Mission Statement:

The mission of the GHC Information Competency Program is to create a curriculum-wide culture of information competency among students, which will be demonstrated through writing or other modes of communication.

Definition:

Information literacy is a set of abilities requiring individuals to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information.*

Outcomes:

- The student will determine the nature and extent of information needed.*
- The student will access the needed information effectively and efficiently.*
- The student will evaluate information and its sources critically.*
- The student will demonstrate his/her information competency through writing or other modes of communication.

*Definition and Outcomes adopted from the ACRL (Association of College & Research Libraries) standards of information literacy.
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Executive Summary

Need information? The first impulse of many students is to simply search the internet, grab some information, and go. Often they access inappropriate information, use the information without sufficient analysis or evaluation, and then reference it poorly when communicating it.

The mission of the Georgia Highlands College (GHC) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is to create a curriculum-wide culture of information competency (IC) among students, which will be demonstrated through writing or other modes of communication (such as oral communication). IC is defined by the college as the ability to recognize what type of information is needed, locate that information, evaluate it, and use it effectively. Guided by the Association of Research and College Libraries standards on information literacy, GHC has defined four student learning outcomes (SLOs) based on students’ ability to:

- determine the nature and extent of information needed
- access the needed information effectively and efficiently
- evaluate information and its sources critically
- demonstrate IC through writing or other modes of communication

The QEP was designed to provide critical student skills, assist faculty in teaching those skills, and verify student achievement of IC skills. The QEP will integrate IC skill development across the entire curriculum for the associate of art and associate of science degree programs and career programs, including learning support courses, core curriculum courses, and major program of study courses. The QEP focuses on an individualized approach that augments current
IC efforts by each academic division and does not impose a standardized IC format on all divisions. Continual assessment of the four SLOs will generate feedback as the basis for annual revision of the QEP in order to assure student success.

Beginning with communication and computer skills courses in 2007-08, IC skills will be integrated into each of the five required core curriculum areas at GHC (Areas A-E) sequentially. Courses related to program of study (Area F) and learning support courses will be included beginning in 2008-09.

Assessment of the SLOs includes curriculum-wide assessment and individual project assessment. GHC has developed a brief IC instrument that is given to all entering students at Fall orientation sessions and later administered as a post-test to continuing students as the campus-wide assessment of general IC skills. Specific evaluation tools for the IC projects in Year One have been developed; the projects for the other core curriculum areas will be developed as implementation progresses. Annual assessment reports will provide feedback for changes needed to assure achievement of the SLOs.

IC was chosen as the focus of the QEP after an extensive and broad based involvement of faculty, staff and students. Town hall meetings, focus groups, faculty meetings, divisional meetings, and student forums all discussed possible topics for the college's QEP. Students have continued to be actively involved as the college prepares its QEP, evidenced by a student contest that led to the design of the logo for IC as well as student membership on the QEP Authoring Committee. Although the phrase "information literacy" is more commonly used to
refer to the skills that GHC is emphasizing with the QEP, the college felt that “information competency” best described the outcome that we are working toward in this project.

The college administration has committed new resources and redirected existing resources to assure success of the QEP. GHC faculty members are optimistic about the impact of this QEP on student lives. GHC provides an essential foundation for students in their future academic, professional, and personal life choices, and strong IC skills are needed for success in these choices. The goal of this QEP is to assure that all GHC students have these skills, enabling them to be more successful communicators.
Rationale and Background

GHC began the process of choosing a topic for the QEP during the 2005-2006 academic year. The summer just prior, a delegation from GHC attended the Association of American Colleges and Universities Greater Expectations Institute in Burlington, Vermont. The Institute gave the group from GHC a chance to explore ways of improving learning at the college, and they returned ready to examine concrete methods to accomplish that goal. Out of this work an Increasing Expectations Committee was formed and began to discuss concerns at the college. This committee addressed two major issues: 1) how faculty, administration and staff could assist students, and 2) the most important challenges to learning that the students face. Over that Fall semester, a college-wide planning survey was developed. The timing was right for such a survey on many levels, as a new strategic planning cycle was due to begin in the following academic year.

The survey, which was administered in March, 2006, consisted of three sections: Increasing Expectations, the QEP, and Strategic Planning. Realizing that GHC’s Increasing Expectations project would dovetail perfectly with the upcoming QEP, those sections of the survey were designed to gather information from faculty, staff and administration as to their views on the needs of students. The survey results revealed a myriad of student needs, both personal and academic. It was this basic information that provided the impetus for early discussions of a QEP topic. The first group to review the survey results was the Increasing Expectations Committee, followed soon after by the GHC SACS
Leadership Team, which had been formed in January 2006. These groups began the work of analyzing the survey data and identifying potential QEP topics in May. Over the summer, the SACS Leadership Team (consisting of the college President, the three Vice-Presidents, the Reaffirmation Director, the director of Institutional Effectiveness, the director of Information Technology, the faculty assessment coordinator, a faculty technology liaison, and a support staff liaison) worked to identify ten potential QEP topics, which would then be vetted by the college administration at the Administrative Council retreat in July.

The original list of ten topics consisted of:

1. learning communities
2. concepts across the curriculum
3. field experiences/service learning
4. improvement of existing tutorial centers
5. writing skills
6. increased mentoring of part-time faculty
7. critical thinking
8. information literacy
9. citizenship (increasing knowledge, responsibility, etc.)
10. managing barriers to student learning

These topics were presented to all faculty, staff and administration at the In-Service Meeting for Fall semester 2006, at which time the attendees were asked to rank the topics specifically as potential QEP topics based on the following criteria: appropriateness for GHC, resources, budget, assessment, and
practicality. The SACS Leadership Team examined the responses in the aggregate and then disaggregated by faculty, staff, or administrative status in late August. Out of that discussion the four top choices from the college-wide rankings were affirmed by the Team: learning communities, writing, critical thinking, and information literacy. There was a striking similarity in the results across status, and the Team was confident that these were the most important issues related to student learning to the GHC community as a whole.

Once these four topics were identified, the SACS Leadership Team organized a series of seven focus groups in September 2006 to present further information on each topic and gain additional input from college constituents. These groups were led by members of either the SACS Leadership Team or the Increasing Expectations Committee, and sessions were held at four different GHC sites. The general sessions were open to faculty, staff and administration. Special sessions, however, were held specifically for students, to begin their participation in the planning process. The focus groups provided information to participants about each topic, as well as allowed time for discussion and questions. Members of the college community provided research material for these sessions that addressed issues related to experiences of other colleges with each topic, GHC’s experience with each topic, resources and budget necessary for each topic, the compatibility of each topic and GHC, and the assessment challenges presented by each topic.

At the end of all of the sessions, the SACS Leadership Team determined, based upon input given at the focus groups, to eliminate critical thinking as a
potential topic. The remaining three (information literacy, learning communities, and writing) then became the centerpieces of two identical Town Hall meetings held at GHC’s two largest campuses – Floyd and Cartersville – in October 2006. These Town Hall meetings led to extensive discussion among faculty, staff, and administration as to which of the three potential topics would be the best fit for GHC. At the conclusion of each meeting, all participants ranked the three topics. The result of the ranking from both sites was the same, with information literacy and writing gaining approximately the same amount of support and learning communities trailing far behind.

Bearing that in mind, the SACS Leadership Team discussed a synthesis of the two topics. Such a synthesis was logical on two fronts: 1) it would guarantee that the top choice of the vast majority of the college community would be addressed, and 2) since information literacy and writing are highly complementary, it was difficult to foresee an information literacy project that would not necessarily include some writing component. At that point (in November 2006), potential QEP Authoring Committee members were identified. The Authoring Committee was charged with crafting the QEP document due in August 2007 and developing an implementation plan. The SACS Leadership Team also specified the need for an Implementation Committee, whose work would begin in Summer 2007 to oversee the initial implementation of the QEP in Fall 2007.

At the initial meeting of the Authoring Committee in December 2006, the group decided to make information literacy the main focus of the QEP, with
writing being one of the components through which students would demonstrate information literacy. Committee members represented all of the academic divisions at the college, as well as the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and the Accreditation Reaffirmation Director. Work then began on a review of information literacy literature, and the creation of a mission statement and student learning outcomes.

**Literature Review**

The number of sources related to information literacy (or competency) has blossomed over the past decade, with new material coming out each year. This area of academia has attracted more and more attention as information via the internet has become ubiquitous in our lives. The glut of information throughout society has revealed the need for new skills. The need to effectively and efficiently sort through and analyze data is great; these skills, however, have proved elusive to many college students, thus creating the need for specific instruction in information literacy.

