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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This generation of students, referred to as digital natives, the net-generation, or generation tech, is very unlike the generation of learners that graduated prior to the start of the 21st century. These digital natives have never known an analog world without the internet. Conversely, many professors are digital immigrants who recall a land where the clumsy slide projector, dusty overhead, and monstrous opaque projectors were “king” of the “high-tech” classroom. Against this reality, the Warner community completed a three-year process of selecting and designing a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to address a need particularly among first-year students in the area of digital literacy. Several institutional effectiveness studies using both external tools (NSSE, SLA and CLA) and a variety of internal tools shape the QEP, or “the E.D.G.E.” as it is known.

Warner University’s mission is to graduate individuals who exemplify academic excellence and Christian character, who are prepared to lead and committed to serve. To this end, the Warner University EDGE (QEP) equips students for a digital age. Research and literature reviews conducted by the steering committee indicate that the skills needed to lead and serve today’s complex marketplace are dramatically different from the skills needed in 1968 when the institution began.

The goal of Warner University’s EDGE is to improve the ability of students to use digital technologies to access, evaluate, and communicate information and knowledge. Two freshmen general education courses are the primary venue for experimenting with methodologies designed to achieve the three student outcomes:

1. Search, identify, and retrieve information in digital environments. (Access)
2. Judge the currency, appropriateness, accuracy and adequacy of information and sources for a specific purpose or audience (including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials). (Evaluate) (adapted from California ICT Digital Literacy Assessments and Curriculum Framework)
3. Adapt the information and choose a digital communication medium and format that best supports the purposes of the product or performance and the intended audience. (Communicate) (adapted from ACRL literacy competency standards)

The goal will be measured using the ETS iSkills tool and internal pre- and post-class assessments. The administration of the assessment tools along with cyclical review and analysis pinpoints areas for improvement, while best practices disseminate to the community. A semi-annual digital literacy conference will provide resourcing for faculty and staff.

The EDGE director and implementation team oversee the project assisted by three working teams (resource, marketing, and assessment). The membership on the teams includes faculty, staff, alumni, and students. Representation includes each school, library, academic skills, and directors of institutional research, information technology, and general studies. Forty individuals are directly involved in the EDGE working and implementation teams.

The steering committee has transitioned from planning to implementation with a two-phase process and timeline. Implementation teams, the EDGE director, budget, resources, and technology support are all in place to facilitate the successful implementation and sustainability of Warner’s EDGE to improve the digital literacy of students as they access, evaluate, and communicate information digitally.
INTRODUCTION TO THE DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

A thorough 3-year process of research, investigation, reading, discussions, forums, meetings, confusions, focus groups, teams, committees, “brick walls,” and sometimes even, “the ah-ha,” is hard to capture on paper, but this document represents one attempt to do so. The QEP process has given the institution an opportunity to take a look forward in a very significant way. The end result of this process is one that the Warner community is excited to see take shape and produce “fruit” for both students and faculty alike in the month and years to come.

This document will provide the SACS visiting team with a clear picture of the process that has taken place over the last three years and a snapshot of the future hope and vision for enhanced student learning at Warner University, a small, yet vibrant, liberal arts institution within the Christian tradition in central Florida.

Following the example on page 49 of the August 2011 Edition of the Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation, this document is organized into five chapters around the five fundamental issues related to successful compliance with CR 2.12 and CS 3.2.2.

Chapter 1 describes the broad-based institutional process used to choose, create, and prepare the QEP for implementation. This chapter uses broad strokes as it describes the process without going into the details of the actual plan.

Chapter 2 provides specific details about the primary focus of the project. This chapter begins with a glossary of definitions that are essential for understanding the terminology used throughout the document. This chapter does not focus on timelines, structures, or research leading to best practices, but focuses instead on the desired learning outcomes associated with the curricular and co-curricular initiatives designed to enhance and encourage student learning.

Chapter 3 presents an action timeline and institutional plan for implementing and completing the QEP demonstrating institutional capability for allocation of time, expertise, and resources to ensure accomplishment of the desired student outcomes.

Chapter 4 describes the literature and best practices review conducted to arrive at the definitions, goal, and student learning outcomes. Additional details regarding the broad-based organization structures of implementation describe the plan to ensure sustainability and completion of the project.

Chapter 5 contains the plan for assessment that will involve external and internal instruments providing both formative and summative assessment of the project.
I. INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING AND DEVELOPING QEP TOPIC

“Digital literacy is much more than a functional matter of learning how to use a computer and a keyboard, or how to do online searches. Of course, it needs to begin with some of the «basics». ” (Buckingham, 2006, p. 267)

The Warner University community of students, alumni, faculty, and staff invested a considerable amount of time and capital identifying key issues that inform the Quality Enhancement Plan to improve the digital literacy of Warner’s first year students. This narrative began just before 2008 as students completed several assessment tools in the 2007-2008 academic year. This chapter describes the process, people, and information that influenced the formation of Warner University’s QEP proposal in order to demonstrate that Warner has complied with the goals of CR 2.12 “an institutional process for identifying key issues” and CS 3.3.2 “broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development...of the QEP.”

Description of Warner University

Warner University is a four-year private Christian liberal arts university affiliated with the Church of God – Anderson, Indiana. A liberal arts curriculum, in a wide variety of academic disciplines, prepares students to successfully meet the demands of today’s workplace and the challenges of graduate school. We develop servant leaders who evaluate issues from a Christian perspective and who strive to live out their belief in their communities, churches, and homes. The administration, faculty, and staff are Christian, qualified in their areas of service, and dedicated to the ministry of higher education. The campus provides an environment where administrators, faculty, and staff model the values of Christian heritage.

Mission Statement

The mission of Warner University is to graduate individuals who exemplify academic excellence and Christian character, who are prepared to lead and committed to serve.

Demographic Information

Founded in 1968 as Warner Southern College, the first entering class consisted of 27 students. The institution transitioned to university status in 2008 and was renamed Warner University. Currently, Warner is comprised of three organized schools: the School of Ministry, Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, and the School of Education. In the fall of 2010, Warner University welcomed its largest freshman class on record as 178 first time students enrolled. The total enrollment for fall of 2011 is 1,016 students.

Warner University students come from 30 different states and represent 25 foreign countries. Florida residents comprise 88% of our student body population with over 40%
coming from the surrounding area of Polk County. Other states represented by high population of students include Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Warner has been ranked nationally for the diversity of its student body.

For the fall 2010 academic year financial aid was awarded to 99% of the student body population with an average award over $13,000 dollars. Our students’ families heavily rely on financial aid as our demographics show that 76% of them have incomes under $60,000 per year. This figure represents the highest need of any private college in Florida. (as reported by the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida www.icuf.org)

Academic Information

Warner offers over 25 majors and students experience a student / teacher ratio of 13:1. The top five majors by student population include Business, Education, Church Ministries, Social Sciences, and Communication. During the 2010 spring graduation, 352 degrees were awarded from associates to master’s level. Degree programs exist in three different formats consisting of traditional campus based, non-traditional evening, and weekend programs as well as online.

First-Year Retention and Admission Information

The average SAT score of entering first-year Warner students in 2011 is 945, an indication of Warner’s liberal admission policy. The 2011 retention rate for first year students dropped to 56%, slightly below the average of institutional peers. A recent report, which contained data on the 2010 and 2011 first year students, grouped Warner’s 122 enrolled (2011) first-year students into four academic ranks. The composite SAT score for the 23% (28) in the highest rated group was 1107 while the composite SAT score for the 30% (37) in the lowest rated group was 794. According to the national ACT data, the typical range of SAT scores for schools with liberal enrollment practices is 870-990. The range for schools with open enrollment is typically 830-950. (see appendix 6)

QEP Concept Introduced to University

In 2008, the director of institutional research, Lisa Murphy, initiated an intentional information campaign to educate members of the community on the new SACS QEP requirements for reaffirmation. This campaign included conversations at both the administrative and academic levels including the President's Cabinet, Academic Council, and Faculty Meetings.

In February 2009, Lisa Murphy issued a call for QEP proposals based on the institution’s research and mission. Along with the invitation, Mrs. Murphy provided access to the following pieces of institutional research:
Faculty and staff were to consider QEP ideas that would enhance the quality of Warner’s program and submit the proposals for further review. Proposals were to identify a topic, student learning outcomes, a rationale for need tied to institutional research, methods for assessment, and resources available to implement the plan.

A QEP Review Committee comprised of faculty, staff, and an alumna representative, was formed fall 2009 and functioned as a subcommittee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The QEP Review Committee determined the guidelines for acceptable content of QEP proposals that would be forwarded to faculty for consideration.

The call for QEP proposals generated several ideas; however, only one completed proposal dealing with using technology in the classroom was submitted. The lack of sufficient proposals prompted a gathering of the entire community on November 11, 2009. The meeting on November 11 brought together faculty, staff, students, alumni, administration, and select members of the Board of Trustees.

A community of approximately 75 individuals worked in teams of 4-5 to generate creative topics for a possible QEP project that represented a significant new initiative for the institution. SACS consultant Dr. Margaret Sullivan led the session inviting participants to discuss challenges or barriers to student success and learning and to recommend potential projects that would have the greatest impact on student learning. She reiterated that the institutional mission and institutional research should support the topic.

The following projects were proposed:

1. Agriculture – Growing and donating crops to the needy
2. Service learning infused across the curriculum
3. Integration of Christian worldview into each course
4. Critical thinking outcomes for chapel experience into Senior Seminar curriculum
5. Stewardship with a worldview via invited speakers
6. Provide supplemental education experience to middle school students
7. Commitment to serve program
8. Improve student access to education via use of technology
9. Critical thinking in general education
10. Development of skill sets for service
11. Student portfolio development
12. Writing based on knowledge of worldview
13. Building community partners for service and learning opportunities
14. Student Success in Mathematics
15. Enhancing written communication across the curriculum
16. Christian Character Program

Following the meeting, the working teams submitted their ideas as a formal QEP proposal. Proposals were to identify at least two learning outcomes, a title, a purpose statement, and possible methods of assessment.

Four Topics Considered

A selection committee reviewed each of the topics submitted by members of the Warner community; March 2010, Lisa Murphy and the selection committee identified and presented four viable topics for consideration to the Warner community.

These topics included:

- Extending the Chapel Experience to the Classroom
- Committed to Serve
- Critical Thinking – Teaching HOW to Think NOT What to Think
- Warner Beyond the Classroom – Using Technology to Increase Access and Learning (now known as E.D.G.E)

On March 29, 2010, a second working forum invited faculty, staff, and student stakeholders to “speak into” the four topics under consideration. The community reviewed the four proposals and SACS QEP requirements. Attendees suggested possible student outcomes and additional initiatives that would make each topic a meaningful and significant investment of learning resources. The community of approximately 50 faculty, administration, staff, and students provided specific feedback to each idea under development. Following this working session, the four teams further revised and resubmitted their proposals for final community review and selection.

One Topic Chosen

On April 21, 2010, an invitation was sent to the extended Warner community of students, faculty, staff, administration, alumni, and trustees soliciting their input and vote on a QEP topic that would best fit the mission, need, and educational goals of Warner University.
The Warner Community was comprised of 3,620 individuals and included the following groups:

- **Faculty**: Regular Faculty (49), Adjunct Faculty (76)
- **Staff**: Regular Staff (Full-Time 105) and Part-Time (25), including Administration
- **Students**: Traditional Undergraduates, Non-Traditional Undergraduates, On-line Students, and Graduate Students (1,045)
- **Warner Alumni** (2,300)
- **Warner Board of Trustees** (20)

After a brief presentation of the QEP criteria, the community received access to the four topic proposals. (Appendix 4 contains an example of the presentation slides created for the chosen proposal. To review each of the final four topics go to: [http://online.warner.edu/course/view.php?id=1143](http://online.warner.edu/course/view.php?id=1143) Lisa Murphy and the four teams provided digital online summaries, created visual displays on campus, and gave oral presentations in campus settings. The community voted with either an online “survey monkey” instrument or paper ballots.

The Director of Institutional Research coordinated the voting process utilizing email, verbal announcements in chapel, and social networking to remind members to vote. Two hundred ninety-four (8%) of the 3,620 invited individuals opted to participate in the QEP selection process. Twenty-two percent of faculty, staff and students participated.

On May 24, 2010, the Director of Institutional Research announced that the Board of Trustees officially approved the topic selected by the community, which was **Warner Beyond the Classroom – Using Technology to Increase Access and Learning.** Thirty-seven percent of the participants had selected the technology-focused topic, while 30% chose the critical thinking topic. The final 33% were split between the other two proposals. (See Appendix 5.)

This process, which began in 2008, concluded the first phase of topic selection demonstrating partial compliance with CR 2.12 “an institutional process for identifying key issues” and CS 3.3.2 “broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development…of the QEP.”

The more arduous task now began of developing the project and demonstrating full compliance with CR 2.12 “focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning,” and CS 3.3.2 “broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP.”

**Steering Committee Appointed to Shape the Project**

An appointed steering committee consisting of three full-time faculty members, two program directors with faculty rank, and one staff director began developing the chosen
Warner University

Warner's Chief Academic Officer (CAO) convened the committee providing members with several reaffirmation related documents. The CAO encouraged the committee to focus on student learning outcomes and quality enhancements that would improve student learning. The CAO suggested that an inquiry into the field of digital literacy might be necessary given the topic of the selected QEP and the need to connect the QEP with student learning outcomes.

Mark Thomas, Director of Institutional Technology Services, chaired the Steering Committee. Once convened, the committee met almost weekly October 2010 through June 2011. Mark Thomas reported regularly to the CAO and the President throughout this process and attended the SACS conference in Louisville, KY. The information he gleaned from the SACS conference was particularly helpful in refocusing the ultimate goal and direction of the final QEP project. The steering committee initiated a review of QEP projects from peer institutions on similar themes.

As the steering committee immersed itself in the reaffirmation compliance documents, the challenge became clear. The community’s chosen topic, “Using Technology to Increase Access and Learning,” although relevant, required some “reworking” in order to comply with the QEP expectations. The topic required a refocus on the learner, instead of technology. The topic needed a clear goal, with measurable student learning outcomes grounded in best practices and research.
Learning Resource Staff Employed to Conduct Literature Reviews

The steering committee quickly employed the skills of the Learning Resource Center (LRC) staff to conduct a thorough literature search on the topics of digital literacy and technology in the classroom. The LRC staff posted their findings and reviews in the QEP Lit Review MoodleRoom at: http://online.warner.edu/course/view.php?id=1465.

Each week, the committee reviewed the work of the LRC literature review team and the discoveries from reviews of found QEPs on like subjects. The LRC staff provided the steering committee with an abundance of material on informational literacy, information fluency, information and communications technology (ICT), and digital literacy. As the committee reviewed the literature, language, and associated best practices, the original proposed technology-centered topic gave way to a more student-focused initiative that was within the same technology “ballpark.”

Aided by the research, the steering committee narrowed the focus of the original proposed topic, shifting the focus from using technology to improving the digital literacy of students. The literature review provided key terms, concepts, skills, and practices that are a measurable part of digital literacy. The steering committee utilized this research to create a definition of digital literacy and a set of student learning outcomes to measure student learning.

Faculty, Departments and Students Consulted

Throughout the process, committee members sought input from faculty colleagues, administration, students of each school, and appropriate staff. Members of the committee conducted and participated in several student and faculty focus groups in this phase of formation. Each academic department participated in shaping and validating the final student learning outcomes, the definition of digital literacy, and the revised goal of the QEP.

