead author and project participants; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee
 - Obtain evaluative data from students in ENG 210 and PSYC 480 information literacy enriched courses to inform curriculum initiative. Principal Responsibility: KISSES project participants; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee.
 - Develop assessment criteria to evaluate Information Literacy Summer Institute. Principal Responsibility: QEP Committee Chair; information literacy librarian, course instructors.
 - Develop assessment rubric for peer mentors' information literacy skills. Principal Responsibility: QEP committee chair; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Receive outside evaluation of QEP draft document. Throughout the five-year life of the QEP, an outside evaluator will be retained to provide advice on the plan's assessment and implementation. Principal Responsibility: QEP committee chair
 - Complete QEP document. Principal Responsibility: QEP committee.

- 2009-2010
(Year One)
- Continue assessment of incoming freshman using standardized assessment. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Pilot assessment of graduating students at Frank White Academy. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Evaluate results of course embedded and standardized assessments to advise curriculum development of information literacy student learning. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Develop assessment criteria to select best student research papers in ENG 210/220. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
 - Assess effectiveness of assigning a common to incoming freshmen and discussed at seminars during orientation and in ENG 110 classes. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Using rubric evaluate success of information literacy peer tutors program. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** Director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** Director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
- 2010-2011
(Year Two)
- Continue to establish baseline information literacy data through analysis of embedded course assignments in additional courses: ENG 210/220 and targeted transfer students in LNCN 300. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
 - Continue to evaluate success of Information Literacy Summer Institute. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
 - Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
- 2011-2012
(Year Three)
- Continue to establish baseline data from tier instruction to additional courses: SEWS 300-level, Graduate MEd, MBA, MSN, PA courses. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
 - Continue to evaluate success of Information Literacy Summer Institute. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—**

- 2012-2013
(Year Four)
- **on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
 - Tier instruction to additional courses: SEWS 400-level, EdS, EdD, DO and JD classes. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Continue Information Literacy Summer Institute. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; course instructors.
 - Using embedded and other assessment measures, review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee, course instructors.
- 2012-2013
(Year Five)
- Review and evaluate curriculum strengths and weaknesses by student learning outcome assessment. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee; course instructors.
 - Continue Information Literacy Summer Institute. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian
 - Conduct needs assessment to further enhance information literacy student learner outcomes. Principal Responsibility: **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee
 - Institutional effectiveness will be a combination of the existing NSSE and Libqual surveys and will include yearly assessment of incoming freshman with the SAILS and pre-post assessment with the iSkills. Principal Responsibility: Department of Institutional Research; **LINC—on** director; information literacy librarian; assessment subcommittee chair and subcommittee.

X. INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY FOR THE INITIATION AND CONTINUATION OF THE PLAN

Faculty and Staff Development

Preparing faculty and staff to integrate information literacy into the LMU curriculum will be fundamental to achieving the program goals and objectives of the **LINC—on** QEP. As described above, professional development initiatives associated with the KISSES information literacy pilot culminated in June, 2008, with a workshop that provided an opportunity to revise the Psychology capstone and a general education English course. The 2008 workshop served as a model for a more ambitious annual Information Literacy Summer Institute to be inaugurated in June, 2009 and to continue for the next five years. Planned as a systematic and intensive immersion in information literacy instruction, it is anticipated that the institute will meet for three consecutive day-long group and individualized sessions

allowing faculty and staff sufficient time to collaborate on course revisions, develop shared instructional and assessment strategies, and become familiar with the most recent information technologies. These workshops will be led by LMU librarians and invited experts in information literacy from outside the University community, and assisted by LMU's information technologist. Participants will include QEP administrators and all instructors of courses in which, according to the implementation timeline, information literacy enrichment will be introduced. Participating faculty will receive one-time stipends as compensation for their attendance. In addition, during the following five years, undergraduate faculty, including adjunct faculty, who are the initial implementers of the information literacy curricula as scheduled in the implementation timeline outlined below, will receive an additional one-time stipend for attending the summer institute.

As the QEP is implemented, faculty and staff who have attended the institute in previous years will be an important human resource for its continued development. Current and former participants will meet with librarians in follow-up workshops during the fall and spring to discuss the effectiveness and review the assessment results of their information literacy initiatives. Moreover, in keeping with the collaborative spirit of the **LINC—on** QEP, faculty, librarians, and other staff who have trained at the institute will conduct freshman orientation seminars and take conspicuous roles in information literacy forums at both the annual faculty and staff conferences and at the University leadership's strategic planning retreats.

In partnership with Student Support Services, the information literacy librarian will develop an Information Literacy Peer Tutor Program that will provide students with additional opportunities for instruction and remediation. Peer tutoring has many benefits for both mentors and mentees and will complement the tutoring program already administered by SSS, which has been shown to contribute to an improvement in the academic skills of LMU students. Peer tutors will demonstrate a high level of information literacy competency and will receive additional training from the University's information literacy librarian.

Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence

The LINC—on QEP will be housed in a Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, scheduled to be launched in the fall of 2009. The center will be maintained by the University's instructional technologist and work closely with the QEP leadership personnel. For this reason, the development of the center will be considered a parallel effort to the QEP, rather than one under the direct administration of the plan itself. The center will feature on-line student and faculty tutorials and function as a vital hub for the convergence of the University's information literacy efforts.

Personnel

- QEP Director: In the summer of 2009, a QEP director will replace the current QEP committee chair as the chief administrator of the plan. The responsibilities of the director will include development of information literacy student and faculty support services and other initiatives within the Virtual Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. He/she will also hold a teaching appointment in the English department (the workload to be determined at a later date) and will manage the SEWS program, which is currently administered by an English department faculty member. The director (with the assistance of the information literacy librarian) will: oversee the information literacy training of adjunct instructors of ENGL 110 and 210 courses; develop and assess freshman information literacy fall orientation sessions; and use embedded and other assessment measures to review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed. The QEP director's position profile has been written to reflect the importance of faculty leadership for the fullest accomplishment of the goals of the QEP. (See Appendix J).
- Information Literacy Librarian. This is not a new position; however, with the elimination of the INFL 100 stand-alone course and a minor reorganization of his/her staff responsibilities, the information literacy librarian will be able to assist the QEP director to: prepare adjunct instructors of ENGL 110 and 210 to introduce an enriched information literacy curriculum into their sections; develop and assess freshman information literacy fall orientation sessions;

participate in the summer faculty development institute; and use embedded and other assessment measures to review and realign student learning outcomes, as needed. The information literacy librarian will also teach information literacy in ENG 110 and 210 sections and, to a limited extent, develop tutorials for the on-line teaching and learning center. To the extent that the tutorials used are not commercially produced, members of the QEP subcommittees, some of whom have expertise and/or training in specialized software applications, are prepared to offer ideas about their structure, content, usability, etc.. It is anticipated that approximately 75% of the information literacy librarian's workload will be devoted to the QEP.

- Library Staff. The LMU library staff's leadership has been a major catalyst for the University's intensifying awareness of the need for information literacy instruction. The information literacy QEP topic itself, from which the **LINC—on** QEP was developed, was conceived by LMU librarians and it is the library staff who, at present, teach all Information Literacy 100 sections. However, as the University replaces its stand-alone information literacy course with a more extensive, integrated curriculum, librarians will maintain a presence in the classroom as information literacy specialists. Indeed, after the second year of the QEP's implementation, the instructional content of the existing INFL 100 course will be delivered in its entirety in ENGL 110 and 210. This material, which will more coherently systematize the information literacy instruction already being introduced in 110 and 210, will account for approximately one sixth of the subject content in these courses, and will be taught by LMU librarians.
- Instructional Technologist. An instructional technologist, hired in fall 2008, will participate at the summer faculty development institute, maintain the information literacy program's presence on the Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence website and support the day-to-day operation of the website itself. The instructional technologist will also work with the QEP director and committee, as well as the information literacy librarian and outside

experts in information literacy to facilitate the development of web-based and live faculty development training opportunities. Approximately 20% of the instructional technologist's workload will be assigned to the QEP.