Librarians have long recognized the need for such instruction and have been conducting “bibliographic instruction” since the early 1970s. What we now call information literacy is an outgrowth of those efforts. The Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association, developed the first guidelines for bibliographic instruction in academic libraries in 1977. The phrase “information literacy” came into vogue in the late 1980s, although colleges across the United States (and the world) continue to offer Bibliographic Instruction Workshops to the present, as does GHC.
In 1998, the Boyer Commission Report, *Reinventing Undergraduate Education*, recommended strategies that require the student to engage actively in "framing of a significant question or set of questions, the research or creative exploration to find answers, and the communications skills to convey the results." Courses structured in such a way create student-centered learning environments where inquiry is the norm, problem solving becomes the focus, and thinking critically is part of the process. Such learning environments require information literacy competencies.

The Association of College and Research Libraries responded in 2000 with the publication of a set of Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. These guidelines have been extremely useful to the GHC QEP as they provide a definition of information literacy and learning outcomes, upon which the GHC outcomes are based. Other recent publications have also been helpful in guiding the development of information literacy programs across the country, as well as guiding GHC in the development of its QEP. As information literacy has developed, the literature has matured also, focusing on pedagogical tools for librarians and faculty, and assessment techniques. Emphasis on student engagement and critical thinking indicates that publications of the past decade seek to provide information that deepens information literacy. The importance of information literacy has grown right along with the information age, as the focus of the movement has shifted from simply learning how to properly use library collections to effectively and efficiently navigate the almost constant information faced by people each day. Please see Appendix A for a bibliography.
Mission Statement and Student Learning Outcomes

The mission of the GHC Information Competency Program is to create a curriculum-wide culture of information competency among students, demonstrated through writing or other modes of communication. This QEP targets all GHC degrees and programs (associate of arts, associate of science, career degree programs) except for the associate of applied science cooperative degree programs with our local technical colleges, Coosa Valley Technical College and North Metro Technical College. Although students in cooperative degree programs will get exposure to the QEP because they take their core courses with GHC, they will not get the full extent of exposure to the QEP because the technical piece of their degree is provided by the technical colleges, which are not involved in the GHC QEP.

Because of the many opportunities for faculty, staff, and students at GHC to contribute to the QEP choice, Information Competency has full campus support. The IC topic also parallels GHC’s long-established commitment to technology in education. Many classrooms provide a computer for each student to use while the instructor demonstrates a task projected on a screen. If an instructor shows students how to look up a research source, he or she can have students follow all the steps in class. GHC students are often able to do more because technology is so accessible to them on a regular basis. However, it remains a challenge for students to navigate information wisely when their options have become overwhelming. Therefore, IC seems a perfect fit for GHC at
this time, and the college community believes the QEP will indeed benefit
students in the classroom, in the workplace, and in the community.

IC also fits well into GHC’s educational program because the college had
already recognized the critical importance of IC skills. GHC has a long-standing
bibliographic instruction (the forerunner of information literacy) workshop system.
For years, librarians have been coming by request to various classes to conduct
such workshops on how to access and use resources. Bibliographic instruction
(sometimes conducted by a librarian, sometimes by the instructor) is also a
requirement of introductory English courses. Another way in which GHC has
recognized the importance of IC can be seen in the college’s educational
programs assessment system. Prior to the 2005-2006 academic year, GHC had
eleven faculty-based assessment teams that oversaw outcomes assessment of
the general education program. Some of these teams are disciplinary (social
science, mathematics, etc.), and some are thematic (critical thinking, computing
technology, etc.). In the 2005-2006 academic year, the college added an
Information Literacy team because GHC recognized this as a need of our
students. Faculty, staff, and administration view the QEP as a logical extension
and systematization of work already begun. The plan will provide needed
guidance, organization, and structure within the area of information competency.

IC is the ability to identify, locate, and analyze needed resources efficiently
and then to communicate this information effectively. GHC chose this topic
because IC addresses both the strengths and challenges of our information-rich
environment in the twenty-first century. Although the Authoring Committee
considered names such as information literacy or information fluency, the group felt that "competency" best shows the aspect of student action that is so vital to the QEP effort. Another aspect that makes GHC's QEP distinct is the emphasis on using information for writing or other communication purposes. If GHC is to accomplish measurable improvement in student learning, the institution must assist students in using information appropriately, not just knowing about it.

IC specifically targets a student's ability to discern the most appropriate information needed for a particular purpose. Certainly, there is a huge variety of information available, but some pieces of information would be better than others for certain tasks. One academic challenge for GHC is the tendency students have to opt for the first choice from a search engine without considering the task at hand. Through the IC initiative, students become more cognizant of types and levels (i.e. scholarly vs. popular) of information and how to use what is appropriate for the task at hand. The specific tasks implied in the QEP are written tasks, so the circumstance compelling one to write will often be something students need to understand before beginning a search. Such skills not only make students more successful in college classes, but also help students succeed in their careers. Although the GHC community has enjoyed electronic resources and expertise across the curriculum, the IC program makes students and faculty more aware of the unified goal of discerning appropriate information for a given task. GHC's QEP brings a culture of information competency to GHC and allows students to move from subject to subject with a sense of interconnectedness.
The QEP Authoring Committee identified the following student learning outcomes, based in part on the ACRL (Association of College & Research Libraries) standards of information literacy:

- The student will determine the nature and extent of information needed.
- The student will access the needed information effectively and efficiently.
- The student will evaluate information and its sources critically.
- The student will demonstrate his/her information competency through writing or other modes of communication.

Faculty Perception of Student IC Needs

In March 2007, as a precursor to further development of the IC Program, surveys were sent out to all full-time faculty at GHC. This survey addressed faculty perceptions of GHC students' level of information competency. Specifically, it surveyed faculty perceptions in the following areas: student knowledge of available resources at GHC, student ability to gather needed information, student ability to critically analyze information, and student ability to accurately communicate this information to others. The survey included eleven Likert-style questions which were based on a five level scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Ten items addressed specific IC skills; one item addressed overall IC skills. A copy of the survey is included as Appendix B.

An additional section of the survey provided faculty an area where they could provide more detailed information. An open-ended question was included that offered faculty the opportunity to discuss any ongoing assignments or
projects they currently used in the classroom to promote information competency. A second open-ended question encouraged faculty to offer suggestions for additional resources or programs which they felt would benefit the IC Program at GHC.

Approximately one-hundred surveys were distributed to faculty members, with sixty-five surveys (65%) returned. Of these, sixty-three were used in the final analysis. Forty-three faculty members also responded to the open-ended questions to share information competency projects they were presently using in their classes. Many of these faculty members also offered suggestions for additional resources and programs.

An analysis of the faculty questionnaire provided some needed insight into faculty perceptions of information competency levels at GHC. The faculty responses were grouped into agree/strongly agree and disagree/strongly disagree. Neutral responses were excluded.

The items were scored according to the weighted difference between positive agree scores and negative disagree scores. Strong responses were weighted twice as heavily. For example, if 5% of faculty strongly agreed and 10% of faculty agreed, that was scored as 20% agreement. If 10% strongly disagreed and 60% disagreed, that would be scored as 80% disagreement. The difference response to the general item is discussed first, then the difference responses to the specific items are ranked.

The difference scores to the specific items are ranked below – the overall item is listed first, then the ten specific items in rank order. As well, the QEP
learning outcome associated with each item is indicated in brackets after each item. The full survey results (including responses to open-ended questions) are attached as Appendix C.

**Overall Assessment Results:**

- 51% -- In general, the information competency skills of GHC students are adequate (or better) for course assignments. [Overall]

**Specific Item Results:**

- 72% (72% disagreement) -- The students at GHC are able to accurately evaluate the credibility of the information they are using for an assignment. [Evaluate]

- 43% -- When students at GHC use source citations, they use the appropriate citation style required for the assignment. [Communicate]

- 40% -- The students at GHC are able to use these resources efficiently to locate the information needed to complete course assignments. [Access]

- 36% -- The students at GHC use source citations when they are needed. [Communicate]

- 31% -- The students at GHC understand the importance of citing the source of information used in class assignments. [Communicate]
• -30% -- The students at GHC are knowledgeable about the different resources (GALILEO, library, internet, etc.) available to aid them in their research efforts. [Access]

• -20% -- The students at GHC are able to effectively incorporate the needed information into their assignments. [Communicate]

• -18% -- The students at GHC are able to evaluate the usefulness of the information (supports topic, helps clarify points) used in the completion of course assignments. [Evaluate]

• -15% -- The students at GHC are able to select the appropriate type of information (scholarly, field specific, on-line/print) needed to accomplish course assignments. [Determine]

• +5% (5% agreement) -- The students at GHC are able to effectively locate the information needed to complete course assignments. [Access]

The strongly negative assessment by faculty of the general IC skills of students is striking. Only 16% of faculty agreed that students had adequate IC skills (no faculty strongly agreed); 41% of faculty disagreed, and 13% of faculty strongly disagreed. This finding reinforces the importance of IC as a critically needed skill of GHC students and the choice of IC as the topic of the GHC QEP.

