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Executive Summary

The Goal of River Parishes Community College’s Quality Enhancement Plan is to improve students’ information literacy skills. The College will implement the QEP through a college-wide coordinated effort involving faculty, staff, and students.

The QEP focuses on five student learning outcomes as follows: 1.) The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed. 2.) The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently 3.) The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system 4.) The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose 5.) The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally. These student learning outcomes are drawn from the American College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education and the ACRL Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction.

The College will measure the QEP learning outcomes using external and internal assessment tools. Specifically, RPCC will assess student performance of two groups during the life of the QEP measuring performance of freshmen and that of 30+ hour students to determine gains in information literacy competencies.

RPCC will use direct and indirect assessment measures to assess the student learning outcomes. The direct measures include SAILS: Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills developed by Kent State University and the College’s current general education assessment process as it relates to information literacy. The indirect measures include use of CCSSE: Community College Survey of Student Engagement and the College’s library statistics and bibliographic instruction surveys. SAILS and the general education assessment tools are knowledge-based assessments that will provide direct information on students’ information literacy competencies. CCSSE and the College library data will provide relevant associated data concerning instructional practices and student activities that promote and facilitate information literacy competencies.

Review of the relevant literature and institutional data confirms the appropriateness of a QEP focusing on information literacy. The College has the capacity, budget, and broad institutional support necessary for this initiative. RPCC has an established implementation process and timeline for the QEP and is committed to its success.
Chapter 1: Developing the QEP

The unexamined life is not worth living for a human being.

—Socrates, Classical Greek Philosopher

Preparations

River Parishes Community College was chartered by the Louisiana Legislature in 1997, employed its first President in August 1998, and offered its first classes in August 1999. In making preparations for launching a new college, RPCC’s executive leadership understood that achieving accreditation had to be a primary consideration and every effort was made to instill an understanding of accreditation requirements and processes in all college employees from day one.

Those preparations enabled the College to achieve Candidacy in June 2003 and accreditation in December 2004. As part of the 2009 reaffirmation process, RPCC hosted its third Visiting Team in five years. Being involved in accreditation related activities during most of the College’s nine year existence, has enabled RPCC to establish and maintain a positive, ongoing momentum toward continuous improvement.

RPCC began informal reaffirmation preparations in the January of 2006, when the faculty returned for spring classes. While most staff members were familiar with the Principles and Compliance Certification, many were only vaguely aware of the QEP requirements. Consequently, more time was spent orienting the campus community to the QEP.

1.1 Beginning the QEP Topic Search

Faculty and staff members were encouraged to begin searching for potential topics. Colleges that posted Quality Enhancement Plans on their website facilitated these research efforts and RPCC staff members became familiar with different QEP models and how Colleges approached the task.

In preparation for the QEP, RPCC faculty and staff members attended QEP presentations during pre-conference and concurrent session presentations at annual meetings from 2005 through 2008, and sent a delegation to a Summer Institute in Orlando.

2006 SACS Summer Institute Attendees

- Kim Dudley, Director of Financial Aid
- Lauri Hatlelid, Academic Adviser/Institutional Research Coordinator
- Wendy Johnson, Director of Library Services
- Jim Rolfes, Instructor (Business)
- Dr. Ed Thompson, Instructor (Mathematics)
1.2 Campus and Community Discussions

Open discussion of possible QEP topics began in the spring of 2006 and continued through 2007. RPCC’s tradition in considering major initiatives is to have those discussions in an open assembly. The College has a small staff, believes in and practices information sharing, and encourages cooperation across departments.

This tradition began with faculty assemblies which have been utilized since the College opened. In an effort to create an environment of cooperation, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of Academic Studies regularly invited instructional faculty, library faculty, representatives from Student Services and other staff members as appropriate to discuss important issues that affected the larger community. Even though the College and its staff had grown, assemblies continued to be the venue for discussing important issues.

RPCC also took advantage of the involvement of several administrators and staff members who are active in community organizations to share information about the QEP and to learn about employer insights regarding what employers are looking for in hiring new employees. Staff members had exchanges with area chamber of commerce boards, Rotary clubs, and the Ascension Community Advisory Panel (CAP) which includes plant managers for area chemical industries. Staff members also spoke with members of RPCC’s Foundation Board since they also represent a broad cross section of the business community.

1.3 Proposed Topics

In June 2006, Dr. Crystal Lee, Dean of Academic Studies, collected and published a list of QEP topics that had been discussed in assembly. Those topics included the following:

- Enhancing the academic climate for student learning
- Strengthening the general studies curriculum
- Creative approaches to experiential learning
- Information Literacy
- Establish a tutoring or learning center for under-prepared students
- Enhancing critical thinking skills
- Innovative teaching/learning strategies
- Increasing student engagement in learning
- Using technology in the classroom
- Improving learning for under-prepared students

Deliberations on QEP topics continued during the fall of 2007 and staff members also examined institutional data for a significant institutional need. They reviewed Institutional Assessments completed by students prior to each spring registration and Graduating Student Surveys that are completed each semester. CCSE reports were also scrutinized for issues raised by students, and survey responses from alumni and students who had transferred to universities were evaluated. Student opinions were also collected with the assistance of the SGA, especially Casey Efird, SGA President.
By the time that Dr. Cheryl Cardell, RPCC’s new SACS Liaison visited campus in April 2007, most of the campus community was very familiar with reaffirmation processes and the QEP. Dr. Cardell met with faculty and staff in order to clarify reaffirmation processes and timelines as well as the QEP. In addition to meeting with the staff in assembly, she had ample time to visit with campus leaders and answer questions.

1.4 Narrowing Choices

Conversations at the departmental level and in assembly meetings, gradually led to a reduction in topics under consideration. Faculty, staff and students were reminded that the topic had to meet QEP requirements related to focus, institutional capacity, and assessing student learning. It became apparent that some of the topics under discussion provided some challenges when considering one or more of those requirements.

For example, there were those who wanted to establish a learning center on campus through which the College could improve services for under-prepared students. While this proposal had broad College support, it was evident that RPCC did not have the current capacity to support that project. The diversion of state resources for recovery following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005, along with sky rocketing construction costs, prevented the College from having a new building constructed and added to the current lease. It was determined that the learning center for under-prepared students would have to be delayed until LCTCS efforts to purchase the site and begin planning for a new building could become a reality.

After reviewing materials on the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) website and becoming familiar with the standards that had been developed over the past two decades, campus support or information literacy as a QEP topic increased significantly. It was apparent that information literacy contained several features that made the topic compelling for a broad cross-section of the College and the community.

Information literacy involved understanding and using technology, critical thinking, and problem solving. Faculty members often shared how students lacked critical thinking and problem solving skills and that opinion was voiced by area employers and RPCC students as well. Dr. Bill Martin, a member of the Ascension Parish Community Advisory Panel (CAP) for the chemical industry, noted that plant managers often expressed the opinion that new hires lacked critical thinking and problem solving skills.

One of the most compelling testimonies for information literacy came from Ava Berthelot, a former RPCC Chancellor’s List student who transferred to LSU in the spring of 2005. Ava responded to a call for transfer students to complete an on-line institutional assessment. In responding to that survey, she indicated that while RPCC did many things to help her succeed as a non-traditional student, the College did not prepare her for the review and critical evaluation of professional literature in her upper division classes.

Faculty members liked the idea that information literacy could be implemented in virtually any course. They appreciated information literacy’s emphasis on encouraging students to become more self-directed and active learners.
In November, 2007, the College adopted Information Literacy as the focus of RPCC’s Quality Enhancement Plan and a QEP Implementation Team was appointed to begin the work of developing the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 - 2008 QEP Implementation Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clen Burton, Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Terry Byars, Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Angela Cutrer, Director of Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kim Dudley, Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beatrice Evans, Student and Administrative Assistant III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Steven Hadley, Instructor of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lauri Hatlelid, Academic Advisor and Institutional Research Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Iris Henry, Assistant Professor of Biology, Chemistry, and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wendy Johnson (Co-Chair), Director of Library Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jane LeBlanc, Accounting Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crystal Lee, Dean of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ben Nabors (Co-Chair), Assistant Professor of English and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jim Rolfes, Assistant Professor of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allison Dauzat Vicknair, Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa Watson, Director of Sponsored Programs and Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implementation team changed slightly in 2008-2009 following some personnel changes and to give some other individuals an opportunity to serve on the implementation team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 - 2009 QEP Implementation Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Terry Byars, Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Angela Cutrer, Director of Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kim Dudley, Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beatrice Evans, Student and Administrative Assistant III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Steven Hadley, Assistant Professor of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Iris Henry, Assistant Professor of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annie Holben, Academic Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michael Hubbs, Director of Accounting and Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wendy Johnson, (Co-Chair), Director of Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jane LeBlanc, Accounting Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crystal Lee, (Co-Chair), Dean of Academic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bill Martin, Vice-Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jim Rolfes, Assistant Professor of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allison Vicknair, Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lisa Watson, Director of Sponsored Programs and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Douglas Weatherly, English Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary
By successfully implementing a Quality Enhancement Plan that intends to improve students’ information literacy skills, RPCC believes that it will satisfy QEP criteria identified in COC publications. The College has selected a topic that is forward looking and will provide the institution with an emphasis that will appeal to students, staff, and its constituents. The College has the resources and the capacity to implement the plan. Most importantly, the plan has developed assessment strategies for measuring student learning as it relates to information literacy.
Chapter 2: Establishing a Foundation and Selecting the QEP Topic

*Education that consists in learning things and not the meaning of them is feeding upon the husks and not the corn.*

—Mark Twain, American Writer

Defining the Topic

The Implementation Team began working at an accelerated pace in January 2008. The Co-Chairs, Dr. Ben Lanier Nabors and Wendy Johnson, organized a series of meetings that were designed to build a solid team, increase QEP and Information Literacy awareness, and to establish critical definitions.

In early February, the Co-Chairs established three Team Focus Groups for the purpose of completing guided work assignments. Focus groups were asked to complete reading assignments, brainstorm about what the readings meant in the context of their particular areas of expertise and to begin establishing definitions of critical terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Implementation Team Focus Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Meta-Institutional Focus Group: Institutional Administration, Finances, and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Clen Burton - Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Angela Cutrer - Director of Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Kim Dudley - Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Jane LeBlanc - Accounting Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Lisa Watson - Director of Sponsored Programs and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Curriculum Administration Focus Group: Curriculum Development, Curriculum Implementation, and Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Lauri Hatlelid - Academic Adviser/Institutional Research Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Wendy Johnson – Director of Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Dr. Crystal Lee - Dean of Academic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Allison Vicknair - Dean of Students and Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Teaching and Learning Focus Group: Course Development, Course Implementation, and Student Centering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Dr. Terry Byars – Assistant Professor (Speech and Drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Beatrice Evans – RPCC Student and Administrative Assistant III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Steven Hadley – Instructor (Art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Dr. Iris Henry – Assistant Professor (Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Dr. Ben Nabors – Assistant Professor (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Jim Rolfes – Assistant Professor (Business)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team focus groups responded to the guided assignments by answering the following questions:

1. As it relates to your group’s focus, what seems to be SACS’ expectations?
2. As it relates to your group’s focus, what can you contribute to the QEP process?
3. As it relates to your group’s focus, for what specific areas are we currently well-equipped?
4. As it relates to your group’s focus, for what specific areas are we NOT well-equipped?
5. Following the previous two questions, what should we do to enhance our strengths and strengthen our weaknesses?
6. What can you do not only to help this QEP “pass SACS” but—via your long-range contributions to this QEP—truly help our students become better students, thinkers, professionals, and citizens?

Additionally, the Team provided to the RPCC community an information literacy series through the Library’s Student Success Workshops program. Facilitated by Ben Nabors, Team Co-Chair, the five-part series addressed the following topics: “How We Think: Making, Filling, and Correcting Spaces”; “What to Do with Information: Moving from Recalling to Creating”; “Critical Thinking and Information Literacy—Integral to Each Other”; “Teaching Literately: Educational Practices that Facilitate Literacy and Thought”; “Testing Literately: Seeing the Wholes through the Fractions” (see Appendix 5). The series was open to anyone interested: faculty, staff, students, and community members. On the one hand, the series was a means to educate the campus community about information literacy and topics related to information literacy. On the other, the series served as a pilot for the sorts of professional development opportunities that will be part of QEP implementation.

Likewise, Nabors piloted an information literacy unit created by Connie Chemay, Library Head of Public Services, in his Introduction to Composition II (ENGL 1020) course during spring 2008. The unit was included as an integral part of Nabors’ course and was counted as an examination. The unit, which is available to all faculty and staff and is executed and assessed through Blackboard educational support technology, focuses on best research practices, information gathering, information evaluation, proper information use, and documentation methods. As with the information literacy series, piloting the unit was a means of testing the unit’s effectiveness and a means of preparing the kind of teaching tool that will be adopted as part of the QEP.

From the beginning of the Team’s work, the Team made a concerted effort to keep the College informed about its activities, as well as about information literacy. For example, the Team sent questionnaires and articles out to faculty and staff so that the College’s whole community would be well-informed about information literacy and the Team’s work; the Team did so to encourage contributions from across the College to the process of developing the QEP and of preparing it for implementation (see Appendices 6 and 7).
2.1 Defining Student Learning

A variety of definitions exist for both student learning and information literacy; however, RPCC has made a deliberate effort to formulate definitions that best reflect the College’s mission, its faculty members’ teaching philosophies, and its students’ needs.

At River Parishes Community College, student learning is considered to be a multi-layered process of finding and using information gained in courses to build a knowledge base that enables a student to achieve personal and professional success, as well as to become a contributing member of society. The college’s understanding of learning is heavily influenced by Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, both in its original and revised incarnations.

On the first level of student learning, a student should be able to acquire and use information to build a knowledge base that will serve to improve his or her personal life. On the second level, a student should be able to acquire and use information in order to be a well-equipped, contributing participant in any professional setting, whether that be as a student in a four-year institution of higher learning or as an employee for an employer. On the third, a student should be able to acquire and use information to become a well-informed, critical thinking, and constructive citizen in his or her local community and in the larger society. Each level is concerned with a student’s ability to build knowledge for the purpose of improving her or his life in a variety of contexts.

2.2 Defining Information Literacy

River Parishes Community College has composed a concise but comprehensive definition of the term information literacy.

Information Literacy Is . . .

the skills needed to responsibly and effectively locate, evaluate, and use information.

A parsing of the definition demonstrates the depth and comprehensiveness of RPCC’s conception of information literacy.

First, the term information literacy itself needs clarification, according to RPCC’s understanding of it.
Information and Literacy

- **Information** includes any data, evidence, inference, concept, or impression that is conveyable or obtainable by a variety of means or media, such as by print, digital sources, personal experience, experimentation, art, mathematics, history, literature, science, popular culture, and so on.

- **Literacy** includes an individual’s abilities to actively and ethically access, recall, decipher, understand, synthesize, analyze, apply, critique, create, and communicate with materials and skills which are presented to and learned by that individual within her or his personal, professional, academic, or social contexts.

As a consequence of RPCC’s comprehension of the term *information literacy*, the definition of the term takes shape. The definition begins with three prefacing elements: **skills**, **responsibility**, and **effectiveness**. These initial elements provide the practical and ethical framework in which the three-fold process of information literacy is set. The three-fold process comprises **locating**, **evaluating**, and **using information**.

### Prefacing Elements of Information Literacy

- **Skills** points to the practical nature of information literacy. Information literacy requires one to be able to access available tools and employ learnable practices.

- **Responsibility** indicates the ethical dimension of information literacy. Information literacy stresses the fair, constructive, and respectful location, evaluation, and use of information, much of which comes from the intellectual labor of others. To be information literate means to understand that one is part of a community of information gatherers, conveyers, and users. Therefore, properly documenting, citing, and attributing sources of information is not just a formality; it is an ethical responsibility.

- **Effectiveness** highlights the need to systematically and purposefully find, evaluate, and use information. Effectiveness concerns the efficiency, applicability, usefulness, and relevance of information location, evaluation, and use.

### Three-Fold Process of Information Literacy

- **Locating information** is the initial phase of information literacy. To locate means to define one’s question or problem or assignment, to accordingly search for information, and to ultimately find information.

- **Evaluating information** is the next phase of information literacy. To evaluate means to analyze and judge the appropriateness, biases, and credibility of information. Based on how appropriate, biased, or credible information is judged to be, one may discover that locating more information is necessary.

- **Using information** is the third phase of information literacy. To use information means to be informed by, to incorporate, and/or to create with information. Nevertheless, while one is employing information, one may discover that more information is needed and/or that information needs to be reevaluated.
2.3 Rationale for Selecting Information Literacy

*I would have also liked some classes on how to read, interpret, and critique journal articles.*

—Ava Berthelot, RPCC Graduate

This epigraph by Ava Berthelot excerpted from one of the College’s Graduate Surveys expresses Ms. Berthelot’s regret for missed information literacy opportunities and her lack of this competency (see Appendix 8). Judging from this and other students’ responses on the CCSSE survey, the College’s focus and goal to improve students’ information literacy skills is timely and appropriate.

Student demographics and data collected from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), the RPCC Institutional Assessment Surveys, and RPCC Graduate Surveys provide the College with justification and solid rationale for the goal of the QEP. There are five critical student learning issues derived from these sources that directly inform the relevant learning issues involved in implementing the QEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Critical Student Learning Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Educational and Socio-economic Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Opportunities for Finding, Evaluating, and Using Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Development of New Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Access to and Effective Use of Career-Related Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Autodidacticism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2003, RPCC has used CCSSE to obtain information to promote improvements in student learning. RPCC has also participated as part of a consortium with other member colleges of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System. The college then has the ability to compare the results of the survey with like institutions within the state, as well as the much larger national CCSSE cohort. The CCSSE data that are presented in this QEP are from RPCC’s participation in the 2003, 2005, and 2007 surveys. Where aggregate data is said to be above or below the mean, the statistical analysis indicates that the quality of the student experience represented by the survey question is appreciably different from other colleges of similar size; and the results, therefore may be of practical as well as statistical significance.

CCSSE is a useful primary source of information about student learning and engagement, simply because of the size of the comparison cohort as well as the analysis that is conducted on the data.

In order to substantiate the QEP’s proposed enhancements, it is important to account for each critical learning issue. Accordingly, what follows are detailed accounts of each critical learning issue. For each issue, the issue will be described, the indicators presented, and the College’s conclusions about the indicators provided.
I. Educational and Socio-economic Background

One factor which arguably contributes to the referenced critical learning issues is related to the demographics of the College’s service area. A significant number of RPCC’s students are first generation students, and the area from which many of its students come is traditionally working-class and agricultural.

• According to CCSSE’s 2003 Institutional Report, 52% of students surveyed indicated that their mothers never attended college or did not graduate from high school, and 52% of their fathers never attended college or did not graduate from high school. Additionally, 28% of their mothers attended some college but did not complete a degree, and 22% of their fathers attended some college but did not complete a degree. Thus, of those surveyed in 2003, roughly 70% of RPCC’s students had at least one parent who had not received a college education.

• According to CCSSE’s 2005 Institutional Report, 64% of students surveyed indicated that their mothers never attended college or did not graduate from high school, and 66% of their fathers never attended college or did not graduate from high school. Additionally, 13% of their mothers attended some college but did not complete a degree, and 13% of their fathers attended some college but did not complete a degree. Thus, of those surveyed in 2005, roughly 77% of RPCC’s students had at least one parent who had not received a college education.

• According to CCSSE’s 2007 Institutional Report, 58% of students surveyed indicated that their mothers never attended college or did not graduate from high school, and 61% of their fathers never attended college or did not graduate from high school. Additionally, 16% of their mothers attended some college but did not complete a degree, and 13% of their fathers attended some college but did not complete a degree. Thus, of those surveyed in 2005, over 70% of RPCC’s students had at least one parent who had not received a college education.

In the present context, the implication of the data provided by CCSSE is that most of RPCC’s students come from socio-economic backgrounds that do not make them well-acquainted with the opportunities, skills, access, or activities that facilitate information literacy. Therefore, the College must enhance itself to accommodate for its student population’s situation.

II. Opportunities for Gathering, Judging, and Employing Information

Students need to have access to in-class and out-of-class experiences in which they locate, evaluate, and use information. Lack of such opportunities has a negative effect on academic performance; nevertheless, because such opportunities provide skills that are also needed outside of the academic environment, lack of such opportunities will prove to be a detriment to the students in personal, professional, and public environments, environments for which the academic environment is supposed to provide students.
According to the CCSSE 2003, 2005, and 2007 Institutional Reports, RPCC demonstrates notable need for enhancement in areas related to locating, evaluating, and using information.

- **Class Presentations**

  In-class presentations give students the opportunity to collect, sift through, prepare, and communicate information to educate or persuade others. A deficiency in such skills hampers a student’s personal social life, intellectual development, professional success, and public life.

  - In 2003, 31% of students surveyed never made a class presentation.
  - In 2005, 27% of students surveyed never made a class presentation.
  - In 2007, 41% of students surveyed never made a class presentation.

  Compared to other consortium colleges, as well as the CCSSE cohorts for 2003, 2005, and 2007, the data show that with regard to class presentations, RPCC students are above the mean.

  Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that the lack of class presentation opportunities could translate into a lack of information literacy. While many of RPCC’s students are provided with opportunities to make in-class presentations, some students are not acquiring good skills as gatherers, evaluators, and users of information as such skills relate to the students’ own assignments. On a less obvious, but no less important level, some students are not being given the opportunity to observe, critique, and use information given to them by their peers.

- **Assigned Readings**

  Reading is one of the essential ways that people today gain information, engage in critical thinking, and build knowledge. Furthermore, reading texts which are longer than pamphlets or articles necessitates that a person makes a deep commitment to information gathering, to analyzing information, and to producing new knowledge. Nevertheless, nearly half of RPCC’s students are assigned fewer than five book-length texts during an academic year.

