Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy

(Formerly known as the Georgia Conference on Information Literacy)

Sep 28th, 1:50 PM - 2:10 PM

Working Information: Developing a QEP for Campus-Wide Information Literacy Infusion

Susan N. Moore
Spartanburg Community College, moores@sccsc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/gaintlit

Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, and the Information Literacy Commons

Recommended Citation
Moore, Susan N., "Working Information: Developing a QEP for Campus-Wide Information Literacy Infusion" (2018). Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy. 77.

This presentation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences & Events at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.
Working Information:
Developing a QEP for Campus-Wide Information Literacy Infusion
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Susan Moore, Director of Instructional Support
Katherine Stiwinter, Library Director
Spartanburg Community College

- Located in Upstate, South Carolina
- Approx. 3,000 FTE (4,500 head count)
- Serves 3 counties with 5 campuses
- Offers arts and sciences, business technology, health & human services, engineering and industrial technology programs
WIn: Working Information

• Increase students’ information literacy skills through a focus on the faculty.

• Faculty Training:
  • The importance of information literacy
  • Methods of incorporating information literacy into their courses, and
  • Good assignment design practices for research-based assignments
Faculty Training

IL Course Infusion

Evaluation of Student Artifacts
Faculty Training
Phase 1: Target high-enrollment gen ed. courses (arts and sciences)

Phase 2: Target career-orientated courses

Phase 3: Recruit other interested instructors
For Each Course...

- Lead Instructor
- Full-Time Instructors
- Adjuncts
## Phase 1: Selected General Education Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG101</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>COL103</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL101</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>ART101</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC205</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>ENG165</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY201</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>BIO101</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG102</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1: Introduction to QEP project and Overview of IL Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2: SLO 1 – Accessing Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3: SLO 2 – Evaluating Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4: SLO 3 – Synthesizing, Organizing, Communicating Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 5: SLO 4 – Properly Using Information (i.e. Citing, Plagiarism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 6: Best Practices Assignment Design for Research Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 7: Workshop Research Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Training Activities
Card-Sorting! … Superheroes?
Synthesis Activity
Assignment Design – A Recipe of Success
So How Did It Go?

Feedback & Results
1) The QEP training and activities stimulated my knowledge of Information Literacy
9 responses

2) How confident do you feel about your information literacy skills following this training?
9 responses

3) I will be able to use what I learned during the QEP training:
9 responses
4) Which topics or aspects of the QEP training did you find most valuable?

- synthesis
- Interesting publishing cycle of information
- Time on keyword search
- Organization of assignment guidelines
- How to incorporate synthesis and evaluation of sources
- Assignment design
- Database information
- Activities for IL
- Available databases
- No suggestions
- Synthesizing information

5) What did you find least valuable during the training?

- the conference
- At times the sessions veered toward pedagogical instruction.
- It was all good :)
- I found that all of it was valuable. I can't answer.
- MLA
- N/A
- Nothing
- No suggestions
- It was all informative.

7) Do you have suggestions for making the QEP training more effective?

- No (2)
- more time for assignment design/infusion
- Spend more time on organization of assignment guidelines with more models.
- Maybe break out sessions by discipline to brainstorm ideas on how to infuse these lesson ideas into our calendars.
- More time for assignment design. The training was great, though.
- no
- No suggestions. Have a nice summer.
- Clearly communicate training expectations.
Before & After: Psychology Assignment
Describe the Kitty Genovese case. Be sure to identify her killer, what happened to him, and why this case is important in social psychology. Use at least three sources, including the following film clip. Use MLA or APA format with which to cite your sources. [video link]

General advice:

- Use the spell check and word count functions in MSWord or other software that you are using.
- You should be able to find plenty of information sources via search engines. Try to utilize a variety of sources in your paper such as newspaper articles, websites, and magazine or journal articles.
- Include a statement at the end of your paper evaluating the credibility of your sources. (e.g. "All sources used in this paper are believed to be accurate.
- If you need help, speak with your instructor and/or take your rough draft to the Tutorial Learning Center for assistance.
- Finally, don't annoy the grader. In other words, follow instructions!!