- Director of Distance Learning: The director will ensure that students at the University's eleven extended sites have availability to the same information literacy learning opportunities as equivalent on-campus students. This responsibility will account for approximately 10% of his/her workload assignment.
- Director of the Department of Institutional Research: The director will conduct regular assessments of the QEP and will assist with the evaluation of the information literacy peer tutors program. These duties will account for approximately 10% of his/her workload
- Assistant Director of the Department of Institutional Research: The assistant director will, among other duties to be specified by the QEP director, assist in conducting regular assessments of the QEP and the effectiveness of the information literacy peer tutors program. These duties will account for approximately 20% of her workload
- Coordinator of Assessment: Approximately 20% of the coordinator's workload will be devoted to QEP assessment assignments.
- QEP Subcommittee Chairs: The subcommittee chairs will receive a stipend for working in an advisory capacity to the QEP administrators.
- ENGL 110, 210, SEWS Instructors: Instructors of ENGL 110, 210 and all courses with a SEWS requirement will attend the Information Literacy Summer Institute in order to prepare to introduce information literacy curriculum into their classes. They will also meet regularly during the semester to review and realign student learning outcomes using embedded and other assessment measures.
- Information Literacy Peer Tutors: Three information literacy peer tutors will be hired annually by the Student Support Services (SSS) peer tutor administrator and the information literacy

librarian with the aim of assisting undergraduate students to achieve the high level of research and evaluation skills promoted by the plan. A peer tutor will be available four hours a day (sixteen hours a week) for the eight months of the regular school year.

Project Administration

The administration of the **LINC—on** QEP will operate under the collaborative supervision of five administrative bodies: the President’s Cabinet, the Office of Academic Affairs, the Department of Institutional Research, the QEP Leadership Committee and the QEP director.

- President’s Cabinet: In addition to the President herself, membership in the President’s Cabinet includes the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Finance, the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Services, the Vice President for University Advancement and the Vice President and Dean of the College of Osteopathic Medicine. The cabinet will regularly inform the University community of the progress of the QEP and ensure that sufficient resources are apportioned to support the successful implementation of the plan.
- Office of Academic Affairs: The Office of Academic Affairs includes the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the academic deans and department level leadership for all academic areas. This office will have immediate oversight of the QEP and associated budget expenditures.
- Department of Institutional Research: The Department of Institutional Research is housed in the Office of Academic Affairs. The Department of Institutional Research is composed of a director, an assistant director, and a coordinator of assessment. The department will support the QEP committee and its director with the planning, assessment and evaluation services that will contribute to the plan’s effective administration.
- QEP Leadership Committee: The composition of the QEP committee includes twenty-two representatives appointed from the student body, faculty and staff, and two at-large members,

- one of whom is the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, and the other, the Director of Institutional Research whose department will advise the committee on compliance issues and assist with the plan's assessment. Three subcommittees—the Assessment Subcommittee, the Curriculum Integration and Development Subcommittee, and the Plan Effectiveness Subcommittee—will operate in an advisory capacity to the QEP director and regularly review the plan's progress and approve changes and new initiatives.
- QEP Director: This a new position to be filled in Summer 2009. As described earlier in the *Personnel* section of this document, the QEP director will have principal responsibility for the administration of the plan and information literacy faculty support services within Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence. He/she will work in collaboration with the information literacy librarian, instructional technologist, QEP committee, and University faculty.

XI. FINANCE

Throughout the planning and development phase of the QEP, careful consideration was given to how the plan could best be supported through the use of existing and future University resources. In the 2006-2007 budgeting process, \$100,000.00 was set aside for use in the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 planning years. In addition to the ongoing operational expenses for the QEP, the LMU Board of Trustees reviewed the QEP budget and on December 12, 2008 allocated \$700,000 of additional funding to further support the success of the QEP. Funds were designated, early in the project, to provide release time and summer stipend funding for QEP faculty and staff, leading the QEP development process. Travel and professional development monies were used to support training in information literacy for members of the QEP leadership team, as well as University faculty and staff to attend the SACS Quality Enhancement workshops.

The QEP Leadership Committee, in collaboration with the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Finance and Operations developed a five-year budget to

address the following needs, supplies and resources for the QEP:

- A QEP director will be hired in the summer of 2009 to administer the QEP. The director will have some teaching responsibilities in the Department of English, as well as oversight of the QEP and the SEWS program.
- An Information Literacy Librarian. It is anticipated that approximately 75% of the information literacy librarian's workload will be devoted to the QEP.
- An Instructional Technologist. Approximately 20% of the instructional technologist's workload will be assigned to the QEP.
- A Director of Distance Learning. QEP responsibilities will account for approximately 10% of his/her workload assignment.
- A Director of the Department of Institutional Research. QEP duties will account for approximately 10% of his/her workload
- An Assistant Director of the Department of Institutional Research. Approximately 20% of his/her workload will be assigned to the QEP.
- A Coordinator of Assessment. Approximately 20% of the coordinator's workload will be devoted to QEP assessment assignments.
- Information Literacy Peer Tutors will work 16 hours a week cumulatively for the eight months of the regular school year.
- An Administrative Assistant will have a half-time assignment with the QEP and provide the necessary clerical support for the plan's implementation.
- The budget includes benefits and other University compensation areas for the personnel listed above.
- Faculty stipends will be paid to University faculty teaching in the identified courses for course development, including the incorporation of information literacy strategies and assessments.
- Consultants will be used to assist the QEP Leadership Team and director in determining

progress toward program goals and objectives. Content experts in information literacy and faculty development will also be chosen to lead in the annual summer institutes for faculty.

- The Information Literacy Summer Institute will be an annual training opportunity for faculty to develop curriculum and information literacy components for their courses. The institutes will be spread out over the five year plan and will be offered to a variety of faculty at all levels.
- Operational expenses such as postage, telephone, printing and supplies are budgeted to cover the resources need to support faculty, staff and students during the five year period. (See Five-Year Budget below)
- Money has been budgeted to allow the director to join a professional or university association that promotes the study of information literacy. (See Five-Year Budget below)
- To assist in determining the levels of student learning and the progress toward QEP goals and objectives, both standardized and personalized student assessments will be purchased through QEP funds. (See Five-Year Budget below)
- Additional books and library resources will be an important aspect of the faculty training, course development and student learning opportunities presented in the QEP. Specific funds have been designated to meet this need. (See Five-Year Budget below)
- In order to support the QEP director and faculty assigned to teach identified courses in the QEP, money has been budgeted for travel and faculty development. Funds are also allocated for student research and travel for presentations of course projects. (See Five-Year Budget below)
- As a part of the student activities, students will be recognized for outstanding work in course assignments and projects that support the development of information literacy. There will be funding to sponsor regular opportunities for student recognition for special achievement. (See Five-Year Budget below)

Five-Year QEP Budget

	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>
<u>Operational Expenses</u>						
Personnel (Salary and Benefits)	129,190	178,883	188,057	197,637	207,641	218,092
Faculty Stipends	12,150	10,000	11,000	12,000	13,000	14,000
Peer Tutors	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
Consultants	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
Summer Institute	8,000	8,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Postage	100	100	100	100	100	100
Telephone	100	100	100	100	100	100
Memberships	0	500	525	550	575	600
Testing Supplies	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500	3,000	3,500
Books and Library Resources	2,000	2,000	3,000	4,000	4,000	2,000
Printing	500	500	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500
Travel	1,000	2,000	2,500	2,750	3,000	3,250
Faculty Development	3,000	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,500	4,500
Supplies	4,000	1,500	1,750	2,000	2,250	2,500
Honors & Awards	1,000	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500	3,000
Student Activities	2,000	500	500	500	500	500
TOTAL EXPENSES	155,390	203,583	212,532	225,137	237,666	248,142

XII. CONCLUSION

Lincoln Memorial University has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that satisfies all of the criteria recommended by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The topic of information literacy focuses on a significant aspect of student learning. It was identified through a rigorous needs-assessment process characterized by careful research and analysis of the University's weaknesses, strengths and institutional priorities. The plan itself, informed by best practices in the field, is closely integrated with LMU's on-going planning and evaluation process. While focused most intensively on students in the undergraduate baccalaureate programs, it will actively solicit the support and engagement of all of the University's academic and broader communities.

