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U Research—Engage, Empower, Enhance
Mississippi College
Executive Summary

Mississippi College (MC) is a private, co-educational, Christian university of liberal arts and sciences and professional studies, affiliated with the Mississippi Baptist Convention and located in Clinton, MS. MC’s mission of preparing students for meaningful careers, life-long learning, and service to God and others guided the selection and development of its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

The QEP topic discovery process, begun in 2008, and the subsequent implementation plan were both accomplished with broad-based involvement of faculty, staff, students, trustees, administrators, and alumni. As a result of the campus involvement in the topic selection process, in February 2010 MC selected “U Research: Engage, Empower, Enhance” as its QEP. U Research is designed to cultivate information literacy competencies among MC undergraduate students, whose academic work will demonstrate that they are discriminating users of information. The aspiration of U Research is to engage students in learning activities that can enhance their research and critical thinking skills, empowering them to become productive citizens in the workplace and society.

U Research will be implemented in the curriculum through embedded activities in congruence with five learning objectives and ten student learning outcomes. Phase one will be launched in fall 2012 and will integrate U Research into all sections of ENG 102, a course included in the general education curriculum and required of all students. In the second phase (years two through four), at least six departments each successive year will integrate U Research into their designated threshold and senior courses. By the end of the fourth year, all departments will have integrated the QEP into their respective programmatic curricula.

On-going assessments will be aligned to U Research objectives and student learning outcomes. The assessment measures will consist of course-embedded assessments and nationally-normed instruments (such as the Research Readiness Self Assessment, the Student Satisfaction Inventory, and the College Senior Survey), and are expected to identify weaknesses and strengths in achieving learning objectives. The findings will be used to enhance student learning, improve curricular design, and impact faculty development.

The university has the necessary funds and the commitment of its various constituencies to establish U Research as a comprehensive information literacy program. What is learned from U Research will likely influence the structure and pedagogy of the entire curriculum, as a significant value added to the MC student educational experience.

Contacts: Dr. Ron Howard, Vice President for Academic Affairs, howard@mc.edu; Dr. Beth Dunigan, Co-Chair, QEP Development Committee, dunigan@mc.edu; Mrs. Susan Newman, Co-Chair QEP Development Committee and U Research Director, newman@mc.edu
### SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE WITH SACS CR 2.12 AND CS 3.3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACS CRITERION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE CRITERION MET</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR 2.12 Broad-Based Process for Addressing Key Institutional Issues:</strong> Includes a broad-based institutional process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment</td>
<td><strong>Broad-based Process:</strong> The QEP Steering Committee, charged with the task of identifying the topic, was composed of faculty from all schools as well as staff and students. All members of the campus community were invited to submit topics for consideration. Once the topics were considered, eight topics emerged, and the authors were asked to develop white papers. Seven of the authors chose to develop their white papers. White paper topics were presented to campus groups in numerous formats and on numerous occasions. Trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students were asked for input and comments. Members of the campus community completed the <em>Topic Interest Survey</em>, in which they were asked to choose the best topic for MC. The Steering Committee analyzed the results and the results were used to select U Research as the QEP. <strong>Key issues emerging from institutional assessment:</strong> Data to support the QEP was obtained from the UCLA/CIRP College Senior Survey, Student Research Skills Survey, and Topic Interest Survey. In addition, data from the Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey were used to identify the faculty’s perception of students’ information literacy skills.</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR 2.12 Focus of the Plan:</strong> Focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution</td>
<td><strong>Focus on learning outcomes and supporting student learning:</strong> The focus of Mississippi College’s Quality Enhancement Plan, U Research, is the development of information literacy competencies in undergraduate students. This will be achieved through five objectives and ten associated learning outcomes. <strong>Accomplishing the mission of MC:</strong> U Research was found to complement Mississippi College’s Mission Statement, specifically as the mission statement refers to the “pursuit of academic excellence,” the “intellectual development of its students,” and in the encouragement of the use of “skills, talents, and abilities as they pursue meaningful careers, life-long learning, and service to God and others.”</td>
<td>25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 Institutional Capability for the Initiation and Completion of the Plan:</strong> Demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP</td>
<td><strong>Capability:</strong> Mississippi College is committed to the success of the proposed QEP. The institution has provided and pledged continuing support for U Research in the form of financial resources, human resources, and capital improvements to ensure the success of the QEP during the five years of implementation. The Chief Financial Officer was instrumental in designing the proposed budget.</td>
<td>27-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS CRITERION</td>
<td>EVIDENCE CRITERION MET</td>
<td>PAGE NUMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 Broad-Based Involvement in Development and Proposed Implementation:</strong></td>
<td>Broad-based involvement in development: A Development Committee was formed to design the implementation plan for U Research. This committee consisted of faculty, staff, and students, with the Vice President of Academic Affairs as an ex-officio member. Several subcommittees were formed to address and provide input for the various components of the QEP. These committees also involved administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The Development Committee frequently solicited input from all campus groups. A forum was developed and placed on the QEP website in order for the campus community to provide input. Pertinent suggestions were incorporated into the plan.</td>
<td>11, 23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broad-based involvement in implementation:</strong> Students, staff, administration, and faculty will all play critical roles in the implementation and continuation of U Research. As U Research is implemented, an Oversight Committee will direct the process. Other subcommittees will report to the Oversight Committee. They will include an Assessment Committee, a Faculty Development Committee, and a Curriculum Integration Committee. The members of these committees will include faculty, staff, and students.</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 Assessment of the Plan:</strong></td>
<td>Goal, objectives, and student learning outcomes: The goal for U Research is that Mississippi College students will become discriminating users of information as a result of a deliberate and sequenced information literacy program. From this goal, five objectives were identified. Students will be able to: 1. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed 2. Access needed information efficiently and effectively 3. Evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into his or her knowledge base 4. Individually or as a member of a group, use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose 5. Understand many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and access and use information ethically and legally Each objective has two associated student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment: A detailed assessment plan can be found in the narrative. Assessments will include a standardized instrument</td>
<td>42-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS CRITERION</td>
<td>EVIDENCE CRITERION MET</td>
<td>PAGE NUMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Research Readiness Self Assessment, to be used for pre and post-testing), course-embedded assessments, and questions from the College Senior Survey and the Student Satisfaction Inventory. The Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey will also be given to faculty again.</td>
<td>55-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi College also has a plan for program assessment to ensure that the quality and progress of the QEP is maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Mississippi College

Mississippi College, affiliated with the Mississippi Baptist Convention, is a private, co-educational, Christian university of liberal arts and sciences serving more than 5,000 students from 40 states and 30 countries. Founded in 1826, Mississippi College is the oldest institution of higher learning in the state of Mississippi and second oldest Baptist university in the nation. With more than 80 areas of study, 14 graduate degree programs, a doctorate of jurisprudence and a Doctor of Educational Leadership degree, Mississippi College seeks to be a university recognized for academic excellence and commitment to the cause of Christ.

Mississippi College is located in Clinton, Mississippi, about fifteen minutes west of the capital city of Jackson. The campus is steeped in tradition, history, and beauty. Off-campus facilities include the Mississippi College School of Law in downtown Jackson and the Flowood Center in nearby Rankin County. MC has a diverse student body, including 240 internationals and 364 students in the recently instituted accelerated degree program for working adults. Of the 5,200 students enrolled last fall, 3,208 were undergraduates, 1,442 were graduates, and 550 were law students. A new physician assistant program, the only one of its kind in Mississippi, is completing its first year for the initial cohort of students.

Mississippi College consistently receives high ratings from *U.S. News & World Report* and other college ranking surveys.

- *U.S. News & World Report* ranked Mississippi College 9th among regional colleges in the South in its 2010 survey, “Great Schools, Great Prices.” This survey ranks schools based on quality of academics and cost.
- *The Princeton Review* ranked Mississippi College as one of 133 colleges in the “Best in the Southeast” category in the 2011 Best Colleges: The Best Southeastern Colleges report.
- *Forbes* magazine listed MC as one of the nation’s top 25 “Best College Buys” in its 2009 edition of America’s Best College Buys. It considers student/faculty awards, faculty salaries, graduation rates, and academic quality when weighing affordability.

Mississippi College’s mission statement and strategic planning goals also proclaim a commitment to civic engagement and community service. Students participate in a number of community service and mission activities in the local area and around the world. The MC Community Service Center coordinates the placement of MC students with 150 agencies in metro Jackson. This commitment to community service was recognized by MC’s inclusion in Learn and Serve America’s 2010 President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll with Distinction list.

With a student to faculty ratio of 15:1, Mississippi College seeks to accomplish its academic mission through a student-centered learning environment. U Research will complement Mississippi College’s mission, enhancing student learning with a richer learning environment and preparing graduates for a rapidly changing work environment.
Section I: Broad-Based Involvement in Selection and Development

Discovery Phase – Selecting the QEP Topic

U Research focuses on the development of information literacy competencies in undergraduate students at Mississippi College. This initiative will be accomplished through a deliberate and sequential integration of information literacy into the curriculum, with components of the plan introduced in ENG 102 (the second semester of English composition), reinforced and given a discipline-specific focus in an introductory major course, and mastered in a senior-level major course. U Research was chosen as the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for Mississippi College after an analysis of institutional needs and with the participation of all campus constituencies. With its potential to enhance student learning and its “fit” within the culture and mission of Mississippi College, U Research meets the criteria outlined by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.

Mississippi College began the process of selecting its QEP in January 2009 with the establishment of the QEP Steering Committee, composed of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The membership of the Steering Committee included representation from each school, and is detailed below. Serving under the leadership of the President’s Council, the QEP Steering Committee’s initial task was to coordinate the process through which Mississippi College would choose its QEP topic. This committee was very involved in informing the campus (faculty, staff, students, and administrators), trustees, and alumni of the importance of the QEP and led all constituencies in considering various proposed topics in light of the institutional mission, current university needs, and academic aspirations.

Mississippi College QEP Steering Committee

Dr. Ron Howard, Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Stan Baldwin, Dean of School of Science and Mathematics and Professor of Biology
Dr. Beth Dunigan, Associate Chair and Assoc. Professor of Biology
Ruth Ann Gibson, Head of Technical Services, Speed Library
Dr. Kerri Jordan, Associate Professor of English
Davis Lofton, Student 2010-2011
Phillip McIntosh, Associate Dean and Professor of Law
Dr. John Meadors, Professor of Christian Studies and Philosophy
Susan Newman, Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library
Dr. Steve Price, Associate Professor of English and Director of the Writing Center
Carly Stegall, Student 2010-2011
Dr. Beth Twiner Tinnon, Assistant Professor – Nursing
Shirley Tipton, Executive Secretary to the Dean of the School of Education
Deborah Welch, Instructor of Nursing
Dr. Chris Washam, Professor and Chair of Kinesiology
Ashley Winford, Student 2009-2010
Dr. Press York, Professor of Business Administration
Involvement of campus in the selection of topic

The Steering Committee members met with faculty, staff, and students to explain the QEP selection process and the importance for all constituencies to be involved in this process. Dr. Ron Howard, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chair of the Steering Committee, met with the Board of Trustees, alumni, the Faculty Council, the President’s Council, and other administrators to discuss the selection process and to solicit ideas for the QEP. Examples of QEPs from other universities were presented at faculty, staff, and student government meetings. The Quality Enhancement Plan - Discovery LibGuide, an online resource guide, was developed and published to provide further explanation and links to helpful information. Additionally, the Quality Enhancement Plan website was established, providing information about the QEP and the process for selecting a topic. It contained examples of QEPs and a discussion board for questions and answers. The discussion board allowed members of the MC community to post ideas for QEP topics and to discuss these topics. The information on the website was also communicated to the MC community through meetings and through e-mail.

During the Discovery phase, the Student Government Association (SGA) formed a QEP Committee which conducted research, communicated, and solicited ideas from the student body. The SGA committee looked at QEPs from other campuses, analyzed data from MC’s institutional assessments, created student focus groups to discuss the QEP selection process, and conducted open-ended surveys, allowing students to voice their concerns and endorse topics they were interested in pursuing as the QEP. Minutes of the SGA Committee, posted on the QEP website, document these activities.

Faculty were encouraged to speak to their classes about the importance of the QEP. Additionally, many departments held meetings to discuss the QEP and to encourage faculty and staff to participate in the selection process. During Spring 2009, roughly 25 ideas for QEPs were gathered through departmental meetings, website, and e-mail submissions.

Once QEP information had been distributed and discussed among all constituencies, the Steering Committee invited those who were interested to write a short summary on a topic that they felt would enhance student learning at Mississippi College and promote its mission. Thirteen one-page topic descriptions were submitted to the Steering Committee. From these suggestions, the Steering Committee combined some topics and narrowed the focus in others. Out of this process, eight topics were identified. During the summer of 2009 the Steering Committee invited interested campus constituents to develop these eight topics into white papers explaining the purpose, structure, and desired impact of each particular QEP proposal. Stipends of $1000 were awarded to each author or team of authors to research and design the QEP white papers. Of the eight topics selected, seven were developed into white papers and ready for campus consideration by late August 2009.

- Center for Learning And Student Success (CLASS)
- Quantitative Fluency: Creating a Curriculum that Counts
- The Importance of the Pen: Writing Across the Curriculum
Global Learning for Global Influence
U-Research: Engaged, Enhanced, Empowered
Reformulating the Freshman Experience through First Year Seminars and Learning Communities
A Campus Community Approach to Learning Through Serving

Students submitted two of the white papers, staff members submitted one white paper, a faculty member/administrator team submitted one white paper, and a faculty member/staff member team submitted one white paper. Faculty members submitted the other two white papers. The documents were posted to the QEP website and the campus community was encouraged to visit the web page to read and consider them all.

In order to involve the faculty, staff, and students in assessing and choosing the QEP topic, the Steering Committee sponsored a fair-like event to highlight proposed Quality Enhancement Plans. The fair was held in the cafeteria during the lunch period to reach the majority of people on campus. In order to have the feel of a real fair, there were balloons, a popcorn machine, and a cotton candy machine. While the participants were standing in line to obtain “goodies,” the Steering Committee members, who hosted the various booths, answered questions about the proposed QEPs. QEP buttons were also passed out along with packages of M&M’s with the QEP slogan attached. As people entered the venue, they encountered tables which showcased the proposed QEPs in poster presentation format, with the authors of the QEP proposals available to answer questions.

Other methods were used to promote the importance of campus involvement in the selection of the QEP topic. Steering Committee members, department chairs, and deans emphasized to their faculty and staff the importance of reading the white papers. The authors of the white papers presented their proposals at faculty and staff meetings. Videos of the proposals were also posted on the QEP website. SGA members involved in the QEP held a forum for the SGA and students to discuss the different QEP proposals and to learn how they could become involved in the selection process. During this time Dr. Howard, Vice President for Academic Affairs, asked the President’s Council, the Board of Trustees, and the President to review the white papers and he kept them updated on the QEP selection process.

On October 22-23, 2009, during the topic selection phase, Dr. Mark Taylor visited the campus to present a lecture and a workshop on “Generation Next” students. Dr. Taylor is a nationally recognized educator and consultant on methods for improving student persistence and success. He discussed the characteristics of Generation Next students and suggested techniques to increase student learning and engagement. The lecture and workshop further stimulated faculty and staff to think of the Quality Enhancement Plan as an opportunity to strengthen student learning.

Analysis of institutional data. As the campus was being encouraged to participate in the selection process, the Steering Committee members critiqued each proposal with respect to meeting institutional needs and potential for implementation. As part of the analysis of
institutional assessment information, the Steering Committee examined five years of data from student surveys and the mandatory Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE). The Institutional Research Coordinator provided data regarding the UCLA/CIRP College Student Survey (now named the College Senior Survey), administered yearly to graduating seniors at Mississippi College. The Steering Committee identified several pertinent questions from the College Student Survey and analyzed comparison data from MC’s peer institutions. In addition, the Steering Committee examined data from other assessments such as the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) and annual assessment information provided by each academic department.

Data from several assessments contributed to the selection of U Research as the topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan. Summarized below are findings from the CIRP College Student Survey, the Topic Interest Survey, the Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey, and the Student Research Skills Survey.

**CIRP College Student Survey.** The UCLA/CIRP College Student Survey, now named the College Senior Survey, is administered to graduating seniors at Mississippi College. This survey measures, among other items, students’ perceptions regarding cognitive and affective growth during the college experience. As the U Research White Paper was being written, results from the 2007 CIRP College Student Survey were examined, and statistics regarding library use and research behaviors showed that 71 percent of MC seniors claimed that they were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the library. Yet only 53 percent used the library “frequently” or “occasionally” for research or homework, while 86 percent used the Internet. Compared to when they first entered college, only 45 percent of the seniors reported having “much stronger” critical thinking skills.

**Topic Interest Survey.** After promotion and discussion of the white papers, a Topic Interest Survey was sent via Survey Monkey to all constituencies of Mississippi College. The survey resulted in a total of 1,091 responses from trustees, alumni, staff, faculty, administrators, and students (undergraduate, graduate, and law school.) Results of the data showed that CLASS received the highest ranking of importance, with U Research receiving the second highest ranking; 86.6% of respondents ranked CLASS as “very important” or “important,” and 84.4% ranked U Research as “very important” or “important.” When asked to select the top three choices for the QEP, respondents ranked CLASS as first choice and U Research as the second choice. The full results of the survey can be found on the QEP website.

During the fall of 2009 semester while MC was reviewing the white papers, the consulting firm of Noel-Levitz was hired to suggest ways to improve retention. The firm’s recommendations were very similar to those proposed in “CLASS - Center for Learning and Student Success.” Because the university decided to implement the Noel-Levitz strategies immediately, the Steering Committee decided not to use CLASS as the QEP. Since U Research received the second highest ranking of importance and a high level of support, the Steering Committee recommended U Research as the topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan.
Faculty perception of student information literacy skills. Following the recommendation to use Information Literacy as MC’s QEP, a subcommittee from the Steering Committee developed a survey using Survey Monkey to examine the faculty’s perception of students’ information literacy skills. The survey consisted of a five-point Likert scale. Faculty were asked about students’ information literacy competencies – their abilities to find quality information, to evaluate and document sources, and to understand plagiarism. A total of 186 faculty were surveyed, and 131 faculty responded to the survey.

