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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The majority of graduates from the Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics (GIAL) work outside of the USA in minority languages and cultures which are often undescribed or underdescribed due to a lack of prior research. These GIAL graduates assist minority language speakers in language development projects which frequently involve linguistic research, translation, and the development of literacy materials. In many instances, graduates are working in previously unwritten languages. Even if a minority language or culture has never been described, usually something has been written about a related language or culture which is invaluable to researchers. In order to assist minority language communities in documenting their languages, and in order to make significant scholarly contributions, it is imperative that GIAL graduates learn how to efficiently access and effectively use the research literature.

The primary purpose of GIAL’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is to facilitate the development of students who are able to more effectively use the professional research literature. GIAL’s QEP topic — Effective Use of Professional Research Literature – emphasizes the research component of GIAL’s mission statement. The QEP is designed to develop students’ research and research reporting skills. The three major goals of the QEP are to enable students to:

1) Efficiently find professional research literature;
2) Effectively use professional research literature; and
3) Accurately document professional research literature.

GIAL’s QEP contains seven student learning outcomes which make these three major goals explicit. Briefly, they are:

1) Students can locate appropriate research literature through a variety of ways, including institution-supplied tools and services.
2) Students can make use of sources with adequate coverage of the topic in question.
3) Students can select high quality and credible sources that are increasingly advanced and specialized.
4) Students can evaluate the relevance of the concepts found in the literature.
5) Students can apply insights from sources to their work.
6) Students can document all referenced sources accurately.
7) Students can format references consistently.

The GIAL faculty is confident that this QEP will enhance GIAL’s graduate programs by applying best practices developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries to our unique environment.

Contact: Dr. Shelley Ashdown, QEP Coordinator, shelley_ashdown@gial.edu
2. QEP TOPIC

GIAL’s QEP topic — *Effective Use of Professional Research Literature* — flows directly from the mission statement below:

The mission of the Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics, as an institution of higher education, is to provide training and research opportunities leading to graduate degrees in applied linguistics and development of languages.

The GIAL Board has approved the following Expanded Mission Statement which clarifies this Mission Statement.

In fulfilling its mission, GIAL considers the following to be important ingredients:

a) Graduates of GIAL degree programs will have acquired skills to learn another language and culture effectively (possibly through completion of the Certificate program).

b) Graduates of GIAL degree programs will be equipped to participate in development of the minority languages of the world.

c) Graduates of GIAL degree programs will have basic skills necessary to pass on knowledge and skills they have learned at GIAL to others in a cross-cultural environment.

d) Students who complete GIAL graduate programs will have attained a level of professional competence at the graduate level, allowing them to participate actively in scholarly activity and/or professional service in one or more of the following areas – Bible translation, ethnology, literacy, Scripture use, language survey, sociolinguistics, language acquisition, descriptive linguistics, and cross-cultural service.

The QEP is designed to develop students’ research and research reporting skills. The three major goals of the QEP are to enable students to:

1) Efficiently find professional research literature;

2) Effectively use professional research literature; and

3) Accurately document professional research literature.

GIAL equips its graduates to work in minority language communities worldwide. GIAL graduates build capacity for sustainable language development by means of research, translation, training others, and the development of reading materials. Most students who come to GIAL desire to invest their lives in the development of minority languages, often by helping provide translation and literacy skills to those who speak previously unwritten languages. Minority languages are frequently undocumented and endangered. Part of the responsibility of workers in minority languages is to describe and document these endangered languages. This involves the collection and analysis of primary data, as well as the comparison of their analyses and descriptions with previously published research about related languages and cultures. Minority language workers have an ethical responsibility to make available the data gathered through publication and other suitable means. It is imperative that GIAL graduates know how to efficiently find, effectively use, and accurately cite the professional research literature, especially if they
want to make significant scholarly contributions to their discipline and the language communities they serve.

3. DEVELOPMENT OF THE QEP

This section traces the historical development of the QEP to date. After a review of the relevant literature in §4, section 5 lists the desired student learning outcomes, section 6 describes the interventions planned, and §7 shows how GIAL intends to assess the effectiveness of its Quality Enhancement Plan. Section 8 provides a timeline for both the interventions described in §6 and the assessment plan outlined in §7. Finally, sections 9 and 10 summarize the organizational structure and resources required for success.