Analyzing the individual item results helped the authoring committee focus on the specific areas of IC that were perceived to need improvement. Grouping the faculty survey items together by the learning outcome associated with each demonstrated that the ability of students to critically evaluate information was the
most needed IC skill, followed by the ability to communicate information, then the ability to determine nature of information needed, and finally the ability to access information. The table below gives the results by individual item and by associated learning outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>item #s</th>
<th>item scores</th>
<th>average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>-72, -18</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>7, 8, 9, 10</td>
<td>-20, -31, -36, -43</td>
<td>-33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td>+5, -30, -40</td>
<td>-21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IC skill most lacking according to faculty responses was the student ability to accurately evaluate the credibility of sources. 41% disagreed and 17% strongly disagreed that students could accurately evaluate the credibility of sources of information. In an age of instant information on the internet, students are too willing to accept and believe much of the information they access. Too often students accept BLOGS as an authority on subjects without any assessment of the credentials of the person writing the BLOG. The ability of students to evaluate the source of information is critical, since they assess sources according to their education, experience, and associations.

The ability of students to demonstrate IC through their communication was questioned by faculty. Several items specifically addressed GHC students'
knowledge of the importance of citing resources and their ability to properly cite those sources. While many of the faculty (50%) felt that the students did understand the importance of citing sources, only 18% felt that students used citations when needed. Only 13% said that students possessed the ability to use citation styles appropriately. In this area, there seemed to be a gap between knowledge and ability to utilize this knowledge. IC projects will incorporate application opportunities in addition to knowledge attainment.

Student ability to efficiently and effectively access information was also assessed on the survey. The faculty reported that students were deficient in their ability to use the appropriate citation style, to realize when source citations were needed, to understand the importance of citing sources of information, and to effectively incorporate needed information into assignments.

As well, faculty reported that they felt that GHC students have some deficiencies in determining the nature of information needed. 43% of faculty disagreed that students were able to select appropriate information (scholarly, field specific, etc.) for needed assignments, and 3% of faculty strongly disagreed.

Student Involvement

The QEP Authoring Committee believes student involvement at all levels of the venture is integral to its success as such participation will facilitate students' connection to and ownership of the project's goals. In February, 2007, a student was added to the QEP Authoring Committee to facilitate input from the
student body as a whole. This student has attended all committee meetings, and participated in the work of the committee as a whole.

Student involvement in the QEP was also encouraged via a logo contest for which students from all campuses were invited to submit an original logo to represent the IC Program. The contest was announced in the college’s student newspaper; an email announcement was sent to all enrolled students; plus, a webpage with contest rules and procedures was placed on the college’s website. Likewise, student participation was encouraged by a number of faculty members, including the head of the college’s Art Department – who offered a logo creation option on a design project for his art students. Once logos were collected, they were judged by several members of the QEP Authoring Committee and the College Relations graphic designer, as well as two currently enrolled students – both of whom serve as orientation leaders for the College. From a total of twenty-eight logo submissions, an original work from Annika Mieling, an art major from Germany, was selected as the winner. Her logo will be included on all print and electronic publications related to the IC Program.
Assessment

Assessment of the QEP at GHC is critical to assure the success of the IC Program. Assessment focuses on outcomes (the four IC @ GHC student learning outcomes – figure 1) and process (integration within six curricular areas – figure 2). As well, the resources available to support the QEP and faculty perception of student IC abilities will be assessed. Each year one member of the Implementation Committee (who will have access to professional development activities) will be designated as the QEP assessment coordinator. This person will organize incoming assessment data and serve as the liaison between the QEP Implementation Committee and the Information Literacy faculty assessment team.

Figure 1 – Outcomes of IC @ GHC
Assessment data will be reviewed annually over the five-year period to provide feedback to the QEP Implementation Committee so that progress can be monitored. The QEP Implementation Committee will recommend changes needed to improve the plan based on the annual assessment. QEP assessment is three-fold: overall IC assessment based on the GHC IC assessment test, project-based assessment from core courses implemented each year, and GHC student learning outcomes assessment related to the already-extant college Information Literacy assessment team. Assessment of the four IC learning outcomes includes both an overall assessment of college-wide data (from the IC assessment instrument and the Information Literacy assessment team) as well
as assessment of data from implementation of IC projects within the six curricular areas of the core. This project assessment will be conducted in Spring semester in the core concentration areas for each year of implementation (Area B – Communication and Freshman College Computer Studies – in Year One, for example). Thereafter, already-implemented areas of the core will conduct assessment during Spring semester only. Please see Appendix D for a breakdown of the GHC core curriculum.

The college has also developed a short assessment test of IC abilities that measures needed student IC skills (as identified by the faculty survey) and addresses the QEP learning outcomes. The QEP Authoring Committee considered using other established tests of information literacy as a means of determining IC abilities at GHC. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) test of Information & Communication Technology Literacy (ICT), the Kent State University Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy (SAILS) test, and the Tool for Real Time Assessment of Information Literacy (TRAAILS) test, also developed at Kent State, were examined. Concerns about costs, the length of time to administer the tests, the levels of specificity, and the ability to tailor the test to GHC needs led the Committee to decide to develop its own instrument. In particular, the Committee wanted to include an assessment of student skills in using Georgia’s virtual library system, called Georgia Library Learning Online (GALILEO) and the University System of Georgia’s online library catalog, called Georgia Interconnected Libraries (GIL). This test was piloted during the first new student orientation session for Fall 2007. The QEP Authoring Committee
evaluated the results, determined that the test was sound, and continued its administration during the remaining orientation sessions to establish baseline data. Low scores on many of the questions only affirmed that the QEP learning outcomes are reflective of the needs of the students. The IC test will also be given to a structured sample of “second year” classes to determine progress in student abilities. Testing at both orientation and second year classes will occur each year of the five year program. Comparison of the baseline orientation data will be made to the second year data. Over time, the expectation is that the baseline data will stay approximately the same while second-year data will improve significantly. The target goal for improvement at this point is 5% per year. This second-year student data is critical to the QEP because those overall trend lines will indicate the progress of the IC program. As IC is fully implemented across the curriculum, student IC skills should also become stronger each year, demonstrated by increased improvement each year in the second-year student data from the IC assessment test. At the time of testing student ID numbers are captured so that individual progress comparisons can be made as well. Assessment reports, beginning at the end of the first year, will document these paired comparisons as comparison of orientation groups to the second year groups. Please see Appendix E for the GHC IC assessment instrument.

As the GHC IC instrument assesses students across the college, assessment of IC abilities also occurs as the QEP is implemented across the GHC curriculum by curricular area. For example, as the first year IC projects are implemented in Area B courses, those courses include their own assessment of
the QEP learning outcomes. Each IC implementation project includes assessment of one or more of the learning outcomes. Those curricular areas involved each year will develop specific IC assessment activities and rubrics, just as the first-year areas have already done. These activities will assess the success of each area of implementation. Please see the section on Year One Activities below for a breakdown of learning outcomes and assessment projects.

In conjunction with the assessment activities of the QEP overall and those of the individual IC assignments across the core curricular areas is the work of the Information Literacy assessment team. This team, as a part of the on-going general education assessment system at GHC, works with the QEP Implementation Committee. The assessment data gathered by the Information Literacy team is used as a component of the QEP assessment of individual IC assignments. The QEP Implementation Committee assessment coordinator and the Information Literacy team facilitator work together to ensure that all assessment data is mutually beneficial to the two groups and that no one group is working in isolation of the other.

The five-year QEP plan is assessed annually to determine progress with integrating IC projects throughout the GHC curriculum. Critical to the success of the GHC QEP is the availability of the needed library resources (e.g., IC Learning Centers), supporting services for faculty (e.g., Faculty Academy), and supporting student services (e.g., Tutorial Centers). The assessment plan annually reviews the availability and success of such services from the standpoint of both users and providers. Surveys of participants determine the levels of satisfaction of
users of the above services, and feedback from providers offers suggestions and recommendations for improvements.

As an additional form of feedback on the QEP, the Committee has developed a faculty questionnaire assessing perceptions of student IC (mentioned above in the Mission Statement and Student Learning Outcomes section). The faculty questionnaire was developed and tested during Spring 2007. This questionnaire will be administered to faculty annually to track perceived improvement in student IC skills as the project continues.

An annual report on the progress of the QEP will be prepared by the QEP Implementation Committee based on assessment data collected during the year. The report will focus on improvement in scores on IC assessment instruments, meeting scheduled progress in implemented IC projects across the curriculum, feedback related to supporting resources, and the results of the annual faculty questionnaires. This annual report will be due June 1 of each implementation year.

Based on the annual report, the QEP will be reviewed and revised as needed. It is expected that some annual changes will be needed. These changes will help focus and strengthen the QEP at GHC.

As well as monitoring the progress of the overall QEP, the QEP Implementation Committee will be monitoring the assessment plan. Is the right data being collected at the right time? Is there a better way to implement
assessment? Does the planned assessment allow for the needed comparisons to be made? Based on the annual review of assessment, the QEP Implementation Committee expects to make minor changes in data collection each year as well.
Implementation Plan

The following timelines represent the work done thus far to create and initiate the QEP, plus the implementation work that will be done over the five years of the QEP. The areas of the core curriculum for each year of implementation are listed. Please also see Appendix D for a list of the GHC core curriculum, Appendix H for a more detailed list of activities for Year One, and Appendix I for a graphic representation of the implementation schedule. Training opportunities for faculty and assessment are emphasized in the detailed list of activities for Year One.