The implementation of the **LINC—on** QEP follows an explicit timeline and assigns a clear delegation of responsibilities. Incentives for faculty and staff, commitment from the University administration and the wide involvement of the student population will support the attainment of the QEP’s goals and objectives. The plan’s assessment—extending throughout the course, program and University levels—will occur within a framework of specific timelines and leadership responsibilities, and offer useful evidence of teaching and student learning accomplishments.

The University administration is committed to providing the resources necessary to successfully implement and sustain this plan for the next five years. However, it is anticipated that the crucial features of the QEP will continue to be important to the University long after this period. The plan, in fact, proposes to braid information literacy into the DNA of the school’s academic culture, distinguishing the student learning experience at LMU from other institutions of higher learning. The **LINC—on** QEP is, at bottom, an instrument for the fulfillment of University’s institutional mission and strategic plan, and, if successful, will significantly improve student learning and provide a sustaining opportunity for personal and professional empowerment and productivity.

XIII. REFERENCES

- 2006 ICT literacy assessment preliminary findings. (2006). *Educational Testing Service* Web site. Retrieved April 23, 2008, from http://www.ets.org/Media/Products/ICT_Literacy/pdf/2006_Preliminary_Findings.pdf
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2008). Retrieved January, 25, 2008, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency.cfm>
- Behrens, S. (1994). A conceptual analysis and historical overview of information literacy. *College & Research Libraries*, 55, 310
- Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I, Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Eisenberg, M.B., Lowe, C.A., Spitzer, K.L. (1998). *Information literacy: Essential skills for the information age*. Eric Clearinghouse on Information and Technology. Retrieved June 17, 2008, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/17/5c/ed.pdf
- ETS (2007). Definitions of iSkills areas. Retrieved December 17, 2008, from http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/ICT_Literacy/pdf/iSkills_Institutional_Skill_Sample_Report.pdf
- Gardner, H. (1991). *The Unschooled Mind: How Children Think and How Schools Should Teach*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1996). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gilton, D. (n.d.). Information literacy instruction: A history in context. Retrieved May 17, 2008, from <http://www.uri.edu/artsci/lsc/Faculty/gilton/InformationLiteracyInstruction-AHistoryinContext.htm>
- Henne, F. (1960). *Standards for school library programs* (pp.18-19). Chicago: American Library Association.
- Horton, F. (1983). Information literacy vs. computer literacy. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science*, 9 (4), 16.
- Hughes, S., & Shapiro, J. (1996). Information literacy as a liberal art. *Educom Review*, 31(2). Retrieved April 7, 2008, from <http://net.educause.edu/apps/er/review/reviewarticles/31231.html>
- Hutchins, E., Fister, B, & MacPherson, K.H. (2002). Changing landscapes, enduring values: Making the transition from bibliographic instruction to information literacy. In P. Durisin (Ed.), *Information literacy programs: Successes and challenges* (pp. 4-5). New York: The Haworth Information Press.
- Jensen, E. (2000). *Brain-Based Learning; The New Science of Teaching and Training*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Johnston, B., & Webber, (2000). Conceptions of information literacy: New perspectives and implications. *Journal of Information Science*, 26, 382.

- Levin, H. (1996). *Innovations in Learning: New Environment for Education*. Mahway, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lyman, P., & Varian, H.R. (2003). How much information? Retrieved May 9, 2008, from <http://www2.sims.berkeley.edu/research/projects/how-much-info-2003/>
- Mission and purpose. (2006). *Lincoln Memorial University* Web site. Retrieved December 12, 2008, from <http://www.lmunet.edu/about/mission.html>
- A nation at risk: the imperative for educational reform. (1983). National Commission on Excellence in Education Web site. Retrieved June 6, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/title.html>
- Nine principles of good practice for assessing student learning. (1992). American Association for Higher Education Web site. Retrieved June 20, 2008, from <http://www.cord.edu/dept/assessment/nineprin.pdf>.
- O’Leary, D. (1997). *The Lifespan Development of Individuals: Behavioral Neurobiological and Psychological Perspectives*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- OCLC white paper on the information habits of college students. (2002). *Online Computer Library Center* Web site. Retrieved April 23, 2008, from <http://www.oclc.org/research/announcements/2002-06-24.htm>
- Radcliff, C., Salem, J. A, O’Connor. L. G., & Gedeon, J. A. (2007). Project SAILS skill sets for the 2008-2009 academic year. Retrieved December 17, 2008, from <https://www.projectsails.org/abouttest/skillsets.php>.
- Reddy, R. (1999). Global digital libraries: building the infrastructure. *Digital information organization in japan*. Retrieved April 20, 2008, from <http://www.wtec.org/loyola/digilibs/toc.htm>
- Rockman, I. (2003). The importance of information literacy (p.17). Retrieved March 27, 2008, from http://media.wiley.com/product_data/excerpt/78/07879652/0787965278.pdf
- United States Census Bureau. (2006). State & county quickfacts: Claiborne county, TN. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/47/47025.html>
- United States Census Bureau. (2008). Public education finances. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from <http://ftp2.census.gov/govs/school/06f33pub.pdf>
- United States Department of Agriculture. (2004). Measuring rurality: 2004 County Typology codes. Retrieved December 20, 2008, from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/Rurality/Typology/maps/Poverty.htm>
- Wurman, R.S. (1989). *Information anxiety: What to do when information doesn’t tell you what you need to know*. New York: Doubleday.

XIV. Appendices

Appendix A

2000-2008 LMU SEWS PAPER ASSESSMENT

Submitted to Dr. Dan Debord, Chair, General Studies Committee
and Dr. Jacques Debrot, QEP Director
from Dr. Elizabeth Lamont, SEWS Director and Chair, SEWS Review Subcommittee
May 12, 2008

Methodology. To evaluate the strengths and weakness of the SEWS program from fall 2000 to fall 2007, the members of the SEWS subcommittee examined a stratified random sampling¹ of SEWS papers viewed with regard to three SEWS rubrics: one designed to aid holistic grading of essays; one for evaluating source-based papers; and one for evaluating critical thinking skills in 300- and 400-level papers. The committee specifically sought to answer the following questions for a) freshman and sophomore English SEWS papers, and b) junior- and senior-level SEWS papers written in the major program of study:

1. What percentage of SEWS papers demonstrate acceptable college-level writing skills based upon the holistic SEWS rubric?
2. What percentage of SEWS papers demonstrate acceptable research skills based upon the source-based paper SEWS rubric?
3. What percentage of 300- and 400-level SEWS papers demonstrate critical thinking skills located at the higher end of Bloom's Taxonomy?
4. What percentage of SEWS papers demonstrate little understanding of conventional rules of grammar, punctuation, and spelling?
5. What percentage of SEWS papers contain passages that are probably plagiarized?
6. What percentage of SEWS papers fail to adhere to standard methods of documentation appropriate to the discipline?
7. What percentage of SEWS papers would receive a grade of D or F if evaluated according to *either* the holistic or source-based SEWS paper rubrics?
8. What percentage of SEWS papers would receive a grade of A or B if evaluated according to *either* the holistic or source-based SEWS paper rubrics?
9. Which departments' faculty might serve as SEWS mentors in helping LMU faculty develop SEWS assignments that better elicit critical thinking and research skills?

Findings of the 2008 SEWS paper review.

1. *What percentage of sample SEWS papers demonstrate acceptable college-level writing skills when measured against the holistic paper grading rubric?*

Freshman English papers: 72.5%

Sophomore English papers: 78%

Upper-level English papers: 92%

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Science, and Nursing major papers: 30% --

NOTE: the Social Work papers scored well in this category.