The committee also spent considerable time considering the scope and target for the QEP in relationship to institutional resources, institutional research, and the needs of the Warner student body. With much of the institutional research pointing to the diverse needs of the first year student, the steering committee eventually chose to narrow the scope of the QEP project to first year students. Lower than average admissions standards, lower than average ACT and SAT scores, and data from CLA, NSSE, and SSI provided substantial evidence that Warner’s first year students need to build a solid foundation early in their careers to ensure success and achievement of Warner’s mission to “graduate individuals who exemplify academic excellence and Christian character....”
A Productive Meeting Focuses the Project

On June 9, 2011, nearing the end of their commission, the steering committee had a productive meeting with Dr. Barry Goldstein, Warner's previous SACS liaison. This meeting helped the committee to “sift out” extraneous elements that had been accumulating through the months of brainstorming, thinking, rethinking, and transitioning from a QEP project that was originally more focused on using technologies than student learning outcomes. Following this meeting, the committee’s work crystallized into a more focused scope and plan, which is the content of Chapters 2-5.

The steering committee adopted and forwarded several recommendations to the CAO and faculty that are part of the ongoing preparation and implementation phase.

1. After ten months of research, discussion, and institutional input, the steering committee was able to recommend a specific scope, goal, definition, student learning outcomes, and specific curricular and co-curricular initiatives designed to facilitate successful achievement of the QEP goal to improve the digital literacy of Warner’s first year students.

2. The steering committee recommended that a QEP director be appointed with at least ½ time responsibilities for managing and guiding the QEP in the final preparation and implementation stages. Shawn Taylor, director of online education and a key member of the steering committee, assumed this position fall 2011.

3. The steering committee also recommended that the creation of five QEP administrative or working teams would increase the involvement of faculty, staff, and students in the final stages of preparation and implementation. Members of the steering committee remain actively engaged with the implementation teams that formed fall 2011.

4. The steering committee recommended a yearly cycle of faculty development, evaluation, and improvement, particularly important for those digital “non-natives.”

5. The steering committee investigated and tested several assessment tools before recommending the adoption of the ETS iSkills instrument as the primary external assessment tool. Additional internal tools need to be created to assist in providing formative and summative evaluations of the QEP and the achievement of student learning outcome.

6. The steering committee also recommended that the QEP Marketing team involve the Warner community in developing both the official name and logo for the Warner QEP.

The Name Emerges – “the EDGE”

Nominated by a student from the class of 2005 and subsequently selected by the community, the Warner QEP is now known officially as “the E.D.G.E.” (Enhancing Digital
Growth through Education). The EDGE is Warner’s Quality Enhancement Plan designed by the Warner community to give first year students an “edge” as they improve their digital literacy skills in order to digitally access, evaluate, and communicate information digitally. The Warner community believes that the EDGE initiative can be executed and that it will strengthen the institution’s ability to achieve the mission “to graduate individuals who exemplify academic excellence and Christian character, who are prepared to lead and committed to serve” in this new digital age.

**Summary: A Concise Timeline of the Institutional Process**

(Bolded words indicate various constituencies engaged in the process.)

2007-2008----------Key Assessments given: NSSE, CLA, SSI, other internal tools
2008 --------------**Director of Institutional Research (IR)** Initiates QEP Campaign
Feb 2009 ----------Call for QEP Proposals Issued
August 2009 -------One Proposal Returned – Technology in Education
Nov 2009 ---------Dr. Sullivan - **Campus QEP Brainstorm Session** – 15 Topics
March 2010 -------Dir. of IR and Selection Committee Narrow 15 to 4 Topics
March 2010 -------**Community QEP Forum** to Develop the Four Best Topics
April 2010 --------294 Community Members Participate in Selection Process
May 2010 ----------QEP Project Selected – Using Technology in Education
Oct 2009 ---------**Steering Committee** Commissioned – Meet Weekly
Oct 2010 ----------Steering Committee Reviews Peer QEPs
Oct 2010 ---------Steering Committee Reviews SACS Documents
Nov 2010 ---------**LRC Staff** Begins Literature Review – Ongoing through March
Nov 2010 ---------Reviews and Discussion Continue Weekly
Nov 2010 ---------Steer Com. Develops Digital Literacy Definition
Dec 2010 ---------Steer Com. **Invites Faculty** to Respond to Definition
Dec 2010 --------SACS Louisville Conference Helps Refocus on Students
Dec 2010 ---------Steer Com. **Updates Faculty** on Progress and Seeks Input
Dec 2010 ---------Steer Com. Explores Possible Assessment Tools – Readiness
Jan 2011 ---------Steer Com. Explores ETS – ICT Tool and SmartMeasures
Jan 2011 ---------Steer Com. Develops Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)
Feb 2011 ---------Steer Com. Asks **Each Department** for SLO Feedback
Mar 2011 ---------Steer Com. Reviews Feedback on SLO’s
Mar 2011 ---------Steer Com. Reviews iSkills Test – Makes Plans to Benchmark
Mar 2011 ---------Steer Com. Enters new Discussions about Scope and Focus
Mar 2011 ---------Steer Com. Conducts **Student Focus Group**
April 2011 --------**LRC Staff** Finish the Lit Review Process
April 2011 ---------Steer Com. Prepares Updates for **Staff and Faculty**
April 2011 --------- Steer Com. Prepares Seniors and Freshmen for iSkills
April 2011 --------- Steer Com. Shares and Gets Feedback from SGA
April 2011 --------- Steer Com. Recommends a Gen Ed First Year Experience Scope
April 2011 --------- Steer Com. Receives Approval from Gen Ed Council to Proceed
May 2011 ---------- Steer Com. Works through Project Goals
June 2011 -------- Steer Com. Meets with Dr. Barry Goldstein to Review QEP Status
June 2011 -------- Steer Com. Debriefs Meeting and Begins Revisions
July 2011 -------- Steer Com. Approves Implementation Team Structure
July 2011 -------- Steer Com. Revises SLO - Access, Evaluate, Communicate
July 2011 -------- Steer Com. Adopts Refocused QEP Scope
August 2011 ------- Steer Com. Transitions to Implementation Teams
August 2011 ------- QEP Director Appointed
Sept. 2011 ------- Implementation Teams Formed and Organized
Oct. 2011 -------- Assessment Team Administers iSkills to 50+ first-year students
Oct. 2011 -------- 199 participate in Name Contest – QEP becomes E.D.G.E
Oct. 2011 -------- QEP Director Begins Weekly Updates for Faculty
Nov. 2011 -------- LOGO Contest Initiated by Marketing Team
Nov. 2011 -------- Resource Team Gathers Resource Names, Sets Tentative Dates
Nov. 2011 -------- Expo Team Sets Parameters
Nov. 2011 -------- Assessment Team Finishes Review of Courses/ Begins Rubrics
Dec. 2011 -------- Final Narrative Edited and Approved by Implementation Team
II. THE PROJECT DEFINED: A FOCUS ON ENHANCING STUDENT LEARNING

“The current and future health of America’s 21st century economy depends directly on how broadly and deeply Americans reach a new level of literacy—‘21st Century Literacy’.” (21st Century Workforce Commission, 2000, p. 4)

The process of identifying the goals and initiatives for the EDGE project was a thorough and thoughtful process that culminated in a project of substance that will enhance the educational readiness of Warner students to meet the demands of this digital century. This section of the EDGE proposal details the project’s definitions, goal, scope, desired student learning outcomes, and the shape of the project’s curricular and co-curricular initiatives to strengthen student learning and enhance the learning environment. The content of this section seeks to present more evidence of compliance with CR2.12 “focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning.”

EDGE Definitions

The following terms and concepts are essential to understanding the focus, goals, and student learning initiatives of EDGE.

Digital Literacy:

Digital literacy is the ability to use digital technologies to access, evaluate, and digitally communicate information and knowledge.

EDGE:

EDGE is the title selected by the Warner community for our QEP project. The “EDGE” survived a name selection contest that began with over 50 name submissions. The marketing team used the contest to educate the community about the QEP goal, student learning outcomes, and the definition of digital literacy. One hundred ninety-nine persons participated in the online voting. The E.D.G.E (Enhancing Digital Growth through Education) received 58% (108) of the vote.

EDGE Goal:

The EDGE goal is to improve the digital literacy of Warner’s first year students, which will be demonstrated by their ability to access, evaluate, and communicate information and knowledge digitally. Three identified Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s) will be measured throughout the EDGE project using both external and internal assessments.
EDGE Student Learning Outcomes:

There are three student learning outcomes (SLO’s) corresponding to the digital literacy skills of accessing, evaluating, and communicating. Digital literate students will be able to:

1. Search, identify, and retrieve information in digital environments. (Access)
2. Judge the currency, appropriateness, accuracy, and adequacy of information and sources for a specific purpose or audience (including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials). (Evaluate)
3. Adapt the information, and choose a digital communication medium or format that best supports and matches the purposes of the product or performance with the intended audience. (Communicate)

Note: The student learning outcomes were adapted from several respected sources including: 1) the California ICT Digital Literacy Assessments and Curriculum Framework, and 2) the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education.

First-Year Experience Courses or EDGE courses:

The EDGE program is targeting two first-year experience courses for introducing and teaching the fundamentals of digital literacy. The QEP steering committee supports and recommends the creation of one new 1000 level course: Literacy in the 21st Century and the inclusion of EDGE assignments in the General Education course, Composition I. The new course will be developed and piloted during phase one (2011-2012) and will become the foundation of the EDGE in phase two (2012-2016). The General Education Council gave approval for the development of the new course as part of the EDGE initiative. After completing the pilot stage, Literacy in the 21st Century was approved by the faculty and will become a required course in the General Education Program.

Project Meets a Need

The identified EDGE goal and the three student learning objectives gradually came into focus after a deliberate process that involved examining available institutional research and conducting additional qualitative and quantitative research. Institutional research conducted throughout the inception and development period of the EDGE has continued to confirm the merits of and the need for this project.

The initial ETS iSkills assessment conducted during the developmental phase of the topic, for instance, supports two identified needs, one for first-year students, the other for faculty. The average score results clearly reveal that the digital literacy competencies of
Warner students are below the national average (see also recommendation 4), a statistic that is consistent with other internal research such as the below national average first-year student entrance scores on the SAT and ACT. (see also appendices 1-5)

In order to accomplish the EDGE goal, the institution is prepared to invest time, personnel, and resources into facilitating this plan. The primary focus of time and resources is on the curricular initiatives within the First-Year Experience, and the related co-curricular student initiatives designed to shape the campus ethos and increase competencies of students. The steering committee believes that the success of EDGE is conditional on the skills and training of faculty to access, evaluate, and digitally communicate information and knowledge within adequately equipped classrooms.

Two Courses – the Heart of the Curricular Initiative

Upon recommendation from the visiting team and consideration from both the EDGE implementation and assessment teams two courses, instead of the three originally piloted will be the focus of the EDGE program. (Recommendation 2) Composition I and Literacy in the 21st Century, a new General Education course, are required of all incoming first-year students. These two courses are the primary training ground for the digital literacy skills of access, evaluate, and communicate. These courses are the heart of the EDGE program.

Composition I

This course encourages development of the first two student learning outcome that requires searching, identifying, and retrieving information in digital environments (access) and judge the currency, appropriateness, accuracy, and adequacy of information and sources for a specific purpose or audience (including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials). (Evaluate) A specific writing assignment (A Formal Investigative Paper) is required in this course. In order to complete this assignment, research on topics specified by the instructor is necessary. Students must develop competencies using a number of digital resources to conduct the majority of this research. A rubric has been developed by the assessment team to assess this assignment. (Appendix 11) (Course Syllabus)

In addition to this assignment, one of the school librarians will conduct two classes. (Digital Literacy Classes) Both classes will take place in the Warner computer lab.

The first class:

In this class period students will be presented with information about the resources available to them as Warner students through the Learning Resource Center (LRC), credible references, and doing an effective search. The students will be taught how to
access and search three databases available through the LRC by seeing a live demonstration. Students will be given the opportunity to do some searches under the direct supervision of the librarian and one or more assistants.

Assignment:

The students will leave the class with an assignment in hand to be completed and returned for a grade in the next class period. (Appendix 11 – Digital Literacy Exercise).

The second class:

An assessment will take the entire second class period – also to take place in the computer lab. Knowledge will be assessed through a twenty question online quiz using a Moodle Room designed for this session (Appendix 11- MOODLE Room). Skills will be assessed by giving students research topics and evaluating both the process (steps) and the product (results) or this search. (Appendix 11- Knowledge Test ). If a student fails to complete the knowledge test, a score of less than 75%, he or she will be able to take the test a second time (15% reduction in grade).

Specific EDGE student learning outcomes for these two classes: (referenced by the items below)

- ACCESS – 2, 10
- EVALUATE – 3, 6, 7, 8,

As a result of participating in this lesson, students will be able to:

1. list and describe digital resources available to them through Warner LRC
2. access digital information through the Warner LRC
3. identify and define a credible reference
4. paraphrase and cite information taken directly from reference material
5. use the limiters “full text” and “scholarly articles” in EBSCO
6. select appropriate “key terms” needed to conduct an effective search.
7. narrow a digital search using Boolean terms
8. expand a digital search using Boolean terms
9. list the key elements of referenced material for a book and a journal article.
10. access a Moodle Room to complete assignments.

These two classes will help prepare the students for the final investigative paper which will also be assessed as an EDGE assignment. (Appendix 11 – Rubric and Assignment Description)
Literacy in the 21st Century

All three of the student learning outcomes: access, evaluate, and communicate are significant to the assessment of objectives in this course. Students have multiple opportunities to use and develop their access skills in order to complete weekly discussions, written assignments, a webquest, and a final project. Students learn to conduct academic research both on the Internet and in the LRC digital databases. Students learn how to evaluate websites, weblinks, social bookmarking sites, digital images, digital conversations, blogs, persuasive letters, a webquest, and wikis using guided worksheets and hands-on exercises. (Appendix 11) (Course Syllabus)

Students learn how to use a variety of digital media to communicate their ideas. Activities may include using tools to create a Voki, avatar, blog, prezi, glog, persuasive letter, voicethread, or public service announcement. Students will incorporate use of all three EDGE objectives in a final project that requires both a written paper and a digital presentation using appropriate tools. Professors will use the rubric provided by the Assessment Team to assess the final project. (Appendix 11) Students must receive a minimum of score of 75% to pass this assignment.

Institutional Research Reveals Faculty Need

Institutional research not only points to the needs of first-year students, it also reveals the existence of wide ranging levels of digital literacy among the current faculty, a fact documented in annual ITS technology surveys and recent iSkills testing of current faculty. A secondary benefit and necessary component of the EDGE, therefore, will be to raise the digital literacy competencies of Warner’s faculty through targeted faculty development and training.

To this end, and for the better part of two decades, the institution has been making steady, deliberate, and incremental progress in increasing faculty and student access to appropriate educational technologies. The institution has experienced accelerated growth and expansion over the past six years including improvements in hardware, software, bandwidth, wireless access, digital presentational equipment, and smart board technology.

The Steering Committee also noted that there has been an increased use of our institutional course management software (Moodle) by traditional site based faculty over the last two years. The recent increase in the use of Moodle to digitally enhance many of the traditional classroom courses is indicative of the readiness of the majority of the faculty to become better users of 21st Century educational technologies. The QEP will encourage the continued development and deployment of new technologies to assist in the achievement of the desired EDGE goal to improve the digital literacy of students.
EDGE Conference Supports Student Learning Environment

To support and enhance the student learning environment, the EDGE proposal includes a semi-annual EDGE conference each May and August. The semi-annual conference is a one-day in-house digital literacy conference designed to resource and to enhance the learning environment by strengthening the digital literacy skills and competencies of faculty and staff. Coordinated and planned by the resource and implementation teams, a guest digital literacy expert keynotes and leads the bulk of this conference.

EDGE instructors and the assessment team also share reports on assessments and best practices. The EDGE Conference provides a cyclical forum for sharing ongoing discoveries regarding best practices in the classroom. The May conference will continually review assessment information so that EDGE faculty can make changes if warranted in teaching methodologies year to year.