Fall 2006
Preparation/Planning

- The preparation and planning for the QEP began.
- Faculty and staff at GHC were surveyed about their perceptions of student learning and areas where student learning could be improved.
- The survey results revealed three possible topics for the QEP: information literacy, writing, and learning communities.
- Town Hall meetings were held with the faculty and staff of GHC to determine which of the three topics generated the most interest.
- Town Hall meetings were held with students in order to get their input.
- The Town Hall meetings revealed a divide in interest between the information literacy and writing.
- A QEP Authoring Committee was formed to decide between the two remaining topics and begin the process of writing the QEP.
- The QEP Authoring Committee held its first meeting.
- The QEP Authoring Committee decided to combine information literacy and writing as the subject of the QEP, with the primary focus on information literacy.

Individuals Participating in the Process

- The GHC SACS Leadership Team
- The Administration of Georgia Highlands College
- Human Resources
- Faculty
- Students
- Staff
• Division Chairs
• The QEP Authoring Committee

Spring 2007
Preparation/Planning Continued
• The preparation and planning for the QEP continued.
• The QEP Authoring Committee held additional meetings.
• The QEP Authoring Committee decided to move away from the term information literacy and towards the term information competency.
• The QEP Authoring Committee developed a mission statement and outcomes for the GHC QEP.
• A student representative was added to the QEP Authoring Committee.
• Plans for increasing student involvement in the QEP were discussed.
• The QEP Authoring Committee members were assigned the task of developing and writing certain portions of the QEP.
• Additional Town Hall meetings were held with GHC faculty and staff in an effort to inform them of the QEP Authoring Committee’s work. The QEP was formally presented as IC @ GHC.
• The faculty of GHC were surveyed concerning student abilities in the area of information competency.
• The QEP Authoring Committee made a decision to implement the QEP into the core curriculum at GHC on an area by area basis, starting with Area B.
• The QEP Authoring Committee created assessment tools for the QEP.
• The QEP Authoring Committee created a QEP logo art contest to increase student involvement in the QEP.
• The QEP Authoring Committee presented a draft of the QEP to the faculty of GHC.
• The faculty in Area B created projects for implementation of the QEP in the fall.
• It was determined that the library staff will play a crucial role in the QEP.
• A QEP presentation was made at the May 7 faculty meeting, including guest speakers from Oglethorpe University.
• QEP discussion and overview took place at the May GHC SACS Leadership Team meeting

Individuals Participating in the Process
• The QEP Authoring Committee
• The GHC SACS Leadership Team
• Faculty
• Students
• The Administration of GHC
• Human Resources
• Office of Institutional Effectiveness
• Staff
• Division Chairs
• Area B Faculty

Summer 2007
Preparation/Planning Continued
• The QEP Authoring Committee used comments from the faculty to finish the task of writing the GHC QEP.
• Area B Faculty continued to develop QEP projects that will be implemented in the Fall.
• Students were introduced to the QEP at summer orientation sessions.
• Leadership for the QEP Implementation Committee was established.
• The GHC QEP was submitted to SACS for review.

Individuals Participating in the Process
• Area B Faculty
• The GHC SACS Leadership Team
• The QEP Authoring Committee
• The QEP Implementation Committee

Fall 2007-Spring 2008
Phase I Implementation
• The initial assessment of the level of information competency in new students takes place.
• QEP Presentation takes place at August 2007 In-Service meeting.
• The implementation of the GHC QEP begins in Area B courses.
• Area C Faculty begin to prepare course projects for the QEP implementation in their courses.
• Area F Faculty begin to prepare course projects for the QEP implementation in their courses.
• Learning Support Faculty begin to prepare course projects for the QEP implementation in their courses.
• Evaluate the results of student assessment before and after the completion of information competency projects in Area B courses.

Individuals Participating in the Process
• Area B Faculty
• Area C Faculty
• Area F Faculty
• Learning Support Faculty
• The QEP Implementation Committee
• Students
• Tutorial Center Staff
• Library Staff
• Office of Institutional Effectiveness
• College Administration

Fall 2008-Spring 2009
Phase II Implementation
• Begin implementation of the QEP in Area C courses.
• Begin implementation of the QEP in Area F courses (Nursing, Dental Hygiene, and Human Services Career Programs, Sci/PE Division).
• Begin implementation of the QEP in Learning Support courses.
• Continue implementation of the QEP in Area B courses.
• Continue assessment of the level of information competency in students.
• Survey faculty concerning the level of information competency in students.
• Area A Faculty begin to prepare course projects for the QEP implementation in their courses.
• Evaluate the results of student assessment before and after the completion of information competency projects in Area B, Area C, Area F, PHED, and Learning Support courses.

Individuals Participating in the Process
• Area B Faculty
• Area C Faculty
• Area F Faculty (Nursing, Dental Hygiene, and Human Services Career Programs, Sci/PE Division)
• Learning Support Faculty
• Area A Faculty
• QEP Implementation Committee
• Students
• Tutorial Center Staff
• Library Staff
• Office of Institutional Effectiveness
• College Administration

Fall 2009-Spring 2010
Phase III Implementation
• Begin implementation of the QEP in Area A courses.
• Continue implementation of the QEP in Area B, Area C, Area F (adding Business and Math Divisions), and Learning Support courses.
• Continue assessment of the level of information competency in students.
• Area D Faculty begin to prepare course projects for the QEP implementation in their courses.
• Evaluate the results of student assessment before and after the completion of information competency projects in Area A, Area B, Area C, Area F, and Learning Support courses.

Individuals Participating in the Process
• Area A Faculty
• Area B Faculty
• Area C Faculty
• Area F Faculty (adding Business and Math Divisions)
• Area D Faculty
• Learning Support Faculty
• QEP Implementation Committee
• Students
• Tutorial Center Staff
• Library Staff
• Office of Institutional Effectiveness
• College Administration

Fall 2010-Spring 2011
Phase IV Implementation
• Begin implementation of the QEP in Area D courses.
• Continue implementation of the QEP in Area A, Area B, Area C, Area F (adding Social Sciences Division), and Learning Support courses.
• Area E Faculty begin to prepare course projects for the implementation of the QEP in their courses.
• Continue assessment of the level of information competency in students.
• Survey faculty concerning the level of information competency in students.
• Evaluate the results of student assessment before and after the completion of information competency projects in Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area F, PHED, and Learning Support courses.

Individuals Participating in the Process
• Area A Faculty
• Area B Faculty
• Area C Faculty
• Area D Faculty
• Area E Faculty
• Area F Faculty (adding Social Sciences Division)
• Learning Support Faculty
• QEP Implementation Committee
• Students
• Tutorial Center Staff
• Library Staff
• Office of Institutional Effectiveness
• College Administration

Fall 2011-Spring 2012
Phase V Implementation
• Begin fifth year of QEP implementation.
• Begin implementation of QEP in Area E courses.
• Continue implementation of the QEP in Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area F (adding Humanities Division), and Learning Support courses.
• Continue assessment of the level of information competency in students.
• Evaluate the results of student assessment before and after the completion of information competency projects in all areas of the core curriculum.
• Evaluate the success of the QEP in increasing the level of information competency in students.
• Evaluate faculty response to the success of the QEP.

Individuals Participating in the Process
• Faculty in all areas of the core curriculum (adding Humanities Division in Area F)
• QEP Implementation Committee
• Students
• Tutorial Center Staff
• Library Staff
• Office of Institutional Effectiveness
• College Administration

Fall 2012
Phase VI Implementation
• Evaluate the performance of the QEP over the five years of its implementation.
• Prepare a report for SACS concerning the performance and evaluation of the QEP at GHC.
• Develop a plan for sustaining the QEP at GHC.
**Institutional Support and Sustainability**

GHC is totally committed to the QEP and has committed sufficient institutional resources to ensure the success of the plan. The first year of the plan (AY2007-2008) has a line item of $10,000 in the college budget. This money was earmarked to purchase printed resource material, electronic resource material, promote the QEP, and enable participants to take part in development activities such as professional conferences related to information competency.