  - In 2003, 4% of students surveyed were assigned no textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings. 45% were assigned 1-4 textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings.
  - In 2005, 4% of students surveyed were assigned no textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings. 44% were assigned 1-4 textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings.
  - In 2007, 5% of students surveyed were assigned no textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings. 44% were assigned 1-4 textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings.
Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that a deficiency in substantial reading opportunities could translate into a lack of information literacy. Without reading assignments that require students’ undivided attention, students will not build the long-term information retention skills that they will need to succeed as private individuals, as students, as professionals, or as informed citizens. Moreover, without reading assignments that require a student to exercise critical thinking, students will not be exercising analytical or thought-producing skills that are so highly demanded in today’s information-driven world. Although RPCC’s CCSSE results indicate a pattern that is consistent with the Louisiana consortium as well as the nation, it is slightly below the mean in this area. RPCC will monitor the number of reading assignments through use of CCSSE to be sure students are being afforded as ample reading opportunities in regard to improving information literacy skills.

Similar to reading substantial texts, writing papers that require sustained thought necessitates that a person makes a deep commitment to accessing information, to analyzing information, and to applying, communicating, and creating information. In most college-level courses, as well as in many professions, writing requires research. Research entails locating, evaluating, and using information to increase comprehension, solve problems, make proposals, and convince readers. Moreover, writing substantial papers compels people to use thought-generating, planning, drafting, and revising skills—all of which are skills that involve the retrieval, shaping, and review of information. Additionally, writing academic- and professional-grade papers and reports gives students practice in using documentation and citation methodologies; methodologies which are part and parcel of responsibly using information. Nevertheless, from a third to a half of RPCC’s students are assigned fewer than five papers or reports of any length in an academic year.

- In 2003, 5% of students surveyed wrote no papers or reports of any length. 28% wrote 1-4 papers or reports of any length. The number of students who positively responded to this question is significantly above the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium; however, it is lower than national results.

- In 2005, 9% of students surveyed wrote no papers or reports of any length. 41% wrote 1-4 papers or reports of any length. The number of students who positively responded to this question is significantly above the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium; however, it is lower than national results.

- In 2007, 11% of students surveyed wrote no papers or reports of any length. 41% wrote 1-4 papers or reports of any length. The number of students who responded positively mirrors the results of the 2005 survey, although the results were not statistically significant.

The CCSSE results in this area are consistent with consortium colleges as well as the nation. There is certainly a rising trend in the percentage of students who did not write any papers or reports of any length during the academic year. There is also an increase in students reporting that they have not brought outside sources into their writing assignments in an academic year.
• In 2003, 7% of students surveyed never worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources.

• In 2005, 9% of students surveyed never worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources.

• In 2007, 13% of students surveyed never worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources.

Conclusion: In 2005 and 2007, the percentage of students who indicated that they worked on a paper or project that required the integration of ideas from other sources was significantly above the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium. National comparisons were much closer. However, RPCC recognizes that a deficiency in substantial writing opportunities for a growing number of students could translate into a lack of information literacy. Without writing assignments that commit students to retrieving, evaluating, using, and producing information in a systematic, responsible, and sustained manner, students will not be well-equipped for or productive in a world dominated by text-based communication, innovation, research, analysis, and intellectual property. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

o Using Computing and Information Technology

In nearly all aspects of today’s world, the ability to use such technologies as the internet, email programs, word processors, presentation software, databases, digital video, wireless communication, and so forth is no longer an exceptional ability. Many learning institutions, businesses, and industries not only expect their members to be acquainted with computing and information technologies, but to be productive with those technologies. Moreover, much of today’s information is produced, maintained, archived, and retrieved with such technologies. Accordingly, a college should give students many opportunities to use computing and information technologies.

• In 2003, 55% of students surveyed observed that their experience at RPCC contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in using computing and information technology either very much or quite a bit. These results are comparable with the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort.

• In 2005, 67% of students surveyed observed that their experience at RPCC contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in using computing and information technology either very much or quite a bit. These results are above the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium, and significantly above the mean when compared to the national cohort.

• In 2007, 56% of students surveyed observed that their experience at RPCC contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in using computing and information technology either very much or quite a bit. These results are slightly below the mean compared to the Louisiana consortium; and consistent with the national cohort.
Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that every student who graduates from an institution of higher learning should not only have exposure to computing and information technologies, but that every student should be given ample opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills required to effectively and productively use such technologies to find, evaluate, and use information. 72% of recent graduates indicated that after completing the general education requirements at RPCC, their ability to understand key technological applications and their impact upon society improved either significantly or considerably. RPCC has even made computing and information technology part of the College Mission. Accordingly, to be information literate entails that students must be able to use the tools required to access the information they need for a successful personal, educational, professional, and public life. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

III. Development of New Skills

Higher education is geared toward providing students with skills that they will find useful in the various aspects of their life. Of course, college courses should reinforce information and knowledge sets acquired during the preceding years, but college should ultimately provide students with means to independently launch into various situations. However, many of RPCC’s students come to college ill-prepared by their K-12 experiences, and they frequently do not come from socio-economic backgrounds that promote the sorts of skills they will need in academic or professional settings. Practically every course, every degree, and most professions require a person to critically, responsibly, and effectively locate, evaluate, and use information; however, those are the very skills that many of our students lack. Therefore, those are skills that should be stressed in a college such as RPCC.

- Analyzing, Synthesizing, Evaluating, Applying, and Using Information

For a sizable number of RPCC students, the following mental skills, which are key skills according to Bloom’s Taxonomy, are new ones: analyzing information, synthesizing information, evaluating information, applying information, and using information. However, well over a third of RPCC’s students are not practicing or developing those skills during the academic year.

- In 2003:
  - 44% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory;
  - 43% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways;
  - 44% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods;
  - 40% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations;
  - 37% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to using information they have read or heard to perform a new skill.
In 2005:
- 40% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory;
- 48% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways;
- 51% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods;
- 47% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations;
- 49% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to using information they have read or heard to perform a new skill.

In 2007:
- 28% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory;
- 38% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways;
- 46% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods;
- 42% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations;
- 37% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to using information they have read or heard to perform a new skill.

These results are typically at or slightly below the Louisiana consortium and national cohort, though not significantly so.

Granted, RPCC students do relatively well when it comes to what is a familiar skill—memorizing and recalling information, which is the most rudimentary and rote cognitive process in Bloom’s Taxonomy.

- In 2003, 57% of students surveyed received very much or quite a bit of exposure to memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from courses and reading in order to accurately repeat them.
- In 2005, 64% of students surveyed received very much or quite a bit of exposure to memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from courses and reading in order to accurately repeat them.
- In 2007, 68% of students surveyed received very much or quite a bit of exposure to memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from courses and reading in order to accurately repeat them.

However, when read closely, the surveys’ results indicate that a third of RPCC’s students are not practicing elementary information use—recall.
Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that if students are not exposed to or practicing the referenced, highly demanded information processing skills, then they will be seriously disadvantaged in academic, professional, and societal life. Such a disadvantage will, therefore, undermine students’ success in education, in careers, and in an information-intensive society. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

Using Information Read or Heard to Perform a New Skill

Being able to perform new tasks—as well as to create new ideas, new solutions, and new proposals—after reading or hearing information from a variety of sources is, according to Bloom’s Taxonomy, one of the highest-level cognitive processes. Moreover, it is a skill that educational institutions, professions, and society greatly prize. However, nearly 50% of RPCC students have only had some or very little exposure to innovative use of information.

- In 2003, 37% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to using information read or heard to perform a new skill.
- In 2005, 49% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to using information read or heard to perform a new skill.
- In 2007, 37% of students surveyed had some or very little exposure to using information read or heard to perform a new skill.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that if students are not able to employ information in order to adapt to new situations, to move beyond the status quo, or to perform new skills, then those students’ success is significantly hindered. The College, therefore, should make certain that students are encouraged to discover and practice new skills based on the information that they have acquired during their college experience. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

IV. Access to and Effective Use of Academic- and Career-Related Information

The ultimate goal of a student at RPCC is ostensibly not to continue enrolling haphazardly and indefinitely in college courses; the goal is to move into an academic field, a higher-level of education, and ultimately a career. Therefore, the College should provide students access to academic- and career-related information, and it should assist students in making effective use of that information.

While RPCC has consistently rated above the mean on CCSSE surveys in the areas of satisfaction with academic advising and in transfer credit assistance, there are still indications that more than half of the students surveyed are not satisfied with academic advising/planning, career counseling, or transfer credit assistance. Transfer credit assistance and some career guidance are contained within the academic advising function of the Office of Student Services. A less-frequented service within Student Services is career counseling. Dissatisfaction might be occurring because students are not consistently or effectively accessing the information available to them due to lack of information literacy skills.
o  **Academic Advising/Planning**

The information that students gather during academic advising and planning sessions with representatives from Student Services are crucial to a student’s effectiveness and, ultimately, to that student’s success in and out of college.

- In 2003, 49% of students surveyed indicated that they were very satisfied with academic advising/planning. 63% of the students surveyed indicated that they often or sometimes used academic advising/planning; 93% indicated that academic advising/planning was very or somewhat important. Although frequency of use and importance ranked above the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort, satisfaction with the service was significantly above the mean, and has noted statistical implications.

- In 2005, 45% of students surveyed indicated that they were very satisfied with academic advising/planning. 68% of the students surveyed indicated that they often or sometimes used academic advising/planning. 94% indicated that academic advising/planning was very or somewhat important. The 2005 CCSSE results for this area are in line with those obtained from the 2003 survey.

- In 2007, 38% of students surveyed indicated that they were very satisfied with academic advising/planning. 53% of the students surveyed indicated that they often or sometimes used academic advising/planning. 91% indicated that academic advising/planning was very or somewhat important. Satisfaction with academic advising/planning was significantly above the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort. Frequency of use and importance were also above the mean.

Conclusion:  RPCC recognizes that academic advising and planning is available to and utilized by most students, many of whom indicate a high level of satisfaction with the service. However, RPCC also recognizes that the College must encourage and train students to access and use academic advising/planning information and continue to make certain that such information is made easily available in order to ensure students’ effectiveness and success. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

o  **Career Counseling**

Because many community college students plan on pursuing higher educational degrees in a specific field to ultimately enter a career, and because many community college students receive certification or an Associate degree to begin a career following graduation, students need to know how to prepare for a career path and then know how to gain placement in such a career. Informal career guidance is usually provided during group and individual advising sessions, as is transfer credit assistance – one service is typically not isolated from another. Formal career counseling by a licensed counselor is also available at RPCC; however, approximately half of all students surveyed were not aware of the importance or perhaps the availability of the service.
• In 2003, 47% of students surveyed indicated that career counseling was very important; 36% often or sometimes used the service; and only 6% were not at all satisfied with the service. Frequency of use and importance were similar to the Louisiana consortium and national cohorts; and satisfaction with career counseling was significantly above the mean in both comparisons.

• In 2005, 50% of students surveyed indicated that career counseling was very important; 35% often or sometimes used the service; and 11% were not at all satisfied with the service. Frequency of use and importance were above the Louisiana consortium and national cohorts; and satisfaction with career counseling was significantly above the mean in comparison to the national cohort.

• In 2007, 57% of students surveyed indicated that career counseling was very important; 35% often or sometimes used the service; and 8% were not at all satisfied with the service. Comparisons with the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort are consistent with the 2005 results.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that if students do not adequately prepare for their careers or are not informed about how to pursue employment opportunities in a career, they are less likely to attain or advance in a profession. Such a situation does not lead only to a lack of economic opportunity; it can also lead to a lack of personal self-satisfaction. Accordingly, the College must encourage and train students to access and use information available through career counseling and must make certain that such information is made easily available. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

○ Transfer Credit Assistance

Approximately two-thirds of RPCC students indicated that they plan to transfer to a four-year college or university (68% according to CCSSE, Institutional Report 2007), so one would assume that students would be aggressively accessing and using transfer information provided by Student Services. However, as with academic advising/planning and career counseling, many of RPCC’s students indicated dissatisfaction or a lack of awareness of the importance of the services and information offered.

• In 2003, 61% of students surveyed indicated that transfer credit assistance was very important, but only 45% used the service often or sometimes. 50% of students surveyed indicated that they were somewhat or very satisfied with transfer credit assistance. Compared to the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort, importance and frequency of use were above the mean; satisfaction with the service was significantly above the mean with regard in both areas.

• In 2005, 61% of students surveyed indicated that transfer credit assistance was very important, but only 44% used the service often or sometimes. 55% of the students surveyed indicated that they were somewhat or very satisfied with transfer credit assistance. Frequency of use, importance, and satisfaction with
transfer credit assistance was significantly above the mean when compared to both the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort.

- In 2007, the results mirror the 2005 survey in that 61% of students surveyed indicated that transfer credit assistance was very important, but only 44% used the service often or sometimes. 55% of the students surveyed indicated that they were somewhat or very satisfied with transfer credit assistance. Frequency of use, importance, and satisfaction with transfer credit assistance was significantly above the mean when compared to both the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that students must have access to and must utilize transfer-related information to successfully enter and succeed in a four-year institution of higher learning. Without accessing or using such information, a student’s future academic success might be significantly hindered. Accordingly, the College must encourage and train students to access and use information available through transfer credit assistance and on their own initiative. Further RPCC must continue to offer transfer credit assistance, and find innovative ways to encourage more frequent use. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

V. Autodidacticism

To be a successful student and, ultimately, a successful private individual, professional, and citizen is to be an active versus passive participant in one’s learning. A fundamental part of being an active learner is independently searching for, gathering, evaluating, and using information. Instructors and advisors can provide opportunities, resources, and encouragement, but ultimately the student must decide whether or not she or he will effectively and responsibly locate, evaluate, and use what is available to her or him. A sizable number of students at RPCC demonstrate reticence when it comes to initiating the autodidactic (“self-teaching”) behaviors that are required to successfully acquire, judge, and employ information: asking questions in class or contributing to class discussions, completing readings and assignments, using electronic media to communicate with classmates and instructors, talking about career plans with an instructor or advisor, discussing readings or classes with instructors outside of class, discussing ideas from readings or classes with others outside of class, reading books on one’s own for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment, and preparing for class.

- Asking Questions in Class or Contributing to Class Discussions

Whether a student is taking a traditional lecture-oriented course, a hands-on lab, a service-learning assignment, or an on-line course, she or he will benefit greatly from asking their instructors and peers questions, as well as from offering insights, ideas, or proposals to their instructors and peers. However, nearly a third of RPCC’s students do not consistently demonstrate those behaviors.

- In 2003, 30% of students surveyed indicated that they sometimes or never asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions.
• In 2005, 32% of students surveyed indicated that they sometimes or never asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions.

• In 2007, 36% of students surveyed indicated that they sometimes or never asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that active student involvement in courses is a basic way by which students may acquire, evaluate, and use information. Accordingly, instructors must make sure that she or he creates an environment in which student questions and comments are openly welcomed. Moreover, instructors and advisors should provide models to students related to academic discourse: how to ask effective questions, how to offer productive comments, and so on. Students should also be made aware that success as a student, professional, or private individual is contingent on being an active participant, not a passive observer. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

• Completing Readings and Assignments and Preparing for Class

If a student does not spend adequate time preparing for class and does not complete her or his readings or assignments for a class, then she or he is effectively illiterate in that course. As far as the number of hours of study is concerned, the generally accepted standard is that for each hour of instruction, a student should dedicate two hours of study: for example, if a student is taking four courses that meet three hours per week each, a student should ideally spend twenty-four hours each week in preparation. That number includes reading. Without basic information acquired by reading, and without working with that information in assignments, it is impossible for a student to effectively and responsibly locate, evaluate, or use information. Moreover, the student is not practicing and developing the practical skills necessary to succeed as a student in other classes, to succeed as a professional in almost any field, or to succeed as an active participant in wider society. Unfortunately, many of RPCC’s students demonstrate that they do not practice and develop information literacy at the basic level of preparing for class, including the completion of readings and assignments.

• In 2003, 84% of full-time students (students enrolled in 12 or more credit hours) surveyed indicated that they spent from zero to ten hours per week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing or other activities related to their programs). RPCC is below the mean compared to the Louisiana consortium and significantly below the mean compared to the national cohort.

• In 2005, 74% of full-time students surveyed indicated that they spent from zero to ten hours a week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing or other activities related to their programs). RPCC is below the mean compared to the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort.

• In 2007, 66% of full-time students surveyed indicated that they spent from zero to ten hours a week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing or other activities related to their programs). RPCC is below the mean compared to the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort.
Although there is a percentage decline in full-time RPCC students who spend 10 hours or less preparing for class, this trend is also mirrored state-wide and nationally.

With regard to completing readings and assignments before class, RPCC was significantly above the mean compared to the Louisiana consortium and the national cohort for all three years that the College has participated in CCSSE.

- In 2003, 26% of students surveyed indicated that they very often or often came to class without completing readings or assignments.
- In 2005, 14% of students surveyed indicated that they very often or often came to class without completing readings or assignments.
- In 2007, 16% of students surveyed indicated that they very often or often came to class without completing readings or assignments.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that students who do not complete reading and assignments are jeopardizing their success as personal, academic, professional, and social individuals. Therefore, the College must create an academic environment in which preparing for class and completing coursework are essentials for success in any context. Faculty and staff should provide students with student success workshops that reflect best practices, should set up assessments that encourage completion of reading and assignments, and should support students who are having difficulty completing readings and assignments. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

Using Electronic Media to Communicate with Classmates and Instructors

Today, electronic communication is the rule, not the exception. In addition to using electronic media to conduct research, another key function of such media is to communicate with peers and experts. Such communication is becoming more prevalent in academic courses and professional settings; therefore, being able to productively use such media can be a factor in one’s success. However, over a third of the students at RPCC do not take full advantage of the electronic communication media that are available to them.

- In 2003, 33% of students surveyed indicated that they never used electronic media (such as Blackboard®, listserv, chat group, etc.) to communicate with classmates and instructors. 73% used email to communicate with an instructor.
- In 2005, the survey question was revised slightly and 13% of students surveyed indicated that they never used the internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment. 78% used email to communicate with an instructor.
- In 2007, 12% of students surveyed indicated that they never used the internet or instant messaging to work on an assignment. 79% used email to communicate with an instructor.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that the ability to communicate by electronic means should be something that all information literate students possess. Students should not
be left out of the emerging information communication technologies which will (and in many cases do) dominate their world. Accordingly, the College should provide adequate training in electronic communication media, and courses should require some amount of electronic communication. The Library, Student Services, Information Technology, and faculty would be great resources for such training. Instructors should require more course-related electronic communication and should model for students by consistently using course-related electronic communication. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

Talking about Career Plans with an Instructor or Advisor

One of the primary reasons why students attend college is to prepare for starting or changing careers. At college, students are surrounded by people who can be a wealth of information—their instructors and advisors. First, instructors and advisors are themselves in careers, so they have first-hand knowledge of career-finding and career-building processes. Second, advisors (and to some degree instructors) are responsible for helping students find career-related information. However, at least one-third of RPCC’s students do not take full advantage of information available to them because they do not discuss their professional plans and aspirations with instructors or advisors.

- In 2003, 33% of students surveyed indicated that they never talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor; which is consistent with state and national comparisons.
- In 2005, 34% of students surveyed indicated that they never talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor; which is consistent with state and national comparisons.
- In 2007, 37% of students surveyed indicated that they never talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor; which is consistent with state and national comparisons.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that faculty and staff should be a primary resource for students as they consider their career plans. It is important to note that in all years of CCSSE participation, students positively responded to the question about their relationships with administrative personnel and offices. In this area, RPCC was significantly above the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium and national cohort, Accordingly, the College will continue to facilitate a strong community environment that makes talking to faculty and staff a natural part of the college experience; advisors should encourage, if not require, career-centered counseling sessions; and faculty should encourage students to ask about career-related information, as well as openly discuss with students their own career experiences. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

Discussing Readings or Classes with Instructors and Others Outside of Class

In addition to completing coursework, such as readings and assignments, a student should discuss readings with others. Oftentimes a reading might not make sense—information might not be gained—until one discusses it with an instructor, classmate, friend, relative, or colleague. Moreover, a deeper, critical engagement with the information from a reading will arise when one has to explain, clarify, and evaluate it in a
conversation with others. Consequently, a student will ostensibly be better prepared to effectively and responsibly use the information from the reading. However, a large number of RPCC’s students do not consistently or fully take advantage of reading-centered academic/intellectual discussion with others, particular with the instructors who are the experts on the information covered in the readings.

- In 2003, 35% of students surveyed indicated that they never discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class; and 13% of students surveyed indicated that they never discussed ideas from readings or classes with others (students, family members, coworkers, etc.) outside of class. These results are consistent with the Louisiana consortium and national cohort.

- In 2005, 44% of students surveyed indicated that they never discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class; and 15% of students surveyed indicated that they never discussed ideas from readings or classes with others (students, family members, coworkers, etc.) outside of class. These results are consistent with the Louisiana consortium and national cohort.

- In 2007, 42% of students surveyed indicated that they never discussed ideas from readings or classes with instructors outside of class; and 14% of students surveyed indicated that they never discussed ideas from readings or classes with others (students, family members, coworkers, etc.) outside of class. These results are consistent with the Louisiana consortium and national cohort.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes the importance of discussing readings with instructors and others. The College, accordingly, will create a welcoming academic environment, in which discussing readings—not to mention coursework in general—is considered to be a key part of becoming a well-informed student. Instructors, as well as librarians, may initiate reading discussion groups and may make themselves more available to discuss readings with students. Instructors, librarians, and advisors may encourage students to discuss what they read with others off-campus. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

- **Reading Books on One’s Own for Personal Enjoyment or Academic Enrichment**

Reading assigned readings for course is certainly a key component in becoming a well-informed student; however, reading non-assigned texts is a way that students can acquire a broader range of information, practice their information-processing skills, and enrich themselves personally and academically. Conversely, well over a third of RPCC’s students do not demonstrate a strong commitment to such information-gathering, practice, or enrichment.