The EDGE conference answers a growing cry of faculty for training and help adjusting to the rapidly changing technological landscape. A Faculty Digital Technology survey administered in 2009 and again in 2011 indicates a varied level of digital proficiency among faculty, but a strong desire among faculty to use technology as an enhancement to their teaching methods. Eight-seven percent of the 2009 survey respondents indicated a “strongly agree” or “agree” response to the question “I would like to use technology in the classroom to teach in the future.” When asked, however, “in how many classes did you use some form of technology this semester” 37% indicated 2 or less classes, 6% indicated 1, and 16% indicated none.

III. INSTITUTIONAL PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND SUCCESS

"Accessing, evaluating, applying, and managing information well, and using information sources appropriately and effectively, are just some of the skills that define 21st century digital literacy." (Trilling, 2009, "Chapter 4," para. 6)

Introduction

The content of this chapter provides support for the institution’s compliance with CS 3.3.2 “institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP.” The EDGE initiative is a project designed to address a real and significant student learning need. The plan includes several new and ambitious initiatives, but it also takes advantage of many of the processes, systems, and resources that Warner already has in place to support these new initiatives. The plan is realistic, achievable, and conscious of Warner’s institutional context.

A True Story

During the formation stage of this plan, the steering committee reviewed numerous QEP plans. Our central Florida neighbor, the University of Central Florida (UCF), graciously provided the steering committee with a copy of their QEP via their QEP website. The
committee was eager to examine their QEP because of the overlapping focus on information fluency, but reviewing the 98-page document set a trap that kept the committee stuck for weeks. The problem? Some of the committee skipped over the first sentence of their QEP abstract that reads, “the University of Central Florida is the seventh largest institution in the U.S., with over 45,000 students and nine academic colleges” (http://if.ucf.edu/files/2009/09/UCF_QEP_document.pdf). The moral of the story? Be yourself. The UCF context of a two million plus QEP budget is far different from the WU context.

The strength of Warner’s plan lies within the direct involvement of over 40 faculty, staff, and students in the on-going implementation process. This broad-based design allows the institution to focus its resources on a major collaborative new initiative that has potential benefits that can easily spill over into other academic areas that are not part of the plan’s scope. This chapter outlines the specific goals and actions necessary in the two phases of implementation. The chapter concludes by addressing the shared budgetary resources needed to complete the plan.

More EDGE Definitions

The following terms, frequently used in this section, warrant definition and explanation up front.

Phase 1:

The initial year of the EDGE that began academic year 2011-2012. Phase 1 prepares the student learning environment for successful implementation and achievement of the EDGE student learning outcomes.

Phase 2:

Begins fall 2012 and continues until the 5 year report. The focus of Phase 2 is on the SLO’s for first-year students in the two EDGE courses and the QEP goal to improve the digital literacy of first year students. Annual cycles of assessment and evaluation commence along with the semi-annual EDGE Conferences each August and May.

EDGE Director

The EDGE director is a member of the faculty whose assignments have been shifted to allow for a 50% FTE focus on the EDGE plan. Mr. Shawn Taylor assumed this position as EDGE director in August 2011 after having served on the QEP steering committee. Mr. Taylor will remain as the part-time Director of Online Education.
Implementation Team

A coordinative team, led by the EDGE director, responsible for coordinating the actions of the three working teams, maintaining progress reports, setting new goals, and overseeing any changes to the implementation plan as the process moves forward. The makeup of this team is discussed in chapter 4.

Working Teams

Working Teams are working subcommittees of the implementation team. A member of the implementation team co-chairs each working team. There are four working teams described below:

Assessment Team

The assessment team conducts, collects, and provides analysis of all assessments, recommending changes to assessment methods and/or instruction methodologies as indicated by the data. The Assessment team sets annual assessment goals or markers to assist in interpreting and utilizing the assessment data. The makeup of this team is discussed in chapter 4.

Resource Team

The resource team works with the EDGE Director and General Education Director to identify specific types of training or resourcing needed to ensure achievement of the SLO’s. The resource team provides and schedules appropriate training as needed. The resource team will develop a plan for the annual EDGE conferences and develop a process of ongoing faculty development and resource sharing utilizing a shared Moodle classroom. The makeup of this team is discussed in chapter 4.

Marketing Team

The marketing team continually highlights the goal, discoveries, and accomplishments of EDGE. They assist the EDGE Expo team and resource team in promoting the annual Expos and EDGE Conferences. The makeup of this team is discussed in chapter 4.

Implementation Begins

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the EDGE project shifted from the formation stage into phase 1 of the implementation stage. The steering committee shifted into implementation mode and the shape of the steering committee expanded and changed its name to the implementation team under the leadership of the new EDGE director. Four members of the steering committee transitioned to the implementation team; another became a co-chair of a working team. The transition to phase 1 of
implementation was possible because the steering committee accomplished the following tasks before the transition:

1. Reviewed current literature and other QEP documents for best practices regarding key concepts, terms, skills, and understandings related to the task of developing digitally literate students.
2. Creation and approval of a QEP goal, definition of digital literacy, and a set of SLO’s that emerged from the literature review.
3. Creation of a QEP plan that includes two specific new initiatives, each supporting the QEP goal and SLO’s. These new initiatives include: two EDGE courses and two EDGE conferences.
4. Creation of an implementation strategy, basic timeline, and organizational structure to support completion of the project.
5. Recommendation approved by the General Education Council to pilot and test one new General Education course and implement EDGE assignments in Composition I as EDGE courses during the 2011-2012 academic year. Two members of the QEP steering committee designed the initial courses for testing.
6. Approval given by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) to invest in the iSkills assessment tool chosen to be the primary external assessment instrument.
7. Recommendation accepted to appoint a part-time EDGE director.

Implementation Stage: Phase 1 (2011-2012)

Beginning with the fall 2011 term, Shawn Taylor assumed the role of EDGE Director. The first task was to begin forming the implementation team and three working teams. Working with the CAO, forty individuals received invitations to serve on an EDGE team. The Implementation Team began monthly meetings chaired by Mr. Taylor. Each of the working teams was formed and began meeting.

The following list of goals and action steps guide actions of the institution, the director, and each supporting team during phase 1 of the implementation plan. The steering committee created clear, but flexible guidelines and boundaries for this phase of the project. This flexibility allows the teams and individuals to continue to shape the project creating ownership. At the same time, the boundaries set by the steering committee related to the project’s scope and focus keep the teams from becoming distracted from the mission and goal of completing the project.

Goals and Action Steps: Phase 1

1. Appoint an EDGE Director than can devote 50% FTE to this assignment. (Completed 8/2011)
   a. Form, organize, and educate the Implementation Team and four sub-teams. (Completed 9/2011)
b. Oversee the work and progress of the teams ensuring that the implementation goals stay on target. (in process)
c. Oversee the final writing of the EDGE plan. (completed 1/2012)
d. Prepare annual reports of progress.

2. Educate, release, and utilize the Marketing Team to communicate and teach the definition of Digital Literacy, the Goal, and Student Learning Objectives
   a. Conduct Name and Logo Contest Fall 2011. (Task Completed)
   b. Develop a long range marketing plan taking into account several key dates: the February SACS site visit and the annual May and August EDGE conferences commencing May 2012.
   c. Develop a marketing plan to highlight the accomplishments of EDGE students and faculty each semester. (in process)

3. Educate, release, and utilize the Assessment Team to begin work developing tools and establishing workable timelines for formative and summative assessment of the EDGE project and EDGE courses.
   a. Review and become familiar with the iSkills assessment. Each member should take the exam. (Completed 11/2011)
   b. Gather baseline assessment data on first-year students. (Completed 9/2011)
   c. Review the syllabi for the EDGE courses under development. Review course objectives and methodologies to ensure the presence of the EDGE SLO’s. (completed) (Course Syllabi)
   d. Begin work on internal formative and summative assessment tools and rubrics. (completed 5/16/2012) (Appendix 11)
   e. Clearly communicate the assessment plans with the Director of General Education and the EDGE instructors.

4. Educate, release, and utilize the Resource Team to begin work on developing resources to assist faculty teaching EDGE courses and make preparations for the EDGE conferences.
   a. Begin work on a plan for ongoing faculty development in the area of digital literacy. (begun and in process)
   b. Begin work on a plan for the semi-annual EDGE conferences in May and August. Secure a digital expert for the August 2012 conference by June 2012. (begun and in process)
   c. Gather resources to assist the pedagogical needs of the EDGE faculty. Develop a shared Moodle room of resources and best practices. (begun and continued development)

Implementation Stage: Phase 2 (2012-2016)

Phase two begins with the 2012-2013 academic year. The primary focus of this phase is on the curricular initiatives surrounding the two first-year experience courses. The implementation team and four working teams are accountable for keeping the EDGE project on target. The EDGE director will lead the initiative and report progress directly
to the CAO, Dr. James Moyer. Unless adjusted by the implementation team due to shifting needs of the EDGE plan, Phase 2 uses a cycle of planning that repeats each year.

Yearly Goals and Action Steps: Phase 2

To be completed in August/September each year.

1. Each EDGE year begins with an EDGE conference held in August during the usual faculty workshop week and time slot. The EDGE director will coordinate these dates each year with the CAO to avoid conflicts with other startup agendas. The digital expert leading the EDGE conference is secured 2-3 months before the scheduled conference date. The Resource Team and EDGE director will ensure that a presenter is scheduled.

2. The Resource Team supports the planning and preparations for the EDGE Conference in August and completes a post conference evaluation.

3. Any new EDGE instructors will meet with the EDGE director to receive a briefing on the EDGE plan, resources, goals, and instructor responsibilities related to assessments and reporting. The returning EDGE instructors will receive oral and written reminders each year too.

4. The assessment team will prepare to administer the iSkills exam to 60 first-year students within the first 2 weeks of the fall semester. (Recommendation 3) The results will be shared with the EDGE faculty in a joint meeting no later than the beginning of week four of the fall semester so that the results might have a formative effect on the course agenda. Each instructor will submit a report on how he or she plans to use the results. The assessment team ensures the scheduling of other internal assessment measures they have developed.

To be completed by the end of the fall semester each year.

5. All required EDGE internal course assessments will be collected by the Assessment team, compiled and evaluated. The report will consider how to use the results and make recommendations to instructors, the implementation team, and the resource team.

To be completed in January each year.

6. Any new EDGE instructors will meet with the EDGE director and the Director or General Education to receive a briefing on the EDGE plan, resources, goals, and instructor responsibilities related to assessments and reporting. The returning EDGE instructors will receive oral and written reminders each year too.

7. The assessment team will share the fall assessment report with the spring EDGE instructors. The assessment team ensures the scheduling of other internal assessment measures that they have developed.
To be completed in April or the end of the semester each year.

8. The assessment team prepares to re-administer the iSkills exam to 60 first-year students who were enrolled in the two EDGE courses. Additionally, a randomly selected group of twenty-five Warner University juniors and seniors will be given the iSkills assessment. (Recommendation 3,5) The results from this group will be compared to the data of those who have completed the EDGE program, as well as the ETS national average score. A summary report will be created to be shared at the EDGE conference in May.

9. All required EDGE internal course assessments will be collected by the Assessment team, compiled, and evaluated. The report will consider how to use the results and make recommendations to instructors, the implementation team, and the resource team.

10. The resource team secures a digital expert for the August EDGE conference and reports the name and vitae to the Implementation Team. Final preparations for the May EDGE conference are made.

To be completed in May each year.

11. The EDGE year concludes with an EDGE conference held in May during the usual end-of-year faculty workshop week. The EDGE director will coordinate these dates each year with the CAO to avoid conflicts with other end of the year agendas. This conference will not include an outside presenter, but will be used to gather feedback from all EDGE instructors and work on plans for further development of the EDGE program. The Resource Team and EDGE director will provide the necessary resources to complete these tasks. The EDGE Assessment Team will provide summary reports of the assessments used for the EDGE program.

12. The resource team supports the planning and preparations for the EDGE Conference in May and completes a post-conference evaluation.

13. The assessment team reviews the data generated during the year and ensures that the implementation team and EDGE instructors are making use of the assessment results. The assessment team will set assessment goals or markers for the upcoming year.

14. The marketing team will gather stories and successes and devise a method to broadcast these to the wider community.

15. The EDGE director will meet with the General Education Director and all Edge instructors for an end of the year debriefing in preparation for the next round of first-year students.

EDGE Budget Support

The EDGE implementation plan relies solely on budgetary funding that already exists in current budget line items. In most cases, money is already budgeted for the types of initiatives proposed in this plan.
The CAO, CFO, and President support the following extra initiatives and associated EDGE costs. A budgetary provision to support each of these projected expenses exists.

1. 50% FTE Salary for the EDGE Director ($3000)
2. iSkills Testing @ $20 per exam. Minimum 150 units each year $3000.
3. EDGE Conference expenses (May and August) $2500. The structure of the May conference has been changed; it will now be more of a workshop setting for faculty teaching EDGE courses, instead of an extensive conference setting.
4. Marketing Expenses $500
5. EDGE Course Resources $1000 earmarked in Learning Resource Center (LRC) Budget
6. Miscellaneous Project Expenses $400 each semester

Additional funds will be made available for the EDGE program through academic and student life budgets.

Learning Resource Center Support

The staff and director of the Learning Resource Center endorse this project wholeheartedly. There is a direct and natural affinity for the project due to the relationship between information literacy and digital literacy, which makes this an easy topic to support. The staff expects to see an increase in student use of the growing collection of digital resources in the LRC.

Sherrill Harriger, the LRC director, has earmarked $1000 annually out of her budget for resources that may be helpful to instructors teaching the EDGE courses. With the Director of the LRC sitting as a permanent member of the EDGE implementation team, her involvement provides a direct information conduit that will prove to be invaluable. The LRC staff supported the efforts of the steering committee by investing countless hours conducting the literature search and review. The director assisted the steering committee by purchasing resources for the collection that might aid the committee.

Technology Services Support

Another student service department that assisted the EDGE program is the Warner Institutional Technology department. Mark Thomas, Director of the ITS department, served as the QEP steering committee chairperson and sits as a permanent member of the implementation team. Mark Thomas’ desire to see the institution stay current with the explosive technology market is a huge asset and resource to this project. His department and the institution’s technology resources stand ready to assist the successful completion of this project. Exciting new and expanded initiatives are in the early planning stages for adding additional smart boards, document cameras, webcams, and lecture capture capabilities.
IV. BEST PRACTICES AND SUSTAINABLE STRUCTURES

“In contemporary usage, digital (or computer) literacy often appears to amount to a minimal set of skills that will enable the user to operate effectively with software tools, or in performing basic information retrieval tasks. This is essentially a functional definition: it specifies the basic skills that are required to undertake particular operations, but it does not go very far beyond this.” (Buckingham, 2006, p. 265)

Introduction

This chapter provides additional compliance evidence for CS 3.3.2 “broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP.” This chapter begins by outlining the process of literature review that led to the adoption of the goal, definition, and SLO’s for the project, providing “evidence of consideration of best practices related to the topic.” The chapter concludes with a description of the constituencies involved in the implementation structures designed to ensure broad-based participation and sustainability through the five-year cycle.

The steering committee enlisted the skills and resources of the Learning Resource Center (LRC) staff as a Literature Review sub-committee during the formation stage of the EDGE plan. Members of the literature review sub-committee searched, reviewed, excerpted, and then posted their findings to the QEP Lit Review Moodle room into a searchable set of forums. The subcommittee found and reviewed one hundred twenty-five relevant articles, eBooks, and print sources. For each relevant source, they rated the relevancy on a scale of 1-10 and summarized the content excerpting key concepts from the search parameters given to them. The LRC staff added several new bound resources to the collection including Paul Gilster’s 1997 seminal work, Digital Literacy. (See appendix 7 for more details on the work of the subcommittee and access to their online resource room.)