**Budget**

For the first year of implementation, the QEP has a $10,000 line item in the college budget. The SACS Leadership Team has approved the QEP budget and the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs administers it. During each year of implementation, the QEP Implementation Committee chair for that year receives one course credit (3 semester hours) reassigned time to perform his or her duties in relation to the QEP for each of Fall and Spring semesters. The chair each year is a faculty member who teaches in the area of the core that is being integrated into the QEP that particular year. The QEP Assessment Coordinator also receives one course credit reassigned time for Spring semester each year of implementation. The total QEP budget for Year One is $14,000. As indicated below, $10,000 of this budget comes from the line item in the college budget. The other $4,000 comes from re-direction of existing college funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, hard copy materials</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Software</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC Consultants/trainers</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/In-Service speakers</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training materials</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS QEP conference, July 07</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Conference on Information Literacy, October 07</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; support materials</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development new instructional materials</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment forms printing</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; printed materials</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Assessment coordinator reassigned time</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total QEP budget</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional QEP Leadership Support from redirected funds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Committee Chair 2 course reassigned time</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resources

While the college has committed a portion of its institutional budget to support IC, it is critical during implementation that every core curriculum area (and the academic divisions associated with those core areas) has the specific academic and personnel resources needed by its faculty and students. The success of GHC's QEP depends upon the college's use of its academic resources to implement and support IC throughout the entire college curriculum. Sufficiency of resources is important, but just as important is the effective delivery of those resources to the IC projects as they are implemented. Effective delivery means focusing on the division level, as the divisions are the practical academic areas through which the core curriculum is delivered to students. When resources are readily available from a specific division, those resources are more likely to be used and be more effective.

Efficient use of the college resources is one key to the sustainability of information competency as an area of interest after the five-year implementation of said QEP has run its course. The implementation of a QEP suggests something of greater moment than a five-year journey from "Point A to Point B", as it were. Instead, it represents a significant shift in the relationship between the college and its stakeholders. To help ensure the visibility and viability of the QEP, for each year of the IC Program there is an administrative liaison (one of the division chairs) on the QEP Implementation Committee. The person in this position maintains membership in the Administrative Council and the Instructional Council, bringing pertinent information about the QEP to those groups. Such a
link to the Instructional Council is particularly important as this body has statutory authority to act on behalf of the faculty and can thus aid in maintaining faculty governance and ownership over the process, which will give a sense of cohesiveness to the QEP implementation. Assessment data will also be presented to the Instructional Council. The consistent flow of information related to the QEP informs all campus constituents of the progress of the QEP. Here is an organizational chart for the QEP:

---

**GHC QEP Organizational Chart**

- **SACS Leadership Team**
  - Compliance Committee
  - QEP Implementation Committee (including Administrative Liaison)
    - Area B Point Person (Communication)
    - Area B Point Person (PCCS)
  - QEP Authoring Committee
    - Instructional Council
    - Academic Council
    - Administrative Council
The liaison for the first year of implementation is the Humanities Division chair, who was chosen because Communication (the most prominent course in year-one implementation) falls within the Humanities Division. In addition, as a division chair, she is integrally involved in budget management to support the Implementation Committee as it supervises the year-one budget.

In addition to personnel resources, GHC possesses numerous other resources that will be used during the implementation of the QEP as the college engages in ongoing inculcation of information competency into the academic culture of GHC.

Assessment:

One way to assure systematic incorporation of IC within GHC is to include it in the overall college assessment plan. Assessment is based upon the college's student learning outcomes. The faculty created this set of outcomes that they, through their assessment teams, have the opportunity each year to revise as necessary. The college faculty is divided into twelve assessment teams. The newest of these teams (now in its second year) is the Information Literacy team, which was created as a response to a perceived need within the student population. This team works closely with the QEP Implementation Committee and the committee's assessment coordinator to share and coordinate assessment information. The information gathered from both the GHC IC Assessment Instrument and the individual core area projects assists the Information Literacy team in its overall evaluation of GHC learning outcomes related to information literacy. In turn, other types of assessment information
gathered by the Information Literacy team not necessarily related to QEP implementation projects (evaluation of the bibliographic instruction workshops provided by library staff, for example) are shared with the QEP Implementation Committee. This use of multiple methods creates a deeper and richer system of assessment for the QEP.

**Student Resources:**

The GHC librarians and Information Technology Department have begun the process of launching a student web-site for Information Competency, which will be ready for Fall 2007. This site consists of information about the GHC QEP, games and activities related to IC, and lists of electronic and print resources that students can access either on-line or at the college library to improve their IC skills. Most of the electronic resources and modules on the site have been developed by other colleges and are available for use with no charge to the college.

The GHC library already provides a wealth of on-line resources to assist students with improving their IC skills. The Online Library Learning Center (http://www.usg.edu/galileo/skills/) instructs students in how to find and evaluate source material through on-line modules. In addition to basic IC information at this site, there are also specific tutorials for GALILEO and GIL.

Discipline-based IC Workshops for students would be generated by collaboration between the instructor and the support service (the Library or Tutorial Center as an extension of the classroom), and will supplement existing Bibliographic Instruction workshops.
Recognition of high-level student work and progress is an important part of any new initiative. A new award honoring a term paper or project that exemplifies quality use of IC will be presented at the 2007-2008 GHC Honor's Night. A faculty committee will choose the recipient.

Although not strictly an IC resource, GHC has a license to use Turnitin.com, an on-line plagiarism detection service. This service allows faculty to set up a class home page to which students turn in their papers electronically. Each piece of written work is evaluated for plagiarism, and a report for each student is generated for the faculty member. Turnitin.com not only identifies plagiarism, but also clearly outlines the source of the plagiarism and provides guides and tutorials that demonstrate proper citation form, good writing style, and originality. Part of why IC is such an issue at GHC is that students do not seem to understand how to access and cite source material; faculty frequently discover that students are not aware that they are engaging in plagiarism. While not every faculty member currently uses Turnitin.com, a side effect of the QEP will be to increase the number of those who do use the service.

**Faculty Training:**

Training is key to the success of the QEP. Faculty must understand how to integrate IC into their classrooms, how to conduct assessment related to the QEP, and how the mission and learning outcomes of the QEP relate to classroom activities and assessment. In order to facilitate this process, several training opportunities are available throughout the academic year. Each core area in a given implementation year will receive training in the Spring semester.
prior to their implementation year. This training, which includes full and part-time faculty, is conducted by a GHC faculty member who has been designated as the point person for that particular core area. The training is designed to familiarize each faculty member with the IC projects and assessment tools for their area.

A different type of training occurs at the end of Fall semester. At this time, an outside speaker or consultant is brought in to discuss overall themes and trends in assessment or information literacy. This training is designed to keep faculty abreast of the latest pedagogy and research related to GHC’s QEP topic, thus encouraging innovation and, hopefully, continued enthusiasm. In addition to these QEP-specific opportunities, IC has also been included as a topic in the following traditional GHC forums.

The first Faculty Academy session devoted to the QEP is scheduled for September 2007. Faculty Academy is the GHC program that provides training and development for faculty, especially for first- and second-year faculty. This specific Faculty Academy class has been developed and added to that curriculum to support integration of IC into existing courses. In addition to new faculty, tutorial center workers and librarians will attend this session to prepare them for student IC inquiries during this first year of implementation.

Beginning in May 2007, sessions for faculty on integrating IC into their classroom experience became a part of the traditional GHC Assessment Day, which is held at the end of Spring semester. As implementation progresses (and demand dictates), multiple workshops will be presented to focus on needs of specific divisions. The first annual QEP session at Assessment Day was devoted
to hearing the experiences of Oglethorpe College (a private college in Atlanta),
that had recently implemented a QEP about information literacy. Assessment
Day 2008 will concentrate on re-capping the GHC QEP experience, with an
emphasis on Year One assessment feedback.

In August, 2007, an introductory workshop on IC @ GHC was held at the
college's In-Service day. Although an overview of the entire five-year process
took place, the bulk of the workshop was devoted to first-year implementation.
Faculty participating in first-year implementation explained their projects and
assessment methods. Data from the GHC IC Assessment Instrument
administered to in-coming students at orientation was provided as well. Guests
from North Georgia College and University, a college that has recently
implemented a QEP based around information literacy, also spoke. Similar
workshops will occur at In-Service during each year of implementation.

In addition to these formal settings, resource collections related to
teaching and learning already exist at the two largest campus libraries (Floyd and
Cartersville) under the aegis of the Increasing Expectations Project (mentioned in
the Rationale and Background section). These centers have begun to be
expanded for the IC @ GHC Project into IC @ GHC Resource Centers. In
addition to printed materials, an indexed archive of IC use in GHC classrooms
will be added to the collection, which will grow as implementation proceeds. This
resource will include syllabi or projects including IC that faculty members find
effective in their disciplines. Both the archive and an annotated bibliography of
print materials will be available online.
Year One Activities

Area B of the GHC Core Curriculum

Area B was selected as the first area to officially implement IC into its curriculum in Fall 2007. Emphasis has been placed on creating projects which could be assessed for value added to GHC students' knowledge, skills, and abilities.