When asked about students’ overall knowledge, skills and abilities in the area of information literacy, 71 percent of the faculty rated students as “fair,” “poor,” or “very poor.” While faculty generally considered students’ technological skills as adequate (only 33 percent of faculty rated students’ technological skills as “fair” or below), questions that dealt with critical skills such as assessing the value of different types of sources showed that students are perceived as lacking such skills. A theme that emerged in both the ratings and the open comments was that many faculty members did not consider their students to have an adequate understanding of plagiarism and were unable to differentiate between peer-reviewed and non-scholarly sources. For the item that asked if students “demonstrate an understanding of intellectual property and fair use,” eleven faculty members rated students’ performance as “very poor,” while only one faculty member responded “excellent.” The survey results indicate that faculty generally perceive that information literacy competencies are lacking in MC students.
FACULTY PERCEPTION OF STUDENT INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS SURVEY
QEP STEERING COMMITTEE APRIL 2010

Please indicate your perception of students’ ability to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>VP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure information searches efficiently</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge credibility, usefulness, and adequacy of information for a specific purpose</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarize/synthesize from a variety of sources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame a problem statement or research question</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective written communication skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate appropriate information to meet need and express main thesis while providing support for each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select and use appropriate referencing/documentation styles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate ideas and concepts clearly and logically</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively organize and present information to an audience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions based on a specific topic of discussion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find/access information from various sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt information for delivery via different types of media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize information for a specific assignment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate a knowledge of plagiarism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess effective technology skills</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of intellectual property and fair use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to use an electronic index or database to research a topic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to use non-electronic library resources to research a topic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the difference between scholarly or scientific journals and periodical literature</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the concept of “peer review”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate proper ethics with regard to rules of plagiarism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate your students’ knowledge, skills, and abilities in the area of information literacy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X=Excellent, G=Good, F=Fair, P=Poor, VP=Very Poor.

Comments received from faculty substantiate that perception. When asked to describe any other areas of deficiency relative to information literacy, faculty offered the following comments:

- “Internet search tools such as Google have become the new definition of scholarly research.”
- Students “lack the ability to take a specific topic and generalize it…broaden out a literature search.”
- There continues to be confusion with identifying and utilizing professional sources vs. nonprofessional sources. . . .Many students accept various websites as a “professional source.”
- They “utilize Internet sources that lack credibility.”
- Students lack “the ability to comprehend and process information.”
- Students need help “shaping research with different search terms.”
- Students need help “understanding exactly what plagiarism is and how to avoid it.”

The questions on the Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey are mapped to the U Research student learning outcomes. The survey will again be given to faculty at both the mid-point (third year) and the conclusion of the U Research implementation period (fifth year) to measure any change in students’ information literacy skills from the faculty perspective. It is expected that faculty perceptions of students’ information literacy and research skills will be an important indicator in determining the success of U Research.

**Student Research Skills Survey.** Just prior to the selection of U Research as the topic for MC’s Quality Enhancement Plan, English faculty members and librarians collaborated to examine information literacy competencies of students as they entered English Composition (ENG 102). Students in selected sections of ENG 102 were given a Research Skills Survey (Appendix B) to measure the students’ self-perceived research competencies, their knowledge of research sources at Mississippi College, and their knowledge of basic research principles. Students were also asked about their past usage of the library, previous research experiences, and the skills they would like to learn. A total of 124 students completed the survey (105 freshmen, 11 sophomores, 6 juniors and 2 seniors).

Results of the survey were similar to national library usage trends and were not surprising considering that the majority of the students surveyed were just beginning their academic careers. Almost 59 percent of the students did not know to use MICAL, the library catalog, in order to find a book. Approximately 76 percent of the students incorrectly answered a question involving Boolean search principles (use of and, or and not). When given examples of citations, students were generally unsure of the format referred to in the citation. While 41 percent of the respondents could correctly identify a book citation, only 31 percent could recognize another citation as being a chapter from a book. Similarly, 85 percent of the respondents could correctly identify a citation as being from a magazine, but only slightly over one third of the students could identify another citation as being a journal article. Additionally, the responses to the questions dealing with plagiarism showed a lack of understanding as to what constitutes plagiarism; over one third of the students could not correctly identify the circumstances under which a citation is required.

When completing the survey, the students were asked about the skills they felt they needed to learn from the library. Almost two thirds of the students (62 percent) indicated they would like more information about when and how to cite sources, 53 percent wanted help in searching for books, 56 percent wanted help in evaluating sources, 53 percent wanted help in accessing good sources from outside the library, and 40 percent indicated that they needed help in searching for magazine or journal articles. Results of these self-assessments show that students recognize their own need to acquire better research skills.
Fit within mission statement and strategic planning process. Having determined that U Research would respond to identified needs of our students and our curriculum, the Steering Committee considered its fit within the current culture of Mississippi College as reflected in the mission statement and in the strategic planning process.

Mission statement. U Research was found to complement Mississippi College’s Mission Statement, specifically as the mission statement refers to the “pursuit of academic excellence,” the “intellectual development of its students,” and in the encouragement of the use of “skills, talents, and abilities as they pursue meaningful careers, life-long learning, and service to God and others” (para. 3). Additionally, U Research supports Goal 1.f of the Speed Library Mission Statement to “provide for faculty and students an effective program of information literacy instruction to fulfill current research needs, promote lifelong learning, and develop critical thinking skills as necessary prerequisites to success in a technological world” (para. 2).

Strategic planning. U Research directly addresses the University’s Strategic Planning process, in particular Goals I and II:

I. Academic Excellence: “Mississippi College will pursue excellence by …providing an enriched learning environment and innovative delivery methods; and promoting outstanding scholarship, service, and creative activities that advance knowledge.”

II. Curriculum: “The undergraduate curriculum will prepare students for a lifetime of learning and instill basic skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary for personal development and reasoned response to a changing world.”

The following Strategic Planning Objective explicitly addresses information literacy: “Mississippi College students will become discriminating users of information as a result of a deliberate and sequenced information literacy program” (MC Strategic Planning minutes, December 15, 2011).

U Research also complements Speed Library’s Strategic Plan, specifically Initiative One:

I. Services: “Expand/improve existing library services and introduce new services to aid library users in accessing appropriate informational resources and in developing independent lifelong learning skills” (Leland Speed Library Strategic Plan, 2006, p. 4).

Selection of U Research. U Research was deemed to be an initiative with a clear potential to enhance student learning. Additionally, U Research was found to be compatible with the university mission statement and Mississippi College’s strategic planning goals. The analysis of institutional data showed that the teaching of information literacy competencies could meet an identified need at MC. The evidence showed that U Research satisfied all the SACS requirements for a Quality Enhancement
Plan, and it had the support of the campus community. After the Steering Committee recommended the selection of U Research, Dr. Ron Howard, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, presented the choice to the President’s Council at the beginning of the Spring 2010 semester. The President’s Council voted unanimously in favor of U Research as MC’s Quality Enhancement Plan, and Dr. Howard was given approval to proceed with the development of the plan.
**Development of U Research**

After the selection of U Research as the Quality Enhancement Plan, a Development Committee was formed in early February 2010 and was charged with planning U Research. The Steering Committee, with its information network to every part of the campus, remained in an advisory capacity. The Development Committee was eventually expanded to thirteen members (four faculty, one librarian, one staff member, one Graduate Assistant, one Instructional Technologist, one part-time administrator and adjunct faculty, two students, and two *ex officio* members from the administration). Dr. Ron Howard, Vice President for Academic Affairs, was the liaison between the Development Committee and both the advisory Steering Committee and the supervisory President’s Council, which serves as the overall Leadership Team for the MC SACS effort. The structure and composition of the Development Committee and its subcommittees are outlined in Appendix A.

**Involvement of the campus.** The Development Committee coordinated the research and efforts of fourteen subcommittees as they developed various aspects of the U Research plan. The establishment of the subcommittees allowed additional faculty, staff, administration, and students to progressively take part in the research and development of U Research. The subcommittees made recommendations for their respective areas of responsibility and presented those plans to the Development Committee. The Development Committee reviewed each proposal and worked with each team in making modifications to strengthen the overall QEP.

At various stages of the development of U Research, information was presented to the campus community and was posted on the QEP website. Input and suggestions were solicited at those presentations and through the Discussion Board on the website. The writing of U Research was a recursive process with the draft of the plan being constantly improved by the input and perspectives of various groups on campus.

**Review of literature.** One of the first subcommittees established was the Literature Review Subcommittee, consisting of eighteen members representing administrators, staff, students, and faculty from most of the schools on campus. This group was charged with examining the professional literature and researching information literacy models at other colleges. Department faculty examined documents and articles relating information literacy to their respective disciplines. The subgroup identified best practices in the field of information literacy and summarized the ideas that might be useful for Mississippi College. Findings and
summaries were published on the [Quality Enhancement Plan – Developing U Research LibGuide](http://www.libguides.com/qualityenhancement), with 24/7 online access to the campus community. The review of literature, conducted initially during the Discovery phase and more extensively during the Development phase of U Research, provided additional evidence of the need to teach information literacy competencies to college students.

**What is information literacy?** The phrase “information literacy” was used in 1974 by Paul Zurkowski, president of the Information Industry Association (IIA), in a paper presented to the National Commission of Libraries and Information Science. Zurkowski wrote that “people trained in the application of information resources to their work can be called information literates. They have learned techniques and skills for utilizing the wide range of information tools as well as primary sources in molding information-solutions to their problems” (p. 9). In 1989, the American Library Association (ALA) [Presidential Committee on Information Literacy: Final Report](https://www.ala.org/ala/pcc/activities/ils/presidentialcommittee/report.pdf) developed the definition that is commonly used - “to be information literate, a person must be able to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (ALA, para. 3). The report also described information literate people as “those who have learned how to learn. . . .They are people prepared for lifelong learning” (ALA, para. 3).

In 2000, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) section of ALA published [Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education](https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilcstds), organizing information literacy into five broad standards and providing a series of learning outcomes by which information literacy attainment can be defined and measured. The U Research Development Committee used this framework to establish student learning outcomes. The document outlines information literacy competencies and describes their importance in all of higher education, rather than just in libraries. The ACRL publication describes information literacy as being a metacognitive approach, making students “conscious of the explicit actions required for gathering, analyzing, and using information” (p. 6). These standards moved the focus of information literacy from skills and resources to strategies and processes, emphasizing the methods and the recursive nature of research. The ACRL document described information literate students as being “engaged in using a wide variety of information sources to expand their knowledge, ask informed questions, and sharpen their critical thinking for still further self-directed learning” (p. 5). Mastering such skills should prepare students for reasoned inquiry and critical discernment of information during their academic careers as well as throughout their lives. The ACRL document identifies information literacy as a “key component of, and contributor to, lifelong learning” (p. 4).

**Why is information literacy important in higher education?** The importance of information literacy in higher education is evidenced by the inclusion of information literacy as a requirement by most of the regional accreditation agencies, among them the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (ACRL, 2011). Additionally, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), in their Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative, included information literacy as one of the essential learning outcomes to prepare

Information literacy includes the concepts of critical thinking that are crucial for academic success: asking appropriate questions, gathering relevant information, reasoning logically, and making valid conclusions. Furthermore, teaching information literacy within the curriculum answers the call of higher education to move toward a pedagogy that includes metacognitive strategies. Metacognition involves thinking about the learning process itself. Intentionally learning and practicing “soft” skills such as information literacy and critical thinking in lower-level classes can lead to mastery of the skills as students apply them in upper-level courses. Information literacy skills become a vehicle by which students learn the content and research methodology of a discipline.

Information literacy strategies can also contribute to success in the workplace and in life after college. The business community has long recognized information literacy as a necessary skill for graduates in the rapidly changing work environment. As early as 1991, the U.S. Department of Labor SCANS (Secretary of Labor’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills) report identified information literacy as a critical skill for success (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991). Almost twenty years later, the Association of American Colleges and Universities commissioned a study entitled “Raising the Bar: Employers’ Views on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn.” The study found that employers recognize the importance of certain educational practices, including teaching students to “conduct research and develop evidence-based analysis” (Hart, 2010, p. 7). A majority of the employers surveyed believe that colleges should place a greater emphasis on a variety of learning outcomes developed through a liberal education, one of which is “the ability to locate, organize, and evaluate information from multiple sources” (p. 2).

Patricia Breivik (2006) recognized the lifelong importance of information literacy, stating that students need to “understand how the skills they are learning can be applied to both civic and home situations. If they finish their education thinking that they can find all the information they need through a fast Google search and that libraries are useful only for classroom assignments and recreational reading, they are not information literate. Indeed, transferability is the essence of information literacy” (p. 64).

Why is information literacy important to our students? Many students are entering college without the skills needed to do college-level research. The proliferation of information, coupled with the rapid development of technologies that deliver the information, has changed the way college students conduct research. As information increases, it becomes more vital to learn effective processes and methods to acquire, evaluate, and use information. While students have always been required to find and analyze information, they have never had such responsibility for evaluating its credibility. Information in the past was more centralized and was usually filtered through a mediator (either a professor or librarian). The Internet has resulted in
information being decentralized with “less distinction than older media between consumers and producers of content” (Adler & Breivik, 1999, p.4). More than ten years after this observation, technologies such as blogs, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, and other collaborative publishing platforms have blurred this distinction even further. There are no editorial or fact-checking requirements to be met before publishing on the web. Students find themselves responsible for evaluating the authority of information retrieved, yet they may not have the appropriate skills to do so.

Numerous studies confirm that students need to acquire skills to help them become discerning consumers of information. As early as 1998, the Boyer Commission’s report on educating undergraduates warned, “If anything is evident, it is that the more information a person can obtain, the greater the need for judgment about how to use it. Obtaining information from the Internet is easy; children in elementary school can do it” (p. 26). Patricia Breivik (2005) points out that while beginning college students may be considered tech savvy, “what is growing ever more obvious is that today’s undergraduates are generally far less prepared to do research than were students of earlier generations, despite their familiarity with powerful new information-gathering tools” (p. 22).

Other large scale studies confirm the difficulties students encounter while conducting research. The Online Computer Library Center in 2002 published the “OCLC White Paper on the Information Habits of College Students.” The study found that “more than 31% of all respondents use Internet search engines to find answers to their questions. However, students who use Internet search engines express frustration because they estimate that half of their searches are unsuccessful” (OCLC, p. 2).

Several studies have been conducted by Project Information Literacy from the Information School at the University of Washington. In 2009, principal researchers Head and Eisenberg published the study entitled Lessons Learned: How College Students Seek Information in the Digital Age and again uncovered some disturbing trends. Students tend to use the same small set of information resources, no matter what the research need. “Google was the go-to resource for almost all of the students in the sample. Nearly all of the students in the sample reported always using Google, both for course-related research and everyday life research” (p. 15). Frustrations and challenges identified by students involved “narrowing down topics, finding relevant resources, sorting through too many results from online searches, and evaluating the credibility” of sources used (p. 32). In an interview with the Seattle Times, the authors of the study contend that:

Evaluation, interpretation and synthesis are the key competencies of the 21st century. These information literacy skills allow us to find what we need, filter out what we do not and chart a course in an ever-expanding frontier of information. Information literacy is the essential skill set that cuts across all disciplines and professions. (Head & Eisenberg, 2011, para. 23)
Another large-scale research project underway is the Citation Project, a multi-institutional analysis of how students use sources in papers written for first-year composition courses. Researchers examined sources and categorized them into one of four categories: exact copying, “patchwriting” (copying with minimal alteration or synonym substitution), paraphrasing (restatement of the source’s argument with mostly fresh language, but minimal understanding), and summary (the desired result, with comprehension of the source’s argument and intent). Preliminary results showed that only six percent of the citations examined were categorized as summaries, indicating that most of the citations showed no synthesis of the resources used. Seventy percent of the citations came from somewhere in the first two pages of the sources used (Jamieson & Howard, 2011). Analyzing the preliminary results of the Citation Project, Berrett (2011) suggested that blatant plagiarism may be less of a problem than is skimming the surface when using sources. Results of the Citation Project confirm the earlier observations of Sharon Weiner (2010), who reported in Information Literacy: A Neglected Core Competency that many college students “view their research activities as ‘satisficing’ – finding just enough information that is ‘good enough’ to complete course assignments. They miss opportunities that college education provides for exploration, discovery, and deep learning” (para. 4).

While these studies pertain to the general population of college students, there is reason to believe that Mississippi College students share these same characteristics. The results and comments from the Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey indicate that faculty believe MC students need improved information literacy competencies. In addition, the Research Skills Survey given to students in the ENG 102 classes show that the students recognize their own need for guidance.

**Information literacy and the workplace.** As disturbing as the studies about students’ information-seeking habits might be, even more disturbing are the studies that spotlight the fact that students graduate from college unprepared to succeed in the workplace. Mark Taylor (2007) terms this “an epidemic of work-life unreadiness” (p. 2:35) because, while students possess some technology skills, they lack the meaningful information and communication skills that contribute to workplace problem-solving.

Recent publications, such as Academically Adrift (Arum & Roksa, 2011), Higher Education? (Hacker & Dreifus, 2010) and Declining by Degrees (Hersh & Merrow, 2005), lament the lack of preparedness of college graduates. While there is no one solution to cure these deficiencies, certain practices in higher education can improve student learning. The teaching of information literacy skills is a strategy that can empower graduates with the skills necessary to compete in a knowledge-based workplace and to contribute positively to society.

**Models of best practices in information literacy.** As the Literature Review Subcommittee examined information literacy literature, they also identified potential strategies that would be most effective at Mississippi College. The Literature Review Subcommittee and the Development Committee looked at different types of information literacy programs, including
programs developed by schools that have chosen information literacy as the Quality Enhancement Plan. Finally, ACRL’s *Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices* (ACRL, 2003) was consulted and compared to the planned components of U Research.

The review of literature revealed two types of information literacy programs – those involving a stand-alone information literacy course and those programs that have distributed or integrated information literacy (IL) components into the curriculum. While stand-alone information literacy classes can be of great benefit, it was decided that the general education curriculum requirements at Mississippi College would not be conducive to such a model nor would it best meet the needs of our students.

The curriculum integrated or distributed model uses a variety of courses to address a set of desired competencies. In the general education or lower-level courses, competencies are more generic. In the upper-level courses, information literacy is placed in the context of the discipline. Higher order thinking abilities are required as students advance in their academic career. A curriculum integrated model was chosen for the U Research implementation plan, thus providing sequenced IL programs through the undergraduate curriculum of each major.