As the steering committee read the literature reviews, realizations emerged as to the new direction for the EDGE plan. The original QEP direction was about access, or improving access to technology in the classroom, or perhaps a focus on technology fluency. The current literature and research, however, pointed to a slightly different need for this decade of learner. Distinctions between technology access, technology fluency, information literacy, information fluency, IT fluency, ICT literacy, digital literacy, and other assorted literacies were abundant, yet subtle. A choice would be required. The chosen literacy type would affect the best practices, methodologies, and learning initiatives that the committee needed to explore. As intended, the process of literature review added depth and focus to the steering committee’s thinking and options.
Literature Review Provides New Vocabulary

The steering committee engaged in lively discussions around some of the distinctions between literacy types discovered in the literature. Key concepts and terminologies overlapped, inviting the committee to establish a Warner QEP definition for digital literacy. First, the committee had to learn a new vocabulary.

Andrew Churches’ development of Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy provided a starting point for the development of Warner’s digital literacy definition and student learning outcomes (SLOs). Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy, see Figure 1, identifies new behaviors and actions that have emerged because of technology advances. Outcomes are not focused on the tools or technology, but are measured by competence of use and the quality of the process or products. Key terms included: creating, evaluating, analyzing, applying, understanding, and remembering.

![Figure 1: Bloom's Digital Taxonomy](http://edorigami.wikispaces.com/Bloom%27%20Digital%27%20Taxonomy)

The groundbreaking work of Paul Gilster provided a helpful starting place for understanding differences between simply developing functional competencies for using digital hardware and software applications and developing digital literacy. Much of the focus and IT training at Warner has been of the functional type (faculty still request it, students still need it), but the definition of digital literacy takes us beyond the mere
functions of the technology. P. Gilster’s definition of digital literacy is worth including, even if penned before the release of Windows 98, the IPod, IPhone, and IPad. His definition is:

. . . the ability to understand and use information in multiple formats from a wide range of sources when it is presented via computers. The concept of literacy goes beyond simply being able to read; it has always meant the ability to read with meaning, and to understand. It is the fundamental act of cognition. Digital literacy likewise extends the boundaries of definition. It is cognition of what you see on the computer screen when you use the networked medium. It places demands upon you that were always present, though less visible, in the analog media of newspaper and TV. At the same time, it conjures up a new set of challenges that require you to approach networked computers without preconceptions. Not only must you acquire the skill of finding things, you must also acquire the ability to use these things in your life. (Gilster, 1997: 1-2)

As the QEP steering committee continued to search for the “right” definition for digital literacy, key words, concepts, and phrases began to surface. These key words eventually become the vocabulary from which the steering committee writes both a definition and the list of desired SLO’s.

The National Education Technology Standards (NETS) for both teachers (NETS-T) and students (NETS-S) provided examples of the skills that students need in acquire and master in order to be successful in a modern digital age. The standards also focus the skills and knowledge educators need in order to evoke changes in teaching methodologies. The development of higher-order thinking skills is one of the main focal points of the NETS-S. The key terms used in the standards call for students to demonstrate creativity, to communicate and collaborate, to conduct research and use the information, to think critically, solve problems, and make decisions to use technology effectively and productively.

http://www.iste.org/standards.aspx
http://www.iste.org/standards/nets-for-students.aspx

Education Testing Service (ETS) Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Literacy Assessment/iSkills identifies seven measurable ICT literacy skill areas. These areas include: defining, accessing, managing, evaluating, integrating, creating, and communicating information. Information gathered from ETS’s preliminary assessment results indicated that students face the following challenges: “identifying trustworthy and useful information, managing overabundant information, (and) communicating information effectively.” http://www.ets.org/iSkills/about/content/

Key terms gleaned from The Association of College and Research Libraries’ (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education included locating, evaluating, and effectively using information. ACRL defines information literacy as
“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.”

http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/guidelinesandstandards/learningstandards/AASL_LearningStandards.pdf

The DigEULit project originating out of the European Union (EU) provided the committee with one of the more advanced definitions of digital literacy, increasing the committee’s digital literacy vocabulary even further.

Digital Literacy is the awareness, attitude and ability of individuals to appropriately use digital tools and facilities to identify, access, manage, integrate, evaluate, analyse and synthesize digital resources, construct new knowledge, create media expressions, and communicate with others, in the context of specific life situations, in order to enable constructive social action; and to reflect upon this process. (Martin A. & Grudziecki, J., 2006: 255)

Literature

The definition of Allan Martin, University of Glasgow, Scotland, and Jan Grudziecki, Technical University of Lodz, Poland is more complex than some definitions because they identify and layer six literacies that are part of “the literacies of the digital.” These literacies are foundational to their understanding of digital literacy and include: computer literacy, technological literacy, information literacy, media literacy, visual literacy, and communication literacy. (Martin A. & Grudziecki, J., 2006: 250-255)

Computer, IT or ICT literacy has been identified as a need from the late 1960s. We can see concepts of computer literacy as passing through three phases, the Mastery phase (up to the mid-1980s), the Application phase (mid-1980s to late-1990s) and the Reflective phase (late-1990s on). In the Mastery phase the computer is perceived as arcane and powerful, and emphasis is placed on gaining specialist knowledge and skill to master it. (Martin A. & Grudziecki, J., 2006: 250)

As the steering committee wrestled with nearly 20 similar, yet different, definitions of digital literacy, the committee realized that the QEP project was an opportunity for the University to go beyond computer literacy, technological literacy, and information literacy emphases of the past two decades. The QEP had to go beyond simple mastery and application.

Over a decade ago, Warner’s faculty passed a mandate that each major include a technology-centered course, or a course that taught students a particular workplace related computer application. Today this mandate is hollow because students need more. “Digital literacy is much more than a functional matter of learning how to use a computer and a keyboard, or how to do online searches. . . .” D. Buckingham (2006) does not end his paragraph there, however. She adds, “Of course, it needs to begin with some of the «basics».” (p. 267)
A Goal and Definition is Created

From the literature review, the steering committee began to develop a definition of digital literacy that fit the Warner context. The challenge was to address the particular needs of Warner students and faculty, who still need some basics. The DigEULit definition, for instance, seemed like it was more than one QEP! The goal and definition for Warner needed to be simplified while still capturing the fuller definition of digital literacy. The committee realized that “digital literacy” could not be just another way to say “information literacy” or “computer literacy.”

The goal was clearer than the definition. **The QEP goal would be to improve the digital literacy of Warner students.** Later, the scope narrowed to specifically first-year students because of their need for basics and their need for solid foundations in digital literacy early in their academic careers.

The definition took a few drafts before the committee was satisfied:

**Digital literacy is the ability to use digital technologies to access, evaluate, and digitally communicate information and knowledge.**

Embedded in the definition are a few key words. “The ability to…” references the development of skills and competencies, the basics. The use of the plural “…technologies…” is also intentional. Students do not need to learn a particular technology or application, instead they need to learn how technologies work and function so that they are ready to use and apply concepts of digital literacy to the new technology not yet invented.

The committee chose just three specific competencies “access, evaluate, and digitally communicate.” The committee chose to focus on a primary action or skill throughout the levels of thinking, starting with a lower level thinking or action, "to access,” and progressing to a higher level of thinking or action, “to communicate.” The inclusion of “digitally” was also intentional, acknowledging the changing ways that we communicate in life and work. Finally, the inclusion of “knowledge” added another dimension or measure of literacy. Knowledge requires evaluation and synthesis of information at higher orders of thinking.

Review Shapes Student Outcomes

The next task was to develop specific student learning outcomes that emerge out of the goal and definition. The committee culled the literature again looking for examples. Attention turned to the definition and the learner. What should a first-year digitally literate student at Warner University know, feel, and do? What indicators will we look for and assess?
The literature review directed the committee to the ETS iSkills tool that, at the time, was undergoing some “retooling.” The rubric of measures that were part of this instrument paired well with the definition. Initially, the committee created a list of four student outcomes. Each academic department received the list of outcomes along with the definition for their review. Faculty received instructions to review the outcomes recommending changes or additions if needed.

The committee received positive feedback that was helpful in clarifying the language. Consequently, the committee reorganized the outcomes to directly mirror the three skills listed in the definition.

Digitally literate Warner University students will be able to:

1. Search, identify, and retrieve information in digital environments. (Access)
2. Judge the currency, appropriateness, accuracy, and adequacy of information and sources for a specific purpose or audience (including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials). (Evaluate)
3. Adapt the information, and choose a digital communication medium or format that best supports and matches the purposes of the product or performance with the intended audience. (Communicate)

Determining the Scope

After completing the process of clarifying the goal, definition, and student learning outcomes, the committee turned to the process of determining the scope and academic arena in which to initiate the QEP. The committee scoured the SACS website for peer QEPs that had related targets. As the committee sifted through these documents and the literature, a reoccurring focus on the first-year student emerged.

The committee decided to test the iSkills instrument with our Warner first-year students at the end of the spring 2011 semester. The results confirmed what the committee already believed anecdotally. Our first-year students’ iSkills composite score was below the national average. The average composite score for those first-year students in our test group was 195 and the national average for the iSkills test is 250. This did confirm that we do have room for improvement and that this project will have merit.

Concurrent with this process, a discussion began in the General Education Council about the need for a different General Education approach with the first-year student. With this information, the QEP steering committee petitioned the General Education Council for permission to embed the QEP initiative in two first-year courses designed to build skills and competencies critical to retention and success.

The General Education Council concurred with the proposal and the QEP began work on developing a process for instilling digital “literacies” into the two courses. A course
offering plan was devised and a schedule was developed for the EDGE courses. (Recommendation 5) (Appendix 12)

Determining the Methodology

As the steering committee searched for best practices related to the pedagogy of digital literacy, the committee continued to find more examples related to the layered “literacies of the digital.” Drawing from research initiatives in these related literacies, the committee recognized several recurring patterns or themes: the power of deliberate collaboration with literacy experts, the unique and varied needs within the first-year population, the need for faculty development, and the importance of developmental and repeated exposure to the concepts of a particular literacy across the curriculum.

A Few Examples of Best Practices

Collaborative Course Development

A helpful article, “Aligning Information Literacy with Faculty Teaching and the Learning Agenda,” (Dearden, 2005), detailed a project at the University Tasmania that focused on two important elements in implementing an information literacy program, the first being involvement of the library staff in developing assignments and the second of focusing on first year students. The authors of this article implemented an information literacy program (IL) into their school using a first year zoology course as the test course with IL components built into it. A joint effort between the library staff and the faculty teaching this course developed IL components for the course. The results of this initiative were positive. The study shows the value of collaborative development of IL components intentionally embedded in courses and the importance of working with first-year students.

Web 2.0 – Pedagogy 2.0

As the EDGE implementation teams, the resource team, and instructors explore methodologies to incorporate into the two EDGE courses, the literature encourages exploration of Web 2.0 pedagogies and best practices. A growing group of educators are experimenting, researching, and subsequently writing on the pros and cons of a pedagogy shift using Web 2.0 tools. (Batson, T., 2009), (van Harmelen, M., 2007) (Clark, J., & Eynon, B., 2009), (McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M.J.W., 2007), (Jones, B. L., 2008)

Appendix 8 contains a full-page chart with references to educational research into Web 2.0 best practices and what the authors refer to as Pedagogy 2.0. C. McLoughlin and M.J.W Lee (2007) describe this as:
Although there are multiple interpretations of the term “Web 2.0”, we define it broadly as a second generation, or more personalized, communicative form of the World Wide Web that emphasizes active participation, connectivity, collaboration and sharing of knowledge and ideas among users (p. 665).

... Pedagogy 2.0 makes use of the affordances of social software tools to enable connectivity, communication, participation and the development of dynamic communities of learning (p. 668).

Faculty Development

In the article, “Faculty development for the net generation,” Ann H. Moore, John F. Moore and Shelli B. Fowler (2005) discuss the need for faculty development in reaching the contemporary student, especially with regards to the pedagogical practice of integrating technology into formal student learning activities. The model they discuss is based upon the National Research Council’s concept of FIT, or Fluency in Information Technology. Several schools have implemented technological literacy programs based upon this concept model. While this model is slightly different from the digital literacy model proposed in this QEP, the foundations are similar and apply directly to faculty development and directly to the technological aspect of digital literacy.

Moore, Moore and Fowler (2005) point out that this model suggests that institutions be intentional about meeting student learning needs and of those technologies that are available to them. The authors also suggest that schools enable their faculty through regular, systematic, and comprehensive faculty development programs. Trainings should focus on both the use of the technology and the pedagogy associated with the technology or literacy. While IT is involved, Moore, Moore and Fowler point out that institutions must encourage faculty through quality training opportunities to become the creators of learning opportunities and owners of the technology as they are the ones who directly impact student learning.

A Note of Caution

Several indicators exist in the literature describing the false assumptions that can be made today about the digital abilities of first-year students. Take this reference, for example, from I.R. Katz (2007):

College students who grew up with the Internet (the “Net Generation”) might be impressively technologically literate, more accepting of new technology, and more technically facile than their parents and instructors (Oblinger and Oblinger 2005). However, anecdotally and in small-scale studies, there is increasing evidence that students do not use technology effectively when they conduct research or communicate (Rockman 2004). Many educators believe that students today are less information savvy than earlier generations despite having powerful information tools at their disposal (Breivik 2005). (p. 4)
More importantly, several articles also referenced a digital divide resulting from a variety of factors primarily related to income, race, and academic preparations (Pietrass, M., 2007) (Goodfellow, M. and Wade, B., 2007) (Leopold, W., 2010). Going forward, the implementation team should monitor the impact of these factors on the proposed plan. An emphasis on digital literacy without proper computer literacy could be a greater challenge than currently foreseen. This may affect the required methodologies of the EDGE courses.

The Need for Sustainability and Structure

As the plan was developed, sustainability was a concern for the committee. How would the plan be accomplished and carried out? The steering committee identified five essential sustainability needs:

1. a halftime director,
2. a broad-based implementation team that could provide support to the director and steer the project,
3. an ongoing process for resourcing faculty teaching the EDGE courses,
4. a process to market and promote the plan,
5. a process for assessment and evaluation of SLO’s and the EDGE goal.

The sustainability needs formed a framework for the implementation structure. The previous chapter described the primary functions of the teams. This chapter concludes by emphasizing the constituencies on each of the teams and the overall accountability structure of the EDGE plan.

Organizational Accountability

Figure two below shows the institutional accountability and the nature of the team relationships. The teams are joined around a common goal to improve the digital literacy of first-year students, the teams work with interconnected vision guided by the Implementation team, led by the EDGE director who reports to the CAO. The teams represent a broad-based group of faculty, staff and students.
Broad-Based Team Constituencies

Thirty-eight unduplicated individuals serve on the EDGE teams. A chart showing the names of first year memberships is attached as appendix 9. Members of teams will serve a minimum of one year as invited by the CAO and EDGE director. Each team is led by a co-chair. The CAO and EDGE director will ensure overlapping years of membership and “chairship” to preserve history and continuity.

Implementation Team:

A representative team of faculty, administrators, students, and staff who meet monthly to report, shape, and advise. The QEP director will lead the team. Tasks will include marketing, assessment, reporting, resourcing, and training. The implementation team consists of 10 individuals including: the QEP Director, the Director of General Education, two students appointed by the Dean of Students, the Director or representative of ITS, a representative of the Learning Resource Center, and one faculty member from each school appointed by the CAO. The Implementation team will oversee and serve as a coordinating body for the four working teams.