Upper-level Education, Business, and Math and Natural Sciences papers:

31.4% -- NOTE: the Science papers scored quite well in this category.

¹ To conduct the random sampling, the SEWS director pulled every 10th paper submitted each semester in fulfillment of the freshman and sophomore SEWS requirements from fall 2000 through fall 2007. One fourth of all papers submitted from fall 2000 to fall 2007 in fulfillment of each department's 300- and 400-level SEWS requirements were examined.

Upper-level Humanities papers: 69%
SEWS AVERAGE: 62.15%

2. *What percentage of sample SEWS papers demonstrate acceptable research skills when measured against the source-based paper rubric?*

Freshman English research papers: 52% -- NOTE: over-reliance on dotcoms and Wikipedia; little familiarity with scholarly databases. Student ability to integrate quotes effectively is limited. Student ability to synthesize source material is limited. Too many papers accepted that do not adhere to MLA documentation *at all*.

Sophomore English papers: 23% -- NOTE: from 2000 to fall 2006, most sophomore English students were only required to analyze a literary text. When secondary sources were assigned, the papers demonstrate a failure to synthesize sources effectively; in-text parenthetical citations are off; quotes are not always placed in context or incorporated naturally into the student's own larger argument; there is confusion over how to punctuate longer quotes; titles are often punctuated incorrectly; there is an over-reliance on 1 or 2 sources; and the thesis is often non-arguable.

Upper-level English papers: 76% -- NOTE: there is a tendency among students in certain classes to work with a limited number of sources and to avoid scholarly databases.

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Sciences, and Nursing papers: 50% -- NOTE: Social Work and Psychology papers score well in this category, bringing the overall average higher than it would have been if only Allied Health or Nursing papers were measured.

Upper-level Education, Business, and Natural Sciences papers: 22.9% -- NOTE: EDUC 300 papers do not require research at all; EDUC 400 papers ask students only to identify how "they would" research a topic. BUSN papers often lack arguable theses and give evidence of plagiarism. SCI papers perform well in this category.

Upper-level Humanities papers: 30% -- NOTE: the figure is lower than it might be because 400-level Art papers are not source-based, and a worrying percentage of HIST and COMM papers contain evidence of lifted quotes that are not identified as such.

SEWS AVERAGE: 42.31%

3. *What percentage of 300- and 400-level SEWS papers demonstrate critical thinking skills at the higher end of Bloom's Taxonomy?*

Upper-level English papers: 81%

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Sciences, and Nursing papers: 43%

Upper-level Education, Business, and Natural Sciences papers: 8.6% -- NOTE: The low results for this subgroup result from the fact that the Education Dept. does not assign 300- or 400-level SEWS papers that require higher thinking, genuine research, or advanced writing skills.

Upper-level Humanities papers: 41% -- NOTE: HIST performed quite well in this category.

SEWS AVERAGE: 43.4%

4. *What percentage of SEWS papers demonstrate **little** understanding of conventional rules of grammar, punctuation and spelling?*

Freshman English: 12.5%

Sophomore English: 12%

Upper-level English papers: 8%

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Sciences, Nursing: 70% -- NOTE: Social Sciences papers do not consistently reveal the problems evidenced in Allied Health and Nursing papers. Serious attention to writing remediation is recommended for all majors who demonstrate poor basic writing skills in their junior year.

Upper-level Education, Business, and Natural Sciences papers: 20% --NOTE: Natural Sciences papers do not consistently reveal the problems evidenced in EDUC and BUSN papers. Serious attention to writing remediation is recommended for all majors who demonstrate poor basic writing skills in their junior year.

Upper-level Humanities papers: 11% -- NOTE: Serious attention to writing remediation is especially recommended for COMM students demonstrating poor basic writing skills in their junior year.

SEWS AVERAGE: 22.5%

5. *What percentage of SEWS papers contain passages that were probably plagiarized?*

Freshman English: 27.5% NOTE: the course supposedly stresses the avoidance of plagiarism. Adjuncts require more training in spotting plagiarism.

Sophomore English: 3% -- Note: many of these papers were written in class.

Upper-level English papers: 6%

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Sciences, and Nursing: 7%

Upper-level Education, Business, and Natural Sciences papers: 14.3% -- NOTE: the overall number is artificially low because most EDUC papers written at the 300-level are personal experience papers.

Upper-level Humanities: 35% -- NOTE: It is recommended that each department in Humanities develop its own anti-plagiarism rubric which is gone over with students at both the 300- and 400-levels.

SEWS AVERAGE: 15.4%

6. *What percentage of SEWS papers fail to adhere to standard methods of documentation appropriate to the discipline?*

Freshman English: 31% -- Note: adjunct faculty need to be better trained in spotting plagiarism.

Sophomore English: 28% of those source-based papers written out-of-class

Upper-level English papers: 9%

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Sciences, and Nursing papers: 77% -- NOTE: it is recommended that each instructor be required to review discipline-appropriate documentation standards with all students in 300- and 400-level SEWS courses.

Upper-level Education, Business, and Natural Sciences papers: 60% -- NOTE: it is recommended that each instructor be required to review discipline-appropriate documentation standards with all students in both 300- and 400-level SEWS courses. Natural Sciences papers perform well in this category.

Upper-level Humanities papers: 31% -- NOTE: it is recommended that each instructor be required to review discipline-appropriate documentation

standards with all students enrolled in both 300- and 400-level SEWS courses.

SEWS AVERAGE: 39.3%

7. *What percentage of SEWS papers would receive a grade of ‘D’ or ‘F’ if evaluated according to either the holistic or source-based rubrics.*

Freshman English: 31% -- Note: adjunct faculty need to be required to adhere to standards indicated on both rubrics as applicable.

Sophomore English: 23% -- Note: adjunct faculty need to be required to adhere to standards indicated on both rubrics as applicable.

Upper-level English papers: 9%

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Sciences, and Nursing papers: 53%

Upper-level Education, Business, and Natural Sciences papers: 60% --

NOTE: the high overall average does *not* reflect problems with the majority of Natural Sciences papers.

Upper-level Humanities papers: 35%

SEWS AVERAGE: 35.1%

8. *What percentage of SEWS papers would receive a grade of ‘A’ or ‘B’ if evaluated according to either the holistic or source-based rubrics?*

Freshman English: 38%

Sophomore English: 46%

Upper-level English papers: 81%

Upper-level Allied Health, Social Sciences, and Nursing papers: 30%

Upper-level Education, Business, and Natural Sciences papers: 22.9% --

NOTE: The quality of the Natural Sciences papers greatly improved the overall average in this category.

Upper-level Humanities papers: 41%

SEWS AVERAGE: 43.15 – NOTE: the analytical thought and overall writing skills characteristic of the upper-level Biology, English, History, and Psychology papers improved the overall average.

9. *Which departments’ faculty might serve as SEWS mentors to help LMU faculty develop assignments that better elicit acceptable critical thinking and research skills from their majors?*

Full-time faculty within the Biology, English, History, and Psychology departments have demonstrated strong ability in developing assignments that elicit critical thinking and research skills.

Appendix B

Carnegie Vincent Library
 Lincoln Memorial University
Information Literacy Pre-test
Harrogate Campus
Fall 2001
 Report of Results

CARNEGIE VINCENT LIBRARY INFORMATION LITERACY PRE-TEST (2001)

I. INTRODUCTION

Approximately 38 freshmen UACT 100 students completed a 20-question information literacy pre-test on August 28, 2001. This pretest is designed as a starting point to measure competencies set forth by the Association of College and Research Libraries and is used to identify areas in the curriculum that need further development.

1. Which of the following is a characteristic of scholarly journals? (C)
 - a. 0 (0%) contains glossy pictures and advertisements
 - b. 12 (32%) reports news events in a timely manner
 - c. 9 (24%) contains a literature review within the articles
 - d. 17 (45%) provides an author's opinion about a controversial event

Analysis: The above data indicates that the majority of students surveyed (76%) were unable to identify a scholarly journal.