A variety of studies substantiate the advantages of a curriculum integrated model. The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (2003) states that the distributed approach makes information literacy more relevant to students, “deepening students’ understanding of the importance within their chosen fields” (p. 17). Hunt and Birks (2004) proposed that by integrating information literacy into the curriculum, skills are taught in context and they are transferrable and applicable to problem solving in the discipline and in life (p. 30). Other researchers discuss possible negative repercussions of teaching information literacy outside a disciplinary context.

Decontextualized data and information become knowledge only when someone working within the framework of a discipline, integrates it into the knowledge-base of that discipline. . . .The risk is that of isolating entirely information-seeking skills from knowledge, thereby losing sight of information-seeking skills as a tool whose ultimate goal is the synthesis of information into knowledge. (Grafstein, 2002, p. 200)

Additionally, the teaching of information-seeking skills without the higher order skills of analysis and application might convey to students that research requires only the “ordered use of tools to locate pieces of information from which research projects can be assembled” (Fister, 1993, p. 212). Given these expectations, students are likely to summarize bits of retrieved information and never move into the synthesis and analysis of information.

The Literature Review Subcommittee and the Majors Subcommittee identified and summarized additional publications dealing with the distributed approach to information literacy
While examining practices at other institutions, the Literature Review group and the Development Committee consulted information literacy QEP documents and personnel from other selected institutions, among them the University of Central Florida, Trinity University, North Georgia College and State University, North Carolina Wesleyan, Southwestern Adventist College, Georgia Highlands College, the University of Montevallo, and Lincoln Memorial University. The committees looked at strategies and ideas from these plans and considered which might fit within the context of Mississippi College.

Another important document consulted was Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices (ACRL, 2003). This document articulates the following elements that might be present in exemplary information literacy programs: a mission statement, goals and objectives, a planning process, administrative support, articulation with the curriculum, collaboration, diverse pedagogy, adequate staffing, outreach, and assessment. The subcommittee found that the criteria identified as best practices in that document are present in the planned components of U Research.

Additionally, some disciplinary accrediting agencies have defined the set of literacy skills appropriate for their field of study. Information Literacy in the Disciplines on the ACRL website provides links to various disciplinary standards. These standards will be consulted as U Research is integrated into the respective disciplines.

Conclusion. Mississippi College’s mission statement embraces the creation of “lifelong learners.” With the exponential growth of information, knowledge in a discipline is not static and cannot be totally mastered within the scope of a college career. U Research is a deliberate and sequential program that can produce a graduate who has “learned how to learn,” and who has demonstrated an ability to apply information literacy skills to problem-solving situations throughout life and beyond the college degree.

“While meeting SACS accreditation requirements and addressing a campus need, U Research is an investment in Mississippi College students that engages them in sequenced information literacy practice and meaningful activities; enhances their research, organizational, critical thinking, and communication skills for a deeper learning experience; and empowers them with important transferable skills for greater personal growth and contributions to society beyond the classroom.” (Gibson, 2009, p. 19)

U Research’s potential to enhance and improve the current information literacy program. The Leland Speed Library has been advocating and promoting information literacy efforts on campus for several decades. Early activities reflected the pedagogies and
methodologies that were prevalent at the time, such as a Library Workbook assignment (early 1990s) with skills-based tasks that were specific to library resources. The library also advanced an information literacy initiative in 1999, focused mainly on resources and technologies, rather than strategies such as critical thinking or evaluation of sources.

Meanwhile, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) published *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* in 2000. These standards encompassed the critical thinking process and incorporated more complex higher order learning skills, broadening the concept of “information literacy” beyond skills-based instruction. More significantly, the standards addressed all of higher education rather than just academic libraries. Information literacy found its way into the terminology of higher education and accreditation bodies across the country.

The current instructional program at Mississippi College provides a brief introduction to information sources to students in ENG 102. In addition, discipline-specific information literacy sessions are provided “on demand” for other classes in the core curriculum, upper-level classes, masters-level and doctoral-level classes. While the program is growing and provides a vital service to the university, there has been no coordinated effort to include information literacy throughout the entire curriculum. Although the current program reaches many students in different phases of their academic careers, the lack of a sequenced information literacy program integrated into the curriculum may result in students receiving either sporadic instruction or redundant instruction sessions. Students now may find themselves in a senior capstone class, close to graduation, with less than the desired knowledge of resources available to begin a research project. U Research will allow for a planned progression of information literacy competencies to be interwoven into the curriculum – introduced in ENG 102 and reinforced as the student moves into the major courses.

**Testing the Waters with Pilot Courses.** In Fall 2011, three courses were used as pilot courses to examine how U Research could be integrated into the core curriculum and into courses in the majors. The purpose of the pilot courses was to put theory into practice – to test the compatibility of information literacy student learning outcomes with the existing course outcomes, and to examine the efficacy of the methods and procedures proposed in the implementation of U Research. Faculty in the pilot courses developed or refined assignments and assessment tools to address the information literacy student learning outcomes. Lessons learned in the pilot courses will be used to fine-tune U Research procedures and to assist with faculty development as U Research is implemented into the curriculum.

**English.** ENG 102 is the second course in the freshman composition sequence. The course is included in the general education curriculum, is required of all students, and cannot be satisfied with Advanced Placement credit. ENG 102 has a researched writing emphasis; however, information literacy components of the course have traditionally been limited to a brief library introduction. Class time spent in research activities onsite in the Leland Speed Library or using computers in other classrooms has varied widely based on instructor preferences and technology availability.
In recent semesters, key English Department faculty have collaborated to refine the ENG 102 curriculum to more explicitly teach and assess information literacy competencies. Subsequently, in Fall 2011, four sections of ENG 102 were specifically designated as pilot sections for U Research. The purpose of the pilot sections was to experiment with common assignments and to design assessments to examine whether those assignments adequately introduce U Research objectives to students.

Shared Objectives: The four pilot sections shared a common syllabus with shared course objectives and information literacy objectives. The relevant passages are excerpted below.

Course Objectives: Students will

1. Learn to read critically and analytically
2. Learn to access library resources, including print and electronic media
3. Learn to evaluate print and electronic sources based on objective criteria
4. Learn to integrate source material into their own with their own analyses and conclusions
5. Learn and practice proper documentation and attribution and understand the ethical dimensions of using source material
6. Develop interpersonal skills that facilitate group work
7. Improve written and oral communication skills

Information Literacy: This section of ENG 102 includes an Information Literacy emphasis as part of U Research, Mississippi College’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The following Information Literacy objectives will be emphasized. The student will be able to

1. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed
2. Access needed information efficiently and effectively
3. Evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into his or her knowledge base
4. Individually or as a member of a group, use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose
5. Understand many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and access and use information ethically and legally

Shared Assignments: The pilot sections also shared several major assignments directly related to information literacy objectives. The English faculty created a document mapping the learning objectives of the assignments to the U Research learning objectives.

Relevant sample handouts/assignments are:

1. Website Evaluation Essay (Assignment, Assessment Rubric, Correlation of Student Learning Outcomes - SLOs)
2. Research Log* [Assignment, Example of Research Log, Assessment Rubric, Correlation of SLOs]
3. Annotated Bibliography* [Assignment, Assessment Rubric, Correlation of SLOs]
4. State of the Conversation Report [Assignment, Assessment Rubric, Correlation of SLOs]

*The Research Log and Annotated Bibliography are included under the “Research Notebook” major assignment on the syllabus.

**Shared Assessments:** Over the semester, the faculty implemented a variety of assessments. For each of the assignments above, the collaborating English faculty compiled and piloted rubrics (Appendix C, and linked above) to assess the information literacy student learning outcomes. Survey Monkey was used to compile the assessments for each assignment. In addition, on the last day of class, students completed the Research Readiness Self Assessment (RRSA). Also near the end of the semester, students were asked to complete anonymous informal evaluations of the course.

Assessment results varied. Importantly, the major assignment assessment rubrics were user-friendly and helped affirm the correlation between major course assignments, information literacy objectives, and student learning outcomes. The Survey Monkey assessments showed a range in students’ abilities to demonstrate student learning outcomes. Some students demonstrated high performance in connection with most or all outcomes; however, other students did not perform as well.

**Conclusions:** Through the pilot semester, a variety of key issues emerged. Some of the most important are described below.

- **Student Motivation, Student Learning, and Course Design.** Several students—some with and some without strong research and writing backgrounds—were constantly attentive and engaged, worked industriously, and performed at high or moderately high levels. Other students were not as motivated and frequently failed to satisfactorily complete the assignments. At times, students used internet search engines to search for articles better found in databases, struggled to construct useful search terminology, and settled for sources that were not of the best quality. These weaknesses will continue to be addressed in instructional sessions in subsequent classes. However, among many students, improvements were seen over previous semesters: the pilot groups seemed better able to evaluate sources, identify types of sources, and synthesize content.

- **Faculty Development and Support.** Faculty development will be a crucial element for the success of U Research. The U Research Leaders in the English Department and the faculty teaching the pilot sections have worked to develop a portfolio of assignments and assessments that can be used as a prototype for other faculty to use. The assignments and assessments adequately address the student learning outcomes in U Research. The ENG 102 curriculum will continue to be improved and enhanced as U Research is further implemented.
Piloting Standardized Assessments. During the Fall 2011 pilot semester, the RRSA (Research Readiness Self Assessment) was given to a sample of freshmen in the first English Composition course, ENG 101. During the same period, SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) was given to a sample of freshmen. Two different instruments were given in order to compare ease of administration, appropriateness of content, and usefulness of data received. Administration of each instrument to a sample of students provided baseline data and allowed the better instrument to be chosen. Giving the tests at the beginning of ENG 101 provided data as to what students know prior to receiving information literacy instruction. Additionally, the RRSA was given to students in the piloted ENG 102 sections at the end of Fall 2011 after having received information literacy instruction. This administration provided more information about what students learned and also served as a gauge of the effectiveness of the planned curriculum for ENG 102.

Results from the end-of-semester RRSA administration showed that students in the pilot sections performed substantially higher than students finishing ENG 101, who received no formal information literacy instruction. The data from that assessment tool also proved useful in showing how well the U Research objectives were met. The complete results from the SAILS administration have recently been made available and are currently being analyzed.

Nursing. NUR 323 – Research in Nursing Practice is an upper-level nursing class that focuses on the research process and the development of an attitude of inquiry. One of the assignments in NUR 323 is a group PowerPoint presentation. Students enrolled in NUR 323 have had prior clinical experience, and they use that experience when selecting a research topic. Students develop a topic based on the PICO method (Patient/Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome) of research design. They locate, evaluate, summarize, and incorporate appropriate research articles into the presentation. The assignment is a good fit for incorporating the U Research information literacy competencies.

The PowerPoint assignment in NUR 323 addressed each of the student learning outcomes in U Research. The learning outcomes of the assignment were mapped to U Research learning outcomes (Submission Form), and the professors in the class developed and used a scoring rubric that correlated with U Research objectives (Appendix D). The scoring rubric provides a description of criteria necessary to earn the maximum number of points available for each component. The rubric was used to assign a grade to the student as well as assess the information literacy competencies. There were several advantages of using a dual purpose scoring rubric. The rubric was not looked on as an add-on responsibility for the professors. It also made the information literacy competencies very specific and relevant to the task at hand. Finally, it allowed the professors to give different weights to different components of the assignment; for instance, developing the clinical question was worth more points than adhering to the prescribed citation style.

Results and Lessons Learned. The development of the nursing rubric showed that the outcomes of the assignment fit well with the outcomes of U Research learning outcomes. Developing the rubric also provided an opportunity to look at the assignment holistically and
make sure that all important criteria were being evaluated. An analysis of the scored rubrics showed that more instruction and emphasis should be placed on accessing and citing information received from a particular required resource.

**Sociology.** SOC 205 – An Introduction in Global Context is the threshold course for Sociology majors and is also in the Core Curriculum as an option by which the Social Science requirement can be satisfied. One of the course objectives is to give students an understanding of “critical research knowledge and skills…” Students in SOC 205 are required to submit a “LibGuide” Resources Report on a chosen sociological topic for three different countries. The assignment requires students to find and annotate the best resources from a variety of information types. Students submit the reports electronically, with durable or persistent links for each source.

The assignments in upper-level courses such as SOC 205 will address those student learning outcomes that are relevant to the course and the assignment. The assignment in SOC 205 addressed all the student learning outcomes from U Research except SLO 1a (identify and develop a topic into a manageable focus). The students were required to select an appropriate topic, but this was a small aspect of the assignment. The assignment objectives were mapped to the U Research student learning objectives (Submission Form), and a [rubric](#) was developed to assess the information literacy competencies (Appendix E). Unlike the rubric in NUR 323, the Sociology rubric was not intended to be used as a mechanism for assigning a grade. Because of the large number of students, each submitting three Resources Reports, the professor decided to apply the rubric to a sampling of student work.

At the end of the semester, the professor analyzed assignments received from a random sample of students. The student work consisted of three resource guides (LibGuides) on a sociological topic from three different countries. The information literacy rubric was applied to the student work and was compared to the instructor’s separate grading sheets. Evaluation points assigned on the information literacy rubric generally paralleled those assigned for the students’ grading sheets. Thus, students scoring higher points on the instructor’s grading sheets had comparable higher marks on the information literacy rubrics and vice versa. Improvement across the three separate LibGuides among the sampled students appeared to be found in the logistics of putting the LibGuide together (e.g., structure of individual resources, assignment of individual resources to the correct resource categories, operational Internet connections to the resources themselves). Students scoring lower on both the information literacy rubrics and the instructor’s separate grading sheets were consistently found to not only include the above listed logistical problems, but more importantly lacked adequate annotations of the individual resources themselves (e.g., not following the required structure or content of the annotation and/or copying directly from the resource’s description such as an abstract, introduction, or summary.) However, in general it can be said that all sampled students’ LibGuides did show improvement in their adherence to the information literacy rubrics across the three separate LibGuide assignments during the semester.
Lessons Learned – Before the pilot semester, the professor had indicated that he wanted to begin placing more emphasis on the students’ evaluation and annotation of resources. He had found that students need more guidance on the correct procedures to properly annotate the source in addition to guidance about the format and conventions of the final product. In many courses, faculty focus heavily on the research product and less so on the research process. During this pilot study, a shift in emphasis to the research process occurred. As U Research is implemented into the majors, faculty should begin to place an equal emphasis on the research process and the research product.

Preliminary campus engagement. The process of planning and developing U Research has resulted in additional learning activities across campus. Faculty in several disciplines are considering how U Research might be implemented and sequenced in their majors, and examining and refining courses that might be used. The library has seen more requests for the creation of course-specific LibGuides. In addition, students have prepared assignments and projects regarding aspects of information literacy, such as the ethical use of information. One of the more satisfying examples of campus activity came anecdotally from a student who had been enrolled in one of the first ENG 102 sections with the enhanced information literacy component. Later, he became a tutor in the Department of English’s Writing Center and recently reported to the instruction librarian how he had been able to help another student with the research process. This confirms the assertion that well-trained student tutors can assist their peers, and that research and writing are both recursive and intertwined processes.

Work of other subcommittees. In addition to the Literature Review Subcommittee, other subcommittees collaborated and submitted reports between Summer 2010 and Spring 2011. Subcommittees (detailed in Appendix A) were convened to establish goals and objectives, to summarize the history of the topic selection, to document the history of information literacy at Mississippi College, to gather the institutional data for the analysis of need, and to study assessment needs. Recommendations were submitted by the Core Subcommittee, the Majors Subcommittee, and the Freshman Experience Subcommittee. In Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, the Publicity Subcommittee met and created a plan to publicize and market the plan to faculty, students, staff, trustees, and alumni. The Faculty Development Subcommittee and the Resources/Budget Subcommittees worked in late 2010 and early 2011 to provide proposals and suggestions. The Assessment Subcommittee developed rubrics, analyzed standardized instruments, and made recommendations regarding overall assessment. With this input from the various subcommittees, the Development Committee began to draft a plan for U Research.

Other campus activities. In addition to the work of the fourteen subcommittees, other members of the campus community were asked to review the plans and to offer suggestions and feedback. A Discussion Board was established on the DEP website as a forum for input of discussion. During the drafting of U Research, the campus was made aware of the plan’s components. Information was presented at faculty meetings, staff meetings, student organizations, and through the website.
During the development of the plan and continuing through the implementation of U Research, Mississippi College has offered ongoing training and faculty development opportunities regarding information literacy and accreditation issues. Six people attended different SACS COC Summer Institutes on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation (2009, 2010, and 2011) and three attended the SACS COC Annual Meetings. Two librarians attended the 2010 Augustana Information Literacy Workshop: Integrative Programmatic Assessment for Information Literacy, and engaged Megan Oakleaf for consultation. One librarian yearly attends the Georgia Conference on Information Literacy and has attended the Citation Project training workshop. One librarian has been accepted for ACRL Immersion – Assessment program in November 2012, and funds are allocated in the U Research budget to continue similar training and development opportunities.

On April 15, 2011, Dr. Barbara Jones, an independent QEP consultant, visited the campus and met with the QEP Development Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee and others. As a result of Dr. Jones’ visit and advice, the Development Committee was able to articulate a sharper focus for U Research and to improve several other components of the plan.

On June 20, 2011, 15 faculty, staff, and administrators from various schools and departments attended an intensive workshop to evaluate the draft of U Research. In preparation for the workshop, attendees were asked to complete a rubric consisting of 30 questions and putting U Research to the test - to determine if U Research met the criteria for an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan. During the workshop, attendees worked in breakout groups and compared and aggregated their comments. This exercise was most helpful in pointing out areas of concern or ambiguity, particularly from those in the group who had not been closely involved in QEP planning. As a result of the workshop feedback, several areas of the QEP were revised to more accurately reflect components of the plan, and graphic displays were added to explain the narrative.

The draft of U Research was disseminated to the campus in Fall 2011, again with solicitation for input and ideas for successful implementation of the plan.

Publicity activities to promote U Research were conducted in Fall 2011 and more intensively in Spring 2012. Short videos were created to present segments of the QEP to different groups at Mississippi College. These videos were presented at faculty and staff meetings, and were e-mailed to campus groups over several months. These clips were short enough to keep the viewers’ attention and also served as an introduction for further discussion of the plan.

The final plan and budget for U Research was submitted and approved by the President’s Council in February 2012.
SECTION II. FOCUS OF U RESEARCH

U Research calls for the development of a sequential information literacy plan, integrated into the curriculum, with general information literacy competencies introduced in required English Composition classes (ENG 102). Reinforcement and mastery of those competencies will occur in designated courses in each major.