Grading: Listed below are factors that will be considered in assigning a grade from our rubric:

- Relevance of sources to this topic
- Variety and credibility of sources
- Synthesis of material and clarity of presentation
- Making in-text citations (e.g. "According to Hogan (2015), a witness saw...")
- Spelling
Assessment
**Developed a Rubric**

### Combined Rubric for QEP Win SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1</th>
<th>4 - Capstone</th>
<th>3 - Milestones</th>
<th>2 - Milestones</th>
<th>1 - Benchmark</th>
<th>0 - Below Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sources are totally appropriate for assignment/academic level and are relevant to topic</td>
<td>Sources are mostly appropriate for assignment/academic level and are relevant to topic</td>
<td>Sources are somewhat appropriate for assignment/academic level and are relevant to topic</td>
<td>Sources are not appropriate for assignment/academic level but have relevance to topic</td>
<td>Sources are not appropriate and not relevant to topic; OR sources are not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>Chooses a variety* of information sources; AND credibility of sources is fully acknowledged (currency, authority, bias/point of view, etc.)</td>
<td>Chooses a variety* of information sources; AND credibility of sources is mostly acknowledged (currency, authority, bias/point of view, etc.)</td>
<td>Chooses a variety* of information sources; AND credibility of sources is somewhat acknowledged (currency, authority, bias/point of view, etc.)</td>
<td>Chooses a few* information sources OR Sources may be credible (currency, authority, bias/point of view), but credibility of sources is not acknowledged</td>
<td>No sources; OR no variety* of source information; OR sources are not credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved</td>
<td>Communicates information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, but the intended purpose is somewhat achieved.</td>
<td>Communicates information from sources, but the information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), and the intended purpose is not achieved.</td>
<td>No sources; OR information from sources is not communicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>List of sources and in-text references is complete in format and quality</td>
<td>List of sources and in-text references is complete in format and quality</td>
<td>List of sources and in-text references is complete, but not of high quality</td>
<td>List of sources or in-text references is incomplete, but of high quality</td>
<td>No sources; OR no list of sources; OR references are not complete in format and quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Process

1. Collect Baseline Assignment Samples
2. QEP Readers Evaluate (& send feedback)
3. After Training, Collect Revised Assignment Samples
4. QEP Readers Evaluate (& send feedback)
5. Ongoing Collection, Evaluation, & Feedback
Initial Assessment Results
Preliminary Results From Initial Scoring Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>Session 1 Average</th>
<th>Session 2 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 4</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 1</td>
<td>SLO 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned

Changes & Challenges
Ambitious Schedule...

• Simultaneously working with 8-9 different courses/instructors.

• Scheduling in-person meetings with faculty group.

• Finding time for all in-person meetings, as well as all follow-up in meetings in the space of one semester.

• Burning the candle at both ends – beginning work on a new round of faculty training, while finishing up the prior semester’s feedback, revisions, and tutorial customizations.
Engagement/Buy in...

- Teaching information literacy would take valuable class time away from faculty’s subject area.

- Faculty weren’t volunteers.

- Faculty are very busy already, and our QEP training was an intense additional project.

Photo courtesy of Steve Austin, Flickr.com, 9/25/17, CC License
Down the Road...

• Long-term momentum

• Continued logistics

• Following up with everyone

• Communication
Assessment Challenges...

- Rubric Language – general yet specific
- Capturing Non-written Student Work (speeches, presentations, etc.)
- Organization of Sample/Artifact Collection

Combined Rubric for OEP Win SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 1</th>
<th>Sources are totally appropriate for assignment/academic level and are relevant to topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2</td>
<td>Chooses a variety* of information sources; AND credibility of sources is fully acknowledged (currency, authority, bias/point of view, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 – Capstone

3 – Milestones

2 – Milestones

1 – Benchmark

Sources are not appropriate for assignment/academic level and have relevance to topic

Sources are mostly appropriate for assignment/academic level and are relevant to topic

Sources are somewhat appropriate for assignment/academic level and are relevant to topic

Sources are not appropriate for assignment/academic level but have relevance to topic

*variety/few – in this context, a variety of information sources means that the student did not pull all their sources from one common source (i.e. 4 entries from the same encyclopedia, or 4 chapters from the same book). It does not refer to a variety of different sources.
Other QEP Activities
• QEP Advisory Council
• QEP Leadership Committee
• QEP booth at Campus Events
• Employer Panel
• Surveys

• Faculty Reunion Breakfast
• Additional Faculty Dev. Workshops
Questions?