2. Which of the following titles would be considered the title of a popular magazine? (B)
 - a. 0 (0%) Journal of Higher Education
 - b. 33 (87%) Newsweek
 - c. 0 (0%) Economic Review
 - d. 5 (13%) American Journal of Political Science

Analysis: The above data indicates that the majority of students surveyed (87%) were able to identify a popular magazine.

3. Which of the following is a primary source? (A)
 - a. 5 (13%) a literary text, such as The Scarlet Letter by Nathaniel Hawthorne
 - b. 5 (13%) books written about The Scarlet Letter
 - c. 8 (21%) journal articles written about The Scarlet Letter
 - d. 20 (53%) dissertations written about The Scarlet Letter

Analysis: The above data indicates that the majority of students surveyed (87%) were unable to identify a classic novel as a primary source.

4. Conducting a survey would be an example of? (C)
 - a. 6 (16%) independent research
 - b. 16 (42%) secondary research
 - c. 16 (42%) primary research
 - d. 0 (0%) historical research

Analysis: The above data indicates that 42% of the students surveyed understand that conducting a survey would be an example of primary research.

5. Which of the following contains an example of truncation? (C)
 - a. 3 (8%) dogs and kittens
 - b. 12 (32%) dogs or cat
 - c. 10 (26%) kitt* and dogs
 - d. 10 (26%) cat not kitt

Analysis: The data indicates that the majority of students surveyed (66%) were unable to identify a truncation symbol.

6. Which of the following contains a Boolean operator? (B)
 - a. 8 (21%) cars into trucks

- b. 3 (8%) cars and trucks
- c. 19 (50%) cars before truck
- d. 5 (13%) cars behind trucks

Analysis: The data indicates that the majority of students surveyed 82% were unable to identify a Boolean operator.

7. When using the library's online catalog for finding books, a subject search on John Grisham would find? (B)
- a. 0 (0%) magazine articles written by the author
 - b. 22 (58%) books written about the author and his works
 - c. 1 (3%) newspaper and magazine articles about the author and his works
 - d. 15 (39%) books written by the author

Analysis: The data indicates that fifty-eight percent (58%) of the students surveyed are familiar with searching a library catalog.

8. To find books written by Margaret Mead, you would use a library's online catalog to do a/an (B)
- a. 2 (5%) title search
 - b. 34 (89%) author search
 - c. 1 (3%) subject search
 - d. 1 (3%) performance search

Analysis: The data indicates that over half of the students surveyed (89%) are familiar in searching library online catalogs.

9. The following....

Adams, Margot. "Eudora Welty: Southern Woman." Southern Voices: An Anthology. Ed. Tamara Kingsley. New York: Random House, 1998. 35 – 41.

is a bibliographic citation for a: (D)

- a. 14 (37%) journal article
- b. 8 (21%) personal interview
- c. 1 (3%) world wide web site
- d. 15 (39%) book chapter

Analysis: The data indicates that thirty-nine percent (39%) of the students surveyed were able to identify a book citation.

10. The following....Mathews, Lawrence. "Urban Development and Growth." American Spectator. May 1998: 23-30..is a bibliographic citation for: (C)

- a. 6 (16%) book
- b. 5 (13%) subject encyclopedia
- c. 27 (71%) journal article
- d. 0 (0%) world wide web site

Analysis: The data indicates that seventy-one percent (71%) of the students surveyed were able to identify a bibliographic citation for a journal article.

11. A bibliographic citation for a World Wide Web site should contain:(B)

- a. 2 (5%) information about external links
- b. 22 (58%) the date the site was accessed
- c. 2 (5%) members of the organization
- d. 10 (26%) contact information

Analysis: The data indicates that fifty-eight percent (58%) of the students surveyed are familiar with citing information referenced from the WWW.

12. Which of the following best represents a Uniform Resource Locator (URL)? (A)

- a. 34 (89%) <http://www.millennium2000.org/events/>
- b. 0 (0%) 658.009 L653d
- c. 2 (5%) smith@prodigy.com
- d. 2 (5%) HG 7402.3 L8555

Analysis: The data indicates that eighty-nine percent (89%) of the students surveyed were able to identify a URL.

13. Which of the following is an important criterion that you should use to evaluate information found on a web site? (B)

- a. 0 (0%) file size
- b. 16 (42%) authority
- c. 21 (55%) location
- d. 1 (3%) bandwidth

Analysis: Data indicates that forty-two percent (42%) of the students surveyed understand that in looking at the creator (or author) of a website, he/she can evaluate the quality of information provided on the site.

14. If you are writing a paper on animal rights and you use information from a web site produced by PETA – the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, which web site evaluation criterion would you consider? (B)

- a. 6 (16%) location
- b. 17 (45%) bias
- c. 3 (8%) currency
- d. 12 (32%) links

Analysis: The data indicates that forty-five percent (45%) of the students surveyed have some knowledge in evaluating websites found on the WWW.

15. To find peer-reviewed or refereed information on a topic of interest, you would most likely look for: (C)

- a. 24 (63%) websites on your topic
- b. 12 (32%) personal interviews with experts on your topic
- c. 0 (0%) journal articles on your topic
- d. 1 (3%) newspaper articles on your topic

Analysis: The data indicates that sixty-three percent (63%) of the students surveyed use the Internet for research purposes. Additionally, sixty-three percent (63%) of the students surveyed believe that the Internet is used to find scholarly or referred information.

16. Which of the following is the name of a periodical database? (A)

- a. 23 (61%) InfoTrac
- b. 8 (21%) Yahoo
- c. 7 (18%) Alta Vista
- d. 0 (0%) Lycos

Analysis: The data indicates that sixty-one percent (61%) of the students surveyed were able to identify InfoTrac as a periodical database.

17. Which of the following is the name of an Internet Search Engine? (D)

- a. 2 (5%) Lexis-Nexis Universe
- b. 5 (13%) JSTOR
- c. 6 (16%) <http://www.whitehouse.gov/>
- d. 25 (66%) Google

Analysis: The data indicates that sixty-six percent (66%) of the students surveyed were able to identify Google as the name of an Internet search engine.

18. Periodical databases will lead you to: (B)

- a. 4 (11%) books about people, places and events
- b. 19 (50%) magazine and journal articles
- c. 11 (29%) web sites containing magazine and/or book articles
- d. 4 (11%) reference books on a specific subject

Analysis: The data indicates that fifty percent (50%) of the students surveyed understand that magazine and journal articles can be found in periodical databases.

19. Not giving proper acknowledgement for another writer's work, thought, or argument is known as: (D)

- a. 0 (0%) originalism
- b. 1 (3%) citation
- c. 4 (11%) referencing
- d. 33 (87%) plagiarism

Analysis: The data indicates that eighty-seven percent (87%) of the students surveyed can identify the definition of plagiarism.

20. If you collect images from the World Wide Web and then compile these images into a web site, paper, or display for a class project, gained permission from the owner to use these images and have given proper credit to the author, you have: (C)

- a. 14 (37%) committed plagiarism
- b. 3 (8%) destroyed intellectual content
- c. 17 (45%) complied with copyright law
- d. 3 (8%) compromised intellectual property

Analysis: The data indicates that forty-five percent (45%) of the students surveyed can identify copyright law compliance.

Appendix C

NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT SATISFACTION (2007)

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): 2007 Mean Comparisons between LMU Freshmen (FY) and Seniors (SR) with Selected Peer Institutions

“In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?”