- In 2003, 33% of students surveyed indicated that they read no books, and 47% indicated that they read only one to four books in the academic year. These results are slightly below the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium and national cohort.
• In 2005, 32% of students surveyed indicated that they read no books, and 49% indicated that they read only one to four books in the academic year. These results are slightly below the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium and national cohort.

• In 2007, 35% of students surveyed indicated that they read no books, and 47% indicated that they read only one to four books in the academic year. These results are slightly below the mean when compared to the Louisiana consortium and national cohort.

Conclusion: RPCC recognizes that becoming a full-time, life-long learner is essential to being a successful and growing individual, student, professional, and citizen. One way to become such a learner is by reading regularly and broadly. Accordingly, the College will foster an environment that stresses broadening and enhancing knowledge through reading beyond the curriculum: by establishing a book club, for example. Instructors might give students opportunities to do additional reading or provide them a suggested booklist. The library may host reading events. RPCC should address this issue while implementing the QEP.

2.4 Relationship between QEP Focus and the College Mission

As noted above, many of RPCC’s students do not come well-equipped for learning in a higher education environment. Many lack the skills and mindsets needed to focus attention, to understand assignments, to follow directions, to locate or study information, to discuss information, to comprehend information, to analyze and evaluate information, to synthesize and apply what is learned, and to create useful, self-sustaining knowledge that may be employed in various situations. This lack of readiness not only affects them negatively as students; it also affects them negatively as employees, as citizens, and as private individuals.

RPCC’s conception of student learning is well-reflected in information literacy. Information literacy feeds directly into a student’s building a knowledge base that will enable that student to succeed. Information literacy honors foundational elements of the College’s mission: student access, success, and retention; responsive, innovative education and training; and stimulating meaningful interactions between students and instructors.

Moreover, student access and success directly relate to information literacy. Access to and the accessing of information are the very foundations of student success: the more well-informed a student is, the more likely she or he will be successful as a student. Responsive, innovative education and training depend on students’ self-confidence in gathering, judging, and applying information. Likewise, stimulating, meaningful interactions between students and instructors cannot occur unless students are information literate.

As a consequence of the preceding observations, the selection of an information literacy focus came naturally to RPCC. The College’s conception of student learning and its mission stress the need for equipping students with the information literacy skills they will need.
The higher-level goals of building knowledge, contributing as a professional, and being capable of critical thinking are only possible if one first has the fundamental skills to responsibly and effectively locate, evaluate, and use information.

Summary

Information literacy stresses the skills, ethicality, and effectiveness that one will need to lead a well-informed and self-enriching life. Constructive knowledge sets and problem-solving capabilities—as compared to hunches, customs, biases, and unchecked assumptions—are forged from information that has been located skillfully, responsibly, and effectively. Accordingly, for student learning to be successful, then a student must be information literate, and the College must foster and assess that student's literacy. Therefore, the College has committed to the goal of improving students' information literacy skills through monitoring and assessing the progress of the QEP.
Reading furnishes the mind only with materials of knowledge; it is thinking that makes what we read ours.

—John Locke, British Philosopher

Overview

Information literacy, as a topic of educational concern, is relatively new. Nevertheless, since the late 1980s, interest in information literacy has grown substantially and is now the focus of much attention. Educational theorists, scholars, teachers, and school administrators have all contributed to a growing amount of literature on the topic. However, as with critical thinking, information literacy can and does entail a variety of meanings, goals, and objectives. The ALA and ACRL have dominated the mainstream understanding and application of information literacy—stressing the acquisition and practice of library research skills, informational and instructional technologies, citation and documentation standards, and so forth. There are, though, other aspects of information literacy that might be neglected if one considers only the library/learning-resource model.

Accordingly, this literature review showcases materials from a wide array of perspectives that have influenced and informed RPCC’s information literacy focus. Moreover, all reviewed resources provide themes, frameworks, and specific suggestions for the best pedagogical and institutional practices to be used while implementing this QEP. The review provided here is by no means exhaustive; nevertheless, it is indicative of the kinds of sources that RPCC will consult during the five years of implementing and assessing the QEP.

This literature review is divided into five sections. Each section addresses materials according to a theme that underpins RPCC’s focus of information literacy.

### Five Review Sections

3.1 Pedagogical Issue Touchstones
3.2 Literacy
3.3 Critical Thinking
3.4 Information Literacy
3.5 Information Literacy, Pedagogical Practice, and Assessment
3.1 Pedagogical Issue Touchstones

This section highlights texts that have guided and shaped the College’s understanding of deeper learning issues, an understanding which will be crucial as the College is implementing its information literacy QEP.

Bloom’s Taxonomy is the generic name given to classifications of educational goals that are derived from or inspired by Benjamin S. Bloom’s *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, first published in 1956. Observing the need for a more systematic approach to educational practice and assessment, and being informed by cognitive science, Bloom and his colleagues in education and cognitive science composed the following six-level educational framework, which progresses from basic cognition to higher-level cognition: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

As educational theory has matured since Bloom’s time, others have modified and revised the original taxonomy, most notably Lorin W. Anderson and David R. Krathwohl’s *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, and Robert J. Marzano and John S. Kendall’s *The New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. The editors and authors of these new versions of Bloom’s Taxonomy have been influenced by recent discoveries in cognitive science, education theory, and pedagogical practice. Moreover, the new versions correct a superficial, rigid hierarchy evident in the original version. Nevertheless, the original and revised taxonomies agree on one point. Education should enable students to move confidently and skillfully through various levels of cognition: from recalling basic information to understanding, analyzing, synthesizing, applying, evaluating, and productively using information.

It is difficult to find another system or taxonomy that best informs and reflects the objectives for or processes behind information literacy. Therefore, it is not surprising that the ALA and ACRL have mirrored Bloom’s Taxonomy in devising its definition of and standards for information literacy. Consequently, RPCC has adopted Bloom’s Taxonomy as a foundational part of its QEP.

In *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Students Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More*, Derek Bok addresses many of the pedagogical, institutional, and social issues confronting higher education today.

In Bok’s view, one key area of concern is writing. As studies show, writing—not multiple choice tests that promote regurgitation of “facts”—is the best way for students to comprehend, judge, apply, and communicate information in a meaningful way. Bok argues, though, that English teachers, many of whom are not composition experts, have been primarily charged with teaching writing. This situation, in his view, neglects the fact that “good writing . . . will never be a skill that students can achieve or retain through a single course. However successful the basic [English] program may become, sustained improvement will require repeated practice. . . . Insufficient practice is undoubtedly a major reason why undergraduates, especially in the sciences, often fail to improve their writing during their college years” (98).

Another major area of concern for Bok is students’ inability to evaluate and use information because they do not understand the basic concepts that compose the
information they are supposedly learning: “students are often unable to think effectively about material in a course or apply what they have learned to new problems and new situations because they have not truly understood the underlying concepts on which the course was based” (115). He considers a few reasons for why this might be the case:

Some cannot grasp the concepts because they enter the course with faulty preconceptions that clash with the principles they are asked to learn. Others simply do not understand the basic principles. Many professors skip over these concepts too quickly, because they are so familiar with the ideas that they cannot appreciate how confusing these materials can be to students or how often undergraduates come to the course with misunderstandings that actually make it harder for them to comprehend. In these circumstances, bright undergraduates frequently use rote learning to pass the course, without truly understanding the basic principles involved. (115)

In the context of information literacy, the charge of all teachers becomes clear: 1) Increase the opportunities for students to find, evaluate, and use information by having them write more, which will help them to better understand and communicate information learned. 2) Meet the students where they are; therefore, adjust teaching practices so that students will have basic course information in order to access and use higher-level, more complex information.

In Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind, Gerald Graff identifies factors in education that make “academic intellectual culture opaque or alienating to many students: seemingly counterintuitive problems and argumentative practices that are rarely explained; curricular mixed messages that further muddy those practices; phobias about adversarial debate and intellectual analysis; obfuscating habits of academic writing; the tendency to withhold the critical conversations that students are expected to enter” (211). In short, colleges and universities, which are supposed to provide access to information and development to students, unintentionally and intentionally forbid students from accessing needed information and, consequently, using that information in building their personal, academic, and professional lives.

In the context of information literacy, Graff provides guidance for institutions that aim to enhance student learning: Provide students the information they need to enter into academic discourse. Give students opportunities to see how the information acquired from one division or discipline in the institution connects to others. Help students to overcome their fears about processes of research, inquiry, and evaluation. Provide students many opportunities to read and write academically so that they can confidently produce effective and responsible academic papers and projects. Instead of protecting students from controversial information produced by academicians, encourage students to explore that information and provide them guidance in how to process and use such information.

In Plato’s Socratic dialogue Apology—which is as much a manifesto on learning, knowledge, and the use of information as it is Socrates’ defense of his life’s work—the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates demonstrates both the purpose and process of learning. The ultimate purpose of learning, which depends on researching information and testing that information in reasonable arguments, is the improvement of both individual and social life, what Socrates calls the “improvement of the soul” (31).
The process of learning is investigation, or research. Socrates demonstrates this process in *Apology* as he recounts his response to being told that he is the wisest of men. Socrates cannot accept the unsubstantiated claim that he, Socrates, is the wisest person on earth. He, consequently, searches for information that will test the claim. After conducting his investigations, he came to the following conclusion: that wisdom is itself worthless (24). In order, though, to offer something useful to the argument concerning wisdom, he gives this insight, which emerged from the process of finding and evaluating information on wisdom: true wisdom, or knowledge, is knowing what one does not know (23-25).

In the context of information literacy, Socrates provides a few helpful insights. First, just because someone claims something, however small or great, one should not immediately accept it. Second, to find out the veracity or validity of information, other information should be acquired. All information should be evaluated—analyzed, tested, confirmed, corroborated, and judged. After information has been evaluated, it may be used—in Socrates’ case, to both define something and to create knowledge. Perhaps most importantly, Socrates’ conclusion about true knowledge implies that the beginning point for gaining or building knowledge is to first admit that something is unknown. In other the words, the true learner admits that she or he does not know something and, consequently, is willing to locate, evaluate, and use the information required to know that something.

In *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School*, Neil Postman effectively asks that all people involved in education ask more questions about education and about the world. He argues throughout the text that the purpose, or end, of education has been subverted by the institution of education. Asking questions, offering alternative information, and utilizing new educational approaches and technologies all form the essential purpose of education, according to Postman; however, they also threaten educational institutions, whose actual goal is to manage education so that it coincides with accepted facts, mainstream thinking, and socio-cultural stability.

To demonstrate the basic conflict in education today, and to demonstrate a solution for education today, Postman addresses the use of textbooks:

Do we want students to know what a molecule is? The text will tell them. But then the questions begin. Has anyone ever seen a molecule? Did the ancient believe in them? Was a molecule discovered or invented? Who did it? Suppose someone disbelieved in molecules, what then?

Do we want students to know about the causes of the Revolutionary War? A text will give some, but from whose point of view? And what sort of evidence is provided? What does objectivity mean in history? Is there no way to find out the “real” truth?

If students were occupied with such inquiries, they would inevitably discover the extent to which facts and truth have changed, depending upon the circumstances in which the facts were described and the truths formulated. They will discover how often humans were wrong, how dogmatically they defended their errors, how difficult it was and is to make corrections. (126-27)

Postman ultimately proposes that educational institutions cease controlling student learning and allow themselves to become an enabler of student learning, even if that means becoming subjects of critical student inquiry. Added to this, how students ask
questions will determine the quality of the information they yield and the usefulness of that information in the future: “a question cannot be answered unless there are procedures by which reliable answers can be obtained . . . and the value of a question is determined not only by the specificity and richness of the answers it produces but also by the quantity and quality of the new questions it raises” (187).

In the context of information literacy, Postman’s insight is this: locating information, as well as evaluating information, is only possible through critical inquiry. Conversely, critical inquiry is based on rigorous, free exploration of information.

### 3.2 Literacy

This section highlights materials that address the importance of understanding and improving literacy in America’s educational system as a whole. Information literacy is but a high-level subset of human literacy as a whole.

In *Literacy and Historical Development*, Harvey J. Graff has collected articles from across disciplines to address literacy as a concept, address myths about literacy throughout time and diverse socio-cultural contexts, and address legacies of literacy in those diverse contexts. This text is very helpful in considering literacy as a human creation and from a broader historical and cross-cultural perspective.

In the context of information literacy, what the writers in Graff’s collection offer are the realities that underpin the term “literacy.” Because information literacy is primarily an American and Canadian addition to literacy issues, it is beneficial to take into account the historical context and socio-cultural values and biases that underpin information literacy. Doing so may help educators understand what they mean by information literacy and be clear about what are the true aims of information literacy.

In Leslie S. Rush, A. Jonathan Eakle, and Allen Berger’s collection *Secondary School Literacy: What Research Reveals for Classroom Practice*, the reader is provided a wealth of recent information by theorists and practitioners of education, reading, writing, and literature studies. Even though it nominally addresses literacy at the secondary school level, it is equally applicable to college students, particularly those in their freshman and sophomore years.

Out of the collection, RPCC has gained much from the chapter “New Literacy Learning Strategies for New Times,” by Robert J. Tierney. In his article, Tierney focuses on what literacy means in the current environment, in which people use a wider variety of means to access, communicate, and create information. The most salient point, though, comes near the closing, when he succinctly describes what literacy means today:

> In closing, being literate is no longer finding the right book or writing a set of papers in a particular genre to specification. It is not simply learning to master a set of skills such as decoding or comprehension or being able to retrieve certain information about characters and plots of narrative or informational texts. Being literate involves research and development as well as collaboration and community engagement. Being literate requires learners who are designers and public intellectuals. (33)
In other words, literacy is a holistic, whole-person, whole-community process of “meaning-making,” to borrow Tierney’s terminology. To be literate, he writes elsewhere, “means being able to participate in one’s world rather than just being an observer of it. Being literate requires being able to make meanings while probing ideas, solving problems, or pursuing new understandings” (22).

In the context of information literacy, Tierney provides a foundational purpose for locating, evaluating, and using information in today’s world. Instead of just processing specific information for a specific project or specialization, processing information is part of an on-going, larger-scale process that will benefit the individual and the larger community.

In 2007, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) published a sobering policy research brief, Adolescent Literacy. In a study conducted between the early 1990s and 2005, NCTE found that there are significant problems facing today’s adolescents and young adults. Middle school and high school students are not given sufficient writing opportunities, and their writing skills show little or no improvement. Most high school graduates are not prepared for college-level reading, and there has been a significant decrease in high school graduates who are proficient readers. In view of those results, the NCTE first dispels myths about why adolescents are not adequately literate so that concerned parties can focus attention on what actually contributes to poor adolescent literacy and on coming up with productive approaches to the problem.

Moreover, the NCTE provides the qualities of teachers and school programs that seem to have a positive effect on literacy among adolescents:

- **Teachers**
  - Teach with approaches that foster critical thinking, questioning, student decision-making, and independent learning
  - Address the diverse needs of adolescents whose literacy abilities vary considerably
  - Possess personal characteristics such as caring about students, being creative and collaborative, and loving to read and write
  - Develop a solid knowledge about and commitment to literacy instruction
  - Use significant quality and quantity of literacy activities, including hands-on, scaffolding, mini-lesson, discussions, group work, student choice, ample feedback, and multiple forms of expression
  - Participate in ongoing professional development
  - Develop high quality relationships with students
  - Manage the classroom effectively

- **School Programs**
  - Direct and explicit instruction
  - Effective instructional principles embedded in content
  - Motivation and self-directed learning
  - Text-based collaborative learning
  - Strategic tutoring
  - Diverse texts
In the context of information literacy at RPCC, the College should, with appropriate adaptations, adopt the qualities that NCTE outlines. Indeed, practically every suggested quality reflects those qualities necessary to promote information literacy at the college-level.

### 3.3 Critical Thinking

This section highlights an educational topic related to, if not integral to, information literacy. Indeed, some literature on critical thinking is just as easily applied to information literacy.

In the college-skills textbook *Becoming a Master Student*, Dave Ellis describes critical thinking as a survival skill because it “underlies reading, writing, speaking, and listening,” basic elements of communication; because it “also plays an important part in social change”; and because it “helps us to uncover bias and prejudice” (225). He goes on to stress how critical thinking is creative; it is not a matter of just gaining knowledge but of building new knowledge (227-31). Accordingly, he offers nine techniques of creative thinking:

- Conduct a brainstorm
- Focus and let go
- Cultivate creative serendipity
- Keep idea files
- Collect and play with data
- Create while you sleep refine ideas and follow through
- Create success strategies
- Trust the process
- Ask questions

He also lists seven qualities of a critical thinker:

- Truth-seeking
- Open-minded
- Analytical
- Systematic
- Self-confident
- Inquisitive
- Mature
When one considers Ellis’s and others’ conceptions of critical thinking, one finds that the overlap between critical thinking and information literacy is great. Accordingly, many of the techniques and qualities attached to critical thinking echo or are easily applied to information literacy. Thus, RPCC has focused its energies toward information literacy, but it has done so with an understanding that critical thinking and information literacy are integral to each other.

In the composition textbook *Writing Logically, Thinking Critically*, Sheila Cooper and Rosemary Patton stress the importance of critical thinking in writing. In the opening chapter, “Thinking and Writing—A Critical Connection,” they offer the etymological definition of “critical” (Greek, *kriticos*), which means “discern or separate” (5). In the very term “critical,” therefore, analysis and evaluation are implied. The authors hold that to be a critical thinker means to have an open mind, but they also assert that critical thinking is self-defense from those who misuse and manipulate information (5). The remainder of the text follows that theme.

In the context of information literacy, Cooper and Patton demonstrate that finding, evaluating, and using information is an ethical matter. One must hold oneself and others to a high standard when it comes to responsibility and effectiveness as information users.

In “Teaching Critical Thinking: Some Lessons from Cognitive Science,” Tim van Gelder approaches critical thinking from the perspective of cognitive science and provides six “lessons” on how to successfully bring about and sustain critical thinking. In his first lesson, Critical Thinking Is Hard, van Gelder points out that critical thinking is a difficult and complicated process that does not come naturally to humans. In the second lesson, Practice Makes Perfect, he argues that people can not only acquire the skill to critically think, but they can excel with it. However, to do so takes continuous effort. The third lesson, Practice for Transfer, focuses on many people’s failure to transfer what they have learned in one context or subject to other contexts and subjects. He suggests exercises and assignments that may help students to improve transference. In lesson four, Practical Theory, van Gelder argues that students need exposure to critical thinking at a theoretical level. Instead of merely learning how to critically think, he suggests that students study why critical thinking is important and what goes on in critically thinking (i.e., students should gain meta-cognitive knowledge of critical thinking). Lesson five, Map it Out, stresses the importance of encouraging students to break down arguments, assignments, problems, and cases into their parts, sequences, and patterns to better understand and address the information being presented. In the final lesson, Belief Preservation, van Gelder touches on the fact that learners are often their own worst enemies because they will hold onto older thinking patterns—they preserve “cognitive biases and blindspots” (45). If a learner does not check this tendency, then she or he is likely to tailor information to preexisting attitudes, assumptions, and biases. Accordingly, van Gelder encourages educators to employ activities that make students aware of this phenomenon so that they may guard against and progress beyond it. In the context of information literacy, van Gelder’s lessons about critical thinking apply well.

In *Critical Thinking: An Introduction to Analytical Reading and Reasoning*, Larry Wright provides a systematic approach to reading, analyzing, and reasoning through texts. He focuses on paraphrasing, finding logical structures, analyzing and evaluating arguments,
predicting (inferring) meaning and implications, and recommending alternative arguments.

In an information literacy context, what can be gained from Wright’s text are practices that are necessary to evaluate (which presumes analysis of) information for effectiveness, credibility, applicability, validity, and usefulness.

### 3.4 Information Literacy Resources

This section highlights some definitive information literacy materials. Even though an individual resource might be restricted to a limited view of information literacy, the resources compose a larger view of information literacy when taken together.

Jointly, the American Library Association (ALA) and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) have produced the most comprehensive resource on information literacy. Their pamphlet introduced above, *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, is an abbreviated version of what they provide through a website, *Information Literacy*, which is dedicated to multiple aspects of information literacy. Through the website and associated links, instructors and administrators may access a wealth of resources:

- **Overview**—gives a general introduction to information literacy, an introduction specifically designed for faculty and administrators, and a glossary
- **Standards and Guidelines**—provides a standards toolkit, a step-by-step tutorial, suggestion on adapting the standards, ideas for using the standards, and information related to accreditation
- **Resources and Ideas**—provides models and tools for information literacy in action, collaboration, curriculum and pedagogy, assessment issues, global information literacy; and it makes available a bibliography and links
- **Professional Activity**—provides information on the Institute for Information Literacy, ACRL initiatives, peer consultants and speakers, and grants; provides practical tools, such as an instruction section, a database, electronic lists, and an information literacy survey

All aspects of the website have proved instrumental in educating RPCC as it has developed its QEP. It will continue to be a primary resource as RPCC implements its plan.

In *Information Literacy in an Information Society: A Concept for the Information Age*, Christina S. Doyle provides both a foundational study on and a persuasive call for information literacy from the educational issue’s earlier days. Her findings and arguments still apply today. She reviews information literacy’s development, situates information literacy among other educational issues and initiatives in the millennial context, provides a general framework for implementing information literacy in the education system, offers information literacy criteria, offers suggestions on assessment in general and in relation to specific disciplines, makes suggestions on education reform, and provides a substantial annotated bibliography.
Doyle’s work, though dated in some areas, remains extremely instructive and useful. Moreover, it is a text that provides the essential reasons and original frameworks underpinning information literacy initiatives today.