Within the University System of Georgia, Area B of the core, which contains four to five credit hours of coursework, is designed to give each institution some flexibility in tailoring one part of the core to their institutional mission. At GHC, this area is made up of one required Communication course and one other course chosen from an array of options, including Computer Studies. This area is a good choice for the first year of implementation because it is relatively small, but pivotal in the curriculum. Area B courses are among the few classes at GHC that do not have prerequisites. As such, many students opt to take these courses at the beginning of their college career. This means that many of these students come into these courses with deep learning curves in information competency levels. For this reason, these courses are instrumental in helping students develop information competency skills. Therefore, Area B is a logical place to officially implement IC. The earlier a student can learn to gather, process, and communicate information effectively through writing or other modes, the richer the college experience can be. Another positive factor for Area B is the experience level of the faculty. Except for one first-year Communication
instructor, all of the Communication and Computer Studies faculty have been at
the college for several years and have much experience in the classroom.

The bulk of Area B is Communication and Computer Studies. Area B
includes two Communication courses: Communication 1100, a study of
interpersonal, small group, and public speaking, and Communication 1010, a
public speaking course. Since Communication is a required course for
graduation, it has a very large student population. Also included in Area B is
Freshman College Computer Studies (FCCS), an introductory course in
computing. A small contingent of additional courses composes the remainder of
Area B offerings. Since these courses are offered on an irregular basis, they
were not included in this initial implementation schedule.

Communication: Information Competency Implementation

In order to better facilitate value-added assessment, the communication
faculty decided to let each instructor generate individualized assignments which
address specific skill sets. Each instructor includes an assignment that involves
a structured study of resources at GHC. In addition, each class incorporates a
project that requires students to navigate through available GHC resources to
assess and gather appropriate information, evaluate this information, and present
this information appropriately through oral communication. One member of the
communication faculty is the point person for the implementation of the QEP in
Communication. She oversees training and consistency in relation to the projects
and their evaluation across the communication faculty as a whole. All curricular
areas will have such a person as they are implemented during the five years of the QEP and beyond.

Assessment tools were also developed to measure value-added knowledge, skills, and abilities. A pre-test was created using ten multiple-choice questions which measures student knowledge in the areas of available resources, source credibility, and appropriate use of source citation. After completing coursework, students are given an identical post-test to assess value-added knowledge levels. The following table illustrates how the four QEP student learning outcomes correspond to specific questions in the COMM 1100 assessment tool. Although these particular questions are incorporated to address a specific outcome, some questions may also give some insight into additional outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Pre/Post Test Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine Information</td>
<td># 1, #3, #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Information</td>
<td># 4, #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Information</td>
<td># 2, #6, #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate IC</td>
<td># 5, #7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the post-test, each instructor evaluates students’ performances in the oral communication project. An identical rubric is utilized by all instructors. This rubric measures value-added skills and abilities in the areas of information analysis and appropriate communication of information. The rubric
was constructed using a scale of 1-4 (1=poor; 4=excellent). Three initial target goals were established for the assessment tools: 1) at least 70% of students will score higher on the post-test than the pre-test, 2) at least 70% of the students will score 70% or higher on the post-test, 3) at least 70% of the students will earn a 3 or higher on the assessment rubric. Please see Appendix F for examples of these materials.

**FCCS: Information Competency Implementation**

Along with Communication, the Freshman College Computer Studies (FCCS) course makes up most of Area B of the core curriculum. Instructors have incorporated an IC component into their FCCS curriculum. This component includes a study of information resources available at GHC and a project requiring students to demonstrate the ability to utilize these resources. Each FCCS instructor gives a pre-test to measure student competency in the areas of accessing available resources, evaluating credibility of resources, and correct utilization of resources. As with Communication, the FCCS faculty has a point person who oversees the process for full and part-time faculty. After completing the IC component, students are given a post-test to assess improvement.

Students receive instruction in utilizing all forms of print and non-print media format information resources available at GHC for the purpose of academic research. This instruction includes the following objectives: 1) students will learn how to search and retrieve books from the library's online book catalog (GIL), 2.) students will learn how to search and retrieve journal
articles from the library’s online periodical collection of databases (GALILEO),
3.) students will learn how to request materials using interlibrary loan, 4.)
students will learn how to properly cite sources in appropriate bibliographic
formats.

The students also complete a project on navigation through the GHC web
site. This IC component emphasizes maximizing personal information available
through the student records system and downloading forms for these processes.
Topics included are locating links for advising transcripts, changing majors,
processing degree evaluations, checking financial aid status, enrollment
verification for insurance, and online registration. The library and internet
activities in tandem provide the student the opportunity to address each of the
QEP learning outcomes, as these assessment activities are designed to take the
student step-by-step through the process of determining, accessing, and
evaluating information. Two initial target goals were established for the
assessment tools: 1) at least 70% of students will score higher on the post-test
than the pre-test, and 2) at least 70% of the students will score 70% or higher on
the post-test. Please see Appendix G for examples of these materials.
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Appendix B: Faculty Questionnaire on Student IC Skills

Georgia Highlands College
Information Competency Program@ GHC

Faculty Questionnaire

In order to develop programs and resources which will most effectively help the students at GHC, the QEP writing committee would appreciate your input. At the end of the scaled questions, you have been presented with two free-format questions to enable you to offer any written comments in addition to the scaled questions. Feel free to provide additional comments by enclosing same in your return envelope.

Please respond to the following questions based on your experiences with the students at GHC.

SA = Strongly Agree  D = Disagree
A = Agree  SD = Strongly Disagree
N = Neither

1. The students at GHC are able to select the appropriate type of information (scholarly, field specific on-line/print) needed to accomplish course assignments.

2. The students at GHC are able to effectively locate the information needed to complete course assignments.

3. The students at GHC are knowledgeable about the different resources (Gallileo, Library, Internet, etc.) available to aid them in their research efforts.

4. The students at GHC are able to use these resources efficiently to locate the information needed to complete course assignments.

5. The students at GHC are able to accurately evaluate the credibility of the information they are using for an assignment.

6. The students at GHC are able to evaluate the usefulness of the information (supports topic, helps clarify points) used in the completion of course assignments.

7. The students at GHC are able to effectively incorporate the needed information into their assignments.

8. The students at GHC understand the importance of citing the source of information used in class assignments.

9. The students at GHC use source citations when they are needed.

10. When students at GHC use source citations, they use the appropriate citation style required for the assignment.

11. In general, the information competency skills of GHC students are adequate

Analysis of Information Competency resources and materials presently available at GHC.

1. Do you presently include any discussion or assignments which are aimed at increasing your students' levels of information competency? Could you please give an example of a project that best demonstrates this practice/goal?

2. Do you have any suggestions regarding possible resources or programs which would be beneficial to the Information Competency Program at GHC?
Appendix C: Results of Faculty Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The students at GHC are able to select the appropriate type of information (scholarly, field specific on-line/print) needed to accomplish course assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. The students at GHC are able to effectively locate the information needed to complete course assignments. |
| **Choice** | **Count** | **Percent** |
| 1 SA | 1 | 2% |
| 2 A | 26 | 41% |
| 3 N | 12 | 19% |
| 4 D | 24 | 38% |
| 5 SD | 0 | 0% |
| **Mean** | 2.94 |

| 3. The students at GHC are knowledgeable about the different resources (Gables, Library, Internet, etc.) available to aid them in their research efforts. |
| **Choice** | **Count** | **Percent** |
| 1 SA | 0 | 0% |
| 2 A | 16 | 25% |
| 3 N | 16 | 25% |
| 4 D | 29 | 45% |
| 5 SD | 3 | 5% |
| **Mean** | 3.30 |

| 4. The students at GHC are able to use these resources efficiently to locate the information needed to complete course assignments. |
| **Choice** | **Count** | **Percent** |
| 1 SA | 0 | 0% |
| 2 A | 13 | 21% |
| 3 N | 15 | 24% |
| 4 D | 31 | 49% |
| 5 SD | 4 | 8% |
| **Mean** | 3.41 |
Faculty Questionnaire
5. The students at GHC are able to accurately evaluate the credibility of the information they are using for an assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 D</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The students at GHC are able to evaluate the usefulness of the information (supports topic, helps clarify points) used in the completion of course assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The students at GHC are able to effectively incorporate the needed information into their assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The students at GHC understand the importance of citing the source of information used in class assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Questionnaire
9. The students at GHC use source citations when they are needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-D</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-SD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. When students at GHC use source citations, they use the appropriate citation style required for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-SA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-D</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-SD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In general, the information competency skills of GHC students are adequate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-SA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-SD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from open-ended questions on faculty survey:

**Question 1:** Do you presently include any discussion or assignments which are aimed at increasing your students' levels of information competency? Could you please give an example of a project that best demonstrates this practice/goal?

Yes, we have a paper which requires peer-reviewed journal references, appropriate use of citation, and us of APA formatting for papers.

Formal paper on current Nursing trends

Second year students have to write a paper on a current trend or issue in Nursing.

Research required for speech assignments; librarians invited to speak during research lecture

I go over Turabian style notation and how to use information found in research for their assignments.

Compilation in Business 1105 and 2205; guided reflections; written assignments (current issues) in all classes

Yes -- website evaluation where I have students compare a known appropriate site with a bogus one

Yes -- Nursing trends/issues paper in NURS 2205

Scientific table clinics including research paper and trip to GHC library for orientation before table clinics; portfolio of substantiation; National Board reviews including references (peer-reviewed)

We require abstracts and papers.