1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; 4 = very often

	LMU		Selected Peers	
	FY	SR	FY	SR
Academic and Intellectual Experiences				
Prepared 2 or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	2.67	2.77	2.72	2.58
Worked on a paper/project that required integrating ideas/information from various sources	2.94	3.32	3.14**	3.43
Included diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments	2.42	2.86	2.85**	2.98
Worked with other students on projects during class	2.49	2.57	2.39	2.54
Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	2.49	2.52	2.49	2.80**
Put together ideas/concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	2.32	2.94	2.63***	2.97
Tutored or taught other students	1.62	1.88	1.72	1.96
Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, internet, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	2.32	3.01	2.55	2.80
Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor	3.02	3.37	3.14	3.41
Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class	1.96	2.21	1.96	2.28
Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with Others outside of class (students, family, etc.)	2.80	2.94	2.76	2.94

p<.01 *p<.001 (2-tailed)

“During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?”

1 = very little; 2 = some; 3 = quite a bit; 4 = very much

Mental Activities	LMU		Selected Peers	
	FY	SR	FY	SR
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	3.16	3.34	3.13	3.30

Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	2.89	3.18	2.92	3.13
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	2.79	2.92	2.93	3.07
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	3.03	3.37	3.06	3.26

“Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?”
0 = have not decided, do not plan to do, plan to do; 1 = done

Enriching Educational Experiences	LMU		Selected Peers	
	FY	SR	FY	SR
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	.05	.13	.06	.21*
Independent study or self-designed major	.05	.17	.04	.23
Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, etc.)	.03	.29	.02	.42*

*p<.05 (2-tailed)

“To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?”
1 = very little; 2 = some; 3 = quite a bit; 4 = very much

Educational and Personal Growth	LMU		Selected Peers	
	FY	SR	FY	SR
Writing clearly and effectively	2.92	3.03	3.12*	3.21
Speaking clearly and effectively	2.84	2.98	2.92	3.15
Thinking critically and analytically	3.04	3.31	3.27*	3.44
Analyzing quantitative problems	2.78	3.00	2.92	3.09
Using computing and information technology	2.91	3.10	3.01	3.19
Working effectively with others	2.91	3.19	3.04	3.27
Learning effectively on your own	2.93	2.99	2.93	3.13
Solving complex real-world problems	2.63	2.65	2.69	2.81

*p<.05 (2-tailed)

Appendix D

LibQUAL 2008 SURVEY RESULTS

On a scale with levels of general satisfaction from 1-9, 1 = strongly disagree and 9 = strongly agree.

UG = undergraduate students

GR = graduate students

Question Text		Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean
<i>Affect of Service</i>				
Readiness to respond to users' questions	UG	7.26	8.30	7.86
	GR	7.61	8.28	8.23
Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	UG	7.05	8.18	7.87
	GR	7.61	8.26	8.23
Employees who understand the needs of their users	UG	7.07	8.15	7.83
	GR	7.63	8.32	8.19
Dependability in handling users' service problems	UG	7.15	8.26	7.58
	GR	7.52	8.18	8.06
<i>Information Control</i>				
Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	UG	6.95	8.24	7.53
	GR	7.54	8.33	7.97
A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	UG	7.11	8.18	7.57
	GR	7.56	8.35	8.05
The printed library materials I need for my work	UG	7.02	8.29	7.59
	GR	7.48	8.16	7.95
The electronic information resources I need	UG	7.13	8.24	7.58
	GR	7.63	8.41	8.06
Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	UG	7.22	8.34	7.53
	GR	7.71	8.29	8.05
Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	UG	7.14	8.22	7.50
	GR	7.66	8.32	7.94
Making information easily accessible for independent use	UG	7.15	8.32	7.67
	GR	7.62	8.28	8.09
Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	UG	7.20	8.30	7.38
	GR	7.57	8.29	7.93

Appendix E

SEWS RUBRIC

Course: _____ Code: _____

1. Title and Thesis (Standard 1)

a. The title is relevant.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

b. The title is focused and not too broad. (e.g. *Cancer*)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

c. There is a clear purpose or thesis statement at the beginning of the paper.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

2. Locating and Accessing information (Standard 2)

See reverse side for this.

3. Evaluating and Using Information (Standards 3 & 4)

a. Sources are relevant and support the argument.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

b. The student draws inferences or conclusions from the sources.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

c. The student attempts an original interpretation or use of the source material.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

4. Citations and Plagiarism (Standard 5)

a. The title page is done according to style.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

b. The references page is done according to style.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

c. In text citations are done according to style.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

d. There is no indication of plagiarism.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

2. References

Website #

.gov _____

.org _____

.edu _____

.com _____

other (specify) _____

Periodical #

Newspaper _____

Magazine _____

Journal _____

Book # (print or electronic) _____

Reference Book # (print or electronic) _____

Survey # _____

Personal Interview # _____

Other (specify) # _____

Total:

Appendix F

QEP PROMOTIONAL MASS E-MAIL (EXAMPLE)

Quality Enhancement Plan**Information literacy: turn facts into ideas**

In relative terms, George Washington was almost certainly the richest American president. Of course, it's difficult to compare wealth over different historical periods, but the next richest presidents are likely to have been (in descending order of wealth): Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Zachary Taylor, Theodore Roosevelt, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson and George W. Bush. Four presidential candidates won the most votes, but lost the presidency: Andrew Jackson (pictured above; 1824), Samuel J. Tilden (1876), Grover Cleveland (1888) and Al Gore (2000).

Don't miss this video: The Whole World today.

<http://release.theplatform.com/content.select?pid=x7aVOMrlfkkijQwcLllwk6WjB5JE0zrF>

**Appendix G
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

Goal 1	Exceeds Expectations			Meets Exp.			Below Exp.				N/A
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Content Specific Rubric											
SAILS											
iSkills											
LibQual											
SEWS Rubric											

Goal 2	Exceeds Expectations			Meets Exp.			Below Exp.				N/A
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
SEWS											
SAILS											
iSKILLS											
LibQual											
NSSE											
Zoomerang surveys											
Instructor rubric											

Goal 3	Exceeds Expectations			Meets Exp.			Below Exp.				N/A
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
SEWS											
SAILS											
iSKILLS											
LibQual											
NSSE											
Zoomerang surveys											

Goal 4	Exceeds Expectations			Meets Exp.			Below Exp.				N/A
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Responses											
LibQual											
NSSE											
Zoomerang Surveys											

Appendix H

Project SAILS Skill Sets for the 2008-2009 Academic Year

The Project SAILS test is based entirely on the work of two ACRL documents: [Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education](#) and [Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction: A Model Statement for Academic Librarians](#).

The following section shows how the ACRL outcomes and objectives have been regrouped into skill sets by the Project SAILS team. The numbering refers to the ACRL documents: the first digit is the ACRL standard, the second is the ACRL performance indicator, the third is the ACRL outcome, and the fourth is the ACRL objective.

There are eight skill sets (revised from our earlier twelve skill sets). In each skill set, only outcomes and objectives with active test items are listed. Work on more test items continues, and we will add the corresponding objectives and outcomes to this list periodically.

For a list of outcomes and objectives that will not be tested by the SAILS instrument, see the [ACRL Outcomes or Objectives Not Tested](#) page. These outcomes and objectives are either covered by other outcomes or objectives, or are not suitable for multiple-choice testing.

- [Developing a Research Strategy](#)
- [Selecting Finding Tools](#)
- [Searching](#)
- [Using Finding Tool Features](#)
- [Retrieving Sources](#)
- [Evaluating Sources](#)
- [Documenting Sources](#)
- [Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues](#)

Developing a Research Strategy

1.1.1 Confers with instructors and participates in class discussions, peer workgroups and electronic discussions to identify a research topic, or other information need

1.1.4.3 Narrows a broad topic and broadens a narrow one by modifying the scope or direction of the question.

1.1.4.4 Demonstrates an understanding of how the desired end product (i.e., the required depth of investigation and analysis) will play a role in determining the need for information.

1.1.4.5 Uses background information sources effectively to gain an initial understanding of the topic.

1.1.4.6 Consults with the course instructor and librarians to develop a manageable focus for the topic.

1.1.5.3 Decides when a research topic has multiple facets or may need to be put into a broader context.

1.2.1.2 Defines the "invisible college" (e.g., personal contacts, listservs specific to a discipline or subject) and describes its value.