This section also highlights materials that provide guidance in improving students’ information literacy skills. The following texts have and will continue to inform how the College will teach and assess information literacy

1. College-Wide Curriculum
   - ACRL’s Information Literacy: Curriculum and Pedagogy
   - Craig Gibson’s Student Engagement and Information Literacy
   - Esther S. Grassian and Joan R. Kaplowitz’s Information Literacy Instruction: Theory and Practice
   - Trudi E. Jacobson and Lijuan Xu’s Motivating Students in Information Literacy Classes
   - Ilene F. Rockman and Associates’ Integrating Information Literacy into the Higher Education Curriculum: Practical Models for Transformation

2. Instructional Assignments and Practices
   - ACRL’s Information Literacy: Curriculum and Pedagogy
   - Babson Library’s Information Literacy Toolbox for Faculty
   - Joanna M. Burkhardt, Mary C. MacDonald, and Andrée J. Rathemacher’s Teaching Information Literacy: 35 Practical, Standards-based Exercises for College Students
   - Patricia Iannuzzi, Charles T. Mangraum II, and Stephen S. Strichart’s Teaching Information Literacy Skills

3. Instructional Assessment
   - ACRL’s Information Literacy: Assessment Issues
   - Indiana University Bloomington Libraries’ An Assessment Plan for Information Literacy
   - Jane Bandy Smith’s Teaching and Testing Information Literacy Skills
   - Scott Walter’s The Teaching Library: Approaches to Assessing Information Literacy Instruction

Summary

This review is by no means exhaustive. More resources will undoubtedly be consulted as RPCC implements its QEP during the next five years. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the review is indicative of the kinds of sources that RPCC will consult while implementing and assessing the QEP.
Overview: QEP Goal and Assessment Process

The goal of the QEP is to improve students’ information literacy skills. This plan will require a college-wide concerted effort for implementation and assessment. The College will use both external and internal measures to assess the QEP’s learning outcomes. The QEP Implementation Team will be responsible for implementing and monitoring progress of the plan. A detailed description of the QEP’s goal, student learning outcomes, and plan for implementation is detailed in this chapter.

4.1 Learning Outcomes

The QEP focuses on five student learning outcomes drawn directly from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (Appendix 10). These five learning outcomes address students’ information literacy competencies. The specific performance indicators, objectives, and detailed learning outcomes associated with these are listed in the ACRL Information Competency Standards for Higher Education and the Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction: A Model Statement for Academic Librarians (Appendix 10).

Discussions have occurred over the past decade on the national level concerning the rapid development of technology and the explosion of information available via a multitude of formats. Many students are versant in the use of several technologies, yet many are still lacking well-developed information literacy skills related to effectively utilizing and evaluating information resources.

The College chose to focus on improving students’ information literacy skills based on the review of literature, the College’s own institutional data, as well as on-going anecdotal evidence of this need. Thus, RPCC will implement a plan that facilitates learning opportunities for students to manage, access, evaluate, and use information.
ethically and effectively. The preceding statement summarizes the student learning outcomes of the QEP, which are as follows:

### QEP Five Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

The QEP’s five information literacy learning outcomes are as follows:

1. The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.
2. The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.
3. The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.
4. The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information to accomplish a specific purpose.
5. The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

Each of these five learning outcomes is mapped to associated ACRL information literacy performance indicators, objectives, and more detailed outcomes in the ACRL Information Competency Standards for Higher Education and the Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction: A Model Statement for Academic Librarians (Appendix 10). These student learning outcomes will be measured using appropriate external and internal assessment tools as described in the next section.

### 4.2 Assessment

The College is using both external and internal measures to assess the QEP. These assessment tools are providing the College benchmarking data for establishing specific targets for student performance. These assessment tools will provide ongoing data to monitor student learning outcomes throughout the life of the plan. The QEP Implementation Team will coordinate and manage the implementation process and will assess the data through compiling an annual report each year, comparing the data to the previous year and establishing targets for student performance in each upcoming year throughout the life-span of the QEP. (See Section 4.3: Implementation Actions and Timeline)
Direct Measures

The central focus of the assessment process is determining the gain in students’ information literacy skills from students’ freshmen semester to the point at which students reach 30 or more hours. The direct assessment measures will provide data specific to the QEP’s student learning outcomes. These direct measures include an external instrument, SAILS, and an internal general education assessment process which determines students’ information literacy competencies through collecting and assessing student work samples. These direct measures will provide comparison data for generalization to these two student groups: freshmen and 30+ hour. The SAILS Fall 2008 Report is located on the College’s QEP website (pp. 72-83) [http://www.rpcc.edu/uploads/SAILS_Fall2008_RPCC_NoQuestions.pdf](http://www.rpcc.edu/uploads/SAILS_Fall2008_RPCC_NoQuestions.pdf)

The external assessment tool for directly measuring students’ information literacy competencies, SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills), was developed by Kent State University. This is a valid and reliable tool for measuring information literacy competencies. [https://www.projectsails.org/abouttest/validation.php](https://www.projectsails.org/abouttest/validation.php)

SAILS is a knowledge-test with multiple choice questions targeting a variety of information literacy skills. The 45 test items are based on the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education and Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction and the Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction: A Model Statement for Academic Librarians (Appendix 10). The test can be administered on-line or in classrooms. The first administration of SAILS was conducted in the fall of 2008 (relevant data reported in Appendix 12).

The QEP Implementation Team has begun collecting benchmarking data and will set targeted improvements for student performance for each of the five learning outcomes, as shown on the QEP Assessment Grid (Appendix 12). The QEP assessment data will show comparative performance of freshmen groups each fall semester with the performance of 30+ hour student groups each spring semester. Again, the intent of the QEP is to improve students’ information literacy skills from students’ first semester to the point at which students accumulate 30+ hours (Appendix 12).

The College will also use the SAILS reports to compare RPCC students’ performance with other two-year institutions. The measurement model used by SAILS is item response theory (IRT), specifically the one-parameter Rasch model. (Project SAILS brochure: [https://www.projectsails.org/pubs/brochure.pdf?page=aboutTest](https://www.projectsails.org/pubs/brochure.pdf?page=aboutTest)) SAILS is published and graded by Kent State University. The College will receive a report after each test administration period.

The internal assessment tool for direct measures of students’ information literacy skills will be through the current general education assessment process which is used to assess each of the College’s general education goals (Appendix 2). Each fall and spring semester, after the official census day, the Dean of Academic Studies identifies courses and sections across disciplines for which student work samples addressing general education competencies are then collected. This general education targeted assessment process provides data at the individual course and student level.
The instructors are asked to collect and submit student work samples addressing general education goals. Specifically for the QEP, work samples are collected across multiple disciplines for general education Goal #12, which addresses information literacy. These un-graded work samples are collected and the general education committee coordinates the assessment of the work samples using the appropriate rubrics. RPCC will use this process as an additional direct internal measurement of students’ information literacy competencies.

General Education Goal / Rubric #12 was revised in January of 2009 specifically to aid in the assessment of the QEP’s student learning outcomes (Appendix 11). All faculty members have received and will continue to receive relevant professional development pertaining to information literacy (See Section 4.3 and Appendix 5).

Additionally, since RPCC is a small College all of the full-time faculty members participate directly in the general education assessment process. During these assessment meetings, the general assembly of faculty is split into groups and each group is responsible for evaluating student work samples for each of the general education goals.

As part of the internal assessment process for the QEP, RPCC’s general education goal/Rubric #12: Utilize Library/Information Resources for effectively selecting, evaluating, and synthesizing information from a variety of formats is used in the QEP assessment “The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.” Essentially, faculty across multiple-disciplines will give students assignments each semester requiring students to use information for a specific purpose (i.e. a specific assignment) either individually or as a group. These assignments are then assessed by a multi-discipline group during in-service under the direction and leadership of the General Assessment Committee and the QEP Implementation Team.

Indirect Measures

The indirect measures include CCSSE and library statistics and bibliographic instruction survey information. These internal indirect assessment measures will provide data to help monitor the College’s activities that promote students’ information literacy skills. The College will use CCSSE (Community College Survey of Student Engagement) every other year as an external indirect measure of activities students are participating in that have an indirect impact on students’ information literacy skills (e.g. number of papers written, number of class presentations, number of books read, etc.) The library statistics and bibliographic instruction information will shed additional light on what information and resources students are using as pertains to completing assignments that require library and/or other learning resources.

The QEP Implementation Committee works hand-in-hand with the General Education Assessment committee, since information literacy is both an RPCC general education goal and the focus of the QEP. The Dean of Academic Studies, Dr. Crystal Lee, who serves as a Co-Chair for the QEP serves on both committees to ensure effective collaboration concerning both general education assessment and the assessment of the QEP. The membership for these two committees is as follows:
These two committees represent students, faculty and staff across all areas of the College. Together, these teams will implement and assess the QEP’s learning outcomes.

4.3 Implementation Actions and Timeline

The College will use a three-tiered approach to implementing the QEP. This involves engagement across the campus through participation by students, faculty/staff, and administration. All groups have participated in the selection of the topic and continue to be involved in the implementation process via the leadership of the QEP Implementation team. This section explains each group’s part and actions necessary for the implementation of the QEP.

Student Actions and Participation:

Students will be involved in implementing the QEP through participating in course-embedded targeted assessments, participating in SAILS (Standardized Assessment of
Information Literacy Skills), and through participating in RPCC’s QEP Promotion Plan http://www.rpcc.edu/qep.cfm. Through the QEP Promotion plan students will gain an increased awareness of information literacy via the use of the QEP logo and details on the College Website, all screen savers on College computers, digital display screens on campus, as well as via flyers, brochures, and literature disseminated.

Faculty and Staff Actions and Participation:

Faculty and staff have participated and continue to be actively involved in the development and implementation of the QEP through engagement in the QEP Implementation Team. Additionally, faculty members across disciplines are supporting the QEP initiative through requiring in-class assignments focusing on information literacy, providing support in administering SAILS, as well as participating in promotional activities. Further, under the direction and leadership of the QEP Implementation Team and the general education assessment team, faculty and staff are coordinating assessment efforts each semester to administer, collect, compile, assess, review, and report data to support and measure the success of the QEP.

Administrative Actions and Participation:

Administrative staff members are involved in supporting the QEP through participating in the QEP Implementation Team, providing budgetary support for the initiative, and for allocating staff support needed in the assessment process (e.g. data collection and reporting). The RPCC QEP Implementation Team will conduct an annual review and prepare a report on the following: 1.) learning outcomes 2.) promotional plan and 3.) implementation audit. This process will allow the QEP Implementation Team to determine if any changes are needed in the implementation plan as it relates to effectively addressing the student learning outcomes. This will also help the College rule out any problems with the implementation plan versus problems with student learning outcomes. The following is a narrative description and timeline detailing the implementation of the QEP:

4.3.a Up to and During First Year before Approval: Spring 2008 - Fall 2008

As explained previously, RPCC’s QEP Implementation Team had formalized the QEP focus and began planning of the QEP during spring 2008. During fall 2008, the QEP Implementation Team continued holding planning meetings and continued to offer informational events and resources to students, faculty, staff, and administration. During this time students, faculty, staff, and administrators took part in developing the slogan and a promotion plan for the QEP http://www.rpcc.edu/uploads/QEP-PR-Plan_RPCC.pdf In addition to creating a 2008-2009 Annual QEP Promotion Plan during fall 2008, the Implementation Team reviewed and responded to the on-site committee’s comments and recommendations. Under the direction of the QEP co-chairs, the QEP Implementation Team refined the learning outcomes, assessment process, and timeline for the QEP. The external and internal instruments were identified and the implementation process was well underway.
Specifics

The QEP annual promotion plan 2008-09 targets students, faculty/staff, and the broader College Community. To reach the targeted audiences the Team worked together to develop the QEP logo, slogan, and informational materials. Versions of the slogan as well as brief descriptions of the QEP were disseminated using through the following: College Website, Fliers/Posters, Blackboard Student Information Pages, College E-mail, student desktop backgrounds on all campus computers, and LCD displays throughout campus. As part of the annual 2008-09 promotion plan, additional marketing will be conducted in the remainder of Spring 2009 through the use of promotional items, QEP banners, and a display table at the RPCC 10th Anniversary and Community Fair.

Throughout the life of the QEP, professional development workshops and in-services will be provided for faculty and staff. The College will invite presentations from external and internal speakers who are knowledgeable on information literacy and assessment. For example, Dr. Saundra McGuire, Director of LSU’s Center for Academic Excellence, conducted a one-day workshop on “Impact of Changing Pedagogies on Student Learning” for all RPCC faculty members on January 14, 2009. The QEP Implementation Team was pleased to have Dr. McGuire conduct this workshop that she previously presented at a previous QEP Summer Institute.

4.3.b. Following the On-Site Committee Visit: Spring 2009 – Summer 2009

Activities during the months after on-site committee visit have involved several important areas; most activities will continue throughout the initiative. Some activities are continuations from the preceding months, such as developing college-wide awareness. While continuing the information literacy activities already underway, the College will fully implement its slogan and continue the marketing and awareness through use of the annual promotion plan. During the life of the QEP, RPCC will provide relevant professional development for faculty and staff and will implement the timeline of actions and assessments required for the plan. The QEP Implementation Team will remain an active group to implement, monitor, assess and report of the progress of the plan. This annually reporting process will provide the QEP Implementation Team an opportunity to reflect on progress and make any necessary adjustments for the upcoming implementation year. The QEP Co-Chairs will prepare annual progress reports to the Chancellor’s Cabinet.

Specifics

There will be three tier groups (i.e. faculty/staff, students, and administration) that will continue necessary implementation actions and assessment. During Spring 2009 through Summer 2009, RPCC will administer the external assessment SAILS to students who have earned 30+ hours and faculty members will create and administer information literacy assignments as part of the general education process. The QEP Implementation Team will collect the SAILS results from fall 2008 and spring 2009 and begin reviewing this data. The general education assessment committee will review and compile a report of students’ performance on the information literacy assessments and make any necessary adjustments for the fall 2009 semester. The QEP Implementation Team will work with administration and student services staff to order and administer the
CCSSE Survey which is administered every two years (i.e. 2005, 2007, 2009, etc.). The CCSSE data will provide information concerning student reporting of their engagement in the classroom in areas that pertain indirectly to the learning outcomes of the QEP, such as number of papers written, number of books read, etc. The QEP Team will continue promotional efforts, compile the annual 2008-09 report, and prepare for the upcoming 2009-2010 cycle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Process Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Tier-Group to Complete</th>
<th>Implementation Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2009</td>
<td>Continue Implementing Promotion Plan 2008-09</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2009</td>
<td>Faculty Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop/Training</td>
<td>Administration: Vice-Chancellor for Academic &amp; Student Affairs and Dean of Students</td>
<td>1.) Copy Power Point from Dr. McGuire's Workshop 2.) Sign-In &amp; Agenda for In-Service info. on QEP &amp; Gen. Ed. Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March – April 2009</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Distribute 30+ Hour Student Report &amp; Collect Library Survey &amp; Statistic Data Related to QEP</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Data Collection of Spring 2009 Course-embedded student work samples &amp; Library Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>Develop Promotion Plan for 2009-2010</td>
<td>QEP Implementation Team Meeting Agendas regarding Promotion Plan</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Annual Promotion Plan for Fall 2009-Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May–July 2009</td>
<td>Compile Annual QEP Report 2008-2009</td>
<td>Copy of 2008-09 Annual Report detailing progress on: 1.) learning outcomes 2.) promotion plan 3.) implement audit</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: Specifically, QEP-Co-Chairs &amp; members of QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Minutes of Chancellors Cabinet at June or July 2009 Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>Order SAILS for fall 2009</td>
<td>Requisition</td>
<td>Administration: QEP Co-Chairs &amp; Business Office</td>
<td>Receipt of SAILS instrument materials for fall 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.c. Continued Implementation: Fall 2009 – Summer 2010

The transition from the 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 will mark the first significant milestone in RPCC’s QEP in that the College will have completed a year of implementation and assessment. The 2008-2009 external and internal assessment data will provide RPCC information on students’ information literacy skills at the freshmen level as well as providing information on the status of their skills at the 30+ hour mark. During the compilation of the 2008-2009 Annual QEP report, the QEP Implementation team will take time to reflect on the QEP’s student learning outcomes particularly as it relates to establishing baseline data for student learning outcomes. Additionally, the committee will review the implementation timeline, the resources, and responsibilities to monitor for any required modifications. During the reflection and compilation of the first annual report, preparations will begin for the upcoming 2010-2011 cycle. This report will detail progress on the QEP as follows: 1.) learning outcomes 2.) promotion plan and 3.) implementation audit. The detailed timeline for this cycle is below.

4.3.d. Continued Implementation: Fall 2010–Summer 2011

The 2010-2011 will mark another significant milestone in the progress of the QEP, as the QEP Implementation team will have completed the process of collecting benchmarking data and will be able to set very specific percentages for student performance targets on both Project SAILS and the internal general education assessment performance rubrics for information literacy competencies. The QEP Implementation Committee will continue promoting, implementing, and monitoring progress. The detailed timeline for this cycle is below.

4.3.e  Continued Implementation: Fall 2010–Summer 2012

The 2010-2012 year will follow the same pattern of actions and activities of the prior two cycles. The difference with this cycle will be that the QEP Implementation Team will have targeted percentages for which the College is striving and will be able to report for the first time actual performance based on targeted projections versus the collection of benchmarking data. The detailed timeline for this cycle is below.

4.3.f  Continued Implementation through Fifth-Year Reporting: Fall 2012 – Summer 2013

The 2012-2013 year will follow the same pattern of actions and activities of the prior cycles. However, this year will culminate in compilation of the previous annual reports into the Fifth-Year Interim Report. The detailed timeline for this cycle is below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-frame</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Process Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Tier-Group to Complete</th>
<th>Implementation Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2009</td>
<td>Continue QEP Promotion Annual Plan 2009-10</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2009</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop / Training</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Administration: Coordinated by Dean of Academic Studies</td>
<td>Copy of presentation materials / Sign-In &amp; Copy of Fall 2009 In-Service Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2009</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for fall 2009</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Fall 2009 Freshmen SAILS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2009</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer information literacy assignments fall 2009 &amp; collect library data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Report of fall 2009 freshmen work samples &amp; library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2009</td>
<td>Compile External &amp; Internal Assessment data for fall ’09</td>
<td>Collection of Assessment Materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Copy of Fall 2009 Semester Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2010</td>
<td>Continue QEP Promotion Annual Plan 2010-2011</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2010</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop / Training</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Administration: Coordinated by Dean of Academic Studies</td>
<td>Copy of presentation materials / Sign-In &amp; Copy of Spring 2010 In-Service Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2010</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for Spring 2010 30+</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>SAILS Report Spring 2010 30+ Hour Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer assignments to Spring 2010 30+ Hour Students &amp; library collect statistics and data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Data Collection of Spring 2010 30+ student work samples &amp; Library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>Develop Promotion Plan for 2010-2011</td>
<td>QEP Implementation Team Meeting Agendas regarding Promotion Plan</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Annual Promotion Plan for Fall 2010-Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – July 2010</td>
<td>Compile Annual QEP Report 2009-2010</td>
<td>Copy of 2009-10 Annual Report detailing progress: 1.) learning outcomes 2.) promotion plan 3.) implement audit</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP-Co-Chairs &amp; members of QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Minutes of Chancellors Cabinet at June or July 2010 Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>Order SAILS fall 2010</td>
<td>Requisition</td>
<td>Administration: QEP Co-Chairs &amp;</td>
<td>Receipt of SAILS materials fall 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fall 2010 – Summer 2011 at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-frame</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Process Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Tier-Group to Complete</th>
<th>Implementation Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2010</td>
<td>Continue QEP Promotion Annual Plan 2010-2011</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2010</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop / Training</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Administration: Coordinated by Dean of Academic Studies</td>
<td>Copy of presentation materials / Sign-In &amp; Copy of Fall 2010 In-Service Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2010</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for fall 2010</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Fall 2010 Freshmen SAILS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2010</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer information literacy assignments to fall 2010 freshmen &amp; library collect statistics and QEP data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Data Collection of fall 2010 freshmen work samples &amp; copy of Library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2010</td>
<td>Compile External &amp; Internal Assessment data for fall 2010</td>
<td>Collection of Assessment Materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Copy of Fall 2010 Semester Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2011</td>
<td>Continue QEP Promotion Annual Plan 2010-2011</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2011</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop / Training</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Administration: Coordinated by Dean of Academic Studies</td>
<td>Copy of presentation materials / Sign-In &amp; Copy of Spring 2011 In-Service Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2011</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for Spring 2011 30+</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>SAILS Report Spring 2011 30+ Hour Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer assignments to Spring 2011 30+ Hour Students &amp; library collect statistics and data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Report of Spring 2011 30+ Hour information literacy student work samples &amp; copy of Library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>Develop Promotion Plan for 2011-2012</td>
<td>QEP Implementation Team Agendas on Promotion Plan</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Annual 2010-2011 Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – July 2011</td>
<td>Compile Annual QEP Report 2010-2011</td>
<td>Copy of 2010-2011 Annual Report detailing progress: 1.) learning outcomes 2.) promotion plan 3.) implement audit</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: Specifically, QEP-Co-Chairs &amp; members of QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Minutes of Chancellors Cabinet at June or July 2011 Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>Order SAILS for fall 2011</td>
<td>Requisition</td>
<td>Administration: QEP Co-Chairs &amp;</td>
<td>Receipt SAILS materials fall 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fall 2011 – Summer 2012 at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-frame</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Process Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Tier-Group to Complete</th>
<th>Implementation Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2011</td>
<td>Continue QEP Promotion Annual Plan 2011-2012</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2011</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop / Training</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Administration: QEP Co-Chairs coordinate</td>
<td>Presentation materials/ Sign-In &amp; Copy of Fall ’11 In-Service Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2011</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for fall 2011</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Fall 2011 Freshmen SAILS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2011</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer information literacy assignments to fall 2011 freshmen &amp; library collect statistics and QEP data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Data Collection of fall 2011 freshmen work samples &amp; copy of Library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2011</td>
<td>Compile External &amp; Internal Assessment data for fall 2011</td>
<td>Collection of Assessment Materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Copy of Fall 2011 Semester Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2012</td>
<td>Continue QEP Promotion Annual Plan 2011-2012</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2012</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop / Training</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Administration: Coordinated by Dean of Academic Studies</td>
<td>Copy of presentation materials / Sign-In &amp; Copy of Spring 2012 In-Service Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2012</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for Spring 2012 30+</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>SAILS Report Spring 2012 30+ Hour Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer assignments to Spring 2012 30+ Hour Students &amp; library collect statistics and data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Report of Spring 2012 30+ Hour information literacy student work samples &amp; Library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Develop Promotion Plan for 2012-2013</td>
<td>QEP Implementation Team Agendas on Promotion Plan</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Annual 2012-2013 Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – July 2012</td>
<td>Compile Annual QEP Report 2011-2012</td>
<td>Copy of 2011-2012 Annual Report detailing progress: 1.) learning outcomes 2.) promotion plan 3.) implement audit</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: Specifically, QEP-Co-Chairs &amp; members of QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Minutes of Chancellors Cabinet at June or July 2012 Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>Order SAILS fall fall 2012</td>
<td>Requisition</td>
<td>Administration: QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Receipt SAILS materials fall 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fall 2012 – Summer 2013 at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-frame</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Process Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Tier-Group to Complete</th>
<th>Implementation Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2012</td>
<td>Continue QEP Promotion Annual Plan 2012-2013</td>
<td>Number of Actions/Items in-progress or completed</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Checklist of Items Completed from the Promotion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2012</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff Professional Development</td>
<td>Completion of Workshop / Training</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Administration: Coordinated by Dean of Academic Studies</td>
<td>Copy of presentation materials / Sign-In &amp; Copy of Fall 2012 In-Service Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2012</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for fall 2012</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Fall 2012 Freshmen SAILS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2012</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer information literacy assignments to fall 2012 freshmen &amp; library collect statistics and QEP data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Data Collection of fall 2012 freshmen work samples &amp; copy of Library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2012</td>
<td>Compile External &amp; Internal Assessment data for fall 2012</td>
<td>Collection of Assessment Materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Copy of fall 2012 Semester Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2013</td>
<td>Implement External Assessment: SAILS for Spring 2012 30+ Hour Students</td>
<td>Collection of completed SAILS administration materials</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>SAILS Report Spring 2012 30+ Hour Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2013</td>
<td>Implement Internal Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Faculty administer assignments to Spring 2012 30+ Hour Students &amp; library collect statistics and data</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>Report of Spring 2012 30+ Hour information literacy student work samples &amp; Library data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Compile Annual QEP Report 2012-2013</td>
<td>Copy of 2012-2013 Annual Report detailing progress: 1.) learning outcomes 2.) promotion plan 3.) implement audit</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff: Specifically, QEP-Co-Chairs &amp; members of QEP Implementation Team</td>
<td>Copy of Minutes of Chancellors Cabinet at March 2013 Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-April 2013</td>
<td>Prepare Fifth Year Interim Report for SACS</td>
<td>Copy of the Report</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff &amp; Students: Coordinated by QEP Co-Chairs</td>
<td>SACS COC Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Resources