Focus

The focus of Mississippi College’s Quality Enhancement Plan is the development of information literacy competencies in undergraduate students.

Goal, Objectives, and Student Learning Outcomes of U Research

Goal. Mississippi College students will become discriminating users of information as a result of a deliberate and sequenced information literacy program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES. Students will be able to:</th>
<th>STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES. Students will be able to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Determine the nature and extent of</td>
<td>a. Identify and develop a topic into a manageable focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the information needed</td>
<td>b. Identify a variety of types and formats of potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sources for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Access needed information</td>
<td>a. Construct and implement effectively designed research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiently and effectively</td>
<td>strategies using appropriate methods or information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retrieval systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate information and its</td>
<td>a. Evaluate information and its sources using</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources critically and incorporate</td>
<td>appropriate criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selected information into his or her</td>
<td>b. Identify main ideas and their potential relevance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge base</td>
<td>summarizing and synthesizing key ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individually or as a member of a</td>
<td>a. Apply new and prior information to the planning and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group, use information effectively</td>
<td>creation of a product or performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to accomplish a specific purpose</td>
<td>b. Communicate the product or performance effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and clearly to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understand many of the economic,</td>
<td>a. Acknowledge sources and use information following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal, and social issues surrounding</td>
<td>the conventions of a particular discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use of information and access</td>
<td>b. Demonstrate an understanding of university policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and use information ethically and</td>
<td>regarding plagiarism, academic integrity and use of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legally</td>
<td>campus networks and information resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objectives and student learning outcomes were derived from the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), 2000. They were developed during the summer of 2010 by the Core Curriculum Subcommittee and the Development Committee. The learning outcomes provide a
framework within which the institution can measure student progress toward the attainment of information literacy competencies.

The focus of U Research and the achievement of the goal, its objectives, and its student learning outcomes will enhance student learning and advance the institutional mission of Mississippi College. Specifically, the successful realization of the goal and objectives will advance the “pursuit of academic excellence,” the “intellectual development of its students,” and the application of “skills, talents, and abilities as they pursue meaningful careers, life-long learning, and service to God and others.”

**Definition Of Information Literacy.** The American Library Association (ALA) in its 1989 *Presidential Committee on Information Literacy: Final Report* stated that “to be information literate, a person must be able to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (para. 3).

**Definition of Student Learning.** Student learning is defined as a positive change in knowledge and skills as a result of experiences or learning activities. Within the context of U Research, student learning will be enhanced by the attainment and application of information literacy competencies. Undergraduate students will learn skills that enable them to make informed decisions because of the acquisition, critical discernment, and synthesis of information.

**Definition of Population.** U Research is targeted at undergraduate students. MC undergraduates will be formally taught information literacy competencies for the first time when they are enrolled in ENG 102. Transfer students will be included in the targeted population for U Research and are defined for these purposes as those who transfer in credit for ENG 102. Transfer students will complete an online information literacy tutorial with embedded quizzes, thus providing them a review of any instruction they received elsewhere, as well as an introduction to resources specific to Mississippi College.
SECTION III. INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY

Accomplishing the Goal through Curriculum Integration

The goal of U Research will be accomplished through the introduction of information literacy (IL) into ENG 102, then through the reiteration and advancement of IL student learning outcomes in designated courses in the majors, and lastly through the mastery of student learning outcomes in senior-level courses. Competencies in the upper-level courses are expected to reiterate and build on skills learned earlier and will encompass discipline-specific research methodologies and resources. While all student learning outcomes may not be covered in each upper-level course, students will be taught all the outcomes during their academic career at Mississippi College. Faculty teaching the major courses will designate the student learning outcomes included in the course, with a course-embedded assessment to measure achievement of the outcomes. The Faculty Development Committee, QEP Director, and faculty development workshop facilitators will support and assist in the development of course-embedded assessments.

U Research will be implemented into the curriculum incrementally, beginning in ENG 102 during the first phase. During the second phase (years two through four) at least six departments each year will integrate U Research into their designated courses. By the end of the fourth year of the Quality Enhancement Plan, all departments will have integrated U Research into their curricula. As Mississippi College enters into the final implementation phase of the QEP, U Research will be fully integrated into each undergraduate major in the university. The final implementation phase of the QEP will be spent in refining courses/assignments that may need revision or modification based on assessment results and in planning for sustainability of the program. A detailed timeline for implementation is included on page 39.

**English Composition.** ENG 102, the second semester of English Composition, will be used as the main venue to teach general information literacy competencies and will address all the student learning outcomes. The goals of the English Composition course are compatible with the desired student learning outcomes of U Research, and ENG 102 provides an opportunity for students to apply information literacy skills to the writing process. Student learning outcomes will be assessed with a standardized instrument as well as embedded assignments and rubrics.

**Departmental majors.** Repetition and reinforcement are necessary components of sustainable learning. Even though the basic information literacy competencies learned in ENG 102 are transferrable across disciplines and into the workplace, U Research will provide for deeper reinforcement and applicability in upper-level courses and within the context of the discipline-specific major.

Each department at Mississippi College has selected two courses from each major in which to integrate information literacy. The courses were selected by the department chair and dean in collaboration with departmental faculty. A course designated as a U Research course
must be a required course for the major and must have an assignment with a research component. Typically, one course will be an introductory course to the major in which the student is engaging the research methodology and resources specific to the discipline. The second course will be a senior or capstone course which culminates in a paper, project or performance. While the culmination of the project will focus on Objective Four - “Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose” - other objectives and student learning outcomes will necessarily be utilized to achieve this purpose.

In the courses within the majors, research methodology and protocols will be appropriate and specific to the discipline. Advanced discipline-specific research methodologies and resources will be introduced, and basic competencies learned earlier will be reiterated and reinforced as students complete a project or participate in problem-based learning opportunities. Applying these competencies in situations similar to what might occur in the workplace or in postgraduate education should make information literacy more relevant and significant to the student.

Deans, Department Heads and faculty in each major have examined courses in their discipline and identified the following as possible U Research courses.

**U RESEARCH COURSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Introductory Course</th>
<th>Senior or Capstone Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>GBU 321 Business Communication</td>
<td>MGT 471 Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>GBU 321 Business Communication</td>
<td>MGT 471 Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>GBU 321 Business Communication</td>
<td>MIS 428 Methods &amp; Materials in Teaching Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>GBU 321 Business Communication</td>
<td>MGT 471 Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology – all majors</td>
<td>KIN 150 Foundations &amp; History of Physical Activity &amp; Sport</td>
<td>KIN 481 Biomechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Counseling</td>
<td>PSY 201 Introduction to Psychology</td>
<td>PSY 482/483 Psychology of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education &amp; Leadership – Elementary Education</td>
<td>EDU 300 Intro to Education</td>
<td>EDU 458 Organization and Mgt of Elementary Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education &amp; Leadership – Secondary Education</td>
<td>EDU 300 Intro to Education</td>
<td>EDU 460 Managing the Secondary Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Christian Studies and the Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art - Art Education</td>
<td>ART 205 Intro to Graphic Software</td>
<td>ART 475 Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art – Graphic Design</td>
<td>ART 205 Intro to Graphic Software</td>
<td>ART 416 Graphic Design Portfolio II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art - Interior Design</td>
<td>ART 205 Intro to Graphic Software</td>
<td>ART 472 Interior Design VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art - Studio Art</td>
<td>ART 205 Intro to Graphic Software</td>
<td>ART 475 Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Studies – All majors</td>
<td>MIN 224 Ministry of the Church</td>
<td>BIB 422 Teachings of Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication – All majors</td>
<td>COM 102 Communication Research</td>
<td>COM 442 Communication Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Introductory Course</td>
<td>Senior or Capstone Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td>MUS 256 Survey of Music History II</td>
<td>MUS 433 Vocal Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Humanities and Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English – Literature</td>
<td>ENG 370 Analysis of Literature</td>
<td>ENG 470 Senior Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English – Writing</td>
<td>ENG 371 Analysis of Discourse</td>
<td>ENG 471 Advanced Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English – English Education</td>
<td>ENG 370 Analysis of Literature</td>
<td>ENG 470 Senior Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages – FLIT</td>
<td>MLG 205 Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>SPA 315/316 or FRE 315 or GER 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages – French</td>
<td>MLG 205 Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>FRE 315 French Civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages – International Studies</td>
<td>MLG 205 Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>SPA 315/316 or FRE 315 or GER 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>MLG 205 Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>SPA 315/316 or FRE 315 or GER 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages – Spanish</td>
<td>MLG 205 Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>SPA 315 Spanish Civilization or SPA 316 Latin-American Civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Pol Sc – Administration of Justice</td>
<td>AJU 100 Intro to Criminal Justice</td>
<td>HIS/PLS 407 American Constitutional Development I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Pol Sc – History</td>
<td>HIS 302 Research and Methods</td>
<td>HIS/PLS 407 American Constitutional Development I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Pol Sc – Paralegal Studies</td>
<td>PLE 201 Introduction to Law</td>
<td>PLE 335 Legal Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Pol Sc – Political Science</td>
<td>PLS 101 Introduction to Political Science</td>
<td>PLS 499 Capstone in Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Social Work – Social Work</td>
<td>SOC 312 Social Science Research Methods</td>
<td>SWK 448 Senior Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Social Work – Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 312 Social Science Research Methods</td>
<td>SOC 450 Seminar in Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Nursing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUR 344 Clinical Practice</td>
<td>NUR 423 Nursing Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Science and Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BIO 307 Cell and Genetics Lab</td>
<td>BIO 431 Biology Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>CHE 310 Quantitative Chemical Analysis</td>
<td>CHE 431 Chemistry Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>CSC 330 Social &amp; Ethical Issues in Computing</td>
<td>CSC 416 (Software Engineering) and CSC 485 (Senior Seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>PHY 301 Modern Physics</td>
<td>PHY 401 Quantum Physics (PHY 402 under consideration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics – Engineering Physics</td>
<td>PHY 301 Modern Physics</td>
<td>ESC 450 Senior Design Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>MAT 301 Foundations of Mathematics</td>
<td>MAT 401 Mathematics Seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U Research Leaders.** Concurrent with the incremental implementation of the initiative, U Research Leaders (URLs) will be designated from each department (2-3 per department according to need). A stipend will be given to each U Research Leader and is included in the budget.
The URLs will be departmental faculty members responsible for developing the plan for incorporating information literacy into their respective departments and will attend the Spring workshop prior to implementation in their departments. The URLs will work with other departmental faculty to develop a proposal for both the introductory and the senior course that will include the appropriate student learning outcomes and recommended assessment tools. The final proposal must be presented to the Curriculum Integration Committee for approval before the beginning of the course. After the completion of the course, the U Research Leaders, in conjunction with other faculty teaching the courses, will gather assessment data from each section, analyze it, and recommend suggestions for improvement. The chart below displays the process, with detailed procedures and forms for documentation of the designated U Research courses available on the internal campus network.
Process for Integration of U Research Courses in the Majors

Deans, Dept Heads, and faculty designate courses and name U Research Leaders (URLs)

URLs attend workshops (Spring semester prior to implementation in the department) to determine student learning outcomes, fine-tune assignments and assessments, and determine intended outcomes for each assessment.

URLs, in conjunction with faculty teaching course, plan assignments & assessments. Plans are submitted to Curriculum Integration Committee for approval.

Courses taught & assessment data gathered

In conjunction with dept. faculty, URLs coordinate analysis of data and recommendations for improvement.

Data and analysis sent to Assessment Oversight Committee after completion of course and each semester thereafter.

Continuous Cycle of Improvement

Improvements implemented in courses
Transfer students. In the context of U Research, a transfer student is defined as a student who has transferred credit for ENG 102 from an institution other than Mississippi College. Transfer students will be identified in the introductory IL major courses. Even though transfer students are presumed to have learned some information literacy competencies elsewhere, they will be required to complete the Speed Library SearchPath Information Literacy Tutorial and its embedded assessments as they begin the introductory U Research course in their major. The tutorial will introduce or reinforce information literacy concepts as well as familiarize the transfer students with information resources that are specific to Mississippi College.

Institutional Processes and Strategies Supporting the QEP

While the goal and student learning outcomes will be primarily accomplished through curriculum integration in the core and selected courses in the disciplines, there are several institutional processes and strategies that will be employed to support U Research.

Faculty development. Crucial to the success of an information literacy initiative such as U Research is the adoption of the program by faculty. Faculty members, responsible for the integration of information literacy into the curriculum of each discipline, are major stakeholders in the program. Workshops will be held each Spring to train faculty who will be integrating information literacy into their disciplines the following year. The purpose of the workshops will be to share ideas, to promote innovative teaching strategies, and to provide an opportunity for development of class assignments and assessment measures. The workshops will be coordinated by the Faculty Development Committee and the QEP Director. Prior to the workshops, attending faculty will be asked to take the RRSA to become familiar with the standardized assessment that is given to our students. Assisting with the workshops will be faculty members who have already integrated information literacy into their courses, instructional librarians, the instructional technologist, and outside experts when appropriate. Workshop content will include:

- Welcome and Objectives
- U Research Goal and Student Learning Outcomes
- Role of U Research Leaders
- Procedures for implementing U Research in specific courses
- Piloted Courses (if applicable)
- Integrating Goal and SLOs into specific major
- Types of possible assignments for specific major
- Developing assessments
- Information for online and hybrid courses
- Library resources and support
- Aggregating and reporting assessment results and improvement strategies
  - Reporting to departmental faculty and dean
  - Reporting to U Research Assessment Committee
  - Reporting in the Annual Academic Assessment Plan
• Oversight Committee and its role
• Questions

Appendix F provides a tentative agenda for the English faculty workshop and for subsequent departmental workshops.

In addition to workshops, online materials will be available to assist all faculty members in developing information literacy assignments and assessments. The U Research Faculty Toolkit will include a repository of assignment ideas and rubrics that can be adapted and modified as needed. This online guide will serve as a clearinghouse through which faculty can share ideas and promote best practices.

New student orientation and Blue & Gold 101

New freshmen and transfer students will have handouts in orientation materials to familiarize them with U Research. In addition, all freshmen are required to attend Blue & Gold 101, a small group experience that introduces them to campus life, including the academic environment at Mississippi College. U Research will again be introduced in these small group settings, with guidance on how to seek assistance with research needs and an introduction to the purpose and content of the Mississippi College policy on academic honesty.

Online instructional modules and research guides. It is anticipated that the instruction of information literacy skills will be a shared task between teaching faculty and library faculty. While some of the English Composition classes will prefer to spend several sessions in the library computer classroom, other sections may need only one or two sessions with an instructional librarian. To augment and supplement the face-to-face library instruction sessions, information literacy and research guides will be available online.

Distance learners. The university is committed to providing instruction and information to distance learners in online classes and students in the Accelerated Degree Program, who may meet at a satellite campus. The instruction librarians conduct sessions at the satellite campus in Flowood when requested; in addition, the online research guides can provide 24/7 information to these distance learners at their point of need. The online research guides can also assist students in upper-level classes who may need reinforcement of earlier learned competencies as they complete assignments.

In addition to the online instructional modules on information literacy topics, LibGuides will be developed as companion research guides for specific classes. LibGuides can be tailored to specific classes or assignments in order to provide online research assistance.

Instructional classroom. The requests for usage of the library’s only instructional classroom have continued to increase over the past years. The projected budget for U Research allows for the renovation of an open space in the library to create another computer classroom. This classroom will accommodate the need for hands-on information literacy
training, for students preparing collaborative presentations, or for classes needing a guided research session.

**Learning Resource Center and Instructional Technologist.** The QEP will receive support from the Learning Resource Center and the Instructional Technologist. The Learning Resource Center personnel will help develop informational videos and tutorials to support the QEP initiative, and the Instructional Technologist will assist in online course development and assessment in the virtual learning environment.

**Writing Center Tutors and Student Research Assistants.** The Writing Center is under the direction of Dr. Steven Price, Associate Professor in English and one of the faculty members who participated in the ENG 102 pilot program with U Research. Noting the intertwined relationship and the iterative nature of the writing and research processes, Dr. Price proposed that the Writing Center Tutors be cross-trained in information literacy to provide basic research guidance to students as needed during the writing process. The Development Committee integrated this proposal into the plan for U Research.

Student assistants in the library are often the first point of contact when students need help, whether it is a directional question, a technology question, or a question about information resources. From the pool of student assistants in the library, those who work in the library Information Commons area will be trained to help patrons with basic research needs. The Student Research Assistant program in the library will be monitored by the Coordinator of Library Instruction. The Writing Center Tutors and Research Assistants in the library will form a focus group whose purpose will be to share information and experiences. A workshop to train Writing Center Tutors and Student Research Assistants will be held at the beginning of U Research implementation and every semester thereafter as needed to train new hires. Additionally, an online training guide to supplement workshop content is under development.

**Resources and Financial Support**

The university has provided and pledged continuing support for U Research in the form of financial resources, human resources, capital improvements, and support from the administration. Throughout the Discovery and Development phases of the QEP, the university supported the process with funds for publicity, travel, professional development, and stipends for development of QEP white papers. Mississippi College is committed to the continued support of U Research through the use of new funds and through reallocation of existing funds. The new funds required for the QEP will be derived from tuition revenue and will come from the regular operating budget of the university.

The projected budget for U Research was developed by the Development Committee in conjunction with the Chief Financial Officer and the Budget and Resources Subcommittee. The proposed budget for each year is approximately $187,622, for a five-year total of approximately $938,110. This figure does not include the approximately $111,500 spent in the preliminary years prior to implementation in Fall 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mississippi College</th>
<th>QEP Budget</th>
<th>YEAR ONE</th>
<th>YEAR TWO</th>
<th>YEAR THREE</th>
<th>YEAR FOUR</th>
<th>YEAR FIVE</th>
<th>YEAR Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Kind</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>In Kind</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>In Kind</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>In Kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Director (75% release time)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assume 2.5% raise/yr</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td>50,430</td>
<td>51,691</td>
<td>52,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adm. Assist - Graduate Assist (10-15 hrs per week)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructional Technologist (5 hrs per week)</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>8,528</td>
<td>8,741</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>9,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learning Resources Studio Manager (5 hrs per week)</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>8,528</td>
<td>8,741</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>9,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>English Faculty Stipends-workshop attendance/course</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,680</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peer Tutors/Writer Ctr Tutors - 200 hrs per week (6,400 hrs per year)</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>46,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td>$63,060</td>
<td>$60,680</td>
<td>$63,486</td>
<td>$84,920</td>
<td>$63,882</td>
<td>$86,150</td>
<td>$64,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Travel, refreshments/misc</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Office Expense</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marketing/Publicity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Peer/Writing Tutor Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assessment Instrument</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Travel, Professional Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Student Symposiums</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Library resources-Software or</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$6,550</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completion of new QEP computer</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Office Space - QEP</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technology Upgrade</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$6,550</td>
<td>$88,800</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$69,560</td>
<td>$156,080</td>
<td>$69,956</td>
<td>$101,320</td>
<td>$70,392</td>
<td>$102,550</td>
<td>$69,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Narrative

Preliminary Years. The approximate total of expenditures for the preliminary years from 2009 to June 2012 is $111,500. This amount includes promotion expenses during the topic selection and development phases, travel expenses for various information literacy and SACS-COC conferences, and stipends for QEP proposal white papers and committee leadership. Additional expenses include fees for two consultants to visit the campus, the QEP Director salary for one-half year, and resources added to the library relating to potential QEP topics.