Section 3.1 provides the background information needed to understand the rationale for the selection of the QEP topic, and §3.2 outlines the historical development of the QEP, including the involvement of various GIAL constituencies in the development of the QEP.

3.1 Institutional background

The Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics (GIAL) was incorporated in 1998 as a private, independent, not-for-profit graduate institution to prepare students to work cross-culturally in areas of applied linguistics and language development. GIAL was awarded initial accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 2005. This Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) was developed as part of GIAL’s reaffirmation process.

Since its beginning in 1998, GIAL has served over 900 students, awarding more than 300 Certificates in Applied Linguistics and over 150 Master of Arts degrees. GIAL graduates and former students (alumni) are serving in various professional and academic capacities in over 60 countries with over 35 organizations and agencies.

GIAL offers introductory and advanced courses leading to an undergraduate Certificate in Applied Linguistics, a graduate Certificate in Multicultural Teamwork, and a Master of Arts degree with a major in either Applied Linguistics or Language Development. Students who major in Applied Linguistics (AL) can choose a concentration in Bible Translation, Descriptive Linguistics, or Cross-Cultural Service. Students who major in Language Development (LD) can choose a concentration in Ethnology, Language Survey, Literacy, Scripture Use, or Sociolinguistics.

3.2 History of QEP development at GIAL

This section summarizes the broad-based institutional involvement in developing the QEP, whereas Appendix I provides a timeline of significant events in the development of the QEP. Since the QEP deals with student learning outcomes, the GIAL faculty is primarily responsible for developing the topic, implementing the plan, and assessing the results.

3.2.1 Administrative initiative

The QEP process was initiated as part of the reaffirmation of accreditation effort beginning in fall 2007. A preliminary QEP Steering Committee was appointed in fall 2007, consisting of the Academic Dean, the Applied Linguistics Department Head, the Language Development Department Head, the Library Director, and solicited nominations from the faculty. A student body representative was added to the committee
in spring 2008. The QEP Steering Committee was complete in June, 2008, when the Director of Public Relations was appointed Accreditation Liaison and QEP Director.

3.2.2 Faculty initiative

The faculty took the lead early in the process to nominate faculty representatives from both academic departments. Discussion concerning possible topics developed early in the process. Surveys were generated and input solicited from all segments of the faculty. As several topics began to take shape, it was quickly decided to survey the student body.

3.2.3 Student initiative

During the spring 2008 term, the Student Body Association sponsored a Pizza Party for the purpose of surveying students for their suggestions about the QEP topic. The suggestions arising from this event helped to solidify the focus on improving research and effectively using the professional literature in the disciplines taught at GIAL (see Appendix II for student and alumni input).

The Student Body Association has provided student representation on the QEP Steering Committee since January, 2008.

GIAL conducted a competition to select a logo and motto for the QEP. Students, alumni, staff, and faculty submitted entries. After reducing the entries to five, the QEP Steering Committee asked the President to select the winning entry. The winning logo and motto are shown in Figure 1.

![GIAL QEP logo and motto](image)

Writing pads illustrating the logo and motto have been produced and are distributed at new student orientation.

3.2.4 Board approval

The GIAL Board of Trustees reviewed the President’s report of SACS Reaffirmation in their January, 2008 board meeting, passing a motion to “look with favor on the administration’s report on SACS reaffirmation and urge the administration to proceed accordingly.” The report included an extensive section on the QEP process. The GIAL Board affirmed the GIAL QEP topic at its July 2008 meeting.

4. REVIEW OF BEST PRACTICES IN CURRENT LITERATURE

In this age of information explosion, many students are overwhelmed by the variety of technological resources and the sheer volume of accessible information available for any one research topic. Essential skills for using professional research literature include the ability to access, understand, and eventually evaluate sources for credibility and
applicability. Despite the many benefits technological advancements give a researcher, students find the research task more complicated than ever. Today’s students need guidance which goes beyond a point-and-click mentality to more productive research skills utilizing the best of what technology and professional literature have to offer with a critical approach. The result of effectively using professional research literature is a student who exhibits information competency through the ability to locate, evaluate and effectively use the needed information.