RPCC has broad institutional support and commitment for the QEP through cross-discipline and cross-departmental representation on the QEP Implementation Team. Through the use of a team from inception of the QEP, the College has been able to build a firm understanding of the need to improve students’ information literacy skills.


Since 2004, College Administration has provided financial and human resources to faculty and staff in order to develop a Quality Enhancement Plan that ensures that student learning continues to be the focus of RPCC’s mission. During the planning stages of the QEP from 2004 through 2008, RPCC has demonstrated a considerable commitment and capacity for the project. Six faculty and staff members (Lauri Hatlelid, Iris Henry, Crystal Lee, Bill Martin, Jim Rolfes, and Allison Vicknair) were given significant amounts of time and financial resources to research, discuss, and disseminate information. In the summer of 2006, these members and other staff and faculty attended the 2006 Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation. Those members gathered information and strategies learned to facilitate discussions with fellow faculty, staff and administration to choose a QEP focus that emphasized the greatest area of need to promote successful student learning at River Parishes Community College.

Pursuant to their research findings, as well as faculty and staff discussions, campus members ratified the information literacy focus. In anticipation of ensuring that the Information Literacy QEP had broad campus involvement at RPCC, the College sent an additional 14 members of its faculty, staff and administration to the SACS Annual Meeting to prepare for SACS Compliance Certification and Quality Enhancement Best Practices in December of 2007. Those members were as follows: Allison Vicknair, Angela Cutrer, Ben Nabors, Bill Martin, Crystal Lee, Debbie Lambert, Iris Henry, Joe Ben Welch, Lauri Hatlelid, LeAnn Detillier, Lisa Watson, Rick Moscatello, Sam Bono, and Tom Henson. Funding for the registration for this professional development opportunity totaled $4,790. In addition to RPCC faculty, participants also represented time commitments for all major departments on campus, as well as a large financial investment for the College.

In the same month, the RPCC QEP Implementation Team was established and began work in the spring of 2008. Ben Nabors and Wendy Johnson, co-chairs of the Committee, assumed responsibilities and demonstrated significant time commitments to the initiative. In addition, another 13 members of the QEP Implementation Team met to establish a working definition of Information Literacy, review models of available QEP models, current literature, work on guided work assignments in order to contribute according to their areas of expertise. Members met more than seven times during the spring of 2008 as a group, as well as a number of times in their own QEP Team Focus Group to work on their areas of expertise during the semester.

Finally, during the summer 2008, Dr. Ben Nabors was given release time to actively compile, synthesize, and complete River Parishes Community College’s Information
Literacy Quality Enhancement Plan. Financial resources for all professional development opportunities have totaled in excess of $17,000.

II. Institutional Capacity during the Implementation of the QEP (2008-2013)

Budget Narrative
The QEP Implementation Team, Co-Chairs will work in concert with the College’s administration to ensure continued support of personnel, activities, and the financial sustainability of the plan. The institutional cost of the implementation is reasonable and realistic for a plan of this type. The QEP Implementation Team will include the co-chairs, support staff, and faculty members across disciplines. The proposed budget contains the following elements:

**Human Resources and Professional Contract Service Costs**
- Personnel – release time and/or summer stipends for the QEP Co-Chairs, a part-time administrative assistant and work-study student.
- Travel – support for the QEP co-chairs, Implementation Committee members, and other faculty to present at and attend conferences on information literacy. This will also include travel for national or local speakers to visit RPCC.
- RPCC faculty development - conference, webinars, speakers, Honoraria – support for the faculty development workshops.
- Benefits – faculty, staff and administration benefits accrued based on 25% of estimated human resource costs.
- Professional Development Workshops of national and local speakers hosted each year for the RPCC Campus constituents.
- Web set-up for contractor – one time cost for the Information Literacy initiative to be added to the RPCC website.
- Lead Evaluator – to assess and evaluate the goals of the QEP, with a special emphasis being given to the quality of student learning.
- Assessment – SAILS – cost of administration of the SAILS instrument.
- Assessment – CCSSE – cost of administration of the CCSSE instrument.

**Other Financial and Infrastructure Costs**
- Telephone and computers – services that will be dedicated to the Information Literacy Initiative.
- Marketing materials – develop campus awareness of the QEP and Information Literacy.
- Subscriptions, dues and memberships – subscriptions to appropriate journals on information literacy and membership in organizations focusing on Information Literacy.
✓ SAILS Survey – cost of Kent State survey instrument to be administered to RPCC students.

✓ CCSSE Survey – cost of CCSSE survey instrument to be administered to RPCC students every other year.

✓ Miscellaneous Office supplies & printing – to support the Information Literacy QEP.

✓ Off-site Server Subscription – to support the Information Literacy initiative, the RPCC website is housed off-site in order on the computer science server but will need to be moved.

A more detailed budget follows the budget narrative with specific amounts allocated to each line item. The College has funded approximately $78,700 during its planning stage of the QEP. Although the QEP is an ongoing college-wide initiative, the College has budgeted an average of $90,200 each year for the five years of the River Parishes Community College Quality Enhancement Plan.

**Summary**

The QEP is an ongoing college-wide improvement initiative that focuses on student’s information literacy skills. In order to ensure that students achieve positive outcomes, the College is committed to providing professional development and teaching/learning resources for faculty and staff; likewise, it is committed to allocating physical and financial resources necessary to accomplish those goals so that students receive educational experiences that promote student learning. The budget has been designed to take into account revenue projections and thus has a plan for cost recovery to sustain the budget beyond the initial years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Project Leader</td>
<td>Faculty Release</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>22,050</td>
<td>23,153</td>
<td>24,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Project Team Members</td>
<td>Release for meetings, conferences and other administrative duties</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,455</td>
<td>7,828</td>
<td>8,219</td>
<td>8,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified support salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Test Administration</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>9,261</td>
<td>9,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Specialist</td>
<td>Support of project</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>3,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Support of project</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>3,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Based on 25% of Total Salary</td>
<td>9,150</td>
<td>10,525</td>
<td>11,051</td>
<td>11,604</td>
<td>12,184</td>
<td>12,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Personnel Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,750</td>
<td>52,625</td>
<td>55,256</td>
<td>58,019</td>
<td>60,920</td>
<td>63,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment -SAILS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>3,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment -CCSSE</td>
<td>Only every other year</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications (Telephone, Computer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Services</td>
<td>(External consultants, training, etc. staff development, etc.)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>(Promotional, etc.)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>SACs Conferences</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,945</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,155</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,096</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$530,741</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 1:  
Introduction to River Parishes Community College

River Parishes Community College is one of several emerging community colleges in the Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS), which was formed July 1, 1999. Accordingly, RPCC is a relatively new institution in a relatively new system. RPCC became fully accredited by SACS in 2004; this accreditation ensures transferability of credits. Moreover, eligible students can receive Pell grants, scholarships, and student loans. Current enrollment is in excess of 1,100 students and the anticipated rate of growth the fall of 2008 will be approximately 20%.

College Vision, Mission, & Philosophy

Vision
River Parishes Community College will be the premier post-secondary learning resource for the river parishes.

Mission
River Parishes Community College is an open-admission, two-year, post-secondary public institution serving the river parishes. The College provides transferable courses and curricula up to and including Certificates and Associates degrees. River Parishes Community College also partners with the communities it serves by providing programs for personal, professional, and academic growth.

River Parishes Community College fulfills its mission by:

1. Providing students with appropriate education, training, and student services at moderate costs, convenient times, and accessible locations to increase their success in obtaining an Associates Degree at RPCC, transferring to baccalaureate studies, or entering the workforce.

2. Developing responsive, innovative education and training programs that prepare students for immediate employment or transfer to two- and four-year colleges or universities.

3. Creating interactions among students, faculty, and staff that stimulate learning.

4. Offering student services programs to motivate students to maximize their potential for learning through goal attainment, healthy competitiveness, and the development of teamwork, leadership, critical thinking, problem solving, information literacy, and citizenship skills.

5. Creating a campus environment that encourages quality learning experiences and that reinforces the value of cultural and economic diversity and mutual respect.

6. Strengthening mutually beneficial partnerships with secondary education and universities, business and industry, government agencies, economic development entities, and community-based organizations that expand educational opportunities for current and future students.
7. Making effective use of new and emerging technology to improve teaching and learning in RPCC’s classrooms, laboratories, and other learning environments.

8. Recruiting and retaining exemplary faculty, staff, and administrators through continuous professional development, and attracting and supporting the professional development and retraining of faculty, staff, and administrators at RPCC.

9. Effectively developing and managing the resources allocated for capital and operational expenses to support the mission of the College.

Philosophy

River Parishes Community College is dedicated to developing and assisting students to achieve personal, professional and academic success. In an effort to ensure that students have opportunities to develop, the College’s administration, faculty and staff are committed to the following:

✓ Access: RPCC will strive to make courses, programs and services affordable and available to all citizens of the river parishes. RPCC is a two year open admissions institution.

✓ Responsiveness: RPCC will collaborate with community leaders, advisory boards, industry leaders, and business and student groups in developing curriculum, programs and services that meet the needs of the communities it serves.

✓ Excellence: RPCC is committed to establishing a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom, that sustains institutional excellence.

✓ Quality Services: RPCC is committed to providing personalized, quality service to all students who select to enroll at the College.

❖ History of the College

River Parishes Community College was born out of a Senate Concurrent Resolution approved by the 1997 Regular Louisiana Legislative Session. It was the brainchild of State Senator Louis J. Lambert, a native of Sorrento, who along with his colleagues in the legislature, recognized that Louisiana was one of the most populous states in the country without a community college system to serve its citizens. Even though two community colleges had existed in the state for decades, and another was established in 1992, they were not placed within a comprehensive system of their own. In the fall of 1998, Louisiana voters approved a constitutional amendment establishing the Louisiana Community and Technical College System and its Board of Supervisors. RPCC joined these six other community colleges in the state under the new system: Baton Rouge Community College, Bossier Parish Community College, Delgado Community College, Nunez Community College, Louisiana Delta Community College and South Louisiana Community College.

The College is located in the small Ascension Parish town of Sorrento, in what is known as the River Parishes region of the state because of the proximity of the parishes to the
Mississippi River. RPCC’s recently-expanded service area includes Ascension, Assumption, St. James, St. John, St. Charles, Tangipahoa, and Washington Parishes. The designation also includes portions of Iberville and Livingston Parishes.

RPCC also sits at the crossroads of Plantation Country. The parishes along the lower Mississippi River have a rich heritage and a historic past that makes them unique within the state. Nestled in various corridors are communities steeped in pre-Civil War history as palatial plantation homes built nearly 200 years ago still stand firmly on their original sites. The Florida Parishes also are proud of a rich history of their own.

RPCC, furthermore, is located where much of Louisiana Acadian—or Cajun—history began. The history of the Acadians in Louisiana begins down the river where the first Acadian settlers set ashore in St. James Parish.

Additionally, RPCC lies in that unique corridor where the majority of the state’s manufacturing facilities - anything from petro-chemicals to raincoats - are located. Accordingly, part of RPCC’s mission is to serve those industries, through specialized training programs for potential employees, which would attract and help retain those industries in the area.

Despite its relatively brief history, RPCC is part of a larger, momentous history – distant and recent.
Appendix 2:
General Education Requirements

The 34-hour general education requirement is a fundamental component of each degree program at River Parishes Community College. Upon completion of the curricula leading to an associate degree, students should be able to demonstrate proficiency in the following areas:

- Communicate effectively in oral and written English;
- Read with comprehension;
- Reason abstractly and think critically;
- Learn independently;
- Understand numerical and statistical data;
- Understand the scientific method;
- Be familiar with key technological applications and their impact upon society;
- Understand the nature of fine and performing arts;
- Recognize and appreciate cultural diversity;
- Understand American social, cultural, political and economic systems;
- Develop a personal value system while retaining a tolerance for that of others;
- Utilize library/information resources.

To ensure that these goals are met, students will complete coursework in the following eight areas: English composition, mathematics, oral communication, arts, humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and computer education.

In an effort to facilitate the transfer of RPCC’s courses to other public state institutions, RPCC has included on the general education list that follows courses that are found in the Louisiana Board of Regents Statewide Student Transfer Guide Articulation System. This publication is available for review in the Office of the Dean of Academic Studies, the Office of the Dean of Students, and online via the College’s website, www.rpcc.edu.
## Appendix 3: College Contact List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of the Chancellor</th>
<th>Donna Whittington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>225.675.0203 P</td>
<td>Director, Human Resources &amp; Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.675.6625 F</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dwhittington@rpcc.edu">dwhittington@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joe Ben Welch</td>
<td>Kim Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jbwelch@rpcc.edu">jbwelch@rpcc.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kstephens@rpcc.edu">kstephens@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Lambert</td>
<td>Yvonne Butler, Custodian II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant to the Chancellor</td>
<td>m <a href="mailto:hubbs@rpcc.edu">hubbs@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dlambert@rpcc.edu">dlambert@rpcc.edu</a></td>
<td>Jane LeBlanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bill Martin</td>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jleblanc@rpcc.edu">jleblanc@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bmartin@rpcc.edu">bmartin@rpcc.edu</a></td>
<td>Christina Ocmand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Cutrer</td>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Public Information</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cocmand@rpcc.edu">cocmand@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:acutrer@rpcc.edu">acutrer@rpcc.edu</a></td>
<td>Lisa Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Watson</td>
<td>Restricted Funds Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Sponsored Programs and Projects</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ljackson@rpcc.edu">ljackson@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lwatson@rpcc.edu">lwatson@rpcc.edu</a></td>
<td>Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>225.675.0218 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.675.8270 P</td>
<td>225.675.8595 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.675.6394 F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.675.6751 F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clen Burton</td>
<td>Wendy Johnson, MLIS, CLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration</td>
<td>Directory of Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cburton@rpcc.edu">cburton@rpcc.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:wjohnson@rpcc.edu">wjohnson@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Sullivan</td>
<td>Connie Chemay, MLIS, CLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Technician</td>
<td>Head of Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jsullivan@rpcc.edu">jsullivan@rpcc.edu</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cchemay@rpcc.edu">cchemay@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Sanchez, MLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Technical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:vsanchez@rpcc.edu">vsanchez@rpcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Williams</td>
<td>Library Specialist III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Dauzat Vicknair</td>
<td>Dean of Students and Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeAnn Detillier</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Landry</td>
<td>Recruiter/Admissions Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Dudley</td>
<td>Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Martin</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gray</td>
<td>Director of Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri Hatlelid</td>
<td>Academic Adviser/Institutional Research Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Evans</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Efferson</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Dauzat Vicknair</td>
<td>Dean of Students and Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Kleinpeter</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Landry</td>
<td>Recruiter/Admissions Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Dudley</td>
<td>Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Martin</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gray</td>
<td>Director of Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri Hatlelid</td>
<td>Academic Adviser/Institutional Research Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Evans</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Efferson</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Dauzat Vicknair</td>
<td>Dean of Students and Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Kleinpeter</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Landry</td>
<td>Recruiter/Admissions Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Dudley</td>
<td>Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Martin</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gray</td>
<td>Director of Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauri Hatlelid</td>
<td>Academic Adviser/Institutional Research Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Evans</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debi Graham</td>
<td>College Prep English/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hadley</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Henry</td>
<td>Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Henson</td>
<td>Chemistry, Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Kleinpeter</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Lagarde</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Marks</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Moscatello</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savitha Pinnepalli</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rolfes</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Smith</td>
<td>Physics, Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Thompson</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Viernum</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Weatherly</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4:
QEP Draft Proposal Memo

From: Bill Martin  
Sent: Mon 4/23/2007 4:44 PM  
To: * Faculty  
Cc: Crystal D. Lee; Allison Dauzat; Lauri Hatlelid  
Subject: QEP Draft Proposal

This attachment has an update on our prospective Quality Enhancement Plan topic: Information Literacy

I have tried to summarize why we think this topic will work well for us and there may be a point on the agenda of your upcoming faculty meeting for more conversation. I'll be out of town at the end of the week so I wanted to save some time by having you look at it before I get away on Thursday.

Once we finalize this topic choice we can begin to do the necessary planning to put the project plan together. If you have questions drop in or send me an email.

There is some jargon in the language...how many of you know what metacognition means? How does an "active learning" classroom differ from other kinds of classroom environments?

[Attachment]

RIVER PARISHES COMMUNITY COLLEGE

“SACS/COC REAFFIRMATION AND THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN”

Introduction:

After achieving Candidacy status in June 2003, River Parishes Community College conducted a compliance review under the Principles of Accreditation and was fully accredited at the December 2004 annual meeting of the Commission on Colleges (COC).

Since Candidate institutions are initially accredited for five years, RPCC must complete a second compliance review in time to be considered for reaffirmation at the December 2009, COC annual meeting. This second review will require the college to update its compliance with the Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards and federal regulations. Compliance work groups are active and collecting information that will help them respond to the standards.

In addition, the college will be required to prepare a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) as part of its 2009 reaffirmation efforts. The QEP was not required of Candidate institutions...
seeking full accreditation for the first time, but colleges seeking their first reaffirmation must develop a QEP.

The college has been preparing for the QEP for more than two years. Five faculty and staff members participated in the COC sponsored 2006 Summer Institute that featured the QEP. In addition, staff members attended several QEP centered presentations at the 2006 annual meeting of the COC in Orlando. College staff members have also examined QEP topics selected by institutions that were in earlier cohorts.

RPCC is in a unique position when it comes to selecting an initiative for the QEP. Unlike more established institutions with an extensive history, RPCC has been in operation for only 8 years. Since the COC emphasizes that the QEP should be “forward looking” and something the college should be prepared to invest time and energy into for the next five to ten years, a wide range of topics are available in helping the institution move into the second decade of its operation.

**SACS/COC QEP Guidelines:**

After attending a summer institute, concurrent sessions at the annual meeting and reading COC publications we have learned the following about the QEP:

1. The QEP **focus** must be on student learning—changes in students’ knowledge, skills, behaviors, and/or values that may be attributed to the college experience. Topic categories may include enhancing the academic climate for student learning, introducing innovative teaching and learning strategies, improving student engagement in learning or exploring meaningful ways to use technology in the curriculum. In all cases, “the goals and evaluation strategies must be clearly linked to improving the quality of student learning.”

2. The institution must show **capability**: The institution must provide evidence that it has sufficient resources to implement, sustain, and complete the QEP. This will require establishing a well-developed project timeline combined with detailed budget projections for each phase of the project.

3. The institution must provide evidence of broad **campus involvement** in the total project. All campus constituencies (faculty, staff, students and administrators—perhaps LCTCS staff or board members) should participate in selecting and implementing the topic.

4. The institution must develop a means for **assessing** the QEP. The college must identify relevant internal and external measures to evaluate the plan and monitor its progress. The plan describes how the results of the evaluation will improve student learning.