U Research Implementation Years

Personnel and Related Costs

1. QEP Director – The QEP Director will be a ¾ position. The QEP Director reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is responsible for the overall administration of U Research. The Coordinator of Reference and Instruction at Leland Speed Library has been appointed to be the QEP Director, beginning January 2012, and will be given release time amounting to ¾ of the position. The amount budgeted is for a ¾ position plus benefits.

2. Administrative Assistant – A part-time administrative assistant will be funded beginning September 2012 to provide support for U Research. This position will assist in developing workshop logistics, tracking QEP budget items, gathering data, and other duties.

3. Instructional Technologist – An Instructional Technologist, hired in June 2010, will provide approximately 5 hours per week in support of U Research. The amount budgeted represents in-kind money for approximately 5 hours per week with benefits.

4. Learning Resource Center personnel – the Learning Resource Studio Manager will provide approximately 5 hours per week in support of U Research. The amount budgeted represents in-kind money for approximately 5 hours per week with benefits.

5. Faculty Stipends and Faculty Development - Since faculty leadership and participation are vitally important, faculty development has been and will remain a top priority in the projected budget. U Research Leaders (URLs) will be designated from each department, will attend workshops, and will facilitate the integration of information literacy into the disciplines. Year One figures are for URLs to develop the plan for implementation into ENG 102.

6. The figures for Years Two through Four are for URLs from the departments that are implementing U Research for the respective year. Amounts allocated are for 2-3 leaders per department, six departments per year.

7. Student Research Assistants - Amount budgeted is an in-kind expense and includes 85 hours per week for Student Research Assistants and 115 hours from the Writing Center Tutors.

Operating Expenses
1. Workshops – Annual workshops will be provided to assist faculty in developing and revising course assignments and assessments. The budget includes funds for consultants or workshop presenters, travel for presenters, and related expenses such as supplies and refreshments. A portion of the yearly budgeted amount will be in-kind funds representing costs such as printing, lodging, and meals for presenters.

2. Office Expenses – The QEP will be physically housed in the Leland Speed Library. Budgeted amounts are for office supplies, printing, paper, postage, and telephone charges.

3. Marketing and Publicity – The university is committed to continuing publicity and marketing efforts to ensure that all campus constituencies are aware of U Research.

4. Workshops for Student Research Assistants and Writing Center Tutors – Upon implementation of U Research, a workshop will be held to train Student Research Assistants and Writing Center Tutors. Each semester, as new students are hired, mini workshops will be held to train the new hires. Amounts budgeted are for supplies and refreshments.

5. Assessment instrument – The amount in the projected budget is for the administration of the Research Readiness Self Assessment (RRSA) to a sample of freshmen as they are enrolled in Blue & Gold 101 and to all students after the completion of ENG 102.

6. Travel and Professional Development – Budgeted amounts during the implementation of U Research include funds for conferences and information literacy workshops.

7. Student awards – The money allocated for student awards will fund competitions for exemplary student work. These “examples of excellence” will be publicized on campus, showing the impact of U Research on student work and clearly demonstrating the application of information literacy competencies.

8. Other library resources – The library will continue to provide resources in the forms of books, server support for research tutorials, and software.

9. Memberships – Amount budgeted represents membership fees for the library for professional organizations (ALA, ACRL)

**Capital Expenses**

1. Computer classroom – An area in the library will be renovated to create another computer classroom to accommodate the growth in classes.

2. Office space – The budget for U Research allows for the renovation of an office space to accommodate the QEP administration.

3. Technology upgrades – Additional funds have been included in the fourth and fifth years of the budget to upgrade technology in the library classroom.

**Other campus support.** As evidenced by financial and personnel allocations, as well as other tangible support, the university is committed to the sustainability of U Research. Both the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Planning and Assessment have served wherever needed during the selection and development of U Research, and their involvement has helped make the initiative a priority. In addition, the Chief Financial Officer was
instrumental in developing the proposed budget. Section V of this document outlines the proposed structure for oversight of U Research, with the continued involvement by administration and all campus groups. As U Research becomes embedded into the curriculum of each discipline, the university will continue to promote and sustain this initiative as part of its “pursuit of excellence.”
U Research will be implemented incrementally, beginning with ENG 102. The chart below details the tasks to be completed and the responsible party, with projected dates of implementation.

### DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Prelim Year 2011-12</th>
<th>Year 1 2012-13</th>
<th>Year 2 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 3 2014-15</th>
<th>Year 4 2015-16</th>
<th>Year 5 2016-17</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give standardized tests (RRSA &amp; SAILS) to Freshmen in ENG 101 to establish baseline data.</td>
<td>F Su Su F Su Su F Su Su F Su Su F Su Su F Su Su</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English faculty and QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Director, faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop for faculty implementing U Research 2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) given to all students. Data analyzed and distributed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research, Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Senior Survey (CSS) given in capstone classes. Data analyzed and distributed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research, Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Department implements U Research in all ENG 102 classes and in designated English upper-level classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Faculty and English URLs, Curriculum Integration Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded assessments in ENG 102 administered and analyzed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Faculty and English URLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give RRSA to Freshmen following ENG 102. Data analyzed and distributed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Faculty and Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups formed from all faculty teaching U Research courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop to train Writing Center tutors and library Research Assistants. Repeat as necessary for new hires.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Center Coordinator &amp; Library Coord. of Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Introduction to U Research in Blue and Gold 101 and Welcome Week
- RRSA given to sample of freshmen for pre-testing.

## Blue & Gold Mentors
- Workshop for faculty implementing U Research 2013-14 (Year 2)

## Faculty Development Committee
- Six additional departments implement U Research in designated introductory and senior-level courses in each major (Year 2)
- Faculty, Library Coordinator of Instruction, and QEP Director.

## Integration Committee
- Embedded assessments Year 2 courses administered and analyzed.

## Assessment Committee
- Transfer students required to complete SearchPath tutorial when registering for designated U Research courses in major.
- Administer Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey.

## Curriculum Committee
- Workshop for faculty implementing U Research 2014-15 (Year 3)

## Faculty Development Committee
- Six additional departments implement U Research in designated introductory and senior-level courses in each major (Year 3)
- Faculty, Library Coordinator of Instruction, and QEP Director.

## Integration Committee
- Embedded assessments Year 3 courses administered and analyzed.

## Assessment Committee
- Workshop for faculty implementing U Research 2015-16 (Year 4)

## Faculty Development Committee
- Remaining departments implement U Research in designated introductory and senior-level courses in each major (Year 4)
- Faculty, Library Coordinator of Instruction, and QEP Director.

## Integration Committee
- Embedded assessments Year 4 courses administered and analyzed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Prelim Year 2011-12</th>
<th>Year 1 2012-13</th>
<th>Year 2 2013-14</th>
<th>Year 3 2014-15</th>
<th>Year 4 2015-16</th>
<th>Year 5 2016-17</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded assessments Year 4 courses administered and analyzed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document activities and assessment results for the President’s Council and for the QEP Fifth Year Interim Report preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>URLs &amp; faculty from Year 4 departments, Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QEP Director, Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV. ASSESSMENT

Careful assessment of U Research is necessary to measure the initiative’s impact on student learning and the achievement of student learning outcomes. Assessment results will be used to identify strengths and weaknesses and to effect subsequent changes in presentation and pedagogy in order to improve student learning. Any changes and revisions will in turn be assessed, creating a continuous cycle of program and instruction review.

Assessments of U Research student learning outcomes will include course-embedded assessments, the use of a standardized instrument (Research Readiness Self Assessment), and the analysis of relevant questions from the CIRP College Senior Survey and the Student Satisfaction Inventory (Noel-Levitz). The Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey will again be given to faculty at both the mid-point (third year) and the conclusion of the U Research implementation period (fifth year) to measure any change in students’ information literacy skills from the faculty perspective. All assessment measures are aligned with objectives and student learning outcomes. Results will be aggregated and analyzed to demonstrate the impact of the QEP.

The Assessment Subcommittee was created in July 2010 to study procedures and possible tools for the assessment of U Research. This subcommittee, chaired by the Vice President for Planning and Assessment, included the two co-chairs of the Development Committee, three additional faculty members, and a Graduate Assistant from the School of Education.

An early recommendation from the committee was the use of a variety of assessment measures, including external/internal and direct/indirect. Such measures would include a standardized instrument, embedded assignments and rubrics, and surveys from students and faculty. The committee also recommended using the principle of triangulation, in which data are gathered and compared using multiple assessment methods or instruments. Varied assessment measures can provide a multifaceted perspective into student progress and learning and into the progress of the program.

Assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment of the program itself will be directed by the Assessment Oversight Committee (see section on U Research Oversight, p. 57). Results from assessments, along with analysis and recommendations for improvement, will be submitted by the departmental U Research Leaders (URLS) to the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee will aggregate all assessment information and report to the President’s Council each semester. Although each discipline may have different assignments and rubrics, each discipline will define “acceptable” as it relates to their students’ ability to use information. Further, the university will adopt unified criteria on which to base the institution’s success in accomplishing its goal for the QEP.
### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Measures</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Who Is Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRSA</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Graduating Seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>All Students Every Two Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td><strong>Who Is Assessed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Assignments</td>
<td>All U Research Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey</td>
<td>All undergraduate faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Of Program</td>
<td>Program Is Assessed Yearly By Assessment Oversight Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Of Student Learning Outcomes

**External measures.** External measures will include standardized instruments, both direct and indirect measures.

**Research Readiness Self Assessment.** The Research Readiness Self Assessment (RRSA) is a standardized instrument that measures information literacy competencies. This instrument measures both the cognitive domain (knowledge, skills, and application) and the affective domain (experience, attitudes, and beliefs) and will be given to students as they complete ENG 102.

The Assessment Subcommittee evaluated and compared several standardized instruments for measuring information literacy, among them SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills), the Research Practices Survey, and the Research Readiness Self Assessment (RRSA). Both the RRSA and SAILS were given in Fall 2011 to a sample of entering freshmen to establish baseline data and to further evaluate the instruments. While each of the instruments examined had good features and good reviews, the Assessment Subcommittee recommended the use of Central Michigan University’s Research Readiness Self Assessment instrument.

Reasons for the selection of the Research Readiness Self Assessment include the following:

- The subcommittee preferred the performance-based aspects of the RRSA instrument, where participants answered questions based on simulated scenarios, such as conducting a search in a library catalog and evaluating websites. In addition, the RRSA seemed to have a good focus on evaluating information, which speaks directly to MC’s goal of producing “discriminating users of information.”
- The logistics of administering the RRSA are manageable. The instrument is web-based and allows for flexible administrations of the test as needed by different classes.
Although there were some issues with student self-enrollment, these issues are being resolved. The instrument can be customized with questions specific to library resources, and the costs are reasonable for continued sustainability.

- The assessment measures two different aspects, students’ cognitive knowledge as well as affective knowledge – the beliefs and perceptions about their research abilities. The gap between the students’ perceived ability and the actual knowledge demonstrated may serve to motivate the students to improve competencies.
- After completion of the instrument, the RRSA provides scores to participants, including narrative feedback based on performance. Participants are referred to relevant websites or instructional videos that teach information literacy competencies. The assessment tool itself, with its feedback, can be considered an instructional activity for students.

Information about the Research Readiness Self Assessment comes from the RRSA website:

The focus of the RRSA assessment is twofold: first, it measures student performance in the knowledge and skill areas identified by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* as characteristic of effective users of information; second, it uses survey questions to provide librarians and faculty with data on their students’ beliefs and behaviors pertaining to information-seeking activities. (para. 2)

Unlike some other instruments that only ask for self-reports (e.g., Can you do an advanced library search?), RRSA objectively measures students’ competencies. Some questions measure students’ declarative or factual knowledge, such as knowledge of terms “bibliography” and “abstract.” Problem-solving questions measure procedural knowledge, for example, when students are asked to conduct an advanced search or to judge the quality of full text articles from different sources. This tandem makes it possible to assess not only what students know but also their ability to apply knowledge in a realistic setting. In addition to objective measures, RRSA captures self-reports of the following: Beliefs about the value of browsing the open-access internet vs. searching specialized databases; beliefs about one’s own research skills; and past library and research experience… Research indicates that when individuals are provided with objective information concerning their own abilities that conflicts with their own perceptions of self efficacy, they will be more willing to attempt to change their current patterns of behavior and be more receptive to learning new techniques for performing old tasks. This principle is precisely what makes ‘Perceived research skills’ so beneficial. If RRSA participants perceive themselves to be terrific researchers and then proceed to perform poorly on various research tasks, the conflicting results should, in theory, produce the response necessary to mobilize them to adjust their behavior. (para. 8)

The RRSA consists of 50 questions, 24 of which measure experience, attitudes, and beliefs. The other 26 questions are direct measures of competencies. The RRSA MAPPED TO ACRL STANDARDS chart links the questions to the relevant ACRL standard and its corresponding performance indicator(s).
Once U Research is implemented in Fall 2012, the RRSA will be given to a sample of entering freshmen as they are enrolled in Blue & Gold 101. This administration will give a snapshot of what students know prior to receiving information literacy instruction at MC. The RRSA will also be given to all students as they complete the second composition course, ENG 102. This administration should provide information about what students learned and will serve as a gauge of the effectiveness of the curriculum for ENG 102. Results will be provided to the Assessment Committee and appropriate faculty and administration.

Benchmarks for Success: The average scores for entry-level undergraduate students, as provided by L. Ivanitskaya (personal communication, September 22, 2011) of the RRSA management team, are:

- Obtaining information - 16.68 out of 30 or 55.6%
- Evaluating information - 5.18 out of 12 or 43.17%
- Understanding of plagiarism - 9.78 out of 14 or 69.86%

As a criterion for success, Mississippi College will expect its students to score at or above the average scores for entry-level undergraduate students.

**College Senior Survey (CSS).** The UCLA/CIRP [College Senior Survey](http://www.heri.ucla.edu/cssoverview.php?tab=Admin) is administered to graduating seniors at Mississippi College and measures, among other items, students' perceptions regarding cognitive and affective growth during the college experience. The test was formerly known as the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) College Student Survey. The CIRP website states:

The re-designed College Senior Survey (CSS), formerly the College Student Survey, helps institutions respond to the need for assessment and accountability data by providing information on a broad range of student outcomes. The new name highlights the updated design and focus for this instrument as an “exit” or “senior” survey. The new CSS continues to offer valuable feedback on your students’ academic and campus life experiences – information that can be used for student assessment activities, accreditation and self-study reports, campus planning, and policy analysis. It also offers new feedback on students’ post-college plans immediately following graduation.

The College Senior Survey allows for up to twenty institution-specific questions, eight of which are being used to measure U Research learning outcomes. Those customized questions will be used as an indirect measure to gain further insight into student perceptions about information literacy and research experiences at Mississippi College (CSS Institution-specific questions included in Appendix G). A benchmark for success will be established after the Spring 2012 administration of the College Senior Survey.

**Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI).** The Noel-Levitz [Student Satisfaction Inventory](http://www.heri.ucla.edu/cssoverview.php?tab=Admin) is administered to all Mississippi College undergraduates every two years. The SSI measures student satisfaction, as well as the importance students place on college experiences and
services. Four customized questions were developed to measure student perceptions about research experiences, and are included in Appendix G. A benchmark for success will be established after the Fall 2011 administration of the Student Satisfaction Inventory.

**Internal measures.** Internal measures will include both qualitative and quantitative measures that are embedded into the courses.

**ENG 102.** The English Department has designed and piloted several assignments and assessments in ENG 102 as previously discussed in Section One of this document. Rubrics were designed to assess the assignments and the information literacy competencies. One assignment required students to evaluate websites according to suggested evaluation criteria. Other assignments included an annotated bibliography, research log, and “state of the conversation” research-based essay. Examples of the assessment rubrics for these assignments are included in Appendix C, and links to additional English documents are in Section One.

**Upper-level courses.** Each major will have two courses designated as U Research courses, an introductory course to the major and a senior-level course. Assessment tools (rubrics) to measure the student learning outcomes for these courses will be developed during the faculty development workshops. The criteria in the rubrics will be aligned to QEP objectives and expected student learning outcomes. The rubrics may be customized according to the product generated in the assignment (written paper, oral presentation, exhibit, multimedia presentation). Rubrics were developed for use by the piloted Nursing and Sociology courses, and are included in Appendices D and E. Another example of a rubric that might be used to measure information literacy student learning outcomes in an upper-level course is included in Appendix H. Additional rubrics, specific to assignment type and discipline, are available for adaptation and modification on the [U Research Faculty Toolkit](#). The [U Research Faculty Toolkit](#) is an online repository of assignment ideas and rubrics to assist faculty in assessment development, and will be developed as a clearinghouse through which faculty can share ideas and promote best practices.

For classes that are offered online or in hybrid format, the assessment module of MCMoodle, Mississippi College’s online course management system, can be used to aggregate data. This module allows for an online rubric for assessment of papers submitted electronically into MCMoodle. Student papers can be evaluated either by the professor of the class or by a panel of faculty assessors.

**Faculty Perception Survey.** The Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey (p. 7) was used while the campus was analyzing institutional needs and selecting a topic for the QEP. The survey will be given to faculty at both the mid-point (third year) and the conclusion of the U Research implementation period (fifth year) to measure any change in faculty perception regarding students’ information literacy skills. It is expected that faculty perceptions of students’ information literacy and research skills will be an important indicator in determining the success of U Research.
Responsibility for the assessment process. The Assessment Committee will direct the assessment of student learning outcomes and assessment of the program itself. Faculty members teaching the U Research courses and the U Research Leaders in each department will coordinate the assessment of student learning outcomes on the departmental level.