Assessment Team:

A working team of at least 6-7 persons, including at least one student, which is co-chaired by a faculty member appointed to the Implementation Team. The
Director of Institutional Effectiveness will serve as a resource to this team. This team will assist the implementation team and QEP director in evaluating and implementing the assessment plan and then tracking, recording, disseminating, and analyzing the data collected. This team will report to and take direction from the Implementation Team and EDGE Director. They will provide guidance to the resource team as assessment data is analyzed each year.

Marketing Team:

A working team of at least 6-7 persons, including at least one student, co-chaired by a faculty member appointed to the implementation team. This team will assist the implementation team and EDGE director in developing and overseeing the marketing plan for the EDGE. This team will assist with creating community awareness and promoting the semi-annual EDGE Digital Literacy Conferences.

Resource Team:

A working team of at least 6-7 persons, including at least one student and one Learning Resource Center staff member, that is co-chaired by a faculty member appointed to the implementation team. This team meets monthly to resource and plan initiatives to support the EDGE instructional process providing resource and planning support to the EDGE curricular initiatives and EDGE digital literacy conferences. The Resource Team will also assist in the planning and implementation of skill development activities for faculty and students in the area of Digital Literacy.

This team has made a recommendation for the guest presenter for the EDGE conference in August 2012. Dr. Martha Marinara, director of the Quality Enhancement Program for the University of Central Florida and the editor of the Journal of Information Fluency has been contacted and recommended for the August 2012 conference. (See additional credential information – Appendix 10)

Conclusion: Benefits of the Plan

The thorough review of literature that guided the steering committee remains a rich resource to be reviewed and utilized by the implementation and working teams. Each working team has a MOODLE classroom to be used as an archive for minutes, ideas, goals, and discoveries. Each online classroom links to the searchable QEP Lit Review Moodle classroom. As the working teams continue to monitor and adjust the implementation process, creativity, innovation, and revisions to the QEP plan may be necessary in order to accomplish the goal. The availability of educational resources and
institutional case studies, along with the broad-based resources of the faculty, staff, and students on the EDGE teams, will ensure the QEP’s sustainability.

In addition to these resources, there are many benefits of this plan that will encourage sustainability and enthusiasm for implementation. EDGE addresses two critical constituencies at the institution: first-year students and faculty. The EDGE resources and plan are designed to give faculty and students an edge in this technologically rich society. As digital literacy skills improve, students and faculty will be better prepared to be productive participants in the educational process. The focus on the needs of the first-year student will give our incoming students an edge in their other courses as they matriculate beyond the first-year experience.

Although the scope is focused on the first-year student, there is great expectation that this initiative will have “spill-over” effects in other areas of the institution. The semi-annual edge conferences will be targeting faculty and students in the EDGE first-year experience courses; however, all faculty, regardless of academic area, will be required to participate in these sessions as part of the normal in-house faculty development process at the start and end of the academic year. As Warner instructors in other academic areas become trained and aware of the shifting pedagogies around digital literacies, the impact of Warner’s QEP will reach beyond the first-year experience, shaping and transforming the educational culture of Warner University.

V. ASSESSMENT: A FIVE YEAR CYCLE OF IMPROVEMENT

“Prior to the 21st century, literate defined a person’s ability to read and write, separating the educated from the uneducated. With the advent of a new millennium and the rapidity with which technology has changed society, the concept of literacy has assumed new meanings.” (Jones-Kavalier & Flannigan, 2006, para. 1)

The EDGE goal is to improve the digital literacy of first-year students by measuring the degree to which students improve their skills related to accessing, evaluating, and communicating information and knowledge appropriately. Digitally literate students will be able to:

1. Search, identify, and retrieve information in digital environments. (Access)
2. Judge the currency, appropriateness, accuracy and adequacy of information and sources for a specific purpose or audience (including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials). (Evaluate)
3. Adapt the information and choose a digital communication medium and format that best supports the purposes of the product or performance and the intended audience. (Communicate)

For purposes of assessment, the scope of the EDGE project is the first-year students enrolled in Composition I and Literacy for the 21st Century. These two courses provide different opportunities for skill development and assessment.
Composition 1, a fall semester course, develops the foundational skills of critical thinking and information fluency, which are co-requisites of digital literacy. Students will utilize skills 1 and 2 above associated with searching, identifying, and retrieving information through digital technologies and judging the currency, appropriateness, accuracy and adequacy of information and sources for a specific purpose or audience. (Syllabus)

Literacy for the 21st Century is a full immersion course that introduces students to all three of the defined student learning outcomes of access, evaluate, and communicate. Through a series of smaller focused assignments and specific digital tasks students will be introduced to skills and technologies used in the process of accessing, evaluating, and communicating information and knowledge. (Syllabus)

External Measures – ETS iSkills

The assessment team adopted the basic recommendations of the steering committee to use the nationally recognized iSkills tool from ETS as the primary external instrument to be used each cycle to track the needs and improvements of the first-year students. (Recommendation 3,4) The iSkills instrument measures seven specific areas of ICT literacy skills: define, access, evaluate, manage, integrate, create, and communicate. This instrument provides the assessment team with an abundance of information that can help track and measure the achievement of our goals to improve the digital literacy of students as they access, evaluate, and communicate digitally.

The EDGE program will use the ETS iSkills assessment of digital literacy on freshman students as they enter school as well as the development and learning gained as a result of the instruction and practices as they complete the EDGE curriculum. The iSkills assessment gauges how well students:

- **Access**, summarize and integrate information from a variety of digital sources
- **Evaluate** the usefulness and sufficiency of information for a specific purpose
- **Create**, generate, or adapt information to express and support a point
- **Define** an information problem or formulate a research statement
- **Communicate** information to a particular audience or in a different medium

The EDGE program will focus on three areas of the assessment as stated in the EDGE objectives: Access, Evaluate, and Communicate. The iSkills assessment will be administered to a minimum of sixty randomly selected first-year students. A minimum of sixty students are being used for evaluation, a minimum of fifty is needed to retrieve an aggregate report from ETS, and it also represents 30% - 40% of this population based on historical enrollment data. The ETS iSkills test will be administered at two points within the freshman year. The first assessment occurs within the first two weeks of the Fall semester. These same sixty students will again be tested within the last two weeks of the Spring semester. Examiners will plan for a 10% attrition rate, based on historical enrollment data, between the Fall and Spring semester. This process of examination and evaluation will be the annual cycle of external formal and summative assessment for the next five years.
The Assessment Team will track and compare the iSkills assessment data each year and provide a corollary analysis of potential differences, anomalies, and relationships to classroom practices. To determine the success of the EDGE program and the achievement of the objectives, the iSkills of scores of Warner University students who complete the EDGE courses will be compared to the groups used by ETS to determine the national mean iSkills score. The ETS group will be our primary comparison group. Additionally a randomly selected group of twenty-five (15%) Warner University juniors and seniors, will also be given the iSkills assessment in the first two years of the EDGE program. This group will be given the iSkills assessment in the Fall semester. The results from this group will be compared to the data of those who have completed the EDGE program. Due to the scope of the EDGE program and that both EDGE courses are also General Education requirements, this group of students will no longer be available for testing after the first two years of the program because all Warner students will have taken at least one EDGE course by this point. This is why we have chosen the ETS group as our primary comparison group. Success will also be determined by looking at the comparison of the initial iSkills score taken by students in the Fall semester and the final iSkills score taken by this same group of students in the Spring semester.

The steering committee and the assessment team experimented with the tool during the development phase and first year of phase one implementation. A baseline of over fifty first-year students, the minimum number required by ETS for comparative study, were examined and compared to the national averages to develop preliminary scores. As expected, the study group performed lower. Based on these preliminary iSkills scores of first-year students, the average composite score was 195, with the ETS national average being 250. The ETS national average composite score is based on all seven categories of the assessment, which includes the three EDGE objectives. In the specific areas of Access, Evaluate and Communicate the preliminary scores are as follows:

**Access: Warner Students: 59, ETS national average: 79**

**Evaluate: Warner Students: 57, ETS national average: 50.** An explanation of this difference in score is explained as follows:
The goal of the EDGE program is to bring Warner students closer toward meeting or exceeding the ETS national average. The EDGE Assessment and Implementation Team have set an initial target goal of 224 for the composite score, which represents a 15% increase in the overall score of Warner students. Students achieving an iSkills score within the range of 214 – 224 will demonstrate they have successfully achieved the EDGE objectives. The range to indicate successful achievement in each of the specific EDGE objects will be as follows:

Access: 64 - 69
Evaluate: 43 - 47
Communicate: 56 - 61

These target score ranges will be evaluated each year to ensure that learning is taking place and that Warner University students are performing within the expected range. Based on the results of these evaluations, the targeted scores may be adjusted.

All quantitative data will be collected by the Assessment Team and EDGE Director at the end of each semester. This data will then be evaluated by the Assessment Team and QEP Director, and a final report will be generated, with recommendations as needed, in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>43 - 47</th>
<th>Calculate</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>64 - 69</th>
<th>Communicate</th>
<th>56 - 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>43 - 47</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>64 - 69</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>56 - 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>43 - 47</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>64 - 69</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>56 - 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>43 - 47</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>64 - 69</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>56 - 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May of each year. This information will be shared with the Implementation Team, General Studies Director, Chief Academic Officer, and all instructors teaching EDGE courses. Based on the information presented in the final report and upon receiving feedback from these individuals, a follow-up report will be generated highlighting any changes that may be needed to the EDGE program to help better achieve the EDGE objectives. The final report, including the recommendations and proposed changes, will be presented to the Implementation Team and Chief Academic Officer for review and approval. All findings from this final report will be presented to the entire faculty at the August EDGE Conference.

Collaboration with the Resource Team

In association with the assessment cycle and the assessment team, the resource team will focus on areas of strength or weakness from a pedagogical perspective by tracking best practices either employed or underused. The two teams, assessment and resource, will share research data, analysis, and qualitative observation of patterns associated with the teaching and learning process that may account for strengths or weaknesses observed by the test data. Annually, the resource team will present an assessment report from their perspective at the EDGE conference in May. Assessment of the EDGE conferences will be a task assigned to the resource team, who may consult with the assessment team for guidance.

Internal Assessments in Development

In addition to the primary external assessment tool, the assessment team has reviewed the embedded student learning outcomes in each of the EDGE courses.

A recommendation to revise the outcomes slightly in Composition I allows for a more unified and incremental process of skill development in the course. The Composition I course now includes a learning module comprised of 2 class session conducted in the computer lab. (Approved by the General Education Director)

The first class:

In this class period students will be presented with information about the resources available to them as Warner students through the Learning Resource Center (LRC), credible references, and doing an effective search. The students will be taught how to access and search three databases available through the LRC by seeing a live demonstration. Students will be given the opportunity to do some searches under the direct supervision of the librarian and one or more assistants.

Assignment:

The students will leave the class with an assignment in hand to be completed and returned for a grade in the next class period. (Appendix 11).
The second class:

An assessment will take the entire second class period – also to take place in the computer lab. Knowledge will be assessed through a twenty question online quiz using a Moodle Room designed for this session (Appendix 11-MOODLE Room). Skills will be assessed by giving students research topics and evaluating both the process (steps) and the product (results) of this search. (Appendix 11 – Knowledge Test). If a student fails to complete the knowledge test, a score of less than 75%, he or she will be able to take the test a second time (15% reduction in grade).

Specific EDGE student learning outcomes for these two classes: (referenced by the items below)

- ACCESS – 2, 10
- EVALUATE – 3, 6, 7, 8,

As a result of participating in this lesson, students will be able to:

1. list and describe digital resources available to them through Warner LRC
2. access digital information through the Warner LRC
3. identify and define a credible reference
4. paraphrase and cite information taken directly from reference material
5. use the limiters “full text” and “scholarly articles” in EBSCO
6. select appropriate “key terms,” needed to conduct an effective search.
7. narrow a digital search using Boolean terms
8. expand a digital search using Boolean terms
9. list the key elements of referenced material for a book and a journal article.
10. access a Moodle Room to complete assignments.

These two classes will help prepare the students for the final investigative paper which will also be assessed as an EDGE assignment.

Assignment:

Students will be required to submit a 3-5 page paper in which they will investigate and issue or problem and develop a viable solution. This paper will require them to use outside sources, either from our online library databases or credible online resources. These sources must be cited within the paper and in a Works Cited or Reference page in the paper. This will not count toward the required pages submitted. Students are asked to avoid using the “Top 40” or overly popular issues. The best investigations will likely spark from personal experience with the problem or issue.

For this assignment the student will be expected to access and evaluate data from scholarly sources and compose a paper that synthesizes that data in conjunction with an original thesis. It will also allow the student to determine the validity and value of source
material. This assignment will be evaluated by a rubric developed by the EDGE Assessment Team and approved by the Director of General Education. (Appendix 11)

Literacy for the 21st Century requires a final integrative research project and digital presentation that provides for a summative internal assessment opportunity. An assessment rubric has been developed by the EDGE Assessment Team that can be used both formatively and summatively. (Appendix 11) Student must achieve a score of 75% or better to pass the final project.

In addition to the final integrative research project and digital presentation, several assignments are required in the course to develop and evaluate the three learning outcomes (Access, Evaluate and Communicate). (Appendix 11)

The assessment team has worked with course instructors and the General Education Director to identify specific activities, assignments, and/or work products for each course that will be used to measure individual student progress throughout the course. Instructors will be asked to submit the assessment rubrics for each student in their courses. An assessment report will be developed by the EDGE Assessment Team, based on these rubrics and submitted to the EDGE Director, EDGE Implementation Team, General Education Director, and the Chief Academic officer. This report will be used to assess the overall EDGE program and the progress of our first-year students.

Pilot Course Evaluation

An evaluation of the pilot courses will be conducted after the first year of implementation (May 2012) to evaluate if the outlined student learning objectives are being met and to assess what changes, if necessary, will be needed to ensure that we are reaching the EDGE objectives. The evaluation will be conducted collaboratively by the course instructors, the Director of General Education, and the EDGE Assessment and Implementation Teams.

Faculty Assessment

The iSkills instrument will also measure the impact of the EDGE program on the skills and teaching practices of Warner’s faculty. Each faculty member teaching an EDGE course will be required to take the iSkills test for purposes of self assessment. Comparative data shared with the Resource team will assist the decision making process regarding resource development needs and EDGE conference planning. Preliminary data gathered during the formation stage indicates the average iSkills score of Warner faculty falls below the national average. At the end of the five-year cycle, faculty will retake the instrument to provide information for the summative assessment. Faculty improvement will ideally mirror or surpass student levels of improvement.
Conclusion

The implementation and working teams have been very active during the fall of 2011 as the plans described in this document have been set in motion. The original topic conceived by the Warner community in 2008 has been strengthened through a deliberate process of exploration, research, and preparation. Faculty, staff and students have been engaged in this effort throughout the journey. As students and faculty embrace the challenges of digital literacy, this plan will place Warner on the cutting “EDGE” of cultural and educational shifts.

Working teams of faculty and students continue to grow in their understanding of and enthusiasm for this project. There are high expectations that this project will bring about lasting and formative change for the Warner educational community. As the goal of this project is met in the coming months, Warner students will gain an EDGE that will better prepare them to lead and serve in this digital age. Students will leave the institution with improved skills in digital literacy. Likewise, this project will sharpen the EDGES of Warner faculty to better teach a new generation of students.

The EDGE is an achievable project designed to enhance the quality of teaching and student learning at Warner University. The institution is prepared, equipped, and positioned to continue the successful implementation and execution of this plan to improve the digital literacy of Warner students.
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Appendix 1: Institutional Mission, Goals and Values statements (updated 08-09)

Mission, Vision, Core Values

The mission of Warner University is to graduate individuals who exemplify academic excellence and Christian character, who are prepared to lead and committed to serve.

Our students will have a biblical view of Christ as creator and sustainer of the universe, and be persuaded in their understanding of Him to enjoy His presence, to seek His mind and to fulfill His purpose with passion and authenticity.