1.2.2.1 Names the three major disciplines of knowledge (humanities, social sciences, sciences) and some subject fields that comprise each discipline.

- 1.2.2.4 Describes how the publication cycle in a particular discipline or subject field affects the researcher's access to information.
- 1.2.3.1 Identifies various formats in which information is available.
- 1.2.5.1 Describes how various fields of study define primary and secondary sources differently.
- 1.2.5.2 Identifies characteristics of information that make an item a primary or secondary source in a given field.
- 1.4.1.1 Identifies a research topic that may require revision, based on the amount of information found (or not found).
- 1.4.1.2 Identifies a topic that may need to be modified, based on the content of information found.
- 2.2.1.1 Describes a general process for searching for information.
- 2.2.2.4 Identifies keywords that describe an information source (e.g., book, journal article, magazine article, Web site).
- 2.3.3.3 Identifies the appropriate service point or resource for the particular information need.
- 2.3.3.5 Uses the Web site of an institution, library, organization or community to locate information about specific services.
- 2.5.5 Uses various technologies to manage the information selected and organized
- 3.4.1 Determines whether information satisfies the research or other information need

Selecting Finding Tools

- 1.1.3.2 Demonstrates when it is appropriate to use a general and subject-specific information source (e.g., to provide an overview, to give ideas on terminology).
- 2.1.3.4 Distinguishes among indexes, online databases, and collections of online databases, as well as gateways to different databases and collections.
- 2.1.3.5 Selects appropriate tools (e.g., indexes, online databases) for research on a particular topic.
- 2.1.3.6 Identifies the differences between freely available Internet search tools and subscription or fee-based databases.
- 2.1.3.8 Determines the period of time covered by a particular source.
- 2.1.3.9 Identifies the types of sources that are indexed in a particular database or index (e.g., an index that covers newspapers or popular periodicals versus a more specialized index to find scholarly literature).
- 2.3.1.2 Identifies research sources, regardless of format, that are appropriate to a particular discipline or research need.
- 2.3.1.4 Uses different research sources (e.g., catalogs and indexes) to find different types of information (e.g., books and periodical articles).
- 2.3.2.2 Explains the difference between the library catalog and a periodical index.
- 2.3.2.3 Describes the different scopes of coverage found in different periodical indexes.
- 3.4.5.3 Determines when some topics may be too recent to be covered by some standard tools (e.g., a periodicals index) and when information on the topic retrieved by less authoritative tools (e.g., a Web search engine) may not be reliable.

3.6.3 Seeks expert opinion through a variety of mechanisms (e.g., interviews, email, listservs)

Searching

1.1.5.1 Lists terms that may be useful for locating information on a topic.

1.1.5.2 Identifies and uses appropriate general or subject-specific sources to discover terminology related to an information need.

1.2.2.2 Finds sources that provide relevant subject field- and discipline-related terminology.

1.2.2.3 Uses relevant subject- and discipline-related terminology in the information research process.

2.2.2.3 Identifies alternate terminology, including synonyms, broader or narrower words and phrases that describe a topic.

2.2.3.2 Explains what controlled vocabulary is and why it is used.

2.2.3.4 Identifies when and where controlled vocabulary is used in a bibliographic record, and then successfully searches for additional information using that vocabulary.

2.2.4.1 Demonstrates when it is appropriate to search a particular field (e.g., title, author, subject).

2.2.4.2 Demonstrates an understanding of the concept of Boolean logic and constructs a search statement using Boolean operators.

2.2.4.3 Demonstrates an understanding of the concept of proximity searching and constructs a search statement using proximity operators.

2.2.4.4 Demonstrates an understanding of the concept of nesting and constructs a search using nested words or phrases.

2.2.4.6 Demonstrates an understanding of the concept of keyword searching and uses it appropriately and effectively.

2.2.4.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the concept of truncation and uses it appropriately and effectively.

2.2.5.3 Narrows or broadens questions and search terms to retrieve the appropriate quantity of information, using search techniques such as Boolean logic, limiting, and field searching.

2.4.1.1 Determines if the quantity of citations retrieved is adequate, too extensive, or insufficient for the information need.

2.4.1.3 Assesses the relevance of information found by examining elements of the citation such as title, abstract, subject headings, source, and date of publication.

3.4.5.2 Determines when a single search strategy may not fit a topic precisely enough to retrieve sufficient relevant information.

3.7.2.1 Demonstrates how searches may be limited or expanded by modifying search terminology or logic.

3.7.3.1 Examines footnotes and bibliographies from retrieved items to locate additional sources.

Using Finding Tool Features

2.1.3.1 Describes the structure and components of the system or tool being used, regardless of format (e.g., index, thesaurus, type of information retrieved by the system).

2.1.3.2 Identifies the source of help within a given information retrieval system and uses it effectively.

2.1.3.3 Identifies what types of information are contained in a particular system (e.g., all branch libraries are included in the catalog; not all databases are full text; catalogs, periodical databases, and Web sites may be included in a gateway).

2.1.4.2 Determines appropriate means for recording or saving the desired information (e.g., printing, saving to disc, photocopying, taking notes).

2.2.5.1 Uses help screens and other user aids to understand the particular search structures and commands of an information retrieval system.

2.2.5.2 Demonstrates an awareness of the fact that there may be separate interfaces for basic and advanced searching in retrieval systems.

2.2.6.4 Uses effectively the organizational structure of a typical book (e.g., indexes, tables of contents, user's instructions, legends, cross-references) in order to locate pertinent information in it.

2.3.1.5 Describes search functionality common to most databases regardless of differences in the search interface (e.g., Boolean logic capability, field structure, keyword searching, relevancy ranking).

2.3.1.6 Uses effectively the organizational structure and access points of print research sources (e.g., indexes, bibliographies) to retrieve pertinent information from those sources.

2.5.1 Selects among various technologies the most appropriate one for the task of extracting the needed information (e.g., copy/paste software functions, photocopier, scanner, audio/visual equipment, or exploratory instruments)

Retrieving Sources

1.2.6 Realizes that information may need to be constructed with raw data from primary sources

1.3.1.1 Determines if material is available immediately.

1.3.1.2 Uses available services appropriately to obtain desired materials or alternative sources.

1.3.3.2 Demonstrates a general knowledge of how to obtain information that is not available immediately.

1.3.3.3 Acts appropriately to obtain information within the time frame required.

2.2.6.3 Demonstrates an understanding of the fact that items may be grouped together by subject in order to facilitate browsing.

2.3.1.1 Describes some materials that are not available online or in digitized formats and must be accessed in print or other formats (e.g., microform, video, audio).

2.3.2.1 Uses call number systems effectively (e.g., demonstrates how a call number assists in locating the corresponding item in the library).

2.3.3.1 Retrieves a document in print or electronic form.

2.3.3.2 Describes various retrieval methods for information not available locally.

2.3.3.4 Initiates an interlibrary loan request by filling out and submitting a form either online or in person.

Evaluating Sources

1.2.4.1 Distinguishes characteristics of information provided for different audiences.

1.4.2.3 Lists various criteria, such as currency, which influence information choices. (See also 2.4. and 3.2.)

- 2.1.4.1 Selects appropriate information sources (i.e., primary, secondary or tertiary sources) and determines their relevance for the current information need.
- 2.4.1.2 Evaluates the quality of the information retrieved using criteria such as authorship, point of view/bias, date written, citations, etc.
- 2.4.1.4 Determines the relevance of an item to the information need in terms of its depth of coverage, language, and time frame.
- 3.2.1.1 Locates and examines critical reviews of information sources using available resources and technologies.
- 3.2.1.2 Investigates an author's qualifications and reputation through reviews or biographical sources.
- 3.2.1.3 Investigates validity and accuracy by consulting sources identified through bibliographic references.
- 3.2.1.8 Demonstrates an understanding that other sources may provide additional information to either confirm or question point of view or bias.
- 3.2.3.2 Demonstrates an understanding that some information and information sources may present a one-sided view and may express opinions rather than facts.
- 3.2.3.3 Demonstrates an understanding that some information and sources may be designed to trigger emotions, conjure stereotypes, or promote support for a particular viewpoint or group.
- 3.2.3.5 Searches for independent verification or corroboration of the accuracy and completeness of the data or representation of facts presented in an information source.
- 3.4.7.2 Distinguishes among various information sources in terms of established evaluation criteria (e.g., content, authority, currency).