**Proposed topic:**

*Information Literacy* should serve as the focus for RPCC’s Quality Enhancement Plan. Information Literacy is defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) as, “…an intellectual framework for understanding, finding, evaluating, and using information—activities which may be accomplished in part by fluency with information.
technology, in part by sound investigating methods, but most important, through critical discernment and reasoning."

Moreover, the Boyar Commission Report, Reinventing Undergraduate Education, recommends the implementation of strategies that require students to be active in the "framing of a significant question or set of questions, the research or creative exploration to find answers, and the communication skills to convey the results..."

**Topic Advantages re: student learning**

Implementing information literacy across the curriculum will:

- initiate, sustain and extend lifelong learning—a primary value at the community college;
- develop reasoning and critical thinking skills;
- help to develop meta-cognition skills which will enhance academic and professional development;
- increase opportunities for students to become more self-directed learners;
- provide more problem-based learning experiences;
- increase students’ responsibility for their own learning;
- serve both the campus learning community and distance learners equally well;
- enable all faculty members an opportunity to apply IL concepts in their unique disciplines;
- enable learners to learn how to use and apply technologies;
- contribute to a more active learning environment;
- provide existing students (university transfer students) as well as potential new student markets with valuable skills for further education or the workforce;
- require the collaborative efforts of faculty, librarians, professional staff and administrators.

**Topic advantages: institutional advancement**

Implementing Information Literacy across the curriculum at RPCC satisfies the requirement that the topic be forward looking and it will provide the college with an institution-wide emphasis that will appeal to its students, staff and the communities it serves. The topic’s primary emphasis is on student learning and there is much within the current literature that supports the choice.

IL is well within the college’s capability in that it does not require capital improvements or new costly technologies. The project will require significant professional development for faculty and staff. Faculty members will learn more about learning theory, learning assessment, and active-learning classroom environments. Through workshops for non-instructional college staff members, employees will discover that Information Literacy skills are invaluable in performing job-related tasks. These efforts will reinforce the emphasis on total campus involvement in the project.

Information Literacy provides the QEP Leadership Team with many advantages when it comes to assessment. The ACRL spent considerable time and effort in 2000 to identify Information Literacy competencies along with five standards and twenty-two performance indicators. Faculty members and librarians utilized “higher order” and
“lower order” thinking skills described in Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives in developing competency standards. These standards and performance indicators will be a great place to begin in looking at assessment models.
Appendix 5: Information Literacy Series

This five-part series will be open to all RPCC students, faculty, and staff. The series is focused on Information Literacy, the topic of the college’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Accordingly, the series’ sessions should be of special interest to faculty and to members of the QEP Implementation Team. Because of the educational focus, Associate in Science of Teaching (AST) students might benefit from attending. Because of cognitive and psychological aspects covered in the series, psychology students might also benefit from one or more of the sessions. One may attend as many or as few sessions as she or he wants. Ben Nabors, Assistant Professor of English and Literature, will facilitate the one-hour sessions of the series.

Information Literacy Series (Session I—Wed., March 19, 1 p.m., B124)
How We Think: Making, Filling, and Correcting Spaces

One of the problems confronting students and teachers alike is a lack of knowledge about how the human mind processes information. Informed by recent cognitive science, this session will focus on how the human mind takes in, organizes, evaluates, and creates information.

Information Literacy Series (Session II—Wed., April 2, 1 p.m., B124)
What to Do with Information: Moving from Recalling to Creating

One of the major problems in pre-secondary, secondary, and post-secondary education is that students are frequently encouraged to practice only lower-level cognitive processes at the expense of the higher-level ones, which are the very processes most prized today. An initial step in combating this nearly universal deficiency is to help both students and teachers become aware of what cognitive processes are possible—not to mention what processes are needed in today’s complex, interconnected, information-driven world. This session will focus on building such awareness and, therefore, strive for higher-level cognition.

Information Literacy Series (Session III—Wed., April 9, 1 p.m., B124)
Critical Thinking and Information Literacy—Integral to Each Other

Gathering information, placing quotes and statistics in papers, and spending hours in the library or on a computer are a waste of time unless one knows why research is needed, why illustrations and evidence can be helpful, and whether or not a website, book, or article is worth one’s time. Literacy not only means recognizing and acquiring information; it also means judging the quality of information and employing information in a thoughtful, practical, and beneficial way. This means that to be an “information literate” is to be a critical thinker.

Information Literacy Series (Session IV—Wed., April 23, 1 p.m., B124)
Teaching Literately: Educational Practices that Facilitate Literacy and Thought

This session will focus on how to develop curricula, classroom practices, and assignments that foster cross-curricular information literacy and critical thinking.
Examples will come from multiple disciplines: e.g., math, science, history, art, sociology, and psychology.

**Information Literacy (Session V—Wed., April 30, 1 p.m., B124)**  
**Testing Literately: Seeing the Wholes through the Fractions**

Wrapping up the information literacy series will be this session on how to assess and evaluate students, teachers, and the college so that all involved can better spot information literacy problems and better promote information literacy. Student testing, course evaluations, and institutional quality-control will be focal points.
From: Benjamin Nabors  
Sent: Tue 2/26/2008 12:28 PM  
To: * Everyone  
Subject: QEP Query I

Dear All:

Even though the following request is directed mainly at faculty, anyone should feel free to respond. Moreover, non-experts (in this case, those who do not teach classes) might have insights that are as enlightening, if not more enlightening, than those of us who teach. Whether you teach or not, we all share an essential common denominator: we all have been (and hopefully still are) learners.

In “New Literacy Learning Strategies for New Times,” Robert J. Tierney explains literacy in this way:

[T]o be literate means being able to participate in one’s world rather than just being an observer of it. Being literate requires being able to make meanings while probing ideas, solving problems, or pursuing new understandings. Meaning-making also requires transacting with people and ideas—both face to face and virtually, by way of written words, audio, and images—in ways that embrace others as potential collaborators and audiences. Being literate involves engagement with the unedited and ever expanding world of ideas 24/7. Meaning-making through these multiple forms of literacies involves a rich and complex array of processes: researching, navigating, and integrating multilayered text, images, and sounds; linking together ideas and patterns; collaborating, considering, and evaluating the meanings that are constructed. (22)

Basically, Tierney is asserting that literacy is the ability to create meaning out of information—information which comes in a wide variety of forms.

Based on Tierney’s definition of literacy and on your own experiences, consider these questions:

1. Do your students solidly demonstrate the kind of literacy that Tierney describes, which is information literacy?
2. Overall, are the majority of our students active “participators” or passive “observers”?
3. Are there one or two assignments, papers, projects, or assessments that you currently give which encourage the kind of literacy described?
4. How would this kind of literacy improve students’ personal, academic, and professional lives?
5. In and out of the classroom, how could RPCC enhance information literacy among our students?
I am not asking you to submit answers to me unless you want to; nevertheless, I would be greatly interested in your thoughts. To encourage open discussion, I make this pledge: I will not share your answers with anyone else without first removing your name from them.

Thank you in advance for contributing to this discussion.

All the best,
Ben
QEP Co-Chair

Ben Nabors, PhD
Assistant Professor of English and Literature
River Parishes Community College
bnabors@rpcc.edu

From: Benjamin Nabors
Sent: Mon 3/17/2008 3:57 PM
To: * Everyone
Subject: QEP Query Two

Dear All:

First, let me thank those who responded to the first query, which I sent out a few weeks ago. I will be sending along the responses once I receive permission to do so by their authors.

Second, let me notify everyone that the QEP Implementation Team has refined the working definition for Information Literacy: the skills needed to locate, evaluate, and use information responsibly and effectively.

Third, let me request something more from you. If you are a faculty member (full-time or part-time), please send me an assignment, test, project, or exam that you think addresses Information Literacy. If you are not a faculty member, put yourself in the shoes of a student, and please send me descriptions of the kinds of assignments that you think would help you become information literate. Because such information will be instrumental in adequately brainstorming and shaping RPCC’s version of Information Literacy, I am going to be a bit more insistent on receiving as many responses as possible. Please do not be shy, and rest assured that I and the Implementation Team will not be passing judgment on the submissions but will be using them to help us build our QEP.

Thanks again for your time and assistance on this.

All the best,
Ben

Ben Nabors, PhD
Assistant Professor of English and Literature
River Parishes Community College
bnabors@rpcc.edu
Dear All:

I hope the summer term and/or vacation is starting off well.

In the QEP Implementation Team’s last meeting, near the end of the spring term, the Team had brainstormed and begun to chart out our QEP’s goals, outcomes, organization, and strategy. I have put together a working version of what our meeting yielded. Please find it attached in MS Word ‘07 format.

I am certain that there are some areas that need review and refinement; nevertheless, this working version will help us to generally get our heads around the overall QEP, clarify divisional responsibilities (i.e. student, faculty/staff, administration), and glimpse on what we plan to occur over the next five years.

All the best,
Ben
QEP I-Team Co-Chair

Ben Nabors, PhD
Assistant Professor of English and Literature
River Parishes Community College
bnabors@rpcc.edu
Hi Ben,
I'm sorry I took so long to get back to you. As far as information literacy is concerned, I've required that students participate in Blackboard discussions based on primary source readings that I had them do. For example, I've made them read an excerpt from the "Epic of Gilgamesh" in their textbook and compare and contrast the flood story in it to the more familiar Biblical account. Then, I asked them, based on what we learned about the Hebrews and Mesopotamians in class, to discuss why each civilization gave the story its own unique spin. This requires them to assess at least two sources of information, the primary source and my lecture, and to try to bring them together and differentiate between the two. I want them to see that sometimes their teachers may have different interpretations of primary sources than they do. Finally, once a student responded to these questions on Blackboard, other students would be required to respond to at least one other student's initial response. I tried to get a virtual class discussion going, but it was like pulling teeth. Unfortunately, telling our students they have to think instead of just regurgitate goes over about as well as telling them that we want to do a root canal on them! In any event, I think this is the kind of assignment that you are looking for. If not, let me know and I'll send something else.

Sam
From: Lisa Jackson  
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2008 8:28 AM  
To: Benjamin Nabors  
Subject: RE: QEP Query Two

The kind of assignments that help me become information literate include the following:

- Electronic / computer-based practice test
- PowerPoint Presentations for the Chapters in the text
- Chapter Summaries
- Electronic / computer-based tutorials for chapters and topics covered in class.

Sincerely,
Lisa A Jackson  
Restricted Funds Accountant  
River Parishes Community College  
P.O. Box 310  
7384 John LeBlanc Blvd.  
Sorrento, LA. 70778  
225-675-8270 - Main  
225-675-0240 - Direct  
225-675-6394 - Fax  
ljackson@rpcc.edu – email
From: Julie Sullivan  
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 12:42 PM  
To: Benjamin Nabors  
Subject: RE: QEP Query Two

Dear Ben,

In both of my TEAC classes they do research papers.

For TEAC 2010 the students had to research a legal case and the implications on current education. They had to search law databases and newspaper archives to find information for the research paper. They then had to synthesize that information and form an opinion about how the case was currently impacting education. Some cases were only relevant to society in the time they were decided, however, some have had lasting impacts on education.

For TEAC 2030 the students had to research disability law (IDEA, 504, and ADA). They had to discuss the history, the scope of the laws, and how the laws are currently being used in schools. They had to search the Internet and use their textbook to find the history of the laws. They were given additional resources to search for the scope of the laws. They then had to synthesize the information in order to be able to understand the laws and use them in their classrooms. For this assignment, the papers were so good and covered different parts of the laws, that I had the students copy their papers and share them with the other students. This way they will all benefit from each others work.

If you have any questions, please let me know. I hope this is what you were looking for.

Thank you,
Julie Sullivan  
AST Coordinator  
River Parishes Community College  
P.O. Box 310  
7384 John LeBlanc Blvd.  
Sorrento, LA 70778  
(225) 675-0242 Fax (225) 675-5478  
jpsullivan@rpcc.edu
Ben,
I usually (this semester excluded) give an assignment mid-semester once we cover what goes into anthropological fieldwork and ethnography. Their project is to find a small community (subculture) for a mini-ethnography. They are to gain permission from the appropriate channels, use participant observation methodology and record data for at least two weeks. Then they write the mini-ethnography. They are provided, via lecture and bibliographic sources, the materials necessary for success including ethical concerns, past theoretical bases, and an historical overview of ethnography in anthropology. After the project is completed, they present their data conference-style. I use an evaluation rubric which includes background research, level of professionalism, originality, and ethics.
That's one of my favorite assignments. Not too sure if it's the best exemplar for info lit, but they are required to do quite a bit of independent research. If you'd also like a syllabus, I can provide that as well. All the best and Hoppy Easter!

Tracy R. LeBlanc
Interdepartmental Program in Linguistics
Louisiana State University
Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T
Ben,
I’ve attached assignments from some of my classes.

The research paper is being done in my 1010 class and in my two 1020 classes with different topic choices. It is my way of getting them to dabble in writing on a scientific topic without being too demanding (because this class is for non-majors). The students must locate information, whether via the web or books. The students must evaluate and use the information to write the paper. There is some thinking involved! They have to decide what is important enough to tell the reader since the paper is so short. They have to reword the information or comment on it in general. Also, they have to communicate effectively in writing.

The assignment on vitamins and minerals is from BIOL 2600 (Nutrition). It is a way to incorporate the facts of vitamins and minerals without forcing the students to memorize all of the numbers! For the exam, I have incorporated the ideas rather than the numerical details. Also, there is a wealth of information on the government’s websites regarding nutrition. Most people don’t know that these websites (mypyramid.gov, nutrition.gov) even exist, much less how much information is on them. I was surprised at the volume of information available! Students need to locate the information by sifting through many topics and web pages of data. I think that most importantly the student will learn where the information can be found; this will serve as a reference for the future. This contributes to the student using the information responsibly and effectively.

Assignment 3 comes from BIOL 1020. I usually give the students an assignment covering two or three chapters before each exam. I find that this gets students to actually flip through their notes prior to the night before the exam! They must read and locate the information, and then evaluate whether or not what they’ve read is what I’m asking! I have also attached a study guide for a 1020 exam. The students receive the study guide about a week before the exam. It narrows down the information a tad, but it is mainly used to encourage students to read and review the material again.

I hope I didn’t give you too much information!

- Erin Graugnard
From: Steven Hadley  
Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2008 8:16 AM  
To: Benjamin Nabors  
Subject: Info-Literacy  
Attachments: Information Literacy Discussion.doc

Ben,

Attached is my write-up of my discussion with my students regarding information literacy. It is a little rough so feel free to edit it accordly to suit your purposes.

Steven

Steven Hadley, M.F.A.

River Parishes Community College

7384 John LeBlanc Blvd.

Sorrento, Louisiana 70778

www.rpcc.edu

[attachment]

After receiving Dr. Nabors’ email concerning the definition of Information Literacy in regards to the QEP I took that paragraph and this issue directly to the students. I gave each of them a copy of Tierney's definition of literacy,

"In "New Literacy Learning Strategies for New Times," Robert J. Tierney explains literacy in this way:

[T]o be literate means being able to participate in one's world rather than just being an observer of it. Being literate requires being able to make meanings while probing ideas, solving problems, or pursuing new understandings. Meaning-making also requires transacting with people and ideas--both face to face and virtually, by way of written words, audio, and images--in ways that embrace others as potential collaborators and audiences. Being literate involves engagement with the unedited and ever expanding world of ideas 24/7. Meaning-making through these multiple forms of literacies involves a rich and complex array of processes: researching, navigating, and integrating multilayered text, images, and sounds; linking together ideas and patterns; collaborating, considering, and evaluating the meanings that are constructed." (22)
After which I showed them a brief video about contemporary artist, Matthew Ritchie, whose work deals with the avenues opened and boundaries imposed by informational systems such as the biological, psychological, social, cultural, spiritual, etc. He says,

"The Universal Cell" is part of "The Lytic Circus." The Sao Paulo Bienal asked me to do a piece, and this was really the only thing I wanted to make. I was wrapping up this project that I've been working on for seven or eight years-a kind of narrative that, collectively, is an encyclopedia of information, a manual of how to deal with information (all the information you could possibly take on)."

In essence, Ritchie's work functions as an abstract model to Tierney's explanation of literacy of which I have provided a few examples.

A brief discussion followed in which we tried to come to some open ended conclusions regarding the ways in which informational systems (in general) influence our lives as well as how the RPCC educational system could be better structured to encourage students to become better "meaning-makers."

Their first observation/critique of the current academic model involved the lack of enthusiasm most professors show towards their own subject(s). "

Students would like to see:

- The majority of students consider the classes they are in to be structured such that they have no choice but to be passive "observers" as opposed to
active "participators." Those classes that are structured to encourage participation are the ones in which information is more easily retained and utilized in other instances.

- Instructors/Professors need to be more excited about the subjects that teach. The common observation from each class amounted to, "If the teacher isn't excited about the subject how are we going to [get excited about it]?

- Students need clearer examples of the contemporary relevance of the information they are given. Being presented with information (knowledge, data, texts, etc) without the context of its pragmatic usage was a very clear issue. “I don't see why I have to know this” or “…” Every class had issue with this idea. Not only did they seem to crave a sense of contemporary relevance, but a stronger sense of personal relevance.

- More visual, audio and interactive learning techniques. Men argued for more interactive learning often using the phrase "hands on" while women were concerned with more visual stimuli and conversational learning. Both voiced concerns over the "boring routine" of lecture classes. They have a better retention rate in classes that are structured around varying presentation/interaction techniques such as videos that supplement lectures; discussions that further videos.

- Peer-to-peer learning. Many students voiced a desire to have the opportunity not for group work, which they find disappointing because they are then responsible for someone else's work, but simply the opportunity to have a fellow student explain the information to them in terms they can understand. The phrase "dumb it down" came up quite often.

In the end, students gave the impression that they require a variety of visual/auditory/hands on stimuli in order to retain and later utilize information. In a few instances, students managed to make the connection between the effects of popular culture (television, text messaging, advertising, etc.) on their attention spans and their inability to concentrate for more than 15-20 minutes in a classroom hence the need to be "entertained" by various teaching approaches. The entirety of four classroom discussions on this subject suggested that the majority of our students require (and would hopefully appreciate) a stronger guiding hand in regards to the contemporary, personal and educational values/uses of their education.
Appendix 8:  
Ava Berthelot’s RPCC Graduation Survey

RPCC General Education Survey  
Graduates

RPCC strives to continuously improve its services and programs. By completing this survey you will assist us in evaluating how effective the college has been in improving student learning in the general education core competencies. Your responses will be utilized solely for the purpose of evaluating and improving our general education program. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Last Name  Berthelot  
First Name  
Email Address  
Home Phone  
Work Phone  

Directions: On a scale of "Significantly" to "Very Little", please make your selection by clicking on the drop box. Then, write a response for suggestions or comments to any of the core competencies assessed. When you are finished, click "Submit."

Please answer each question honestly and thoroughly. Again, your opinion is extremely valuable to RPCC.

1. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to communicate effectively in oral and written English improved: [Considerably]  
2. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to read with comprehension improved: [Considerably]  
3. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to reason abstractly and think critically improved: [Considerably]  
4. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to learn independently improved: [Significantly]  
5. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to understand numerical and statistical data improved: [Moderately]  
6. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to understand key technological applications and their impact upon society improved: [Considerably]  
7. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to understand the nature of fine and performing arts improved: [Moderately]
8. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to recognize and appreciate cultural diversity improved:

Significantly

9. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to understand American social, cultural, political and economic systems improved:

Significantly

10. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to develop a personal value system while retaining a tolerance for that of others improved:

Significantly

11. After completing the general education requirements at RPCC, my ability to utilize library and information resources improved:

Considerably

Comments

I would have liked computer and software classes that were more challenging. As an adult working student I had pretty good computer skills and wanted more in depth, useful instruction.

I would have also liked some classes in how to read, interpret and critique journal articles. I got some basic skills in my sciences (course work and labs), but some in depth work on these would help now that I’m at LSU.

Another area that I would have liked some instruction is writing papers using the journal article format (Intro, Methods, Discussion). Again, Ms. Guzman gave some work on these skills, but more in depth would be helpful.

Please note any suggestions for how RPCC could improve student learning in the general education core.
Appendix 9:  
Assembly and RPCC Foundation Discussions of QEP Topic

Faculty General Assembly Meeting  
March 17, 2006  
1:00pm

SACS Update and Timeline Discussion

RPCC Placement Scores & Student Success Data

Teacher Preparation Degree Program (Update/Work Groups)

Faculty Rank, Promotion, and Tenure – Update on LCTCS committee and work we will need to resume at RPCC

LCTCS 505/506 status

Fall 2006 class schedule (Time/Space Considerations)

Faculty Screening Committees

Sign-up sheet – annual performance, planning, and review
Faculty General Assembly Meeting
April 28, 2006
1:00pm

Housekeeping
Copier Codes
Completed PPR Forms
Update on Position Advertisements
RPCC Graduation
Discussion & Spring Date/Time/Location (Tuesday, May 23, 2006 @ 6:00pm)

Faculty Committee Activity
End-of-the-Year Spending Committee
Disaster Recovery (Grade Records & Online Courses)
Electronic Learning Committee (Test Proctoring – proposed changes)
Faculty Rank, Promotion, and Tenure update

Enrollment and Course Schedule Information
Enrollment and Resignations Discussion
Fall 2006 (Draft Schedule)
& Confirmation of Online Classes

Partnerships, PR, and Possible New Degree/Concentrations
Eatel, Ascension School Board, & RPCC degree concentration possibilities
& Courses for Donaldsonville H.S. students
Teacher Preparation (Grades 1-5)
PR to local area day cares – Fall 2006 ECED Classes
St. James Magnet (Grant Proposal – Henry Smith)
BoR RFP related to High School Redesign related to remedial education

SACS
SACS Monitoring Committee Report
General Education Assessment Discussion
SACS Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation (July 30 – Aug. 2, 2006)
RPCC Quality Enhancement Plan
Pre-QEP Meeting Agenda
May 9, 2006
11:30am

Pre-QEP Planning Group Members

Tentative Timeline for 2009 Reaffirmation Track

SACS Institutional Handbooks, Manuals, Resources
(Related to Reaffirmation & QEP)
www.sacscoc.org/handbook.asp

List of 2004 and 2005 Reaffirmation Class QEPs

General Discussion about Tasks and Activities for Fall 2006 regarding
Pre-QEP planning/preparation
River Parishes Community College

SACS Leadership Team Meeting Minutes

21 June 2006
12:30 PM, Room C118

Attending: Debbie Lambert, Glen Burton, Bill Martin, Wendy Johnson, Allison Vicknair, Jim Roffes, Crystal Lee, Lauri Hatlelid

Results of SWOT Analysis

- Discussion of draft SWOT analysis summary; no corrections or additions were suggested. L. Hatlelid informed the group that the socio-demographic information documented in the 2004-2005 IE Plan is from 2000 Census Data, and that more current information was not available. D. Lambert volunteered to obtain more current information, at least from Ascension Parish, from Ascension Economic Development Corporation. L. Hatlelid will arrange brief informational meetings to gather additional information on the external climate of the service area.