Research Readiness Self Assessment. The Research Readiness Self Assessment will be given to a sample of entering freshmen as they are enrolled in Blue & Gold 101. The QEP Director will be responsible for this administration. The RRSA will again be administered to students as they complete ENG 102. The U Research Leaders in the English Department will analyze the results of the assessment and determine suggestions for improvement. Results and recommendations will be shared with the departmental faculty and distributed to the Dean of the School and the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee will integrate the information into the “Alignment of U Research Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment” chart (p. 50).

College Senior Survey (CSS) and Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI). The Office of Institutional Research administers the CSS each spring to graduating seniors and the SSI every two years to all undergraduates. The Assessment Committee will be responsible for gathering data from the CSS and the SSI and integrating the information into the “Alignment of U Research Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment” chart (p. 50).

Faculty Perception of Student Information Literacy Skills Survey. The Assessment Committee will be responsible for administering this survey in the third year and in the fifth year of the U Research implementation period. The survey questions will be mapped to the U Research student learning outcomes with results integrated into the “Alignment of U Research Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment” chart (p. 50).

U Research Courses in ENG 102 and in the majors. After a U Research course is completed, the U Research Leaders in that department will gather assessment data from each course section. In conjunction with the teaching faculty, the URLs will analyze the data and determine suggestions for improvement. Results will be shared with departmental faculty and distributed to the Dean of the School and the Assessment Committee.

The Assessment Committee will integrate the information into the “Alignment of U Research Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment” chart (p. 50). As data from each course is added, the chart will serve as an evolving curriculum map of the university information literacy program and will identify strengths and gaps in the program.

The QEP Director will report all assessment results to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for further dissemination to the President’s Council.
**Use of assessment results.** Assessment results will be analyzed to determine necessary improvements. English faculty will examine results from the RRSA, and the Assessment Committee will examine results from the College Senior Survey and Student Satisfaction Inventory to determine if student learning outcomes are being achieved. Faculty members in each department will analyze the results of embedded assessments to determine if improvements may be needed. The faculty member may decide that more emphasis needs to be placed on the evaluation and synthesis of sources, or that students need a reminder on what constitutes plagiarism. The plans for improvement will be included on the documents submitted at the end of each semester the course is taught. In addition, the annual campus institutional effectiveness report submitted by each academic unit will include the results of U Research activities.

**Triangulation of data.** The overall goal of U Research is to enhance student learning. To further track the enhancement of student learning, results of the different measures of assessment will be triangulated and compared by the Assessment Committee. Multiple indicators of student learning will be analyzed as to the impact of U Research. As results from different assessment tools are compared and evaluated, this body of evidence can provide substantiation of results and create an overall picture of the strengths and weaknesses of U Research.

**Integration into the campus institutional effectiveness plan.** Assessment of the QEP will become a part of the campus Institutional Effectiveness Plan. Educational effectiveness at all levels of the university is determined through the assessment cycle at MC. Each academic unit develops objectives/student learning outcomes related to its mission; these are, in turn, related to the university’s mission. The objectives and student learning outcomes are annually assessed based on stated criteria. If the criteria are not met, the academic unit puts into place improvement strategies.

As U Research is integrated into each major, that department will include its assessment results in the departmental Academic Annual Assessment Plan. Along with assessment results, this document includes statements of intended student learning outcomes, a plan for improvement, and any budgetary or strategic planning implications. This process will add another layer of accountability and further integrate U Research into the campus institutional assessment cycle.

Applicable administrative and support services, such as the Writing Center, the Library, and the Office of Institutional Research will also document QEP involvement by means of the Annual Assessment Plans. These assessment reports will be compiled for the Fifth-Year Interim Report, showing that the institution has integrated the QEP into its campus culture.

The U Research Assessment Committee will complete an Academic Annual Assessment Plan by September 30th of each year to report the progress of the QEP itself. This
documentation links the U Research goal with the university’s mission and strategic goals, and assists with budget preparation for the following year. The Academic Annual Assessment Plan is submitted to the Vice President for Planning and Assessment.
Alignment of U Research Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment

The following chart maps the U Research objectives and student learning outcomes against assessment activities, with scheduled timelines and responsibilities. The chart represents only those activities that are currently underway. As U Research is further implemented and assessed in departmental courses, the assessment information will be entered into the appropriate area of this chart and electronically linked to its documentation. The purpose of this chart is to aggregate and report assessment progress; it also will serve as a curriculum map for the integration of information literacy into each major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U Research Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measure</th>
<th>Where Assessed &amp; Responsibility</th>
<th>When Assessed</th>
<th>Assessment Results (was the performance goal met?)</th>
<th>Intended Actions for Improvement</th>
<th>Strategic Planning or Budgetary Implications required for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed.</td>
<td>RRSA (SLO 1a, 1b)</td>
<td>ENG 101 and piloted ENG 102 sections</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify &amp; develop a topic into a manageable focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>English faculty and QEP Development Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identify a variety of types &amp; formats of potential sources for information</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>Fall 2012 and later at the end of each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Senior Survey (SLO 1a, 1b)</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Every year in Spring semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Inventory (SLO 1a, 1b)</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Every other year, Fall semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric - research log (SLO 1a, 1b)</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric -</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Research Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment Measure</td>
<td>Where Assessed &amp; Responsibility</td>
<td>When Assessed</td>
<td>Assessment Results (was the performance goal met?)</td>
<td>Intended Actions for Improvement</td>
<td>Strategic Planning or Budgetary Implications required for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Access needed information efficiently & effectively  
  a. Construct & implement effectively designed research strategies using appropriate methods or information retrieval systems  
  b. Retrieve information using a variety of methods & systematically manage the information & its sources | Researched major paper (SLO 1a, 1b) | ENG 102 faculty | (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section | | | |
| RRSA (SLO 2a, 2b) | ENG 101 and piloted ENG 102 sections  
English faculty and QEP Development Committee | Fall 2011 | | | | |
| Engagement Survey (SLO 2a, 2b) | Assessment Committee | Every year in Spring semester | | | | |
| Student Satisfaction Inventory (SLO 2a, 2b) | Assessment Committee | Every other year, Fall semester | | | | |
| Rubric - research log (SLO 2a, 2b) | ENG 102  
ENG 102 faculty | Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section | | | | |
| 3. Evaluate information & its sources critically and incorporate selected information knowledge base  
  a. Evaluate information and its sources using | RRSA (SLO 3a) | ENG 101 and piloted ENG 102 sections  
English faculty and QEP | Fall 2011 | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U Research Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measure</th>
<th>Where Assessed &amp; Responsibility</th>
<th>When Assessed</th>
<th>Assessment Results (was the performance goal met?)</th>
<th>Intended Actions for Improvement</th>
<th>Strategic Planning or Budgetary Implications required for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Use information effective to accomplish a specific purpose</td>
<td>College Senior Survey (SLO 4a, 4b)</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Every year in Spring semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use new &amp; prior information to the planning &amp; creation of a product or performance</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Inventory (SLO 4a, 4b)</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Every two years in Fall semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use appropriate criteria to identify main ideas and their potential relevance, summarizing and synthesizing key ideas</td>
<td>College Senior Survey (SLO 3a, 3b)</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Every year in Spring semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction Inventory (SLO 3a)</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Every two years in Fall semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric – website evaluation (SLO 3a)</td>
<td>ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td>Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric – annotated bib (SLO 3a, 3b)</td>
<td>ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td>Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric - Researched major paper (SLO 3b)</td>
<td>ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td>Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use appropriate criteria to identify main ideas and their potential relevance, summarizing and synthesizing key ideas</td>
<td>Development Committee</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>Fall 2012 and later at the end of each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify main ideas and their potential relevance, summarizing and synthesizing key ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>English faculty and Assessment Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College Senior Survey (SLO 3a, 3b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Inventory (SLO 3a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric – website evaluation (SLO 3a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric – annotated bib (SLO 3a, 3b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric - Researched major paper (SLO 3b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Research Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment Measure</td>
<td>Where Assessed &amp; Responsibility</td>
<td>When Assessed</td>
<td>Assessment Results (was the performance goal met?)</td>
<td>Intended Actions for Improvement</td>
<td>Strategic Planning or Budgetary Implications required for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communicate the product or performance effectively &amp; clearly to others</td>
<td>Rubric – website evaluation (SLO 4a, 4b)</td>
<td>ENG 102, ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td>Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric - Researched major paper (SLO 4a, 4b)</td>
<td>ENG 102, ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td>Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understand many of the economic, legal, &amp; social issues surrounding the use of information &amp; access and use the information ethically &amp; legally</td>
<td>RRSA (SLO 5a, 5b)</td>
<td>ENG 101 and piloted ENG 102 sections, English faculty and QEP Development Committee, Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Acknowledge sources &amp; use information following the conventions of a particular discipline</td>
<td>ENG 102, English faculty and QEP Development Committee, Fall 2012 and later at the end of each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Demonstrate an understanding of university policies regarding plagiarism, academic integrity &amp; use of campus networks &amp; information resources</td>
<td>College Senior Survey (SLO 5a, 5b), Assessment Committee, Every year in Spring semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Inventory (SLO 5a, 5b), Assessment Committee, Every two years in Fall semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric – annotated bib (SLO 5a)</td>
<td>ENG 102, ENG 102 faculty</td>
<td>Fall 2011 (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric –</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Measure</td>
<td>When Assessed</td>
<td>Where Assessed &amp; Responsibility</td>
<td>Assessment Results (was the performance goal met?)</td>
<td>Intended Actions for Improvement</td>
<td>Strategic Planning or Budgetary Implications required for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researched major paper (SLO 5a, 5b)</td>
<td>ENG 102 faculty (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U Research Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes**

**Assessment Measure:**
- Researched major paper (SLO 5a, 5b)

**When Assessed:**
- ENG 102 faculty (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section

**Where Assessed & Responsibility:**
- ENG 102 faculty (pilot) and later in each ENG 102 section

**Assessment Results (was the performance goal met?):**
- |  |  |  |  |  |

**Intended Actions for Improvement:**
- |  |  |  |  |  |

**Strategic Planning or Budgetary Implications required for improvement:**
- |  |  |  |  |  |
Programmatic assessment of U Research. In addition to the assessment of the student learning outcomes, there will be a programmatic assessment of U Research to ensure that the QEP is progressing as scheduled. The QEP will be tracked, and progress will be reported to the President’s Council each semester. The Research Readiness Self Assessment and the questions from the College Senior Survey and Student Satisfaction Inventory will be evaluated yearly by the Assessment Committee to ensure that the instruments are delivering meaningful feedback. In addition, student learning outcomes will be reviewed annually by the Assessment Committee and modified if necessary.

Campus strategies will also be assessed to ensure that they are still offering optimal support to the advancement of the QEP.

- Faculty Development workshop participants will be asked to evaluate the content and format of the workshops, and results will be used to improve training.
- Faculty implementing U Research into their courses will form a focus group to provide feedback on successes, effectiveness of information literacy assignments and assessments, and opportunities for improvement. Further information will be gathered via a faculty survey at the end of the semester and submitted to the Assessment Committee. Recommendations for improvement and best practices will be identified and integrated into subsequent faculty development workshops.
- As departments implement U Research, the aforementioned “Alignment of U Research Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment” chart will be updated with assessments that were used. The chart will serve as a curriculum map to identify strengths and weaknesses of the entire program and to ensure balance of content.
- The Student Research Assistants and Writing Center Tutors will form a focus group in which to analyze trends and share experiences. In addition to sharing successes and experiences, this group will be surveyed each semester to determine the effectiveness of the training workshops for the student peer tutors.
- Online instructional guides created by the library in collaboration with faculty will be monitored for frequency of access and appropriateness and relevance to student needs.
- Finally, the budget will be reviewed yearly to determine sufficiency.

**Program Assessment Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Assessed</th>
<th>Method used to assess</th>
<th>When Assessed</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progression of the QEP</td>
<td>Summary report to the President’s Council</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty training workshops</td>
<td>Surveys from faculty attending workshops</td>
<td>Immediately following workshops</td>
<td>Faculty Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses implementing U-Research</td>
<td>Surveys from faculty teaching course, including an assessment of the academic support services</td>
<td>Immediately following the completion of the course</td>
<td>Faculty teaching course, QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group of U Research Leaders who are teaching U</td>
<td>At least once a semester</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Assessed</td>
<td>Method used to assess</td>
<td>When Assessed</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research courses</td>
<td>Examine the &quot;Alignment of U Research Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes with Assessment&quot; chart</td>
<td>Each semester</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Research curriculum – balance of content</td>
<td>Surveys from students attending training workshops</td>
<td>Immediately after workshops</td>
<td>Coordinator of Library Instruction &amp; Writing Center Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student research assistants and writing center tutors</td>
<td>Focus group of Student Research Assistants and Writing center Tutors.</td>
<td>At least monthly</td>
<td>Coordinator of Library Instruction &amp; Writing Center Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys from student research assistants and writing center tutors</td>
<td>End of semester</td>
<td>Coordinator of Library Instruction &amp; Writing Center Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library online instructional modules</td>
<td>Feedback from faculty, numbers of times LibGuides accessed</td>
<td>End of each semester</td>
<td>Coordinator of Library Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Research budget</td>
<td>Analysis to determine sufficiency</td>
<td>Each January</td>
<td>QEP Director, VP for Academic Affairs, Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION V. BROAD-BASED INVOLVEMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION

Campus Involvement in Development and Implementation

The implementation and oversight of U Research will require the participation of many members of the campus community, continuing the participatory process begun in the Discovery of the Topic and Development of the Topic phases.

The selection of U Research as the Quality Enhancement Plan for Mississippi College was a process that involved all campus constituents. Alumni, administration, faculty, staff, and students were surveyed as to perceptions of needs. Proposals for different topics were presented to different groups, discussion forums were hosted on the QEP website, and surveys were conducted to rate the proposals according to need and the perceived capability to enhance student learning.

The development of the plan for U Research involved input from the entire campus community. The Development Committee consisted of members from administration, faculty, staff, and students. Members of the Development Committee visited student groups, faculty and staff groups, Academic Council, Deans Council, and the Board of Trustees to disseminate information and solicit feedback.

The implementation of U Research will offer the opportunity for active participation and involvement from all campus groups. Student mentors will be involved in presenting U Research components at orientation activities and in Blue & Gold 101. Student Research Assistants and Writing Center Tutors will be involved in peer tutoring. Staff will be involved with orientation, Blue & Gold 101 activities, and with oversight committee assignments. Faculty will be integrating the plan into the curriculum and serving on oversight committees. Administration will be closely monitoring the progress of the QEP as well as serving on the oversight committees. The trustees will receive periodic reports on the QEP progress.

Administrative Oversight, Organizational Chart and Committee Duties

The plan for the administrative oversight of U Research is displayed in the following organizational chart. The membership of the U Research Oversight Committee will consist of the chairs of the Assessment Committee, the Curriculum Integration Committee, and the Faculty Development Committee, as well as the QEP Director and a representative from the Chief Financial Officer’s office. Additional members will be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The membership of the Assessment Committee, the Curriculum Integration Committee, and the Faculty Development Committee will consist of faculty members from each school, librarians, staff members, and others as appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
The duties of each committee are outlined in the chart below. In summary, the implementation and continued success of U Research will remain a team effort, with students, administration, faculty, and staff serving on the U Research management teams.

- **Assessment Committee**
  - Oversees assessment
  - Submits assessment results to Oversight Committee
  - Recommends modifications based on assessment

- **Faculty Development Committee**
  - Oversees faculty development opportunities and implementation of faculty development
  - Assesses faculty development
  - Recommends modifications based on results of assessment of faculty development

- **Curriculum Integration Committee**
  - Determines when departments will implement U Research, in conjunction with QEP Director and VPAA
  - Approves plans for implementation in departments
  - Oversees initial implementation into all ENG 102 sections

- **U Research Oversight Committee**
  - Reviews and approves recommendations from the three subcommittees
  - Coordinates recommendations and other information to VPAA and President’s Council
  - Monitors all budget expenditures

- **President and President’s Council**
- **Vice President for Academic Affairs**
- **QEP Director**
  - Oversees all aspects of QEP and budget
SECTION VI. SUSTAINABILITY AND CONCLUSION

Mississippi College has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that will enhance student learning and that meets all the criteria outlined by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. U Research was selected after an extensive campus-wide process with input from the campus community. The process included an institutional needs assessment and a determination that the plan is consistent and complementary with the university’s mission and strategic plan.

The plan for U Research was written and developed through a collaborative and recursive process with numerous subcommittees reviewing options and making recommendations. Best practices and an extensive examination of the literature guided the proposal and development of the plan. The campus community was asked to provide input as the proposal was developed. U Research has well-defined student learning outcomes and a plan to assess them throughout the undergraduate curriculum.

The university has pledged its ongoing support for U Research. With the integration of the initiative into each major, it is anticipated that information literacy will be fully ingrained into the educational curriculum at Mississippi College. With U Research’s focus on the process of learning as well as the product created, students can learn important transferable skills that will endure beyond the classroom. Even the process of developing the Quality Enhancement Plan was somewhat transformative, as faculty from each discipline examined the curriculum, considered possible methods for implementing U Research, and began to focus more on the process of how students contextualize information literacy.

U Research is an initiative that will improve the educational experience and further the mission of Mississippi College. U Research will engage students in learning activities that can enhance their research and critical thinking skills and empower them to be productive citizens in the workplace and society.
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Appendix A: Committee and Subcommittee Membership Lists

QEP Steering Committee

The QEP Steering Committee was formed in the spring of 2009. Its initial task was to coordinate the process in which Mississippi College would choose its QEP topic. The members of the Steering Committee were:

Dr. Ron Howard (Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs)
Dr. Stan Baldwin (Dean of School of Science and Mathematics and Professor of Biology)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Chair and Assoc. Professor of Biology)
Ruth Ann Gibson (Head of Technical Services, Speed Library)
Dr. Kerri Jordan (Associate Professor of English)
Davis Lofton (Student 2010-2011)
Phillip McIntosh (Associate Dean and Professor of Law)
Dr. John Meadors (Professor of Christian Studies and Philosophy)
Susan Newman (Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library)
Dr. Steve Price (Associate Professor of English and Director of the Writing Center)
Carly Stegall (Student 2010-2011)
Dr. Beth Twiner Tinnon (Assistant Professor – Nursing)
Shirley Tipton (Executive Secretary to the Dean of the School of Education)
Deborah Welch (Instructor of Nursing)
Dr. Chris Washam (Professor and Chair of Kinesiology)
Ashley Winford (Student 2009-2010)
Dr. Press York (Professor of Business Administration)

U Research Development Committee

The Development Committee was formed in early February 2010 and was charged with developing the plan for U Research. The Development Committee was eventually expanded from seven to thirteen members (four faculty, one librarian, one staff member, one Graduate Assistant, one Instructional Technologist, one part-time administrator/adjunct faculty, two students, and two ex officio members from the administration).