Yes. Students must search Medline for dental information.

Many research papers

Yes, comparative assignments – compare viewpoints on a subject, evaluate arguments

Numerous research assignments
Yes, discussion on understanding reports on topics such as weight control, heart disease, etc., plus short paper regarding hepatitis information.

Annotated bibliographies force students to evaluate sources beside the web.

Yes, in MATH 2205 for elementary teachers. They write 5 article reviews found on the internet about teaching math.

Yes, GHC webpage exercise

In MATH 2200 we use projects that rely on information taken from the internet.

In MATH 2205 we require students to review a journal article and an online activity, and then they must write a report on each with citations.

A required paper on the use of community resources

A required paper on a professional issue

Students are required to do outside research for the majority of their speeches. Then, with the speeches, they are required to correctly cite those sources using a specific style.

I have them read and evaluate essays. It’s the evaluate part that throws them often.

Library staff gives lecture and demonstration of information outlets. Proper citation required for assignments.

Yes. I used to do a research paper, but I found students had difficulty with it. I now have them do a research project where they choose a topic, find sources, and list those sources in a bibliography.

Yes – each class has one "hands on" information-gathering project (GDP forecast, wage research, manager interview, and legal case presentation).

I assign a research paper in which they have to use historical sources. I spend a day session going over resources and how to evaluate them.

My students have to prepare for a debate and write a summary of their points in appropriate APA style.
In English 1101 and 1102, I include a library workshop where librarians come in to the classroom to explain Galileo, library catalogs, etc. In each class, students write a research paper or essay.

This semester, I am directing them to specific peer reviewed articles.

Yes- Library orientations speeches with outline/ references required

Yes, we have mentoring sessions that discuss APA style and how to use it. And, we have an example in the Nursing Student Handbook.

Question 2: Do you have any suggestions regarding possible resources or programs which would be beneficial to the Information Competency Program at GHC?

We have started a one hour lecture on “How to write a College Paper” for our first year Nursing students. It is aimed at their competence in literature review, organization of material. I would suggest appropriate citations and use of APA at incoming student orientation to available resources, i.e. Galileo.

Possible 1 hour course (elective) on using APA format

I feel that a 1-2 hour credit information literacy course preferably taught by or heavily involving librarians would be beneficial.

What would you think of a “baseline class” which included surfing the web, citing references, understanding peer-reviewed journals, etc.?

Students need formal introduction (with practice) on Galileo.

Add a critical thinking course taught as a PHIL course, as several other state institutions offer.

Coordinate elements – all courses that anticipate approaching a problem should each tackle components and be aware of what others are doing so that students will get a more comprehensive exposure to the skill.

Need to deal also with popular media other than internet (tv, radio, newspapers, magazines, etc.) to help students know how to sort through the clutter and form a realistic world view in order to be better citizens, parents, etc.
Resources/programs should be standardized and such information disseminated among all faculty, regardless of academic field. That way, we can all adhere to recommended guidelines.

Mandated tutorial visits

More training in use of library and Galileo

Have a general Faculty Academy session each year on the ways to assist students with information competency. Construct the information competency challenge game for students (maybe faculty, staff, and administration as well). In the game, you pose a challenging question or set of questions that require the use of information technology to find the answer. Each person who gets the answer correct wins an IC prize. You can have new question each week or every two weeks.

The more students learn about what is available to them during orientation the better.

I think that the Bibliographic Instruction sessions are great, although it does seem like students get bored with those presentation (especially if they have been through them more than once.) Perhaps some Student Center Skillshops could make it more fun.

If all incoming students were required to take FCST, this and many other helpful things are included in this class.

I highly recommend having the librarians come into the classrooms (or take the class to the library). I believe students need to know there are sources of information available besides the internet.

Not all students have the deficiencies listed above, but I have found the need to give extensive guidance.

Mandatory library tour/orientation; create some assignment with mandatory source information
Appendix D: GHC Core Curriculum

The core curriculum at GHC is structured as follows:

Area A: Essential Skills (two English composition courses and one mathematics course = 9 hours)

Area B: Institutional Options (one required communication course and one other course chosen from an array of options = 4 - 5 hours)

Area C: Humanities/Fine Arts (one required literature course and one other course chosen from an array of humanities/fine arts options = 6 hours)

Area D: Science, Mathematics & Technology (depending on major, one required mathematics course and a required two-course science sequence = 10 – 11 hours)

Area E: Social Sciences (one required political science course, two required history courses, and one other course chosen from an array of social science options = 12 hours)

Area F: Courses Related to Program of Study (18 hours)
Appendix E: IC Assessment Instrument

INFORMATION COMPETENCY TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT ID (Last 5 digits)</th>
<th>CAMPUS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Gender:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date ______________________

Year of Birth: ____________

Please select one answer for the following items. Do not guess. If you do not know, fill in the "e" bubble.

1. You are writing a research paper on violence in American schools; the paper must be supported with scholarly articles. A good example of a scholarly article is:
   a. A nine page article from the Journal of Sociology that includes two pages of references
   b. People magazine cover story on impact of violence in US public schools
   c. 20 pages from www.stopviolenceinusschools.com, a blog by Alan Anderson
   d. Rome News Tribune editorial on violence in Floyd County school system
   e. Don't know

2. You plan to write a persuasive speech in favor of uniforms in public schools. Which library resource is best to locate current articles collected in searchable databases?
   a. Galileo
   b. GIL
   c. Encyclopedia Britannica
   d. Unabridged dictionary
   e. Don't know

3. You have searched the web for information on the dangers of backyard swimming pools. Which of the following sites is most likely to be biased, that is, to be based on personal opinions rather than on facts?
   a. Recent research study at UGA posted on uga.edu
   b. Newsweek magazine special issue reports on newsweek.com
   c. ABC nightly news report on TV posted on abcnews.com
   d. Safe and fun swimming activities posted on backyardpools.com
   e. Don't know

4. You have quoted several authors in your paper, indicating the titles and dates of their books in the body of your paper. In the reference section of your paper you:
   a. Do not have to mention them again
   b. Need only to include them as a footnote
   c. Have to list the authors of books but not authors of articles
   d. Must reference them in your bibliography even though you already included them in your paper
   e. Don't know

5. You are researching the economic impact of the Class A professional baseball team on the local region around its hometown. A good source of information will be:
   b. Letters to the editor in the local newspapers expressing the opinions of local citizens
   c. The daily sports report on WFAN, the regional talk radio
   d. Local county government and regional Chamber of Commerce reports
   e. Don't know

(Continued on back)
Appendix F: Year One Communication IC Assessment Activity

Communication Assessment Tool: Pre/Post Test Information Competency

1. MLA, APA, Chicago, and Turabian are all types of:
   a. Databases
   b. Pizzas
   c. Hats
   d. Citation Styles
   e. Speeches

2. Scholarly articles would probably possess all of the following characteristics except:
   a. be peer reviewed
   b. have a reference list
   c. include at least one author’s name
   d. be less than five pages long

3. In Susan’s speech, she made the following statement: “According to the May issue of the Journal of Pediatrics, nine out of ten children do not get enough sleep.” This is:
   a. A use of plagiarism
   b. A Vocal Citation
   c. An Example
   d. An Anecdote

4. The Online Library Tutorial at GHC can help the student with all of the following except:
   a. Learning about citation styles
   b. Locating admission information
   c. Locating research sources
   d. Understanding the concept of plagiarism

5. Sandra is giving a persuasive speech on purchasing life insurance in America and used the following research in her speech: "A study by Jones and Conner found that only 35% of Americans purchase life insurance." Which of the following qualities of Sandra’s statement makes her research citation weak?
   a. It incorporates the use of a statistic.
   b. We do not have any background about the credentials of Jones and Conner.
   c. The study was limited to American consumers.
   d. None of the above
6. Which of the following types of internet sites is generally considered to be the MOST reliable source?
   a. .com
   b. .net
   c. .edu
   d. .tv

7. Which of the following is the BEST way to incorporate statistics regarding obesity in the U.S. into a speech?
   a. "According to the New England Journal of Medicine, eighty percent of Americans are considered obese"
   b. "Unbelievably, a whopping eighty percent of Americans are obese and the number continues to increase"
   c. "There are many obese people in the U.S. today"
   d. "My brother works at the gym and he sees a lot of obese customers every day"

8. Which of the following is a collection of information databases, mostly from previously published printed sources which can be used to search online for reference materials?
   a. NEWTON
   b. GALILEO
   c. My Space
   d. Wikipedia

9. If Jenny were presenting a speech and needed to know the number of people who die each year in the United States from accidental drowning, which of the following would be the best source to consult?
   a. Encyclopedia Americana
   b. Webster's Geographical Dictionary
   c. Statistical Abstract of the United States
   d. Bartlett's