Review of Mission Statement

- C. Lee submitted a revised Mission for the Team’s approval. The simplified Mission replaces specific degree programs with the more general “Associates degrees”; and removes the bullet statements that follow the Mission Statement. A revised Mission requires LCTCS Board approval.

Review of Core College Initiatives

- C. Lee provided a comparison of the College’s Mission bullet statements to the Core College Initiatives (CCI), pointing out significant parallels. It was suggested that the CCIs include all of the information contained within the Mission bullet statements. The revision will be available for Team review at the next meeting.

Planning Goals Matrix – BoR, LCTCS, RPCC

- A matrix comparing strategic goals from the Board of Regents Master Plan, LCTCS Strategic Plan 2010, and the current RPCC CCIs were discussed. The Team considered the revision of the CCIs to include any relevant strategic goals from the BoR and LCTCS plans. It was suggested that some of the CCIs be renamed to be more inclusive of these goals and to add professional development, diversity, and
fiscal/physical resources. The CCI’s will be rewritten and submitted for team review at the next meeting.

**Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)**

- C. Lee and Dr. Martin presented several possible QEP topics for consideration. The SACS Leadership team will consider these topics and narrow them down for further review by the QEP Committee. The topic chosen must address some aspect of student learning and must involve the entire campus. Possible QEP topics include:
  - Enhancing academic climate for student learning
  - Strengthening the general studies curriculum
  - Creative approaches to experiential learning
  - Enhancing critical thinking skills
  - Innovative teaching/learning strategies
  - Increasing student engagement in learning
  - Imaginative ways to use technology in the classroom
  - Improving learning for under-prepared students
  - Critical thinking across the curriculum
  - Enhancing learning for under-prepared students

**Actions**

1. Revise Mission and CCI’s for approval at the next Team meeting – LH, CI, BM

2. Review the list of possible QEP topics and the QEPS from the 2004 and 2005 Reaffirmation classes (handout) for discussion at the next Team meeting – All
RPCC Faculty Meeting

*Friday, April 27, 2007*

Student Services Information/Update

Business Office Information/Update

Library/Learning Resources Information/Update

*Academic Services:*
  - Rank and Promotion
  - Policy Information (General)
  - Faculty Performance Planning and Review

Review/Approval of New Courses for 2007/2008 RPCC Catalog

*SACS Reaffirmation:*
  - Kick-Off Meeting with Dr. Cheryl Cardell, SACS Liaison
  - General Education Goals & Assessment
  - Compliance Certification & QEP
  - Timeline

Announcements/Reminders

RPCC graduation – May 15, 2007 (6:30PM faculty arrival)

Honor graduate status (final grade reporting)

**Final grades and Grade books due May 14, 2007:**
  - * Grade books turn in to Academic Studies
  - * Enter final grades into OI and print/sign final grade record and turn in to Registrar
RPCC
Faculty Meeting

September 14, 2007

General Update

Campus Safety & Security Info.

Fire Drill Information

General Education Targeted Assessments

Rank & Promotion Policy & Discussion

QEP Discussion
RPCC
Faculty Meeting

April 11, 2008
2:00pm

Sponsored Programs (Grants Awarded / In-Progress)

Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

General Education Assessment (Spring 2008)

AST Selector Training

Faculty Positions (Screening Committees)

Course / Curriculum Revisions (2008-09 Catalog)

-------------------------------------------------------------

Student Success Rates
(Mathematics)
RPCC
Campus Assembly

November 9, 2007

SACS Update and Reminders
- November 30, 2007 posting date
- General Education

Rank & Promotion Policy Update

QEP Topic Selection
Our thanks to ATMOS for sponsoring our meal today.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
FOURTH QUARTER 2007

AGENDA

WELCOME

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT
Approval of September 2007 Meeting Minutes
Election of Members, Officers

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT
Facilities update
Foundation Scholarship Draft
Foundation Donations
New directors in newly created positions

TREASURER'S REPORT

COMMITTEE REPORTS

WHAT'S HAPPENING AT RPCC
QEP
SACS Conference
LCTCS Advocacy Campaign

OTHER BUSINESS
Annual Golf Scramble, elect chair
Seale Resolution

FEATURED SPEAKER
Leah Goss, MBA
"Capital Campaigns in Community Colleges"

ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting:
Noon, March 3, 2008
Mike Anderson's – Holiday Inn, Gonzales, La.
QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN FOR SACS REAFFIRMATION

River Parishes Community College is currently in the process of completing a self-assessment in order to determine if the institution is in compliance with the SACS Commission on Colleges' Principles of Accreditation. RPCC received full-accreditation in December 2004, but that initial certification is for five years. Consequently, RPCC must apply to renew that certification by December 2009.

One unique feature of this reaffirmation process is that RPCC must develop and submit a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to the Commission on Colleges by early August 2008. QEP guidelines require that the plan must:

- Be forward looking—a new project that will carry the college forward into the next decade;
- Be focused on improving student learning;
- Be within the institution’s capability;
- Be broadly supported by the college community; and
- Be reviewed and assessed thoroughly in order to determine the plan’s success.

After examining several different topics, RPCC has chosen “Information Literacy: Preparing Students for the Information Age” for its QEP topic.

Current literature indicates that information literacy includes the following:

- Determine the extent of information needed.
- Access the needed information effectively and efficiently.
- Evaluate information and its sources critically.
- Incorporate selected information into one’s knowledge base.
- Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
- Understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and assess and use information ethically and legally.

We believe that this topic meets all the COC guidelines noted above and its implementation will prove beneficial in many ways. We anticipate the following outcomes:

- Students will acquire or improve critical-thinking skills.
- Students will become more active and self-directed learners.
- Students will become more problem-based learners.
- Students will learn how to use and apply technologies.
- Students will acquire skills that prepare them for the workforce.
- Students will develop skills that support life-long learning.
- Collaborative efforts of faculty, librarians, professional staff, and administrators will be required to implement the project.

Suggested Foundation Board Resolution:

After reviewing the College’s proposed QEP topic, “Information Literacy: Preparing Students for the Information Age,” the RPCC Foundation Board endorses the project as one that provide students with important critical-thinking skills that can be applied in advanced study and the workplace.
Jennifer Kleinpeter serves as director of admissions for River Parishes Community College.

Originally from Baton Rouge, Kleinpeter received her bachelor’s degree in sociology from Louisiana State University, and her master’s degree in counselor education from Southeastern Louisiana University.

Kleinpeter’s experience includes work at Southeastern in the Career and Academic Planning Center and at ITI Technical College in the admissions department.

She has been at RPCC for 2-and-a-half years.
ANGELA HOPE CUTRER
Director of Public Information
River Parishes Community College

Angela Cutrer serves as director of public information for River Parishes Community College, as well as the liaison with the RPCC Foundation. Her duties include creating news releases and publications to further the objective of RPCC.

Born in Baton Rouge, Cutrer is the granddaughter of dairy farmers on one side, and educator-authors on the other. Raised in LaPlace, La., until the age of 12, Cutrer left for Magnolia, Miss., when the family returned to her parents’ hometowns in the Pike and Amite County area of Mississippi.

Cutrer earned an associate’s degree in English from Southwest Mississippi Community College in Summit, Miss.; a double bachelor’s degree in English and journalism from the University of Southern Mississippi; and a master’s degree in communication, with an emphasis in mass communication, from the University of Southern Mississippi.

Cutrer’s experience includes serving as a newspaper managing editor in Missouri, and a newspaper reporter, copy editor, page designer, and columnist in Louisiana. While earning her master’s degree, she served four years as the university proofreader, and then later, as assistant director for news and marketing, at Southern Miss in Hattiesburg, Miss., before moving to Gulfport, Miss., to be near family and teach English and speech for a career college in Biloxi, Miss.

Cutrer moved home to the family farm in Osyka, Miss., after losses in Katrina, where she continued her online work as an assistant professor teaching courses such as mass communication, editing, corporate communication, interpersonal communication, communication and conflict, and others, for Tulane University, Kaplan University, and the Arts Institute of Pittsburgh Online. She continues teaching part time today.

Cutrer’s proudest accomplishments are her daughters, Summer Hope, 24, and Savannah Quinn, 13; and her grandchildren, Jaseleigh Hope, 4, and Keaton Thomas, 2.
LEAH E. GOSS  
Executive Director of System Advancement

Leah Goss’ 11 years of experience as a fundraising executive serves her well as executive director of system advancement. She is responsible for developing the capacity of the community and technical colleges of the LCTCS to raise private resources by providing strategic support to chancellors, directors, foundation boards, and staff.

Goss earned an associate’s degree in liberal arts from Adirondack Community College in New York, a bachelor’s degree in communication, and a master’s degree in business administration from Regis University in Colorado. She is a board member for the Council for Resource Development (CRD), the fundraising council for the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC).

She served for nine years as executive director of a nonprofit social service agency in Vermont, where she raised the agency’s annual budget, recruited and trained volunteer staff, developed and managed client-support programs, planned large fundraising events, and developed and managed all communication strategies, including extensive public speaking.

Goss was appointed in 1998 as assistant to the president of the Colorado Community College System, with the primary role to support the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education.

In 2005, Front Range Community College (FRCC), the largest community college in the state of Colorado (24,000 students on three campuses), appointed Goss as director of development, managing an annual budget of $1 million. During her tenure, Foundation assets grew from $1.8 to $2.2 million; a scholarship campaign raised $100,000 in its first year; an annual funding for scholarships increased from $110,000 to $200,000; the solicitation of endowment gifts grew the Foundation’s permanent scholarship endowment from $110,000 to $285,000; the increase of the revenue from the annual golf tournament grew from $24,000 to $55,000; publications and the Web sites were enhanced and redesigned; and donor tracking and accounting software systems were implemented.
Appendix 10: Information Literacy Outcomes

Association of College and Research Libraries Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education

Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction: A Model Statement for Academic Librarians

Standard 1
The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed

Performance Indicators:
1.1 The information literate student defines and articulates the need for information.
   Outcomes
   1.1.1 Confers with instructors and participates in class discussions, peer workgroups, and electronic discussions to identify a research topic, or other information need
   1.1.2 Develops a thesis statement and formulates questions based on the information need
   1.1.3 Explores general information sources to increase familiarity with the topic

Objectives:
1.1.3.1 Describes the difference between general and subject-specific information sources.
1.1.3.2 Demonstrates when it is appropriate to use a general and subject-specific information source (e.g., to provide an overview, to give ideas on terminology).
1.1.4 Defines or modifies the information need to achieve a manageable focus
   1.1.4.1 Identifies an initial question that might be too broad or narrow, as well as one that is probably manageable.
   1.1.4.2 Explains his/her reasoning regarding the manageability of a topic with reference to available information sources.
   1.1.4.3 Narrows a broad topic and broadens a narrow one by modifying the scope or direction of the question.
   1.1.4.4 Demonstrates an understanding of how the desired end product (i.e., the required depth of investigation and analysis) will play a role in determining the need for information.
   1.1.4.5 Uses background information sources effectively to gain an initial understanding of the topic.
   1.1.4.6 Consults with the course instructor and librarians to develop a manageable focus for the topic.
1.1.5 Identifies key concepts and terms that describe the information need
  1.1.5.1 Lists terms that may be useful for locating information on a topic.
  1.1.5.2 Identifies and uses appropriate general or subject-specific sources to discover terminology related to an information need.
  1.1.5.3 Decides when a research topic has multiple facets or may need to be put into a broader context.
  1.1.5.4 Identifies more specific concepts that comprise a research topic.

1.1.6 Recognizes that existing information can be combined with original thought, experimentation, and/or analysis to produce new information

1.2 The information literate student identifies a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information.

  1.2.1 Knows how information is formally and informally produced, organized, and disseminated
    1.2.1.1 Describes the publication cycle appropriate to the discipline of a research topic.
    1.2.1.2 Defines the "invisible college" (e.g., personal contacts, listservs specific to a discipline or subject) and describes its value.

  1.2.2 Recognizes that knowledge can be organized into disciplines that influence the way information is accessed
    1.2.2.1 Names the three major disciplines of knowledge (humanities, social sciences, sciences) and some subject fields that comprise each discipline.
    1.2.2.2 Finds sources that provide relevant subject field- and discipline-related terminology.
    1.2.2.3 Uses relevant subject- and discipline-related terminology in the information research process.
    1.2.2.4 Describes how the publication cycle in a particular discipline or subject field affects the researcher's access to information.

  1.2.3 Identifies the value and differences of potential resources in a variety of formats (e.g., multimedia, database, website, data set, audio/visual, book)
    1.2.3.1 Identifies various formats in which information is available.
    1.2.3.2 Demonstrates how the format in which information appears may affect its usefulness for a particular information need.

  1.2.4 Identifies the purpose and audience of potential resources (e.g., popular vs. scholarly, current vs. historical)
    1.2.4.1 Distinguishes characteristics of information provided for different audiences.
    1.2.4.2 Identifies the intent or purpose of an information source (this may require use of additional sources in order to develop an appropriate context).
1.2.5 Differentiates between primary and secondary sources, recognizing how their use and importance vary with each discipline
   1.2.5.1 Describes how various fields of study define primary and secondary sources differently.
   1.2.5.2 Identifies characteristics of information that make an item a primary or secondary source in a given field.

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

1.3 The information literate student considers the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.
   1.3.1 Determines the availability of needed information and makes decisions on broadening the information seeking process beyond local resources (e.g., interlibrary loan; using resources at other locations; obtaining images, videos, text, or sound)
      1.3.1.1 Determines if material is available immediately.
      1.3.1.2 Uses available services appropriately to obtain desired materials or alternative sources.

   1.3.2 Considers the feasibility of acquiring a new language or skill (e.g., foreign or discipline-based) in order to gather needed information and to understand its context

   1.3.3 Defines a realistic overall plan and timeline to acquire the needed information
      1.3.3.1 Searches for and gathers information based on an informal, flexible plan.
      1.3.3.2 Demonstrates a general knowledge of how to obtain information that is not available immediately.
      1.3.3.3 Acts appropriately to obtain information within the time frame required.

1.4 The information literate student reevaluates the nature and extent of the information need.
   1.4.1 Reviews the initial information need to clarify, revise, or refine the question
      1.4.1.1 Identifies a research topic that may require revision, based on the amount of information found (or not found).
      1.4.1.2 Identifies a topic that may need to be modified, based on the content of information found.
      1.4.1.3 Decides when it is and is not necessary to abandon a topic depending on the success (or failure) of an initial search for information.

   1.4.2 Describes criteria used to make information decisions and choices
      1.4.2.1 Demonstrates how the intended audience influences information
1.4.2.2 Demonstrates how the desired end product influences information choices (e.g., that visual aids or audio/visual material may be needed for an oral presentation).

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

Standard 2
The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

Performance Indicators:
2.1 The information literate student selects the most appropriate investigative methods or information retrieval systems for accessing the needed information.
   2.1.1 Identifies appropriate investigative methods (e.g., laboratory experiment, simulation, fieldwork)
   2.1.2 Investigates benefits and applicability of various investigative methods
   2.1.3 Investigates the scope, content, and organization of information retrieval systems
      2.1.3.1 Describes the structure and components of the system or tool being used, regardless of format (e.g., index, thesaurus, type of information retrieved by the system).
      2.1.3.2 Identifies the source of help within a given information retrieval system and uses it effectively.
      2.1.3.3 Identifies what types of information are contained in a particular system (e.g., all branch libraries are included in the catalog; not all databases are full text; catalogs, periodical databases, and Web sites may be included in a gateway).
      2.1.3.4 Distinguishes among indexes, online databases, and collections of online databases, as well as gateways to different databases and collections.
      2.1.3.5 Selects appropriate tools (e.g., indexes, online databases) for research on a particular topic.
      2.1.3.6 Identifies the differences between freely available Internet search tools and subscription or fee-based databases.
      2.1.3.7 Identifies and uses search language and protocols (e.g., Boolean, adjacency) appropriate to the retrieval system.
      2.1.3.8 Determines the period of time covered by a particular source.
      2.1.3.9 Identifies the types of sources that are indexed in a particular database or index (e.g., an index that covers newspapers or popular periodicals versus a more specialized index to find scholarly literature).
      2.1.3.10 Demonstrates when it is appropriate to use a single tool (e.g., using only a periodical index when only periodical articles are required).
2.1.3.11 Distinguishes between full-text and bibliographic databases.

2.1.4 Selects efficient and effective approaches for accessing the information needed from the investigative method or information retrieval system
2.1.4.1 Selects appropriate information sources (i.e., primary, secondary or tertiary sources) and determines their relevance for the current information need.
2.1.4.2 Determines appropriate means for recording or saving the desired information (e.g., printing, saving to disc, photocopying, taking notes).
2.1.4.3 Analyzes and interprets the information collected using a growing awareness of key terms and concepts to decide whether to search for additional information or to identify more accurately when the information need has been met.

2.2 The information literate student constructs and implements effectively-designed search strategies.
2.2.1 Develops a research plan appropriate to the investigative method
2.2.1.1 Describes a general process for searching for information.
2.2.1.2 Describes when different types of information (e.g., primary/secondary, background/specific) may be suitable for different purposes.
2.2.1.3 Gathers and evaluates information and appropriately modifies the research plan as new insights are gained.

2.2.2 Identifies keywords, synonyms and related terms for the information needed
2.2.2.1 Identifies keywords or phrases that represent a topic in general sources (e.g., library catalog, periodical index, online source) and in subject-specific sources.

2.2.2.2 Demonstrates an understanding that different terminology may be used in general sources and subject-specific sources.
2.2.2.3 Identifies alternate terminology, including synonyms, broader or narrower words and phrases that describe a topic.
2.2.2.4 Identifies keywords that describe an information source (e.g., book, journal article, magazine article, Web site).

2.2.3 Selects controlled vocabulary specific to the discipline or information retrieval source
2.2.3.1 Uses background sources (e.g., encyclopedias, handbooks, dictionaries, thesauri, textbooks) to identify discipline-specific terminology that describes a given topic.
2.2.3.2 Explains what controlled vocabulary is and why it is used.
2.2.3.3 Identifies search terms likely to be useful for a research topic
in relevant controlled vocabulary lists.

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

2.2.4 Constructs a search strategy using appropriate commands for the information retrieval system selected (e.g., Boolean operators, truncation, and proximity for search engines; internal organizers such as indexes for books)

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

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

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

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

2.2.4.5 Demonstrates an understanding of the concept of browsing and uses an index that allows it.

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

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

2.2.5 Implements the search strategy in various information retrieval systems using different user interfaces and search engines, with different command languages, protocols, and search parameters

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

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

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

2.2.5.4 Identifies and selects keywords and phrases to use when searching each source, recognizing that different sources may use different terminology for similar concepts.

2.2.5.5 Formulates and executes search strategies to match information needs with available resources.

2.2.5.6 Describes differences in searching for bibliographic records, abstracts, or full text in information sources.

2.2.6 Implements the search using investigative protocols appropriate to the discipline

2.2.6.1 Locates major print bibliographic and reference sources
appropriate to the discipline of a research topic.

2.2.6.2 Locates and uses a specialized dictionary, encyclopedia, bibliography, or other common reference tool in print format for a given topic.

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

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

2.3 The information literate student retrieves information online or in person using a variety of methods.

2.3.1 Uses various search systems to retrieve information in a variety of formats

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

2.3.1.2 Identifies research sources, regardless of format, that are appropriate to a particular discipline or research need.

2.3.1.3 Recognizes the format of an information source (e.g., book, chapter in a book, periodical article) from its citation. (See also 2.3.b.)

2.3.1.4 Uses different research sources (e.g., catalogs and indexes) to find different types of information (e.g., books and periodical articles).

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

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

2.3.2 Uses various classification schemes and other systems (e.g., call number systems or indexes) to locate information resources within the library or to identify specific sites for physical exploration

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

2.3.2.2 Explains the difference between the library catalog and a periodical index.

2.3.2.3 Describes the different scopes of coverage found in different periodical indexes.

2.3.2.4 Distinguishes among citations to identify various types of materials (e.g., books, periodical articles, essays in anthologies). (See also 2.3.a.)
2.3.3 Uses specialized online or in person services available at the institution to retrieve information needed (e.g., interlibrary loan/document delivery, professional associations, institutional research offices, community resources, experts and practitioners)
   2.3.3.1 Retrieves a document in print or electronic form.
   2.3.3.2 Describes various retrieval methods for information not available locally.
   2.3.3.3 Identifies the appropriate service point or resource for the particular information need.
   2.3.3.4 Initiates an interlibrary loan request by filling out and submitting a form either online or in person.
   2.3.3.5 Uses the Web site of an institution, library, organization or community to locate information about specific services.