The Development Committee coordinated the research and efforts of fourteen subcommittees as they develop various aspects of the U Research plan. Dr. Ron Howard, Vice President for Academic Affairs, is the liaison between the Development Committee and both the advisory Steering Committee and the supervisory President’s Council, which serves as the overall Leadership Team for the MC SACS effort. The current members of the Development Committee are:

Dr. Beth Dunigan (Co-Chair of Development Committee and Assoc. Chair and Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Susan Newman (Co-Chair of Development Committee and Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library, QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Tommye Henderson (Asst. Professor – Teacher Education & Leadership)
Dr. Ron Howard, ex-officio (Vice-President for Academic Affairs; Chair QEP Steering Committee)
Karen Lindsey-Lloyd, ex-officio (Director of Retention and Career Services)
Davis Lofton (Student – 2010-2011)
Jessica Manzo (Instructional Technologist)
U Research Planning Subcommittees

The following subcommittees were created by the Development Committee to assist in the development of different aspects of the QEP. This allowed more faculty, staff, administration, and students to progressively take part in the research and development of U Research.

The purpose of each subcommittee is evident from its label. The membership of each is listed below:

**Goals & Objectives**

Dr. Beth Dunigan (Co-Chair of Subcommittee and Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Susan Newman (Co-Chair of Subcommittee and Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library, QEP Steering committee)
Dr. Tommye Henderson (Asst. Professor – Teacher Education & Leadership)
Davis Lofton (Student – 2010- 2011)
Michele Morgan (Graduate Asst.)
Carly Stegall (Student – 2010- 2011)
Shirley Tipton (Executive Secretary to the Dean of the School of Education; QEP Steering Committee)
Ashley Winford (Student – 2010; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Ron Howard, ex-officio (Vice-President – Academic Affairs; Chair QEP Steering Committee)

**History of Topic Selection**

Dr. Beth Dunigan (Chair of Subcommittee and Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Ron Howard (Vice-President – Academic Affairs; Chair QEP Steering Committee)
Shirley Tipton (Executive Secretary to the Dean of the School of Education; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Beth Twiner Tinnon (Asst. Professor – Nursing; QEP Steering Committee)
Ashley Winford (Student – 2010; QEP Steering Committee)

**History of Bibliographic Instruction/Info Lit at Speed Library**

Susan Newman (Chair of Subcommittee and Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)
Carolyn Hodges (Reference Librarian and Adjunct Professor, School of Education)
Carol Williams (Reference Librarian and Adjunct Professor, School of Education)

**Local Data/Justification of Need**
Christopher Washam (Chair of Subcommittee and Professor – Kinesiology; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Chair and Assoc. Professor of Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
David de Medicis (Coordinator – Institutional Research, 2009-2010)
Cathy Van Devender (Registrar 2009-2011)

Literature Review

Ruth Ann Gibson (Chair of Subcommittee 2009-2010 and Head of Technical Services, Speed Library – Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)
Susan Newman (Chair of Subcommittee 2010-present and Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)
Clare Agostinelli (Asst. Director - Retention & Career Services)
Dr. Deborah Bolian (Asst. Professor – Nursing)
Dr. Janis Booth (Assoc. Professor – Psychology)
Dr. Marcelo Eduardo (Dean and Professor – School of Business)
Dr. Teresa Floyd (Professor – Mathematics)
Melanie Fortenberry (Instructor and Director – Health Services Administration)
Dr. Walt Frazier (Asst. Professor – Psychology)
Dr. Kenisha Gordon (Asst. Professor – Psychology & Counseling)
Dr. Kerri Jordan (Assoc. Professor – English; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. John Meadors (Professor – Christian Studies and Philosophy; QEP Steering Committee)
Mark Morgan (Asst. Professor – Business)
Dr. Steven Price (Assoc. Professor – English; Director – Writing Center; QEP Steering Committee)
Michelle Ricker (Asst. Dean and ADP Academic Coordinator – School of Business)
Dr. Lloyd Roberts (Professor – Business)
Taylor Stringer (Student, Business)
Amanda Sturniolo (Student, English)

Publicity

Tracey Harrison (Chair of Subcommittee and Director – Media Relations)
Dr. Tommye Henderson (Co-Chair of Subcommittee and Asst. Professor – Teacher Education & Leadership)
Dr. Steven Patterson (Co-Chair of Subcommittee and Associate Professor of History)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Michele Morgan (Graduate Asst.)
Susan Newman (Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)
Shirley Tipton (Executive Secretary to the Dean of the School of Education; QEP Steering Committee)
Hannah Morgan (Student)

Freshmen Experience

Terry Dent (Chair of Subcommittee and Instructor/Lab Coordinator – Biology; Coordinator, Freshmen Experience)
Dr. Amy Christian (Director, Student Counseling Center)
Karen Lindsey-Lloyd (Director of Retention and Career Services; QEP Development Committee)
Davis Lofton (Student)
QEP Steering Committee Member: Dr. John Meadors (Professor – Christian Studies and Philosophy)
Library Consultant: Heather Weeden (Librarian – Mississippi Baptist Historical Commission & MC Collections)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)

Core Curriculum

Dr. Steve Patterson (Chair of Subcommittee and Assoc. Professor – History & Political Science)
Dr. Kerri Jordan (Assoc. Professor – English; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Ivan Parke (Professor – Christian Studies)
Dr. Steven Price (Assoc. Professor – English; Director – Writing Center; QEP Steering Committee)
Carly Stegall (Student)
QEP Steering Committee Member: Dr. Beth Twiner Tinnon (Asst. Professor – Nursing)
Library Consultant: Carolyn Hodges (Reference Librarian)
Susan Newman (Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)

Majors

Dr. Stan Baldwin (Chair of Subcommittee and Dean – School of Science & Mathematics; Chair & Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Chris Maggio (Asst. Professor – Physical & Computer Science)
Dr. Bonnie Blu Williams (Professor – Music)
Library Consultant: Wanda Mosley (Librarian; Assistant Director – Learning Resources Center)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)

Faculty/Staff Development

Dr. Gary Mayfield (Chair of Subcommittee and Dean of School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Chair - Sociology Department; Professor – Sociology)
Cindy Hampton (Trainer/Computer Services Help Desk Coordinator)
Dr. Mandy Pickett Berdami (Asst. Professor – Art; Interior Design Coordinator)
QEP Steering Committee member: Dr. Press York (Professor – Business Administration)
Library Consultant: Carol Williams (Reference Librarian)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Chair and Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)

Assessment Plan

Dr. Debbie Norris (Chair of Subcommittee and Vice-President for Planning & Assessment; Dean of the Graduate School)
Sheree Corkern (Assistant Professor - Business)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Chair and Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Dr. Tommye Henderson (Asst. Professor – Teacher Education & Leadership)
Michele Morgan (Graduate Asst.)
Susan Newman (Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)
Sandra Robinson (Instructor of Nursing)

Resources
Bill Cranford (Chief Information Officer)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Chair and Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Kathleen Hutchison (Director, Speed Library)
Susan Newman (Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)

Budget
Marilyn Allen (Asst. Controller)
Dr. Beth Dunigan (Assoc. Chair and Assoc. Professor – Biology; QEP Steering Committee)
Susan Newman (Coordinator of Reference Services, Speed Library; QEP Steering Committee)
Donna Lewis (Chief Financial Officer)
Shirley Tipton (Executive Secretary to the Dean of the School of Education; QEP Steering Committee)

Proofing & Editing
Cheli Brunson (Program Coordinator – Continuing Education)
Dr. Cliff Fortenberry (Professor – Communication; Department Chair)
Judith Halbert (Administrative Secretary – Continuing Education)
Carolyn Hood (Reference Librarian)
Dr. Debbie Norris (Vice-President for Planning & Assessment; Dean of the Graduate School)
Robert Gatewood (Coordinator of Data and Technology/SACS Assistant)
Appendix B: Research Skills Survey – Given to ENG 102 students at the beginning of the Spring semester, 2010 and 2011. n=124

Please take a few moments to answer the following questions. This survey will help us determine which research skills you already possess and which skills we should further incorporate into the curriculum here at MC. Your answers will remain anonymous, so please answer honestly. Thank you.

1. What is your classification at MC?
   - Freshman 105
   - Sophomore 11
   - Junior 6
   - Senior 2

2. In the past year, have you been required to complete a significant research project (one in which you were required to find at least three sources and include them in a Works Cited, Bibliography, or References list)?
   - Yes 106
   - No 18

   If yes, was this assignment in high school or college?
   - High school 76
   - College 32

   If you have already completed an assignment while in college, for which course was the assignment completed?
   
   Did you come to the Leland Speed Library for an orientation or to get help from a librarian at MC when you were completing the research assignment?
   - Yes 15
   - No 41

3. Which of the following describes your use of the Mississippi College Library during the past year? Mark as many as apply.
   - Used MICAL – the online catalog to find books 21
   - Used one or more electronic databases to find articles – Ebscohost, Academic Search Premier, Academic Universe, ERIC, CINAHL, PsycInfo, etc. 16
   - Accessed an e-book from the library 4
   - Used a reference book, including a style manual such as the APA manual or MLA manual 18
   - Checked out a book 28
   - Used electronic reserve or regular reserve for class readings 10
   - Came to check out a video or DVD 13
   - Used the library website – either for information, to recheck your books, to check hours, etc. 31
   - Used the Ask A Librarian e-mail service 3
   - Used the library for a place to study 87
   - Used the library to meet with a group either to study or work on a project 67
   - Came to visit the coffee shop 41
   - Came to use the Internet for social reasons (Facebook, e-mail, online shopping, sports updates, etc.) 36
   - Came to use the printer 89
4. To see if the MC Library has any books on intelligent design, you would consult
   - Ebscohost 10
   - MICAL 51
   - Amazon 4
   - Unsure 59

5. To find a book about Eudora Welty, you would find the most results using the following search:
   - An author search using the terms Eudora Welty 13
   - A title search using the terms Eudora Welty 19
   - A keyword search using the terms Eudora Welty 71
   - An author search using the terms Welty, Eudora 22

6. If you were doing a search in an online catalog or an online database, which search would retrieve the most results?
   - Women and Afghanistan 72
   - Women not Afghanistan 7
   - Women or Afghanistan 30
   - Unsure 15

7. In a research or scholarly article, a citation is:
   - The call number used to find the source on the shelves 2
   - A word-for-word quotation from another source 13
   - A reference that gives source information for ideas or work you used from another author 94
   - Unsure 15

8. Sometimes you may hear the terminology primary source and secondary source. Which of the following might be the best example of a primary source?
   - Eisenhower, Dwight D. The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower 67
   - D’Este, Carlo. Eisenhower: A Soldier’s Life 8
   - Unsure 23

   - Multicultural Education in the Classroom 56
   - Academic Search Premier 8
   - Multicultural Perspectives 73
   - Unsure 10

10. Look at the citations in the left column below. In the right column, select the format referred to for each citation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Journal article</th>
<th>Magazine article</th>
<th>Chapter from a book</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11. Your professor may ask you to find information from a scholarly journal (sometimes called an academic journal or peer-reviewed journal). What are some characteristics of a “scholarly journal” versus a “magazine” or “popular magazine”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles usually have a bibliography or footnotes to inform readers of sources of information</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually the paper is “slick” with color pictures and advertisements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This type of publication is usually (not always) published quarterly rather than monthly</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended audience may be scholars and practitioners in the discipline</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors are usually journalists and/or employed by the publication and may write on a variety of topics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles are critically reviewed by a panel of “peers,” experts, or “referees” before publication</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Is it plagiarism to use a paper you found on the web if you have obtained the permission of the author?
   - Yes 80
   - No 39
   - Unsure 1
   - No, if you cite it 1

13. Indicate whether the following situations require that you provide a citation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Citation required</th>
<th>Citation not required</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You paraphrase information from a source, but you don’t quote it word for word</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are presenting your own analysis of a work</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entire class is consulting the same source to write an analysis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information you include in your paper is from Wikipedia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. You may use someone else’s ideas in a research paper
   - Only if those ideas appeared in a book that was published prior to 1947
   - Only if you paraphrase and do not use the exact words 15
   - Only when you have received written permission from the author to use the idea 7
   - Only when you give credit by providing a proper citation 95
   - Unsure 9

Please candidly answer the following questions about your research abilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know how to find a book in the MC library</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to think of an appropriate research topic for the assignments given me</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to find a video in the Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about copyright principles regarding books, music, and graphics found on the Internet and other media</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Not sure about the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the library’s electronic databases and know which databases are best to use for different disciplines</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to perform a successful search using Ebscohost Academic Search Premier</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to find a newspaper article using Academic Universe by Lexis Nexis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable using JSTOR and Project Muse.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel as if I am an advanced searcher – I know how to use limiters, multiple search terms, know how to narrow or broaden by topic by source, date or additional terminology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to contact a Reference Librarian for help, either in person or by telephone or by e-mail</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually find my articles by using Google Scholar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually use more than one Internet search engine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to use the advanced search features in an Internet search engine - such as limiting my results to a certain domain (.org, .gov, .edu, etc.) or finding who links to a website</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to evaluate websites to see if they are reliable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When writing a paper, I can easily develop the main argument or thesis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When writing a paper, I can easily organize the materials or information into a logical and meaningful structure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When writing a paper, I know when and how to document sources and how to use a Works Cited page to give credit to others, either in APA format, MLA format, or Turabian.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would you like to learn more about from the library? Mark all that apply.

- Searching for books  66
- Searching for magazine or journal articles  50
- Accessing good sources from outside the library  66
- Evaluating different sources to be sure they are appropriate for the assignment  69
- Knowing when and how to cite sources  77

Comments or suggestions?

Thank you for your input.
Appendix C: Selected Documents Used in ENG 102 Pilot Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP / ENG 102 Assessment Rubric (maps where each SLO is assessed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Access needed information efficiently and effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into his or her knowledge base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individually or as a member of a group, use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understand many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and assesses and uses information ethically and legally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):</th>
<th>a. Identify and develop a topic into a manageable focus</th>
<th>b. Identify a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information</th>
<th>a. Construct and implement effectively designed research strategies using appropriate methods or information retrieval systems</th>
<th>b. Retrieve information using a variety of methods and systematically manage the information and its sources</th>
<th>a. Evaluate information and its sources using appropriate criteria</th>
<th>b. Identify main ideas and their potential relevance, summarizing and synthesizing key ideas</th>
<th>a. Apply new and prior information to the planning and creation of a product or performance</th>
<th>b. Communicate the product or performance effectively and clearly to others</th>
<th>a. Acknowledge sources and use information following the conventions of a particular discipline</th>
<th>b. Demonstrate an understanding of university policies regarding plagiarism, academic integrity and use of campus networks and information resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website Evaluation Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Log</td>
<td>Notebook</td>
<td>Notebook</td>
<td>Notebook</td>
<td>Notebook</td>
<td>AnnotBib</td>
<td>AnnotBib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researched Major Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Selected Documents Used in ENG 102 Pilot Courses

Research Notebook Log Rubric (ENG 102): Fall 2011

For each of your ENG 102 Research Notebook Logs, please provide an objective assessment of the information literacy components described below. Click "Done" after each research notebook log and a new version of the rubric will appear. When you’re finished assessing, simply close the SurveyMonkey window. Thank you!

The researcher identifies and develops the research topic into a manageable focus.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

The researcher is able to find a variety of sources (books, journal articles, magazine/newspaper articles, websites, and other types).

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

The researcher is able to:
1. Create effective search terms.
2. Use a variety of methods for locating information (web searches, MICAL, university databases, etc.).

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

The researcher:
1. Shows how she locates the sources (her “trail”).
2. Indicates how decisions about the usefulness of sources (or lack of) were made.

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree Somewhat ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
Appendix C: Selected Documents Used in ENG 102 Pilot Courses

Annotated Bibliography Rubric (ENG 102): Fall 2011

For each of your ENG 102 Annotated Bibliographies, please provide an objective assessment of the information literacy components described below. Click "Done" after each annotated bibliography and a new version of the rubric will appear. When you're finished assessing, simply close the SurveyMonkey window. Thank you!

The writer includes an evaluative assertion about the quality, usefulness or limitations of each source.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The writer includes a concise but thorough summary of each source, including the overall point, other key points, and important details.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The writer includes consistently and correctly formatted bibliographic information for each source.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Done

Website Evaluation Rubric (ENG 102): Fall 2011

For each of your ENG 102 Website Evaluation Essays, please provide an objective assessment of the information literacy components described below. Click "Done" after each essay and a new version of the rubric will appear. When you're finished assessing, simply close the SurveyMonkey window. Thank you!

The writer evaluates the website effectively, with:
1. Appropriate emphasis on important criteria
2. Judgments (for each criterion and overall) based on specific evidence and clear rationales

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

The writer stays focused on evaluation (and doesn't shift the focus to summary or description).

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Describe the level of writing skills demonstrated in the essay, based on the English Department’s “Standards for Evaluating Student Writing.”

Superior (A-level) | Acceptable (C-level) | Unacceptable (F-level)

Done
SOC Report Rubric (ENG 102): Fall 2011

For each of your ENG 102 SOC Reports, please provide an objective assessment of the information literacy components described below. Click "Done" after each research notebook log and a new version of the rubric will appear. When you're finished assessing, simply close the SurveyMonkey window. Thank you!

The writer identifies and develops the research topic into a manageable focus (with a manageable “should” question or controversy).

□ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Somewhat □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

The writer uses a variety of types of sources relevant to the topic.

□ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Somewhat □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

The writer identifies main ideas in sources and summarizes or synthesizes them effectively.

□ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Somewhat □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

The writer creates an effective SOC Report, as described on the unit plan.

□ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Somewhat □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

The writer demonstrates exemplary writing skills, based on the English Department’s “Standards for Evaluating Student Writing.”

□ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Somewhat □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

The writer:
1. Includes necessary citations.
2. Consistently and correctly formats parenthetical citations and bibliographic information.

□ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Somewhat □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

The writer uses sources accurately and follows all school policies for producing an assignment.

□ Strongly Agree □ Agree □ Somewhat □ Disagree □ Strongly Disagree

Done
## Appendix D: Selected Documents Used in NUR 323 Pilot Course

### NUR 323 Research in Nursing Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Objective(s)/SLO</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Performance Standard</th>
<th>Performance Standard met? Analysis &amp; suggestions attached (after end of course)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint Presentation of Research Topic</td>
<td>1a – Students will identify and develop a topic into a manageable focus. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by choosing a topic of interest and developing the research question based on the PICO method of question development. The students will be able to clearly state the research problem, research question, and research framework.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b – Students will identify a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by identifying the characteristics of a primary report of research, and can distinguish between primary and secondary sources in evaluating nursing research. Students will be able to determine if the author is a nurse and is written from a nursing perspective.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2a - Students will construct and implement effectively designed research strategies using appropriate methods or information retrieval systems. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by searching for and retrieving appropriate information from CINAHL.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b - Students will retrieve information using a variety of methods and systematically manage the information and its sources. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by searching for and retrieving appropriate information from CINAHL.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Objective(s)/SLO</td>
<td>Assessment Method</td>
<td>Performance Standard</td>
<td>Performance Standard met? Analysis &amp; suggestions attached (after end of course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a -</td>
<td>Students will evaluate information and its sources using appropriate criteria. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by assessing the author's credentials or professional affiliation. Students will also be able to assess the relevance of the article to the research question.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b -</td>
<td>Students will identify main ideas and their potential relevance, summarizing and synthesizing key ideas. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by completing a review of literature, identifying key findings, study limitations, and recommendations for nursing practice.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a –</td>
<td>Students will apply new and prior information to the planning and creation of a product or performance. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by using knowledge gained during clinical experiences from previous semesters to investigate and analyze a related research topic. Students will present the information in PowerPoint format as well as a poster session.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b -</td>
<td>Students will communicate the product or performance effectively and clearly to others. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by presenting and delivering a PowerPoint and poster session creatively and professionally.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a -</td>
<td>Students will acknowledge sources and use information following the conventions of a particular discipline. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will demonstrate that competency by using APA format. Students will also be aware of privacy regulations for health information.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b -</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of university policies regarding plagiarism, academic integrity and use of campus networks and information resources. <strong>Students in NUR 323</strong> will understand the need to cite sources using APA format.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Selected Documents Used in NUR 323 Pilot Course

NUR 323 GROUP POWERPOINT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of the Clinical Question (SLO 1a)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____  Maximum 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes the following elements: The research question is appropriate, with evidence of elements from the PICO method of question development. The topic of interest will be chosen from the Cochran Institute of Evidence Based (5 points). Within the question statement the following areas should be addressed: P – the patient or population of interest and the problem to be studied (5 points), I – Intervention – what intervention will be done (5 points), C – Comparison – will there be any comparison to a current intervention (5 points), O – what is your expected outcome (5 points). Can the question be tested and analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Purpose (SLO 1a)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____  Maximum 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes a clear statement of purpose for the problem. This should be 2-3 sentences stating the professional interest in the research topic. A clear and concise explanation of why topic was chosen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework and Hypothesis (SLO 1a)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____  Maximum 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes information about the nursing framework upon which you would base your study. The nursing theory should provide the guide for the intervention in the research. The hypotheses should include variables, relationships, interventions and predicted outcomes. Both the theory and hypothesis should be clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review of Current Research (SLO 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____  Maximum 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes the following elements: Resources used in creating the presentation are primary sources (reports of actual research). Student is aware of information retrieval systems specific to the discipline and understands that it may be necessary to use vocabulary specific to the discipline to search for information. Resources are from the perspective of the nursing discipline, and directly relate to the research question. Each article’s purpose and implications for clinical practice are identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design of Study (SLO 4a)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____  Maximum 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes information regarding what research design would be used. The research design should be based on how to best obtain the answer to the research question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Sample (SLO 4a)</td>
<td>SCORE: _____ Maximum 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points adequately describes the method used to select the sample and the sample size.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection of Data (SLO 4a)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____ Maximum 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes information regarding the collection of data, including more than one method if possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Evaluation (SLO 4b)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____ Maximum 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes a peer evaluation to include individual participation, contribution to the project and equal assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar, References and Citation (SLO 5a,5b)</th>
<th>SCORE: _____ Maximum 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A presentation earning maximum points includes correct spelling and grammar and citations that are correctly cited using APA style. This includes a reference page.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix E: Selected Documents Used in SOC 205 Pilot Course**

**Sociology 205: An Introduction in Global Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Objective(s)/SLO</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
<th>Performance Standard met? Analysis &amp; suggestions attached (after end of course)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LibGuides (annotated bibliography)</td>
<td>1b – Students will identify a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information. <strong>Students in SOC 205</strong> will demonstrate that competency by using the appropriate number of sources according to specified categories in the assignment. The student will correctly categorize the sources in the resource guide and give preference to the use of primary sources (i.e., original works by the original authors) in the report.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis &amp; suggestions attached (after end of course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2a - Students will construct and implement effectively designed research strategies using appropriate methods or information retrieval systems. 2b – Students will retrieve information using a variety of methods and systematically manage the information and its sources. <strong>Students in SOC 205</strong> will demonstrate that competency by searching for and retrieving appropriate information from reference sources, books, journals, magazines or newspaper articles, websites, and videos.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a - Students will evaluate information and its sources using appropriate criteria. <strong>Students in SOC 205</strong> will demonstrate that competency by completing an annotation for each resource chosen. The annotation must describe the relevance and importance of the resource to the chosen LibGuide topic, and must include a rationale as to why the resource is the best information for the chosen topic.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b - Students will identify main ideas and their potential relevance, summarizing and synthesizing key ideas. Students in SOC 205 will demonstrate that competency by completing annotations for each resource. The annotation will summarize the key ideas of the resources chosen.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Objective(s)/SLO</td>
<td>Assessment Method</td>
<td>Intended Outcomes</td>
<td>Performance Standard met? Analysis &amp; suggestions attached (after end of course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b - Students will communicate the product or performance effectively and clearly to others. <strong>Students in SOC 205</strong> will demonstrate that competency by submitting the annotated bibliography in the specified format to the MCMoodle course website by the report due date and time as specified in the assignment.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a - Students will acknowledge sources and use information following the conventions of a particular discipline. <strong>Students in SOC 205</strong> will demonstrate that competency by formatting the report in an acceptable writing style (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.), with a complete and correct bibliographic citation for each resource. Students will include for each resource a working link that links directly to the resource (a persistent, or durable link that links directly to the article and not the database). 5b - Students will demonstrate an understanding of university policies regarding plagiarism, academic integrity and use of campus networks and information resources. <strong>Students in SOC 205</strong> will demonstrate that competency submitting a product that represents the student’s own work and is free of plagiarism.</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E: Selected Documents Used in SOC 205 Pilot Course

**Sociology LibGuides Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Not Acceptable</th>
<th>U Research Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variety of information sources (SLO 1b)</td>
<td>The student uses the appropriate variety of sources according to the specified categories in the assignment. The sources are categorized correctly.</td>
<td>Most of the sources are categorized appropriately.</td>
<td>Some attempt at locating sources according to the categories outlined in the assignment.</td>
<td>Sources fail to represent the categories outlined in the assignment.</td>
<td>1b. Identify a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of information sources (SLO 2a, 2b)</td>
<td>Includes the required number of information sources for each category. Sources were retrieved from a variety of databases and information retrieval systems.</td>
<td>Most categories include the required number of information sources, with occasional instances of sources being categorized incorrectly.</td>
<td>Some categories include the required number of information sources, but most are incomplete or categorized incorrectly.</td>
<td>Fails to include the required number of sources.</td>
<td>2a. Construct and implement effectively designed research strategies using appropriate methods or information retrieval systems 2b. Retrieve information using a variety of methods and systematically manage the information and its sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for selection of information sources (SLO 3a)</td>
<td>Annotations include the relevance and importance of the resource to the chosen topic. Include a rationale as to why the sources used are the best choice for the topic.</td>
<td>Most annotations demonstrate a relevance to the chosen topic.</td>
<td>Sources appear to be included because of easy availability rather than being the best sources. Relevance to the topic is usually not articulated.</td>
<td>No attempt made to critically assess the relevance or value of the information source.</td>
<td>3a. Evaluate information and its sources using appropriate criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the information sources (SLO 3b)</td>
<td>Main ideas of the sources are clearly summarized.</td>
<td>Most annotations include the main ideas of the source</td>
<td>Most annotations are of poor quality and may fail to summarize</td>
<td>Numerous grammar and/or spelling errors. Main ideas are</td>
<td>3b. Identify main ideas and their potential relevance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>U Research Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Annotations are of appropriate length and are grammatically correct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report is formatted in an acceptable writing style (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.) Each resource has a complete and correct bibliographic citation. Each resource has a working link that links directly to the resource (a persistent link that is durable and links directly to the article and not the database). The report is the student’s own work and is free of plagiarism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>Annotations are descriptive. Few grammatical or spelling errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report mostly follows an acceptable format. The citations are mostly complete and usually free of errors. Each resource has a link, most of which are working. Links are not persistent or durable links, but instead go to the home page of the resource.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Annotations are of main points. Numerous grammar and/or spelling errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report may not follow an acceptable style. Some citations are incomplete or have omissions, with frequent errors. Links do not work. Or, summaries appear to be plagiarized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Acceptable</td>
<td>Annotations are not of the appropriate length.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report was late or not properly formatted. Major elements were missing from the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report does not follow an acceptable style. Citations may be incomplete, with major errors and no consistent format. Links do not work. Or, summaries appear to be plagiarized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>U Research Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format and mechanics of the LibGuide (SLO 4b)</td>
<td>The report was on time. All elements as specified in the assignment. Minor errors or omissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of the citations (SLO 5a,5b)</td>
<td>The report was submitted on time as specified. Report was formatted as specified in the assignment, including all elements present as specified. Minor errors or omissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Tentative Agenda for Faculty Workshops

English Faculty Workshop Spring 2012

I. Welcome and Objectives
II. U Research Goal and Student Learning Outcomes/Goals and Student Learning Outcomes for ENG 102
III. ENG 102 Piloted Courses - Background and Overview
IV. ENG 102 – Syllabus, Common Assignments and Assessments
V. Information for Online or Hybrid Classes
VI. Library Resources and Support
VII. Aggregating and reporting assessment results and improvement strategies
   a. Reporting to departmental faculty and dean
   b. Reporting to U Research Assessment Committee
   c. Reporting in the Annual Academic Assessment Plan
VIII. Oversight Committee and its role
IX. Questions

Departmental Workshop (Incremental, as U Research is implemented)

I. Welcome and Objectives
II. U Research Goal and Student Learning outcomes
III. Role of U Research Leaders
IV. Timelines for implementing U Research in to specific courses
V. Procedures for implementing U Research in to specific courses
VI. Piloted Courses (if applicable)
VII. Integrating Goal and SLOs into specific major
VIII. Types of possible assignments for specific major
IX. Developing assessments
X. Information for online and hybrid courses
XI. Library resources and support
XII. Aggregating and reporting assessment results and improvement strategies
   a. Reporting to departmental faculty and dean
   b. Reporting to U Research Assessment Committee
   c. Reporting in the Annual Academic Assessment Plan
XIII. Oversight Committee and its role
XIV. Questions
Appendix G: Institution-Specific Questions for the College Senior Survey & Student Satisfaction Inventory

Institution-Specific Questions for the College Senior Survey

1. Overall, my coursework at Mississippi College helped improve my research and information literacy skills.

2. My coursework at Mississippi College included assignments that required me to locate and use information from sources other than my textbook.

3. My coursework at Mississippi College helped me understand how to evaluate information sources, especially websites, to determine their value.

4. When completing research assignments, I was required to differentiate between and use a variety of information sources (such as book, journals, peer reviewed articles, or primary sources).

5. My coursework at Mississippi College improved my ability to identify main ideas in texts and integrate new information with my previous knowledge.

6. My coursework at Mississippi College required me to complete a research assignment and communicate it by submitting a paper, a presentation, or other project.

7. My coursework at Mississippi College improved my understanding of academic honesty, plagiarism, and the citation of sources.

8. When completing research assignments, I was required to confer with the instructor or explore background information in order to develop my research topic or thesis statement.

Appendix G: Institution-Specific Questions for the Student Satisfaction Inventory

1. Overall, my courses contribute to the improvement of my research and information literacy skills.

2. My coursework at MC includes assignments that help approve my ability to locate and use a variety of types of information.

3. My coursework at MC helps improve my ability to critically evaluate information sources, especially websites.

4. My coursework at MC helps improve my understanding of academic honesty, plagiarism, and the citation of sources.
## Appendix H: Mississippi College Sample Information Literacy Rubric

### Level 5: Student Learning Outcomes

**OBJECTIVE 1: DETERMINE**
- Develops and clearly articulates a quality research question that is appropriately focused and relevant to the assignment.

**OBJECTIVE 2: ACCESS**
- Uses a variety of information from discipline specific and appropriate sources. Uses appropriate information retrieval systems.

**OBJECTIVE 3: EVALUATE**
- Applies evaluation criteria when selecting sources, and usually recognizes bias, inaccuracies, and weaknesses when selecting sources, and articulates that criteria when appropriate.

### Level 4: Student Learning Outcomes

**OBJECTIVE 1: DETERMINE**
- Develops a research question that is somewhat focused and appropriate for the assignment.

**OBJECTIVE 2: ACCESS**
- Uses a variety of discipline appropriate sources. Uses generally relevant, but may not exhibit variety or relevance to topic.

**OBJECTIVE 3: EVALUATE**
- Applies evaluation criteria when selecting sources, and usually recognizes bias, inaccuracies, and weaknesses when selecting sources, and articulates that criteria when appropriate.

### Level 3: Student Learning Outcomes

**OBJECTIVE 1: DETERMINE**
- Develops a research question that needs more focus, or does not go beyond repeating the assignment terminology.

**OBJECTIVE 2: ACCESS**
- Uses few sources beyond the minimal requirements of the assignment.

**OBJECTIVE 3: EVALUATE**
- Applies evaluation criteria when selecting sources, and usually recognizes bias, inaccuracies, and weaknesses when selecting sources, and articulates that criteria when appropriate.

### Level 2: Student Learning Outcomes

**OBJECTIVE 1: DETERMINE**
- Develops a research question that is generally focused and relevant.

**OBJECTIVE 2: ACCESS**
- Uses a variety of discipline appropriate sources. Uses appropriate information retrieval systems.

**OBJECTIVE 3: EVALUATE**
- Applies evaluation criteria when selecting sources, and usually recognizes bias, inaccuracies, and weaknesses when selecting sources, and articulates that criteria when appropriate.

### Level 1: Student Learning Outcomes

**OBJECTIVE 1: DETERMINE**
- Fails to develop a research question or topic. Does not seek assistance from professor to refine topic.

**OBJECTIVE 2: ACCESS**
- Uses minimal or same type sources and may not go beyond web searching.

**OBJECTIVE 3: EVALUATE**
- Uses sources that may be questionable as to credibility and reliability. Sources often do not show relevance or support to the research need or thesis.

---

**Fails to use sources that are appropriate for the assignment. Research need is not met by the types of sources used.**

---

**OBJECTIVE 3: EVALUATE**
- Identifies, summarizes, and synthesizes key ideas from sources; identifies contradictions or unique characteristics of the source; uses sources to support the thesis or argument.

---

**Fails to use sources that are appropriate for the assignment. Research need is not met by the types of sources used.**

---

**OBJECTIVE 1: DETERMINE**
- Fails to develop a research question or topic. Does not seek assistance from professor to refine topic.

**OBJECTIVE 2: ACCESS**
- Uses minimal or same type sources and may not go beyond web searching.

**OBJECTIVE 3: EVALUATE**
- Uses sources that may be questionable as to credibility and reliability. Sources often do not show relevance or support to the research need or thesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 4: USE EFFECTIVELY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combines new information with prior knowledge to create new conclusions or ideas. Integrates ideas from sources to fully support position or argument.</td>
<td>Often uses new information to support ideas and conclusions. Intended purpose is achieved.</td>
<td>Generally applies prior information to create new product, achieving intended purpose.</td>
<td>Uses information inappropriately, or product is not well organized.</td>
<td>Fails to achieve intended purpose. Uses sources poorly when creating the product or performance.</td>
<td>4a. Apply new and prior information to the planning and creation of a product or performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents ideas coherently, using methods appropriate to the discipline and the assignment. Achieves intended purpose, and presents the information effectively.</td>
<td>Usually presents ideas coherently; uses appropriate methods and technology to present the product.</td>
<td>Generally presents ideas in a coherent manner. Could improve the method of communication or presentation.</td>
<td>May not present ideas in a clear manner. Uses technology or media that is not consistently effective or not appropriate to the discipline.</td>
<td>Presents ideas and content in a poor fashion. Required components may be missing from product. Uses technology, media or software ineffectively.</td>
<td>4b. Communicate the product or performance effectively and clearly to others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OBJECTIVE 5: UNDERSTAND** | | | | | |
| Identifies and uses discipline appropriate citation style with no errors; Demonstrates consistent and appropriate use of paraphrasing and quotation of sources. Shows no ambiguity about original thought and the ideas of others. Consistently demonstrates an understanding of the restrictions on the legal and ethical use of information and information resources. Applies ethical use of information to conventions of discipline. | Uses discipline appropriate citation style with minor errors. Minor errors in citation of sources. Usually shows proper attribution of ideas. | Generally uses discipline appropriate citation style, but with errors. Errors in citation and bibliography, with some ambiguity about original thought. | May fail to attribute ideas and words to others. May show improper use of sources or lack or quotation marks. | May exhibit plagiarism. Does not cite sources, or lists sources in bibliography that are not used in paper. | 5a. Acknowledge sources and use information following the conventions of a particular discipline |
| Usually demonstrates an understanding of plagiarism and university networks and information. Understands some of the disciplinary conventions regarding ethical use of information. | Demonstrates an understanding of plagiarism and university networks and information. | Shows little or no understanding of some aspects of plagiarism and use of networks and information. | Shows little or no understanding of university policies regarding plagiarism, academic integrity and use of campus networks and information resources. | 5b. Demonstrate an understanding of university policies regarding plagiarism, academic integrity and use of campus networks and information resources |