10. Rosa is presenting a speech on non-surgical anti-aging treatments. Which of the following would be considered the most reliable type of support to incorporate into her speech?
    a. a quote from the head of the American Medical Association's Board of Dermatology
    b. a statistic from www.lookyoungernow.com
    c. a chart from the Swedish Cosmetology Association's 2003 web site
    d. a brochure from Spa Sydell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student uses the citation style required for class assignment with complete bibliographical information and use of formatting guidelines. Student uses strong sources which are credible, timely, varied, and appropriate for assignment. Student does an excellent job of incorporating research into assignment and correctly referencing this research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student uses a standard citation style for class assignment; bibliographical information may be lacking complete information and formatting guidelines may include stylistic errors. Student uses acceptable sources for assignment but sources may possess some deficiencies in credibility, timeliness, variety, or appropriateness for assignment. Student does a good job of incorporating research into assignment and correctly referencing this research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student uses a standard citation style for class assignment, but bibliographical information is lacking in content and stylistic errors in formatting are present. Student uses sources which are lacking in credibility, timeliness, variety, and/or appropriateness for the assignment. Student incorporates research into assignment but fails to accurately reference the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student fails to use a standard citation style for class assignment; bibliographical information is very limited and stylistic errors are present in formatting. Student uses sources which are lacking in credibility, timeliness, variety, and/or appropriateness for assignment. Student incorporates research into assignment to a limited degree but fails to appropriately reference this research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Year One Freshman College Computer Studies IC Assessment Activities

LIBRARY ORIENTATION - Spring 2007
FCCS 1100

www.highlands.edu, then click on the link entitled “Library”

Features of the Home Page

A. Library Services

Ask a Librarian

ILL Form (Articles)

ILL Form (Books)

Periodical Holdings

Video List

B. Library Catalogs

GIL

Search strategies:

(exact search)

(keyword search)
Features of the "Results List"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. year</td>
<td>Call N.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GIL EXPRESS

NetLibrary

Note: You have to create an account from campus before you can access the record at home.

GALILEO

Connect to GALILEO

*GALILEO Quick Search:

Example 1:

*Note: Quick Search is easy to use, but there are a couple of problems with it. First, it's very broad and it may take several minutes to download all of the citations. Secondly, it will take you to a lot of information that you can't really use. For example, it calls up everything from abstracts to full-text articles; everything from newspapers to magazines to web sites. It also fails to limit your search by date, media format, etc.
Subject Tabs (at top of screen):


Once you narrow your search to a particular subject category, and begin choosing specific databases, you have a better (and faster) chance of finding what you are looking for.

Example 1:____________________________________

Example 2:____________________________________

Subject Databases that will be especially helpful to your research needs:

History:

Academic Search Premier*
Masterfile Premier*
Research Library*

Literature:

Literary Reference Center
MLA International Bibliography

Business and Economics:

ABI/Inform
Business Source Premier
Hoover's Company Capsules
Lexis-Nexis

Nursing and Allied Health:

CINAHL with Full-Text

Medicine:

MEDLINE with Full-Text
**Education:**

ERIC  
Professional Development Collection

**Political Science:**

Lexis-nexis

**Psychology:**

Psychology & Behavioral Science Collection  
PsychINFO

**Sociology:**

Sociological Abstracts  
Sociological Collection

*These are available in the other subject areas as well.

*Other databases that might prove useful include:

Worldcat (great for locating books and journal titles worldwide)  
SKS Webselect (great for selecting websites that are authoritative and academic)

If you prefer to use a specific database, you can go straight to that database to begin your search.

*Find Databases:

*Find Books and Journals*:

*Note: We’ve already looked at the book catalog (which is GIL) so we’re going to focus on how to find specific Journals.*

*Find Journals:

*Find Articles*:

*Note: We’ve already looked at the article catalog (which is GIL) so we’re going to focus on how to find specific Articles.*

*Find Articles with Abstracts*:

*Note: We’ve already looked at the article catalog (which is GIL) so we’re going to focus on how to find specific Articles.*

*Find Articles with Full Text*:

*Note: We’ve already looked at the article catalog (which is GIL) so we’re going to focus on how to find specific Articles.*

*Find Articles with Citation**:
Citing GALILEO

APA
Style__________________________________________

MLA
Style__________________________________________

Get the GALILEO Password

Online Library Learning Center*

*Note: Pay close attention to Units 7, 8, and 9.

LIBRARY ASSIGNMENT, Spring Semester 2007

Name of _________________________________________

Student___________________________________________

Each question is worth 10 pts. Hint: All of the following questions (except for #4 and #5) can be answered by searching various GALILEO databases. Good Luck!

1. Using the GALILEO database, Literary Reference Center, how many articles can you find that critique the William Faulkner novel, Sanctuary?

2. Using the GALILEO database, MEDLINE with full-text, how many full-text articles can you find on the treatment of Parkinson's Disease in the professional journal, "Lancet?"

3. I am looking for a book about an obscure 1970s rock and roll band named Rare Earth. Does such a book exist and, if so, which libraries in the United States actually own a copy?
4. A friend of mine said that he found a netLibrary book on bodybuilding and steroids. In one section of the book, the author discusses the "Superman Syndrome," and writes that this condition is "not considered a direct physiological effect of steroids." What is the title of the netLibrary book to which he is referring, and what is the page number where I can find this quote?

5. Does the Georgia Highlands Library have a copy of the book, EKG plain and simple by Karen M. Ellis? If not, which libraries in the University System of Georgia own a copy?

6. Who designed the Arsenal in Danzig?

7. In which of the following states do women outnumber men—Texas, Colorado, Georgia, Alaska, California?

8. I heard that a sister of Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote a book about him. If Kirkus reviewed the book, what did they say about it?

9. East Timor has a national language called Tetum. I heard that the country wanted to again make Portuguese an official language. What language was the official language?

10. What are the three top competitors of Thomson-Gale?

FCCS 1100

Internet Assignment 2

Answer each question, save your document, and then return to me as an attachment.

Part 1
From the Georgia Highlands homepage: www.highlands.edu

1. Give the names of all Vice Presidents at Georgia Highlands College.
2. Describe 2 different ways to locate an email address for any professor at Georgia Highlands.
3. Where do you go to see a listing of all course offerings for a given semester?
4. How could you limit this list to only those classes offered at the Rome campus?
5. How could you tell if a class is full or available?
6. Where would you find the form to change your major?
7. Where would you find your transcript? Check your grades? Check status of financial aid?
8. How can you update your personal data (address, phone, email, etc.)?
9. Where will you go to register yourself for classes next semester?
10. What is the Galileo password for Spring semester 2007?
11. Where will you find help for your term paper bibliography?

Part 2

12. Technically, Georgia Highlands has 5 campuses. Name 4.
13. Give the dates of your 2007 Spring break
14. There are 3 official Atlanta TV stations that report when Georgia Highlands is closed. Name 2.
15. How much does it cost an in-state student to take only 6 hours?
16. Since we no longer publish catalogs, where can you find one online?
17. We have 4 student publications; name 2.
18. How can you look up your Georgia Highlands id if you lose your card?
19. What is the application deadline for Study Abroad?
20. When did drop/add end?
21. When is the last day to withdraw from this course? (10 week schedule)
Appendix H: Year One Activities

2007-2008 IC @ GHC Major Events and Deadlines

**FALL 2007**

August 14  Implementation Committee Meeting
Preparation Yearly Schedule of Events
Prepare for presence at GHC Club Roundup

August 17  IC Training Workshop for Area B conducted by GHC Faculty
(Communication/FCCS)

August 27-30  IC @ GHC booth at GHC Club Roundup
Familiarize students with IC @ GHC

September 14  IC @ GHC Faculty Academy
Mandatory IC training for tutorial center workers, librarians, and new faculty

September  Implementation Committee Meeting
Results of Orientation IC Assessment Instrument Testing Due

October 15-17  SACS visit to GHC

October 23-24  IC @ GHC booth at Fall Frenzy
Increase student knowledge and involvement with IC @ GHC

Nov-Dec  Assessment Training Workshop with Outside Speaker
2008-2009 IC Programs: Area C, Sci/PE Div., and Area F

December 5  Area B Fall Semester IC assessment data due

**SPRING 2008**

February 5  Annual Faculty Surveys Distributed

March 1  Class assessment instruments due

March  Implementation Committee Meeting
Faculty Survey Results/2008 Core Area Assessment Instruments
April 1-4  Assessment of IC among selected second year students

April-May  Final Training Workshop
           2008-2009 IC Programs: Area C, Area F, and Sci/PE Div. classes

May 1  Area B Spring Semester IC project assessment data due

May  GHC Assessment Day
     Spotlight on IC activities – impressions of Year One from core
     area faculty, progress on analyzing project assessment data,
     plans on integrating IC@GHC assessment data with Information
     Literacy faculty assessment data.

June 1  Annual IC Implementation Progress Report Due
## Appendix I – QEP Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>