2.3.4 Uses surveys, letters, interviews, and other forms of inquiry to retrieve primary information

2.4 The information literate student refines the search strategy if necessary.
   2.4.1 Assesses the quantity, quality, and relevance of the search results to determine whether alternative information retrieval systems or investigative methods should be utilized
      2.4.1.1 Determines if the quantity of citations retrieved is adequate, too extensive, or insufficient for the information need.
      2.4.1.2 Evaluates the quality of the information retrieved using criteria such as authorship, point of view/bias, date written, citations, etc.
      2.4.1.3 Assesses the relevance of information found by examining elements of the citation such as title, abstract, subject headings, source, and date of publication.
      2.4.1.4 Determines the relevance of an item to the information need in terms of its depth of coverage, language, and time frame.

   2.4.2 Identifies gaps in the information retrieved and determines if the search strategy should be revised
   2.4.3 Repeats the search using the revised strategy as necessary

2.5 The information literate student extracts, records, and manages the information and its sources.
   2.5.1 Selects among various technologies the most appropriate one for the task of extracting the needed information (e.g., copy/paste software functions, photocopier, scanner, audio/visual equipment, or exploratory instruments)
   2.5.2 Creates a system for organizing the information
2.5.3 Differentiates between the types of sources cited and understands the elements and correct syntax of
2.5.3.1 Identifies different types of information sources cited in a research tool.
2.5.3.2 Determines whether or not a cited item is available locally and, if so, can locate it.
2.5.3.3 Demonstrates an understanding that different disciplines may use different citation styles.
2.5.3.4 Records all pertinent citation information for future reference

2.5.5 Uses various technologies to manage the information selected and organized

**Standard 3**
The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.

3.1 The information literate student summarizes the main ideas to be extracted from the information gathered.
3.1.1 Reads the text and selects main ideas
3.1.2 Restates textual concepts in his/her own words and selects data accurately
3.1.3 Identifies verbatim material that can be then appropriately quoted

3.2 The information literate student articulates and applies initial criteria for evaluating both the information and its sources.
3.2.1 Examines and compares information from various sources in order to evaluate reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, and point of view or bias
3.2.1.1 Locates and examines critical reviews of information sources using available resources and technologies.
3.2.1.2 Investigates an author's qualifications and reputation through reviews or biographical sources.
3.2.1.3 Investigates validity and accuracy by consulting sources identified through bibliographic references.
3.2.1.4 Investigates qualifications and reputation of the publisher or issuing agency by consulting other information resources. (See also 3.4.e.)
3.2.1.5 Determines when the information was published (or knows where to look for a source's publication date).
3.2.1.6 Recognizes the importance of timeliness or date of publication to the value of the source.
3.2.1.7 Determines if the information retrieved is sufficiently current for the information need.
3.2.1.8 Demonstrates an understanding that other sources may provide additional information to either confirm or question point of view or bias.
3.2.2 Analyzes the structure and logic of supporting arguments or methods
3.2.3 Recognizes prejudice, deception, or manipulation
3.2.3.1 Demonstrates an understanding that information in any format reflects an author's, sponsor's, and/or publisher's point of view.
3.2.3.2 Demonstrates an understanding that some information and information sources may present a one-sided view and may express opinions rather than facts.
3.2.3.3 Demonstrates an understanding that some information and sources may be designed to trigger emotions, conjure stereotypes, or promote support for a particular viewpoint or group.
3.2.3.4 Applies evaluative criteria to information and its source (e.g., author's expertise, currency, accuracy, point of view, type of publication or information, sponsorship).
3.2.3.5 Searches for independent verification or corroboration of the accuracy and completeness of the data or representation of facts presented in an information source.

3.2.4 Recognizes the cultural, physical, or other context within which the information was created and understands the impact of context on interpreting the information
3.2.4.1 Describes how the age of a source or the qualities characteristic of the time in which it was created may impact its value.
3.2.4.2 Describes how the purpose for which information was created affects its usefulness.
3.2.4.3 Describes how cultural, geographic, or temporal contexts may unintentionally bias information

3.3 The information literate student synthesizes main ideas to construct new concepts.
3.3.1 Recognizes interrelationships among concepts and combines them into potentially useful primary statements with supporting evidence
3.3.2 Extends initial synthesis, when possible, at a higher level of abstraction to construct new hypotheses that may require additional information
3.3.3 Utilizes computer and other technologies (e.g. spreadsheets, databases, multimedia, and audio or visual equipment) for studying the interaction of ideas and other phenomena

3.4 The information literate student compares new knowledge with prior knowledge to determine the value added, contradictions, or other unique characteristics of the information.
3.4.1 Determines whether information satisfies the research or other information need
3.4.2 Uses consciously selected criteria to determine whether the information contradicts or verifies information used from other sources
3.4.3 Draws conclusions based upon information gathered
3.4.4 Tests theories with discipline-appropriate techniques (e.g., simulators, experiments)
3.4.5 Determines probable accuracy by questioning the source of the data, the limitations of the information gathering tools or strategies, and the reasonableness of the conclusions
   3.4.5.1 Describes how the reputation of the publisher affects the quality of the information source. (See also 3.2.a.).
   3.4.5.2 Determines when a single search strategy may not fit a topic precisely enough to retrieve sufficient relevant information.
   3.4.5.3 Determines when some topics may be too recent to be covered by some standard tools (e.g., a periodicals index) and when information on the topic retrieved by less authoritative tools (e.g., a Web search engine) may not be reliable.
   3.4.5.4 Compares new information with own knowledge and other sources considered authoritative to determine if conclusions are reasonable.
3.4.6 Integrates new information with previous information or knowledge
3.4.7 Selects information that provides evidence for the topic
   3.4.7.1 Describes why not all information sources are appropriate for all purposes (e.g., ERIC is not appropriate for all topics, such as business topics; the Web may not be appropriate for a local history topic).
   3.4.7.2 Distinguishes among various information sources in terms of established evaluation criteria (e.g., content, authority, currency).
   3.4.7.3 Applies established evaluation criteria to decide which information sources are most appropriate.

3.5 The information literate student determines whether the new knowledge has an impact on the individual’s value system and takes steps to reconcile differences.
   3.5.1 Investigates differing viewpoints encountered in the literature
   3.5.2 Determines whether to incorporate or reject viewpoints encountered

3.6 The information literate student validates understanding and interpretation of the information through discourse with other individuals, subject-area experts, and/or practitioners.
   3.6.1 Participates in classroom and other discussions
   3.6.2 Participates in class-sponsored electronic communication forums designed to encourage discourse on the topic (e.g., email, bulletin boards, chat rooms)
   3.6.3 Seeks expert opinion through a variety of mechanisms (e.g., interviews, email, listservs)

3.7 The information literate student determines whether the initial query should be revised.
3.7.1 Determines if original information need has been satisfied or if additional information is needed
3.7.2 Reviews search strategy and incorporates additional concepts as necessary
   3.7.2.1 Demonstrates how searches may be limited or expanded by modifying search terminology or logic.
3.7.3 Reviews information retrieval sources used and expands to include others as needed
   3.7.3.1 Examines footnotes and bibliographies from retrieved items to locate additional sources.
   3.7.3.2 Follows, retrieves and evaluates relevant online links to additional sources.
   3.7.3.3 Incorporates new knowledge as elements of revised search strategy to gather additional information.

Standard 4
The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

4.1 The information literate student applies new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular product or performance.
   4.1.1 Organizes the content in a manner that supports the purposes and format of the product or performance (e.g. outlines, drafts, storyboards)
   4.1.2 Articulates knowledge and skills transferred from prior experiences to planning and creating the product or performance
   4.1.3 Integrates the new and prior information, including quotations and paraphrasings, in a manner that supports the purposes of the product or performance
   4.1.4 Manipulates digital text, images, and data, as needed, transferring them from their original locations and formats to a new context

4.2 The information literate student revises the development process for the product or performance.
   4.2.1 Maintains a journal or log of activities related to the information seeking, evaluating, and communicating process
   4.2.2 Reflects on past successes, failures, and alternative strategies

4.3 The information literate student communicates the product or performance effectively to others.
   4.3.1 Chooses a communication medium and format that best supports the purposes of the product or performance and the intended audience
   4.3.2 Uses a range of information technology applications in creating the product or performance
   4.3.3 Incorporates principles of design and communication
   4.3.4 Communicates clearly and with a style that supports the purposes of the intended audience
Standard 5
The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

5.1 The information literate student understands many of the ethical, legal and socio-economic issues surrounding information and information technology.

5.1.1 Identifies and discusses issues related to privacy and security in both the print and electronic environments

5.1.2 Identifies and discusses issues related to free vs. fee-based access to information

5.1.2.1 Demonstrates an understanding that not all information on the Web is free, i.e., some Web-based databases require users to pay a fee or to subscribe in order to retrieve full text or other content.

5.1.2.2 Demonstrates awareness that the library pays for access to databases, information tools, full-text resources, etc., and may use the Web to deliver them to its clientele.

5.1.2.3 Describes how the terms of subscriptions or licenses may limit their use to a particular clientele or location.

5.1.2.4 Describes the differences between the results of a search using a general Web search engine (e.g., Yahoo, Google) and a library-provided tool (e.g., Web-based article index, full-text electronic journal, Web-based library catalog).

5.1.3 Identifies and discusses issues related to censorship and freedom of speech

5.1.4 Demonstrates an understanding of intellectual property, copyright, and fair use of copyrighted material

5.2 The information literate student follows laws, regulations, institutional policies, and etiquette related to the access and use of information resources.

5.2.1 Participates in electronic discussions following accepted practices (e.g. "Netiquette")

5.2.2 Uses approved passwords and other forms of ID for access to information resources

5.2.3 Complies with institutional policies on access to information resources

5.2.4 Preserves the integrity of information resources, equipment, systems and facilities

5.2.5 Legally obtains, stores, and disseminates text, data, images, or sounds

5.2.6 Demonstrates an understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and does not represent work attributable to others as his/her own

5.2.7 Demonstrates an understanding of institutional policies related to human subjects research

5.3 The information literate student acknowledges the use of information sources in communicating the product or performance.

5.3.1 Selects an appropriate documentation style and uses it consistently to cite
sources

5.3.1.1 Describes how to use a documentation style to record bibliographic information from an item retrieved through research

5.3.1.2 Identifies citation elements for information sources in different formats (e.g., book, article, television program, Web page, interview)

5.3.1.3 Demonstrates an understanding that there are different documentation styles, published or accepted by various groups

5.3.1.4 Demonstrates an understanding that the appropriate documentation style may vary by discipline (e.g., MLA for English, University of Chicago for history, APA for psychology, CBE for biology)

5.3.1.5 Describes when the format of the source cited may dictate a certain citation style

5.3.1.6 Uses correctly and consistently the citation style appropriate to a specific discipline

5.3.1.7 Locates information about documentation styles either in print or electronically, e.g., through the library’s Web site.

5.3.1.8 Recognizes that consistency of citation format is important, especially if a course instructor has not required a particular style

5.3.2 Posts permission granted notices, as needed, for copyrighted material other information need


Appendix 11: 
General Education Goal & Rubric #12

RPCC Gen Ed Goal 12: Utilize Library/Information Resources

Outcomes Statement:
Upon receipt of an associate degree from RPCC, a student should be able to demonstrate that he or she has developed information literacy skills in order to effectively select, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of formats.

Rubrics:
Student work samples will be evaluated to determine whether the student has demonstrated the ability to perform each rubric item.

The following rubrics will measure the outcome for: Utilize Library/Information Resources (effectively selecting, evaluating, and synthesizing information from a variety of formats)

______1. demonstrates the ability to apply information using a variety of formats to plan and create a particular product or assignment.
______2. demonstrates the ability to revise the development process for the product or assignment. (examples: outlines, draft & final paper, peer-review, student’s own editing or reflection notes)
______3. demonstrates the ability to produce and effectively communicate the product or assignment.
______4. demonstrates the ability to effectively use search tools. (examples: library catalog, electronic databases, internet search engines)
______5. demonstrates the ability to correctly cite sources used for a specific assignment.

_____ Goal Completion Score derived from above rubrics

If the student’s work sample presents evidence that the student demonstrated the ability to perform a rubric, a plus (+) score is given.

If the student’s work sample presents evidence that the student did not demonstrate ability to perform a rubric, a minus (-) score is given.

If the student’s work sample did not present an opportunity for the student to perform a rubric, a zero (0) score is given. This merely indicates the student’s work sample was inappropriate for measuring this particular outcome.

The student work samples scored for Utilize Library/Information Resources must allow the student to perform at least 2 of 5 rubrics, with only plus and minus scores counted. For purposes of standards, the total number of pluses (from 0 to 4) is counted.

Gen Ed Standard:
At least 80% of the Utilize Library/Information Resources student work samples should receive a score of 2 or better.
Suggested assignment guidelines:
An appropriate assignment (e.g., research paper, argumentative paper, position paper, etc) would provide an opportunity for students to demonstrate that they can Utilize Library/Information Resources skills by having students:

1) use scholarly and popular resources in both print and electronic formats (articles, books, websites, etc.)
2) use more than one source of information (print, electronic database, internet, etc)
3) provide proper documentation (citation, bibliography, quotations, footnotes, works cited page, etc) for each resource utilized
4) present a completed assignment via an appropriate medium and format (PowerPoint, word processed, verbal, and/or other media)
Appendix 12:
QEP Assessment Grid
# QEP Goal: Improve Students' Information Literacy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #1</th>
<th>Associated ACRL Performance Indicators &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Actions – Responsibilities – Target Dates</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Fall 2008 Freshmen</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Spring 2009 30+ Hour Students</th>
<th>Outcome Measures Fall 2010 through Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information literate student <strong>determines</strong> the nature and extent of the information needed</td>
<td>1.1.1 1.3.1.1&lt;br&gt;1.1.3.2 1.3.1.2&lt;br&gt;1.1.4.3 1.3.3.2&lt;br&gt;1.1.4.4 1.3.3.3&lt;br&gt;1.1.4.5 1.4.1.1&lt;br&gt;1.1.4.6 1.4.1.2&lt;br&gt;1.1.5.1 1.4.2.3&lt;br&gt;1.1.5.2&lt;br&gt;1.1.5.3&lt;br&gt;1.2.1.2&lt;br&gt;1.2.2.1&lt;br&gt;1.2.2.2&lt;br&gt;1.2.2.3&lt;br&gt;1.2.2.4&lt;br&gt;1.2.5.1&lt;br&gt;1.2.5.2&lt;br&gt;1.2.6</td>
<td>Assignments requiring students to complete a research assignment – Multidiscipline faculty – Spring 2009 &amp; ongoing&lt;br&gt;Librarians and faculty collaborate to provide bibliographic instruction sessions teaching students how to manage a topic and information for research – Director of Library Services and classroom faculty – Fall 2008 &amp; ongoing</td>
<td><strong>External assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;SAILS Report (Dec. 2008)&lt;br&gt;RPC Average Score: <strong>529</strong>&lt;br&gt;Other Associates Institutions Average: <strong>550</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Internal assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and library survey results</td>
<td>To be collected prior to the end of the Spring 2009 Semester.&lt;br&gt;<strong>External assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;SAILS Report (Spring 2009)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Internal assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and library survey results &amp; Assessment of student work using RPCC General Education (Goal / Rubric #12)</td>
<td><strong>External assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Targeted yearly percentage increases on SAILS assessment to be determined (TBD) for fall freshmen and spring 30+ hour students based on benchmark data collected during first two annual cycles (2008/2009) &amp; (2009/2010) CCSSE (2009, 2011, 2013)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Internal assessment:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and survey results &amp; Assessment of student work using RPCC General Education (Goal / Rubric #12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Knowledge is Power

### QEP Goal: Improve Students’ Information Literacy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #2</th>
<th>Associated ACRL Performance Indicators &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Actions – Responsibilities – Target Dates</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Fall 2008 Freshmen</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Spring 2009 30+ Hour Students</th>
<th>Outcome Measures Fall 2010 through Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently | 2.1.3.1  2.2.5.1  2.4.1.1  2.1.3.2  2.2.5.2  2.4.1.2  2.1.3.3  2.2.5.3  2.4.1.3  2.1.3.4  2.2.6.3  2.4.1.4  2.1.3.5  2.2.6.4  2.5.1  2.1.3.6  2.3.1.1  2.5.3.1  2.1.3.8  2.3.1.2  2.5.3.3  2.1.3.9  2.3.1.3  2.5.5  2.1.4.1  2.3.1.4  2.1.4.2  2.3.1.5  2.2.1.1  2.3.1.6  2.2.2.3  2.3.2.1  2.2.2.4  2.3.2.2  2.2.3.2  2.3.2.3  2.2.3.4  2.3.2.4  2.2.4.1  2.3.3.1  2.2.4.3  2.3.3.2  2.2.4.4  2.3.3.3  2.2.4.6  2.3.3.4  2.2.4.7  2.3.3.5 | Dissemination of user guides, web tools, and tutorials describing tools to aid students in choosing and accessing appropriate research tools – Librarians – Fall 2008 and ongoing | **External assessment:** SAILS Report (Dec. 2008)  
**RPCC Average Score:** 515  
**Other Associates Institutions Average:** 538 | To be collected prior to the end of the Spring 2009 Semester. 
**External assessment:** SAILS Report (Spring 2009) 
**Internal assessment:** Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and library survey results & RPCC Library Catalog and Databases search statistics & Assessment of student work using RPCC General Education (Goal / Rubric #12) | **External assessment:** Targeted yearly percentage increases on SAILS assessment to be determined (TBD) for fall freshmen and spring 30+ hour students based on benchmark data collected during first two annual cycles (2008/2009) & (2009/2010) 
**Internal assessment:** Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and survey results & RPCC Library Catalog and Databases search statistics & Assessment of student work using RPCC General Education (Goal / Rubric #12) |
QEP Goal: Improve Students’ Information Literacy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #3</th>
<th>Associated ACRL Performance Indicators &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Actions – Responsibilities – Target Dates</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Fall 2008 Freshmen</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Spring 2009 30+ Hour Students</th>
<th>Outcome Measures Fall 2010 through Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system</td>
<td>3.2.1.1 3.2.1.2 3.2.1.3 3.2.1.8 3.2.3.2 3.2.3.3 3.2.3.5 3.2.4.1 3.4.5.2 3.4.5.3 3.4.7.2 3.6.3 3.7.2.1 3.7.3.1</td>
<td>Assignments requiring students to complete a research assignment in which students evaluate sources - English 1020 classes - Spring 2009 and ongoing</td>
<td>External assessment: SAILS Report (Dec. 2008) RPCC Average Score 519 Other Associates Institutions Average 549</td>
<td>To be collected prior to the end of the Spring 2009 semester. External assessment: SAILS Report (Spring 2009) Internal assessment: Assessment of students work using RPCC General Education (Goal / Rubric #12)</td>
<td>External assessment: Semester yearly percentage increases on SAILS assessment TBD for fall freshmen and spring 30+ hour students based on benchmark data collected during first two annual cycles (2008/2009) &amp; (2009/2010) CCSSE (2009, 2011, 2013) Internal assessment: Assessment of students work using RPCC General Education (Goal/Rubric#12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QEP Goal: Improve Students’ Information Literacy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #4</th>
<th>Associated ACRL Performance Indicators &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Actions – Responsibilities – Target Dates</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Fall 2008 Freshmen</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Spring 2009 30+ Hour Students</th>
<th>Outcome Measures Fall 2010 through Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.</td>
<td>4.1 4.1.3 4.2 4.3</td>
<td>Assignments requiring students to use information sources to accomplish a specific assignment – Multi-discipline faculty – Spring 2009 and ongoing  Librarians and faculty collaborate to provide bibliographic instruction sessions teaching students how to use information for a specific purpose – Director of Library Services and classroom faculty – Fall 2008 and ongoing</td>
<td>Internal assessment: Benchmark data for freshmen on this skills set will be collected during fall 2009 semester: Assessment of students work using RPCC General Education (Goal / Rubric #12) Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and survey results &amp; RPCC Library Catalog and Databases use statistics</td>
<td>Internal assessment: Benchmark data for 30+ Hour Students on this skill set will be collected during Spring 2009 and Spring 2010 semesters: Assessment of students work using RPCC General Education (Goal / Rubric #12) Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and survey results &amp; RPCC Library Catalog and Databases use statistics</td>
<td>Internal assessment: Targeted yearly percentage increases to be determined (TBD) for fall freshmen and spring 30+ hour students based on benchmark data collected during annual cycle (2009 - 2010) Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and survey results &amp; RPCC Library Catalog and Databases use statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QEP Goal: Improve Students’ Information Literacy Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #5</th>
<th>Associated ACRL Performance Indicators &amp; Objectives</th>
<th>Actions – Responsibilities – Target Dates</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Fall 2008 Freshmen</th>
<th>Benchmark Data Outcome Measures Spring 2009 30+ Hour Students</th>
<th>Outcome Measures Fall 2010 through Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.</td>
<td>5.1.1 5.1.2.1 5.1.2.2 5.1.2.3 5.1.3 5.1.4 5.2.1 5.2.5 5.2.6 5.2.7 5.3.1.2 5.3.1.3 5.3.1.5 5.3.1.7 5.3.1.8</td>
<td>Class discussions that deal with the economic, legal, and social issues pertaining to use of information - English 1020 classes - Spring 2009 and ongoing Librarians and faculty collaborate to provide bibliographic instruction sessions for students on the economic, legal, and social issues pertaining to use of information – Director of Library Services and classroom faculty – Fall 2008 and ongoing</td>
<td><em>External assessment:</em> SAILS Report (Dec. 2008) RPCC Average Score <strong>503</strong> Other Associates Institutions Average <strong>529:</strong></td>
<td>To be collected prior to the end of the Spring 2009 semester. <em>External assessment:</em> SAILS Report (Spring 2009) <em>Internal assessment:</em> Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and survey results</td>
<td><em>External assessment:</em> Yearly target percentage increases on SAILS assessment TBD for fall freshmen and spring 30+ hour students based on benchmark data collected during first two annual cycles (2008/2009) &amp; (2009/2010) <em>Internal assessment:</em> Number of bibliographic instruction sessions and survey results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>