1. Service: Demonstrate Christ’s mercy and compassion to others through humility of motive, attitude and action.
2. Integrity: Live blamelessly in light of Christ’s imminent return.
3. Knowledge: Seek the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden in Christ.
4. Wisdom: Choose what is best according to the will of God.
5. Growth: Increase in love and knowledge to the glory of God.
Appendix 2: Warner University “Just the Facts”

A brief look at who we are in 2011-2012

The mission of Warner University is to graduate individuals who exemplify academic excellence and Christian character, who are prepared to lead and committed to serve.

A liberal arts curriculum, in a wide variety of academic disciplines, prepares students to successfully meet the demands of today’s workplace and the challenges of graduate school. We develop servant leaders who evaluate issues from a Christian perspective and who strive to live out their faith in their communities, churches and homes.

The administration, faculty and staff are Christian, qualified in their areas of service, and dedicated to the ministry of higher education. The campus provides an environment where administrators, faculty, and staff model the values of Christian heritage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLLMENT (FALL 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **GENDER:** 61% Women and 39% Men
- **ETHNICITY:**
  - 50% White, 32% Black, 12% Hispanic, 2% Not-Reported, 2% Non-Resident, 2% Asian, 1% Native American and <1% Pacific Islander
- **FROM:** 29 states, 1 US Territory and 25 Foreign Countries
- **FLORIDA RESIDENTS** comprise 89% of all students; 48% from Polk County
- **Greatest number of Out of State students** come from: Ohio, Michigan, Georgia, Indiana, and Pennsylvania
- **ENTERING FRESHMAN CLASS:** 137

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organized into three schools:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Ministry, Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degrees in more than 25 liberal arts and professional majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs for Traditional students on-campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion programs for students on-campus &amp; on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW: Bachelor of Arts in Health Care Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Masters programs designed for working professionals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unduplicated Headcount (10 yr. History)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREES AWARDED (July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Degrees:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unduplicated Headcount represents the total number of students taking at least one course during the school year.

2010-11: Undergraduate Count: 1,107; Graduate Count: 171; Total Count: 1,278
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A brief look at who we are in 2011-2012

ATHLETICS
- Member of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) Division 2 and the Florida Sun Conference.
- NAIA certified intercollegiate sports include:
  - Baseball, Basketball, Cross-Country, Golf, Softball, Soccer, Tennis, Track & Field and Volleyball
- The college also supports a spirit/dance squad
- Athletic participation for Fall 2011: 290 students (29% of the entire student body) are participating in at least one of the 10 sports offered at Warner.

FACTS
Location: 5 miles south of Lake Wales, in Polk County, Florida, 300-acre campus is found on Highway 27. Lake Wales is a town of approximately 12,000, and equal distance between Orlando and Tampa

History: Warner University was founded in 1968 by the Southeastern Association of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), is a co-educational, Christian university in the liberal arts tradition wherein the study of religion, the arts, sciences, literature, languages and mathematics, and related subjects may be taught and advanced.

Only two presidents have led Warner University. Dr. Leroy Fulton was the first president. Dr. Gregory V. Hall has led Warner as its second president since 1991.

Rankings: When comparing the success of 2008-09 graduates from bachelor level programs among the 28 member institutions of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF), Warner ranks #2 for percentage of employed graduates (72.6%) and #7 for mean salary ($39,969).

Seniors participating in the 2009 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) were more satisfied with their entire educational experience at Warner than were seniors at other participating 4-year institutions (91% rated their entire educational experience was good or excellent at Warner University).

Warner has also been recognized in the past by U.S. News and World report for ethnic and economic diversity of students, least debt upon graduation and small class size.

Faculty: 118 faculty members • 44% Men and 56% Women • 51 hold a Doctorate or other terminal degree

Student/Teacher Ratio: 11 to 1

Financial Aid and Scholarships: 98% of first-time, full-time traditional undergraduate students received institutional grants in the Fall of 2010.

Advancement: A capital campaign is underway for the 51,000 sq. ft. Darby Academic Building which is of paramount importance to provide technological capabilities to support innovative programs. The building will have abundant classrooms, lecture halls, computer and science laboratories with academic departments located in cohesive units. Faculty will have offices and space to conduct projects and meet with students. Construction on the $7.5 million building will commence when another $2 million has been committed.

ADMISSIONS CONTACT: 800.309.9563

Warner University
13895 Highway 27
Lake Wales, FL 33859
863.638.1426/800.949.7248 / www.warner.edu

Office of Institutional Research/Rev: 11.4.11
Appendix 3: Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) – 2007-2008 Results

The CLA results, while not a direct measurement of digital literacy, support the chosen scope of EDGE to concentrate efforts on the first-year student. The results of the 2007-2008 CLA were made available to faculty during the QEP topic development stage.

As seen in the scoring results, Warner's first year students overall score was only in the 14th percentile, which is below the expected performance level.

The performance task category, however, was well below the expected level with Freshman scoring only in the 9th percentile. The results do indicate that Warner has been successful overtime in exceeding the expected value added performance level from the Freshman year to the Senior year. These same levels of value added improvement in the area of digital literacy are within reasonable expectations for the EDGE iSkills assessment goals to move closer to the national averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLA SCORING and OUR RESULTS</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Value – Added Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentle Rank</td>
<td>Performance Level</td>
<td>Percentle Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CLA Score</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Task</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Well Below</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Writing Task</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make-an-Argument</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique-an-Argument</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warner Southern College

Review of Institutional Assessment 2007-08
Presented by: The Office of Institutional Research, Strategic Planning, and Effectiveness
Appendix 4: Example of Topic Visual Presentations

Faculty teams created visual presentations of possible QEP ideas. The following 8 slides are an example of what was created to describe the chosen topic. Each of the four presentations can be viewed at: http://online.warner.edu/course/view.php?id=1143.
Appendix 5: Summary of Voting

Warner University’s QEP Selection

The Warner University Community has been engaged in a discussion about the SACS-COC required Quality Enhancement Plan since 2008. Since that time an education process about the expectations of such a project began and the community focused efforts toward reviewing institutional assessments, priorities and needs in order to recommend topics for consideration. In 2010, the QEP Review Committee narrowed proposed projects from more than 15 to four.

The four projects were:
- Extending the Chapel Experience to the Classroom
- Committed to Serve
- Critical Thinking – Teaching HOW to Think NOT What to Think
- Warner Beyond the Classroom – Using Technology to Increase Access and Learning

The four proposed QEP projects were formally presented to the Warner University Community and project selection/voting began Wednesday, April 21, 2010 and closed on Wednesday, April 29, 2010.

The Warner Community was comprised of 3,620 individuals and included the following groups:
- Faculty: Regular Faculty (49 ), Adjunct Faculty (76)
- Staff: Regular Staff (Full-Time(105) and Part-Time (25), including Administration)
- Students: Traditional Undergraduates, Non Traditional Undergraduates, On-line Students, Graduate Students, and a Student Control Group (1,045)
- Warner Alumni (2,300)
- Warner Board of Trustees (20) - These selections were entered manually and included in the results analysis.

Everyone in the Warner Community was invited to participate in the project selection in one of three ways:

I. An e-mail invitation was sent with a direct link to a Moodle classroom
(http://online.warner.edu/course/view.php?id=1143) where the following information was presented:
- A primer to bring individuals up to speed on the expectations and guidelines of a QEP.
- A summary of each of the four proposed projects including:
  - a brief project description,
  - the project’s importance to Warner University,
  - the manner in which the project supports student learning,
  - the manner in which the project contributes to achieving a particular aspect of the Warner Mission,
Appendix 5: (continued)

- the resources that are on hand and/or would be needed to support the project,
- estimated budget needs,
- a description of how success will be measured/recognized.

- A link to a survey on SurveyMonkey.com where voting was to take place.

II. A table display was erected in the Rigel Student Center throughout the voting period where ballots (83) were completed and submitted into a sealed box. These selections were entered manually and included in the results analysis.

III. A link to the QEP Classroom in Moodle was added to the Warner University website homepage as an additional gateway for the Warner Community to participate in the QEP selection process. The link went live Thursday, April 22, 2010.

IV. The Facebook social networking site was also used to encourage the Warner Community to access and participate in the QEP selection process. Because of their strong relationships with students and alumni, several members of the faculty and administration were asked to include a personal invitation to friends and a link to the survey in their Facebook status.

V. Selections verbalized to the Director of Institutional Research after the close of online voting were entered manually through May 5, 2010 and were included in the results analysis.

**Results of the QEP Community Vote:**

294 (8%) of the 3,620 individual who were invited, opted to participate in the QEP Selection process. Excluding the alumni group that participation percentage rises to 22%.

The majority (108/37%) of all participants indicated that the project they thought Warner should adopt was the project that focused on using **Technology to Increase Access and Learning**. Preference for other projects followed: Critical Thinking (88/30%), Committed to Serve (66/22%) and Chapel Experience (32/11%).

Likewise the majority (114/39%) of participants also indicated they would most like to participate in the Technology QEP project.
Appendix 6: First Year SAT and Retention Data

WU average SAT is 945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTIVITY LEVEL</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective</td>
<td>27–31</td>
<td>1220–1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>22–27</td>
<td>1030–1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>20–23</td>
<td>950–1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>18–21</td>
<td>870–990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>17–20</td>
<td>830–950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All First-Year Students

#### 2011 Academic Data by Academic Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Level</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 75 to 100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 68 to 74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 60 to 67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 59 &amp; Below</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>251</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2010 Academic Data by Academic Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Level</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 75 to 100</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 68 to 74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 60 to 67</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 59 &amp; Below</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>313</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: (continued)

First-to-second-year retention rates for private institutions – WU is at 56%

Source: Compiled from ACT Institutional Data File, 2010. ©2010, ACT, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
Appendix 7: Literature Review Subcommittee

The Learning Resource Center research staff agreed to assist with the literature review process. Mark Thomas and Shawn Taylor from the steering committee meet with the staff to set search parameters based on the needs of the steering committee.

Research was limited to the last five years unless the source was deemed to be ground breaking or associated with a ground breaking work such as *Digital Literacy* by Paul Glister, 1997.

Pam Bloomquist searched LIRN and Proquest.

Sherill Harriger searched Lexis-Nexis, Internet, Google Scholar.

Mary Thoresen searched Ebsco.

Virginia Schnarre searched ebooks including Credo, Oxford, and Gale Virtual Library.

Christy Brown searched OPAC (physical books) and posted all entries to Moodle.

The image right is of the main menu on the QEP Lit Rev page.

The PLRC staff reviewed and ranked 125 resources sources including ebooks, journal articles, and 10 bound books in the library collection.

Sherill Harriger, LRC director, coordinated the efforts of her staff and has a permanent seat on the EDGE implementation team. The QEP LIT Review site can be accessed at http://online.warner.edu/course/view.php?id=1465. The guest enrollment key is “warner” (lowercase).
### Appendix 8: Web 2.0 Pedagogy 2.0 Best Practices


**Table 2: Examples of pedagogy 2.0 in tertiary teaching and learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference / author</th>
<th>Institution / Country</th>
<th>Description of technology use</th>
<th>Pedagogy employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read (2005)</td>
<td>Drexel University, USA</td>
<td>Drexel distributed iPod Photo players to their Education freshmen in September 2005. Read reported there were plans for a variety of learner-centred applications, including but not limited to having students record study-group sessions and interviews, as well as having them maintain audio blogs to connect with administrators and peers during the work experience semester.</td>
<td>Peer-to-peer learning, distributed intelligence approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Chan &amp; McLoughlin (2006)</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University, Australia</td>
<td>Second year undergraduate students take charge of producing talkback radio-style podcasts to assist first year students undertaking a unit of study that the former group previously completed.</td>
<td>Learner-centred instruction; student-generated content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans (2006)</td>
<td>Swathmore College, USA</td>
<td>Students studying a literature course read short passages aloud and record them as podcasts, as well as creating separate podcasts discussing the passage they chose and its relationship to other material.</td>
<td>Development of digital and social competencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Miller (2006; 2007) | University of Connecticut, USA | Three types of podcasts are used to support a General Psychology course:  
- *iCube podcasts* – Informal discussions with students following each week’s lectures;  
- *Precasts* – Short enhanced podcasts previewing material prior to each lecture;  
- *Postcasts* – Short post-lecture podcasts containing re-explanations of selected concepts. | Blending of formal and informal learning; mobile, ubiquitous learning |
| Frydenberg (2006)  | Bentley College, USA | Students in an introductory information technology class work in pairs or groups to produce vodcasts to teach topics from the course schedule to their peers. | Peer teaching, reciprocal learning |
| Edirisingha, Salmon & Fothergill (2006) | University of Leicester UK | Students make use of “profcasts”, i.e. material designed to support learning distinct from that which is facilitated through structured on-campus or e-learning processes alone. E.g., weekly profcasts to supplement online teaching through updated information and guidance. | Extended learning, enrichment and extension activities, personalisation of learning content |
| Kukulska-Hulme (2005) | Open University, UK | Students studying German and Spanish courses in distance mode use digital voice recorders and mini-camcorders to record interviews with other students and with native speakers, as well as to create audio-visual tours for sharing with their peers. | Peer-to-peer learning, student-generated content |
| McCarty (2005; 2006) | Osaka Jogakuin College, Japan | Students are interviewed by their professor, perform roles, and/or present their own creations, in contribution to the professor’s bilingual podcast feed and blog targeted to those studying Japanese or English as a foreign language. | Cross-cultural collaborative work using student-generated content |
| Sener (2007b)      | University of North Carolina at Pembroke, USA | A wiki-based encyclopaedia is created by students, the goal being to create entries on a variety of subjects related to law, criminal justice, sociology and criminology. | Student-generated content, collaborative writing, organising and editing content |
| Wenzloff (2005; Richardson (2006) | Macomb Independent School District, Michigan, USA | Social bookmarking is used to compile and share resources with teacher training participants / student teachers. The instructor also subscribes to the RSS feeds of the students’ Furl sites, to see what they are reading as well as their comments about the sites. | Resource-based and collaborative learning |
| Yew, Gibson & Teasley (2006) | University of Michigan, USA | Learners organise and display blog posts and bookmarks, with keywords or tags, openly and in a collaboratively manner. This allows all stakeholders to use social software to organise, share and coordinate knowledge. | Community of learning |
| Boulos, Maramba & Wheeler (2006) | University of Plymouth, UK | Blogs, wikis and podcasts are used for virtual collaborative clinical practice in health and paramedical education, to foster sharing and reflection. | Anytime, anywhere, peer-to-peer learning community, self-regulated learning |
Appendix 9: Membership on Teams

**Implementation Team**
- Shawn Taylor – E.D.G.E Director – Online Education Administrator
- Dr. Jeff Hayes – Steering Committee Representative – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Kelly Mills – General Education Director – School of Arts Ministry and Science – Steering Committee Member
- Lisa Murphy – Director of Institutional Research
- Dr. Ambrey Williams – Co-Chair Marketing Team – School of Business
- Rev. Dawn Meadows – Co-Chair Resource Team – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Jim Rigel – Co-Chair Assessment Team – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Mark Thomas – Director of Information Technology – Steering Committee Member
- Sherill Harriger - Director of the Learning Resource Center, Assistant Professor of Library & Information Science
- Jenny Cook – Student
- Rachel Encarnacion – Student

**Resource Team**
- Dr. Elmer Hall – Co-Chair – School of Business
- Rev. Dawn Meadows – Co-Chair – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Donna Barringer – Director Educational Studies Program – School of Education
- Lynn Johnson – School of Business
- Dr. Robert Miner - Associate Professor of Health Care Management – School of Business
- Christy Brown - Head of Cataloging - Library and LRC Webpage Coordinator
- Jennifer Kiley – Student Representative
- Kaylea Spurlin – Student Representative

**Marketing Team**
- Dr. Melodi Guilbault – Co-Chair - Chair, School of Business, Professor of Business
- Dr. Ambrey Williams – Co-Chair – School of Business
- Tim Craig - Assistant Professor of Communication – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Dr. James Holton - Associate Professor of History –School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Dr. Cory Goehringer - Assistant Professor of English – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
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- Austin Britt – Student Representative
- Rachel Encarnacion-Student Representative

**Assessment Team**

- Dr. Verna Omanwa – Co-Chair- Assistant Professor of Business – School of Business
- Jim Rigel – Co-Chair - Associate Professor of Psychology – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Lisa Murphy – Director of Institutional Research
- Lori Hutto - Instructor of Education – School of Education
- Dr. Nan Moore - Assistant Professor of Business – School of Business
- Dr. Ken Butler - Assistant Professor of Mathematics – School of Arts, Ministry and Science
- Dr. Terry Fasel - Chair, Teacher Education Department, Professor of Education – School of Education
- David Ontermaa – Student Representative
- Kimberly Thomas – Student Representative

**EDGE Instructors**

The instructors teaching Critical and Analytical Concepts 1 and 2 and Literacy in the 21st Century are part of the ongoing team as well.
Appendix 10: Recommended EDGE Conference Presenters 2012-2013

**EDGE Resource Team Recommendations**

The resource team has reviewed the credentials and contacted three individuals that would be happy to assist Warner by providing leadership at the semi-annual EDGE conference for faculty development. (Contracts are being pursued at time of printing.)