Documenting Sources

- 2.3.1.3 Recognizes the format of an information source (e.g., book, chapter in a book, periodical article) from its citation. (See also 2.3.2.)
- 2.3.2.4 Distinguishes among citations to identify various types of materials (e.g., books, periodical articles, essays in anthologies). (See also 2.3.1.)
- 2.5.3.1 Identifies different types of information sources cited in a research tool.
- 2.5.3.3 Demonstrates an understanding that different disciplines may use different citation styles.
- 5.3.1.2 Identifies citation elements for information sources in different formats (e.g., book, article, television program, Web page, interview).
- 5.3.1.3 Demonstrates an understanding that there are different documentation styles, published or accepted by various groups
- 5.3.1.5 Describes when the format of the source cited may dictate a certain citation style.
- 5.3.1.7 Locates information about documentation styles either in print or electronically, e.g., through the library's Web site.
- 5.3.1.8 Recognizes that consistency of citation format is important, especially if a course instructor has not required a particular style.

Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues

- 5.1.1 Identifies and discusses issues related to privacy and security in both the print and electronic environments
 - 5.1.2.1 Demonstrates an understanding that not all information on the Web is free, i.e., some Web-based databases require users to pay a fee or to subscribe in order to retrieve full text or other content.
 - 5.1.2.2 Demonstrates awareness that the library pays for access to databases, information tools, full-text resources, etc., and may use the Web to deliver them to its clientele.
 - 5.1.2.3 Describes how the terms of subscriptions or licenses may limit their use to a particular clientele or location.
- 5.1.3 Identifies and discusses issues related to censorship and freedom of speech
- 5.1.4 Demonstrates an understanding of intellectual property, copyright, and fair use of copyrighted material
- 5.2.1 Participates in electronic discussions following accepted practices (e.g. "Netiquette")
- 5.2.5 Legally obtains, stores, and disseminates text, data, images, or sounds
- 5.2.6 Demonstrates an understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and does not represent work attributable to others as his/her own
- 5.2.7 Demonstrates an understanding of institutional policies related to human subjects research

Appendix I

DRAFT

iSkills Fit with ACRL Standards

ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education

Approved by the ACRL Board, January 18, 2000; Copyrighted 2003, site last updated July 29, 2005

<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/informationliteracycompetency.htm#ilhed>

The domain assessed by iSkills conforms closely to the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. The bulleted text describes the evaluations made of student performance on iSkills.

ACRL Standard One: The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed	
ACRL Performance Indicator	ICT Literacy Performance Area
1. The information literate student defines and articulates the need for information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define
2. The information literate student identifies a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access
3. The information literate student considers the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access
4. The information literate student reevaluates the nature and extent of the information need.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define

ACRL Standard Two: The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently	
ACRL Performance Indicator	ICT Literacy Performance Area
1. The information literate student selects the most appropriate investigative methods or information retrieval systems for accessing the needed information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access
2. The information literate student constructs and implements effectively-designed search strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access
3. The information literate student retrieves information online or in person using a variety of methods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access
4. The information literate student refines the search strategy if necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Evaluate
5. The information literate student extracts, records, and manages the information and its sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Evaluate Manage Integrate

ACRL Standard Three: The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system

ACRL Performance Indicator	ICT Literacy Performance Area
1. The information literate student summarizes the main ideas to be extracted from the information gathered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate
2. The information literate student articulates and applies initial criteria for evaluating both the information and its sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate
3. The information literate student synthesizes main ideas to construct new concepts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate Create
4. The information literate student compares new knowledge with prior knowledge to determine the value added, contradictions, or other unique characteristics of the information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate Create
5. The information literate student determines whether the new knowledge has an impact on the individual's value system and takes steps to reconcile differences.	<i>This performance indicator is not in the domain of the Higher Ed ICT Literacy Assessment since it has to do with internal, unobservable, states of the test-taker.</i>
6. The information literate student validates understanding and interpretation of the information through discourse with other individuals, subject-area experts, and/or practitioners.	<i>This performance indicator is not in the domain of the Higher Ed ICT Literacy Assessment, since it cannot be observed in a testing situation.</i>
7. The information literate student determines whether the initial query should be revised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Evaluate

ACRL Standard four: The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose

ACRL Performance Indicator	ICT Literacy Performance Area
1. The information literate student applies new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create Communicate
2. The information literate student revises the development process for the product or performance.	<i>This performance indicator is not in the domain of the Higher Ed ICT Literacy Assessment, since it refers to a project developed over an extended period of time, which cannot be simulated in a brief assessment.</i>
3. The information literate student communicates the product or performance effectively to others.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create Communicate

ACRL Standard five: The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally

ACRL Performance Indicator	ICT Literacy Performance Area
1. The information literate student understands many of the ethical, legal and socio-economic issues surrounding information and information technology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Evaluate Manage
2. The information literate student follows laws, regulations, institutional policies, and etiquette related to the access and use of information resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access Evaluate Integrate Communicate
3. The information literate student acknowledges the use of information sources in communicating the product or performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create

Appendix J

Director of Information Literacy Program

Reports to: Department Chair

Department: English

Division: School of Arts and Sciences

Classification: Full-time faculty

Date: October 2, 2008

Job Summary: The Information Literacy Program Director will assume responsibility for the administration of the QEP/Information Literacy Program; oversee the Virtual Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence; manage the SEWS program; collaborate with the Information Literacy Librarian to train English adjunct faculty to incorporate information literacy instructional material into their classes; teach two English composition courses each semester. The Information Literacy Program Director shall be held accountable for these obligations as they contribute to the attainment of the mission of the University, the School, and the Department.

Duties and Responsibilities: *promote the mission of Lincoln Memorial University to all faculty, staff, students and to the community at large; * promote effective working relationships among faculty, staff and students; *undertake the “Standard Instructional/Research/Service Workload” as outlined in the Faculty/Staff Policy Manual; *provide course and classroom conduct as outlined in the Faculty/Staff Policy Manual; *comply with the university Faculty/Staff Policy Manual; *provide academic advisement of students; *conduct office/conference hours; *submit textbook requests; *comply with announced requirements; *engage in professional development; *fulfill the University’s scholarship expectation through research, publication, grant development, and creative achievement; *provide committee service; *attend department, school, and university faculty meetings; *participate in community and public service opportunities; *attend commencement activities; *participate in annual faculty evaluation; and *perform other duties as assigned.

Faculty Scholarship Expectation: As a doctoral level institution, LMU’s faculty duties, responsibilities, and reward systems support the scholarship trilogy of teaching, research/creative achievement, and service. Consequently, the University will consider faculty development, workload allocation, merit pay, and promotion processes, which offer incentives for scholarly activities and achievements and promote faculty research productivity. Based on discipline, academic expertise, and institutional mission, elements of the evidentiary scholarly outcomes list (Faculty/Staff Policy Manual, Appendix F: Scholarly Outcomes List) should comprise the faculty member’s professional portfolio.

Knowledge, Skills and Abilities: *effective verbal and written communication skills; *excellent leadership and administrative abilities and experience; * demonstrated ability to complete multiple assignments, meet deadlines; *sufficient knowledge of information literacy technologies; and *mastery of discipline academic expertise.

Qualifications: *Ph.D. or other advanced degree in an appropriate discipline; *educational preparation in accordance with requirements of the University and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; *evidence of potential for effective teaching and scholarly activity; *demonstrated knowledge of student advising; *evidence of experience in program administration and information literacy instruction.