**Dr. Martha Marinara (Recommended for May 2012)**

**Qualifications:**

- Director, Quality Enhancement Program for COC-SACS (reaffirmation of accreditation), the University of Central Florida, May 2005 to Present.
- Chair, 2011 Information R/evolution Conference, March 9-11, 2011, Orlando, Fl
- Editor, Journal of Information Fluency (online Peer-reviewed journal, first issue May 2011).
- Advisory Committee, 2007 ELI Fall Focus Session on Information Literacy, EDUCAUSE, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, October 2007
- Co-Chair, Conference on Hersey, Blasphemy, and Freedom of Expression, January 18-20, 2007 University of Central Florida.

**Dr. Chad Mairn (Recommended for August 2012)**

**Qualifications:**

Chad Mairn has been an Information Services Librarian at St. Petersburg College since August 2004.

In addition to being known as the "computer guy," I am a liaison between the library and the Gibbs campus Business Technologies, Humanities, Fine and Applied Arts, and Music Departments. I am also an adjunct instructor who teaches CTS 1101, LIS 1002, LIS 1002 Honors, LIS 2004, and OST 1793. For more information, please visit my librarian web page.

While an undergraduate studying Humanities at the University of South Florida (USF), I was awarded a Library of Congress Fellowship archiving Leonard Bernstein's personal papers. During my Library and Information Science (LIS) graduate work, also at USF, I became a technology liaison between the Bill Gates Learning Foundation and Florida public libraries. I believe that it is important to understand how technology influences culture and vice-versa and having a Humanities and a LIS background helps me to "see" things from multiple perspectives.
Appendix 11: Course Rubrics and Assignments

Composition I Digital Literacy Take Home Assignment

Digital Literacy Exercise

1. What was the issue you were asked to explore?
   ____________________________________________________________

2. Identify two or three key terms that you might want to search
   Terms ___________________ ____________________________

3. Access EBSCO through the Warner Learning Resource Center (LRC)
   Results of your search – how many hits? __________

4. Go to “Academic Search” and choose new terms.
   List new terms ___________________ ____________________________
   Results of your new search – how many hits? __________

5. Conduct your new search by isolating the results to peer reviewed articles and
   full texts
   Results of your new search – how many hits? __________

6. Narrow your search if more than 200 hits.
   What is your search string (Boolean search terms)?
   _______________________________________________________

7. Expand your search if less than 50 hits.
   What is your search string (Boolean search terms)?
   _______________________________________________________
   Select one article and copy and paste the citation here using three formats.

8. APA Citation:

9. MLA Citation:

10. Chicago Citation:

   Access OPPOSING VIEWPOINTS through the Warner Learning Resource Center

11. Use the two or three search terms you settled on from above (Question 4).
    Terms ___________________ ____________________________

12. Conduct your new search by isolating the results to academic journals
    Results of your new search – how many hits __________

13. Narrow your search if more than 200 hits.
    What is your search string (Boolean search terms)
    _______________________________________________________

14. Expand your search if less than 50 hits.
    What is your search string (Boolean search terms)__________________________
Select one article and copy and paste the citation here using two formats.

15. APA Citation:

16. MLA Citation:

Access EBRARY through the Warner Learning Resource Center

17. Use the two or three search terms you settled on from above. (Question 4)
Terms _______________ _______________ _______________.

18. Narrow your search if more than 200 hits.
What is your search string (Boolean search terms)

19. Expand your search if less than 50 hits.
What is your search string (Boolean search terms)

Select three books and copy and paste the citation here using APA format.

20. Book #1

21. Book #2

22. Book #3

23. Select one book (circle it) and use the same terms from above to find information on that book on your topic.

24. Cut and paste a paragraph (minimum of three sentences) from relevant material found within the book (below).

View the video on paraphrasing from LIBGUIDE (Go to Reference Shelf then writing and Research Help Libguide. Click on the APA style guide tab. From the drop down options choose APA Tutorial. Select “How to Paraphrase.”

25. Now paraphrase this paragraph below (Remember to use APA citation)
Composition I Digital Literacy Test – Library Exercise

NAME________________

Digital Literacy Test

*Please circle the best response to the question or statement.*

1. True / False -- *Newsweek* is a scholarly journal.

2. True / False -- If a website has ".edu" in its address, it is considered a good source for information.

3. True / False -- The purpose of a bibliographic citation is to give the information one would need to retrieve the item.

4. You have found the following record in **EBSCO** on the subject of business management:


   Database: Business Source Complete

   [Add to folder] Relevancy: ●●●●

   [PDF Full Text (119KB)] (Check LinkSource for more information)

   Notes: This title is not held locally

From the information listed in the box, which of the following are true statements? *(Circle all that apply)*

a. This article is available in full text format.

b. This article is available in paper format in the Pontious Learning Resource Center.

c. This is a peer-reviewed article.
d. The Database that supplies this article is Proquest

5. Which of the following Boolean operator BROADENS a database search?

   a. or  
   b. with  
   c. and  
   d. not

6. You are looking for journal articles on the topic of the Salem Witch Trials. Which one of the following Boolean searches would be most effective?

   a. Salem AND history  
   b. Salem AND witchcraft  
   c. Salem AND witch AND trials  
   d. Salem AND trials

7. If the keyword search for “AIDS and United States” retrieved 856 citations, what would be the next best step?

   a. Look through the list of 856 citations to find articles of interest to you  
   b. Take either “AIDS” or “United States” out of your search query  
   c. Try searching under “United States and AIDS”  
   d. Add additional search terms to the original query and search again

8. Which of the following should be considered when evaluating a website?

   a. accuracy  
   b. author/sponsor  
   c. currency (Is the site current, or has it been abandoned?)  
   d. copyright  
   e. all of the above
9. A KEYWORD search will
   a. search only titles
   b. works even if you spell a word wrong
   c. search title, contents, and subject areas
   d. search reference material only

10. What below best defines the word **citation**:
    a. retrieval information
    b. a ticket
    c. location
    d. a French automobile

11. One common research mistake students make is:
    a. to select a topic that is too broad
    b. to overly rely on the course syllabus
    c. to use electronic resources
    d. to use general sources to refine their topic.

12. Using the Boolean operator **OR** in your search
    a. gives you more specific information about your search terms
    b. confuses the computer
    c. gives you information about all of your search terms
    d. none of the above

13. Which of the following describes instances of plagiarism? **(Circle all that apply)**
    a. Directly copying lines from another’s article and not putting quotes around the copied lines
    b. Rewording lines from another’s written work and not giving credit to the author
    c. Cutting and pasting graphics from another’s web page and using them on your own web page
    d. Submitting a term paper that was purchased off the World Wide Web
14. The best resource for locating AUTHORITATIVE and CURRENT information for a research paper on the War on Terrorism is

   a. the World Wide Web
   b. LRC electronic resources
   c. a library book
   d. an encyclopedia

15. Define the word bibliography:

   a. story of a person’s life
   b. list of references used
   c. a Bible commentary
   d. a biographical exploration of a Biblical figure

16. What is a peer-reviewed or refereed article?

   a. an article reviewed by a scholar
   b. an article read just for enjoyment
   c. an article critiqued by a fellow classmate
   d. an article in Newsweek magazine

17. Which of the following information sources is NOT available through Warner’s LRC?

   a. Ebsco
   b. Eric
   c. Ebrary
   d. PsycINFO

18. Which of the following is NOT a key element required of a book citation (no matter what format)

   a. Title
   b. Author
   c. Issue number
   d. Page number
   a. credibility
   b. open-access
   c. currency
   d. all the above

20. According to the LIBGUIDE video, what is the best way to understand the task of paraphrasing?
   a. putting things in your own words
   b. changing key words
   c. putting things into your own phrases or sentences
   d. using ALL new terms.
Composition I Digital Literacy Library Exercise Moodle Room (Screenshot)
Preview of Online Digital Literacy Test – (Screenshot)

1. Define the word **bibliography**:
   - a. a Bible commentary
   - b. story of a person’s life
   - c. a biographical exploration of a Biblical figure
   - d. list of references used

2. One common research mistake students make is:
   - a. to overly rely on the course syllabus
   - b. to use electronic resources
   - c. to select a topic that is too broad
   - d. to use general sources to refine their topic.

3. Which of the following information sources is **NOT** available through Warner’s LRC?
   - a. ERIC
   - b. PsychINFO
   - c. ERARY
   - d. Basco

4. What is a peer-reviewed or referenced article?
   - a. an article reviewed by an recognized scholar
   - b. an article in a newsweek magazine
   - c. an article read just for enjoyment
   - d. an article critiqued by a fellow classmate
## Composition I Investigative Paper Rubric

### Direct Link to Digital Rubric:

**RUBRIC for Investigative Formal Paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ACCESS</strong> Students will search, identify and retrieve information in digital environments</th>
<th>Fundamental Awareness (Basic Knowledge)</th>
<th>Intermediate (Practical Application)</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Student Self-Evaluation Questions (Questions are meant to lead students to a correct answer. When a question is answered fully a student will receive 8-10 points for that section.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 Points each cell</td>
<td>5-7 Points each cell</td>
<td>8-10 points each cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEARCH & IDENTIFY

The digitally literate student constructs and implements effectively-designed search strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Develops a research plan appropriate to the investigative method.</th>
<th>a. Identifies the research plan and investigative method used, but some details are vague.</th>
<th>b. Clearly describes the research plan, providing multiple details identifying the investigative method.</th>
<th>1. List the investigative method (procedures) from the assignment outline (instructions) that were used, and explain how each procedure was accomplished.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Selects controlled vocabulary specific to the discipline or information retrieval source.</td>
<td>a. No selection of controlled vocabulary is identified.</td>
<td>b. There is some evidence of a selection of controlled vocabulary specific to the discipline/retrieval source, but some details are vague.</td>
<td>2. Describe how you chose vocabulary for your topic, why this vocabulary was appropriate, and how it relates to the subject?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identifies keywords, synonyms and related terms for the information needed.</td>
<td>a. No key words are identified.</td>
<td>b. Identified a few key words with some description of their use, but some details are vague.</td>
<td>3. List all the terms (keywords, synonyms or related terms) used in your search. Which of these were most useful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Constructs a search strategy using appropriate commands for the information retrieval system selected (e.g., Boolean operators, truncation, and proximity for search engines; internal organizers such as indexes for books).</td>
<td>a. No construction of a search strategy is identified.</td>
<td>b. There is some evidence of the student constructing a search strategy using appropriate commands but some details are vague.</td>
<td>4. List the commands used in your search strategy, identify any Boolean operators, truncation or punctuation used in these commands, and explain why these commands were used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RETRIEVE

The digitally literate student retrieves information online using a variety of sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Uses various search engines to retrieve information in a variety of formats.</th>
<th>a. As evidence of using various search systems to retrieve information in a variety of formats is identified.</th>
<th>b. There is some evidence of the student using various search systems to retrieve information in a variety of formats but some details are vague or components are missing.</th>
<th>1. List the various formats used to retrieve and store information. Which format was the most dependable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses specialized online or in person services available at the institution to retrieve information needed (e.g., interlibrary loan/document delivery, professional associations, institutional research offices, community resources, experts and practitioners).</td>
<td>a. As evidence of using specialized online services is identified.</td>
<td>b. There is some evidence of the student using specialized online services to retrieve information but some details are vague or components are missing.</td>
<td>2. What specialized services did you use to retrieve information? Which specialized services did you find most helpful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What specialized services did you use to retrieve information? Which specialized services did you find most helpful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referenz Librarians (in-person or online) Interlibrary Loan Professional associations Institutional research office Community resources Experts and practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBRIC for Investigative Formal Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate:</strong> Judge the currency, appropriateness, accuracy and adequacy of information and information sources for a specific purpose or audience (including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundamental Awareness</strong> (Basic Knowledge)</td>
<td>Intermediate (Practical Application)</td>
<td>Advanced (Applied Theory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 Points each cell</td>
<td>5-Points each cell</td>
<td>8-10 points each cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Self-Evaluation Questions:</strong> Questions are meant to lead students to a correct answer. When a question is answered fully a student will receive 8-10 points for that section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The digitally literate student articulates and applies initial criteria for evaluating both the information and its sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examines and compares information from various sources in order to evaluate reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, and point of view or bias.</td>
<td>The composition of the information is unclear, with minimal or no details provided.</td>
<td>There is reflection on the reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, and point of view or bias, but some details are vague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student clearly reflects on the reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, and point of view or bias.</td>
<td>Describe how you compared and determined the validity, reliability, and timeliness of the information used for your subject? Does the source of the information have a point of view or bias?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The digitally literate student compares new knowledge with prior knowledge to determine the value added, contradictions, or other unique characteristics of the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determines probable accuracy by questioning the source of the data, the limitations of the information gathering tools or strategies, the reasonableness of the conclusions, and verification of the information by other sources.</td>
<td>Little insight into the sources of the data, with minimal or no details provided.</td>
<td>There is some evaluation of the data based on its source but some details are vague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student conducts a clear evaluation of the data based on its source.</td>
<td>Describe how you determined the accuracy of the source used. Were the conclusions reached reasonable, and was the information verified by other sources? What were the limitations of the sources and search strategies used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The digitally literate student determines whether the initial query should be revised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determines if original information need has been satisfied or if additional information is needed.</td>
<td>Little reflection on adequacy of the information, with minimal or no details provided.</td>
<td>There is reflection on the adequacy of the information, but details are vague or inconclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student clearly evaluates the adequacy of the information.</td>
<td>Was the information retrieved adequate to cover the subject or would more information be useful?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Literacy in the 21st Century Final Project Rubric

#### Direct Link to Rubric:
http://www.rcampus.com/rubricshowc.cfm?code=W739WA&sp=yes

---

**Warner University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Student:</th>
<th>Grade:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rubric: Special Topics Presentation**

Students will be responsible for thoroughly presenting a current issue/special topic based on current research literature and material covered in the course.

#### Social Issue Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent (200 pts)</th>
<th>Good (170 pts)</th>
<th>Fair (140 pts)</th>
<th>Poor (110 pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facts</strong> - (A,E) 20 %</td>
<td>Student has included at least four facts regarding the topic and has referenced these facts from their selected digital resources.</td>
<td>Student has included at least three facts regarding the topic and has referenced these facts from their selected digital resources.</td>
<td>Student has included at least two facts regarding the topic and has referenced these facts from their selected digital resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Aid</strong> - (C) 20 %</td>
<td>Visual aid is thorough, creative and catches the attention of the audience.</td>
<td>Visual aid is satisfactory. It is clear and easy to understand and add to the overall presentation.</td>
<td>Visual aid is somewhat clear and somewhat understood. It adds somewhat to the presentation, but not always on topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Presentation / C</strong> 20 %</td>
<td>Student has rehearsed the presentation and is speaking clearly, intelligently and professionally.</td>
<td>Student is speaking clearly but is having occasional trouble speaking clearly, intelligently, and professionally about the topic.</td>
<td>Student is not speaking clearly and does not know anything about the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicable Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>The student will use the information from the topic to answer questions posed from the class.</td>
<td>The student is able to answer most questions presented by the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance - E</strong> 10 %</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The student has included at least four facts regarding the topic</td>
<td>The student has included at least three facts regarding the topic</td>
<td>The student has included at least two facts regarding the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance - (E)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% The student will show why the issue is of importance today.</td>
<td>The student has included at least 4 facts regarding the topic and why it is an important issue today.</td>
<td>Student has included at least three facts regarding the topic and why it is an important issue today.</td>
<td>Student has included at least two facts regarding the topic and why it is an important issue today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Work</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% The team will show coordination and presentation of the topic and participation from all members.</td>
<td>All team members participated in the presentation and there was a clear contribution from each member.</td>
<td>Several members participated and there was a noticeable contribution from each member.</td>
<td>Less than half of the members participated and there was not a noticeable contribution from each member.</td>
<td>Only one member reviewed the material and the contribution of the other members was not noticeable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Build free rubrics at: [www.iRubric.com](http://www.iRubric.com)
Investigative Paper Assignment:

Students will prepare a 3-5 page paper in which they will investigate (Access) a problem or issue and develop a viable solution (Evaluate). Students will be required to have a minimum of five outside resources for this assignment, utilizing the LRC databases and credible internet resources. The resources must be cited, both with in-text citations and a Works Cited or References page that will not count toward the required written pages. Students are advised to avoid using overly popular issues and that the best topics will likely spark from personal experience with a problem or issue. All selected topics must be approved by the course instructor.

The purpose of this assignment is to have students access and evaluate data from scholarly sources and compose a paper that synthesizes that data in conjunction with an original thesis. The students will be expected to determine the validity and value of the source material. This assignment will also prepare the student to be able to identify a problem or issue and work toward a viable solution. This assignment will be evaluated based on the rubric developed by the Assessment Team, highlighting the EDGE outcomes, as well as content, organization, format and technical aspects of writing. All papers must be submitted to Turnitin.com to assess originality of the work. Students must receive a minimum of 75%, on the EDGE assessment rubric, to pass this assignment.

Literacy in the 21st Century Assignment List and Related Learning Outcomes

Assignments and EDGE Learning Outcomes

A=Access, E=Evaluate, C=Communicate


   Click on the link below to begin your webquest. Navigate through the site by using the links on the left and once complete, answer the following questions and submit them as a word document.  http://questgarden.com/118/17/4/110606113809/index.htm

   - What is plagiarism?
   - What are characteristics of plagiarism?
   - What are the types of plagiarism?
   - Does plagiarism only occur in writing?
   - What are the ways you can prevent plagiarism?
   - What are citations?

2. Justice Video Search (A,E,C)

   Please locate a video online, either through youtube or another online source and post the link to this forum. The video must be about the topic justice and relate to
the reading for this week. Along with the link, write a brief summary on why you felt this video was important to the topic of justice.

3. Evaluating a website. (A, E)

   It is important that you understand that *you can't automatically trust everything that you find online*—especially when you’re studying a topic that can get people all riled up! In today’s world, people are using the Internet to share their opinions and to try to persuade readers to think a certain way. As a researcher, though, it is your job to find facts and to avoid being fooled by people who aren’t telling you the whole truth. This activity will help you spot websites that aren’t trustworthy by looking at one of the most famous hoax websites of all time—http://zapatopi.net/treeoctopus/—an effort to save the endangered Pacific Northwest Tree Octopus!

4. Judging Quality Web Links (A, E)

   Open the Worksheet, "Judging Quality Web Links." You will need to select 3 websites, links, that you feel are good informational sites. Use the worksheet to evaluate those sites. In the Statements Column, provide your opinion of the site prior to using the evaluation rubric. In the link column provide the URL for the site. Finally, using the rubric, rate the site based on the variables provided in the rubric. Finally, in the statements column, provide a follow-up statement, was your evaluation the same after using the rubric?

5. Blog Post (C)

   Visit our class blog FOOTPRINT this week and post a comment concerning the Human Footprint post. Please include your name in the post.

6. Reflecting on Diigo Annotations (A,E)

   One of the keys to really taking advantage of Diigo (www.diigo.com) as a student research tool is learning to make quality contributions to the conversations that your peers are having around articles. Use this handout—which includes a strand of conversation between sixth-grade students—to reflect on the characteristics of quality annotations and Diigo conversations. This strand addressed a current event article about a U.S. company’s work in the South American country of Peru.

7. Prezi Assignment (C)

   Use the link for Prezi in the course or go to Prezi.com. Create a prezi presentation based on the information you have learned from the Human footprint videos up to this point. Your prezi can focus on just one topic or a couple. Incorporate facts learned from the videos and any outside information you have found on your topic. The presentation should include a minimum of 5 different points or facts. Pictures, videos, graphs, etc. can all be included in your prezi. Once complete, provide you link in the discussion and your topic as the title.

8. Introduction to Convincing Evidence (E)

   You’ll be working to craft an open letter to a world leader convincing him or her to take action on the controversial topic we are studying in class. Being persuasive will
require that you collect and share a range of different types of evidence in your letter. Use this handout to begin exploring the characteristics of three main types of convincing evidence.

9. Recognizing Different Perspectives (E)
One of the keys to being persuasive is the ability to understand the full range of perspectives that people may hold on the issue you are studying. Before crafting the final copy of your persuasive piece, use this handout to think through how others may feel about the same topic. The sample responses are based on the topic of global poverty. Responses can be built on student predictions, conversations with peers, or evidence collected while researching. Remember to focus your response on the controversial issue that you are studying in class and to include as much detail as possible when defining differing viewpoints.

10. Evaluating Persuasive Letters (E)
Convincing evidence can make all of the difference when you are trying to be persuasive. Need proof? Then check out the following two sample letters designed to convince President Barack Obama to take action on global poverty, and answer the reflection questions found at the bottom of this page.

11. Persuasive Letter (A, C)
Research online and select the leader of an organization, charity, business, or a country and write this person a letter about a concern of yours. The issue can be any of the issues covered in the text or one that you feel strongly. You can also choose to write a business asking for a donation for a specific charity. The paper should be 1-2 pages in APA format.

12. Carbon Footprint Glog (A, E, C)
For this assignment you will need to do some research on pollution and the carbon footprint. Collect some facts, statistics, or interesting points on the topics and create a Glog with this information. Also, list some ways you can help reduce the pollution or carbon footprint highlighted in your Glog. Include your sources in the Glog. Post the link to your Glog in the forum. In the title, you can just put your name or the subject of your Glog. Use the Glogster link provided in the class to create your Glog. You will need to create an account in order to build and share your Glog, if you like, you can sign up with your Facebook account.

13. Blog Post #2 (C)
Blog post #2. Please visit the blog Human Footprint2 Post your reactions to the questions.

14. Memorable Images worksheet. (E)
One of the first steps toward creating powerful visual messages is to examine images created by others. In this activity, students are asked to use the criteria outlined in Made to Stick (Heath & Heath, 2007) to evaluate two separate images designed to provoke thinking around the issue of global poverty.

15. Public Service Announcement (A,E,C)
Please read the following documents that are provided in this Week under the assignments section: Checklist for Creating Influential Visual Images PDF document, Public Service Announcement Template PDF document, Assembling Your PSA PDF
document. Use these documents to help create a PSA on the topic of your choosing. Your PSA should be a minimum of 3 powerpoint slides or prezi links, contain some images, a musical background is optional. You will not need to use animoto as suggested in the help guides listed above, but you can if you would like. Have fun with this assignment, but remember the 5 principles of creating a message. Please provide a brief, 1-2 sentence description of your PSA in the forum.

A group of middle school students using pseudonyms recently extended a Socratic circle on hatred by having an asynchronous conversation together on Voicethread (http://ed.voicethread.com/share/88781/). Use this handout to study one strand from that conversation, in which students reflected on a quote from their original seminar.

17. VoiceThread in Action (A,E)
One of the most popular tools for asynchronous conversations is VoiceThread, a group audio blog that allows users to add text, audio, and video comments to slides containing a wide range of multimedia content. To see what VoiceThread can look like in action, spend a few minutes exploring the following conversations, which were all created by a sixth-grade language arts teacher extending traditional Socratic circles beyond the classroom.

18. Glogster Assignment (A,C)
Select a topic, either from the reading or one of the Human Footprint Videos and create a Glogster based on that topic. Your Glogster should have a title and represent factual information on your topic as well as a statement about your opinion on the topic. For the forum title, just use the subject of your glog. Use can use the following link to start your page: GLOGSTER

19. Understanding the Problem (E)
The first challenge that any concerned citizen or world leader must face when tackling global challenges or controversial issues is to understand a problem as completely as possible before evaluating solutions. Understanding a problem begins by studying statistics, opinions, emotions, and impacts. Use this handout to shape your understanding of the global challenge or controversial issue we are studying in class. Remember to evaluate the sources you are studying for reliability and bias and to use http://snipurl.com to shorten Web addresses.

20. Evaluating Potential Solutions (E)
Finding solutions for controversial issues or global challenges is a complex task that requires careful thinking. Use the following checklist to evaluate the quality of the solutions that your group is considering. Remember that the best research projects will review several potential solutions.

One of the first steps to creating a quality wiki page is to spend time exploring other student wiki pages. Working with your research group, use the following handout to evaluate at least one of the wiki pages listed below. Each was designed by groups of sixth-grade students who were presenting potential solutions to global warming—one of our world’s greatest challenges. Remember to note what was impressive about the wiki
page that you evaluate, any ideas you’d like to copy, and what you would improve about the work.

**Wiki Samples:**
The Solution to Pollution: [http://snipurl.com/srf2](http://snipurl.com/srf2)
The Green Squad: [http://snipurl.com/srfz](http://snipurl.com/srfz)
The Global (Warming) Girls: [http://snipurl.com/srfys](http://snipurl.com/srfys)

22. Prezi Assignment #2 (A,E,C)
   Choose one of the topics we have learned about this week, Veganism, Organic Foods, or Genetically Modified Foods and prepare a Prezi presentation on the pros and cons of that topic along with your personal view. Make sure that you use factual information from credible sources and provide the reference to that information in your Prezi.

23. Exploring Wikis in Action (A,E)
   Often, the most challenging tasks in starting classroom wiki projects is imagining what’s possible. Without a clear vision of how wikis can be used to facilitate the work they are doing with students, teachers can end up struggling to structure a successful wiki experience.
   Use this handout to evaluate several examples of student wiki projects and to collect ideas about the kind of projects that you’d like to pursue.

24. Problem-Solution Introductions (E)
   Writing about global problems and potential solutions requires a certain style. Writers begin problem-solution pieces by convincing readers that the problem being studied must be addressed and that there are practical solutions worth pursuing. To do so, they use several unique sentences in their writing, which include grabbers, backgrounders, persuaders, and closers. This handout will help you draft an introduction for your problem-solution piece. While the sentences don’t have to appear in the order listed in the table, it’s usually the best way to organize your introduction. In the final column, write more than one possible sentence and choose the best! In the “Gathering Feedback” portion, have a parent or a partner use the questions provided to rate the draft of your introduction.

25. Webquest - Credit Card Debt: Do you know what you're getting into? (A,E)
   For this assignment you will be doing a webquest using the link provided in the course. After completing the quest, answer the following questions?
   What have you learned from taking this webquest. Please Answer the following questions
   - What do you understand about using credit cards now, compared to your understanding before going through this process?
   - Should you use a credit card if you know that you can only afford to make the minimum payment each month? Explain.
   - What are some reasonable situations that might arise, that would warrant using a credit card?
   - A good way to build your credit history, is to use a credit card for simple purchases, and then paying off the entire bill the following month. Why do you think this gives you a "good credit" history?
   - Please add any other thoughts or questions you have in your summary.
26. Prezi Assignment #3 (A,E,C)

Choose one of the topics from your reading this week, The Digital Divide, E-Rate Program, electronic health records, telemedicine, One Laptop per Child or telework, research additional information online and prepare a Prezi presentation of that topic along with your personal view. Make sure that you use factual information from credible sources and provide the references to that information in your Prezi.

27. Final Project (A,E,C)

Social Issue Paper and Presentation (Group Project): The purpose of this assignment is to provide the opportunity for students to illustrate their knowledge of one of the social issues discussed in this course and use the tools presented in this course to develop a paper and presentation. The students will select a social issue that was presented in the textbook and design a presentation using one of the tools presented in the course, for example power point, Glogster, Prezi or other presentation tools (See Rubric). The paper must be 3-5 pages and follow the paper requirements listed in the Requirements for Written Assignments.

Requirements for Written Assignments
All written assignments must be typed in Courier or Times New Roman #12 font and double spaced on white 8.5”x11” paper. Multiple pages are to be stapled. All assignments must comply with the 6th edition of the APA Manual. The paper must contain a minimum of at least 4 sources.

Social Issue Paper Grading Rubric
Content/Development (70%)
• Met general requirements of the assignment.
• Major points are supported by detail and examples.
• Ideas presented were thoughtful and incorporated individual experience and input.
• Ideas presented incorporated concepts from text reading, discussions, and lectures as appropriate.

Organization (15%)
• Central theme/purpose is immediately identifiable.
• Structure is clear, logical, and easy to follow.
• Introduction is effective and provides background on the topic with a preview of major points to be covered.
• Conclusion/Summary integrates the critical points from the paper and demonstrates how the central theme/purpose has been met.

Style/Mechanics (15%)
• Proper format was used, including APA format with references cited appropriately.
• Spelling, punctuation, and grammar follow proper rules and are correct.
• Sentences are clear and concise; sentence structure varies.
• Paragraphs break at appropriate places and have clear transitions between them.

In addition to the above assignments, student complete weekly online discussions about the topic discussed that week. This requires them to access additional information, evaluate the material for the week and communicate it in a digital environment.
Example Discussion:

Based on the reading for this week, conduct some online research and answer the following Questions. Your responses must be posted by Wednesday, 11PM and you must respond to one of your fellow classmates by Friday, 11PM.

1. Does technology provide a way out of poverty for the poorest nations?
2. What are the disadvantages of telemedicine?
3. What are the security issues involved in the use of mobile and wireless technology in the healthcare industry?
4. For the average worker, does higher productivity result in higher wages? Clearly, higher wages means a higher standard of living. Is there a relationship between GDP and the average earnings of workers?

Appendix 12: EDGE Course Offering Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Period</th>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>UNV 100 University Experience</th>
<th>ENG 1010 Composition I</th>
<th>BST 1020 Life of Christ</th>
<th>UNV CHAP Chapel 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Digital Literacy:** The ability to use digital technologies to access, and digitally communicate information and knowledge.

**Digital Literacy Student Learning Objectives:**

Students will be able to:

1. Access: Search, identify, and retrieve information in digital environments.
2. Evaluate: Judge the currency, appropriateness, accuracy and adequacy of information and information sources for a specific purpose or audience (including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials).
3. Communicate: Adapt the information and choose a digital communication medium and format that best supports the purposes of the product or performance and the intended audience within a digital environment.
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