4.1 Maximizing institution supplied tools and services

The information literacy standards developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries has, as the initial step for student research behavior, the ability to identify sources of information for their chosen research topic (Association of College and Research Libraries 2000). This first step is crucial in developing student understanding of their topic and identifying key terms associated with it. Student success in locating key authors and seminal works from the outset of a research project has a direct bearing on how well a student is able to learn through interaction with sources and to develop their research topic (Neely 2006; Morner 1993). Indeed, a key component of university library surveys evaluating student research skills measures the extent to which students exhibit the knowledge and ability to access literature from the university library (Neely 2006; UMBC Survey 2003).^1

Best practices that universities employ for locating resources include providing tutorials such as the Skunk Ape Tutorial at the Florida Gulf Coast University Library (FGC University Library 2007) to engage students in utilizing library resources and services. At the course level, faculty best practices have a broad range of activities at their disposal. One approach is to provide a general resource list that directs students to the most useful sources associated with the class discipline. Students benefit from having resources identified such as items in the library collection, databases, and electronic resources for a particular field of study (see University of California Berkeley Library 2010).^2

Annotated bibliographies are also a best practice utilized by instructors to aid students in identifying sources of information for their research. The use of annotated bibliographies is twofold. Instructors may provide a class with a prepared sample annotated bibliography and by so doing make recommendations for resources from key print reference sources, subject-related databases, and professional websites. In addition, instructors may require students to prepare an annotated bibliography themselves for their research topic. Traditional annotated bibliographies require finding a specified number of professional sources on a topic and writing descriptive as well as evaluative annotations concerning those sources. The purpose is to refine student skills in literature searching so that they become competent in presenting bibliographic style (see Memorial University Libraries of Newfoundland 2008; UW Madison Writing Center 2009).^3

A key best practice associated with helping students identify and locate sources for research information is an instructional library session organized by a class instructor.

---

^1 See Student Learning Outcome 1 in §5 and Table 5.
^2 See §6.1 Intervention 1: Annotated bibliographies compiled by teachers.
^3 See §6.4 Intervention 4: Annotated bibliographies compiled by students.
with the college library staff. An impressive number of colleges have chosen to develop research skills through this kind of class session. Teachers schedule a library class day to link information competency of institution-supplied tools and services with individual course research requirements (see Florida International University Libraries 2010). This library class day operates as a research practicum tied specifically to a class research assignment. The session(s) should be conducted at the time of an assignment with students being able to immediately apply the tools learned during the session (see Leonard Library of San Francisco State University 2010).

A library class session is most effective when three conditions are met. First, the experience is course-related. Thus, the library presentation is not general; instead, it is focused on a specific discipline and/or topics. Second, research help is given at the time the student actually needs to maximize institution tools and services. Third, instructional research is a priority that is supported by the teacher (Carlson & Miller 1994; Temple University Libraries 2010). A class research practicum is an intervention that helps students to locate appropriate professional literature through a variety of ways.

Instructional library sessions offer knowledge about available resources. However, in order to extract information from sources like EBSCO Host and First Search, students also need knowledge of Boolean operators, truncation, search commands and parameters, etc. Students must learn to identify and use key controlled vocabulary; that is, terminology which indexes topics within databases. Extracting the most appropriate information from these sources is a research skill that can be addressed in a class research practicum. Librarians frequently create research guides which are tailored for a specific class.

Many teaching faculty require a research log in which students document the places consulted for information. The log includes student comments on what search techniques were effective and ineffective, as well as a discussion of how the information found influenced their understanding of the research topic (see Memorial University Libraries of Newfoundland 2008). A research log focuses student attention on their choice of research behavior or methodology and maintains a record of sources consulted and key words searched. This kind of best practice frames the coverage an individual student has given their chosen research and provides an indication of whether or not adequate research coverage has been met.

### 4.2 Selecting, evaluating, and applying professional resources

Effective use of professional literature requires students to select quality resources for their research assignment and evaluate the credibility and relevance of the resources to the topic. An additional step requires students to correctly apply insights from the

---

4 Hellenius (2006) lists the following schools in her survey report: CSU Bakersfield, CSU Monterey Bay, CSU Sacramento, Cerro Coso College, City College of San Francisco, Contra Costa, College of the Sequoias, Cuyamaca College, Diablo Valley College, Long Beach City College, Merced College, Mission College, Saddleback College, and Siskiyous College.

5 See §6.2 Intervention 2: GIAL Library practicum.

6 GIAL librarians will continue to work with faculty to design such targeted resources that will be available online.

7 GIAL will use a locally-designed tool to guide and assess students’ use of resources (see Instrument A in Appendix VII).
sources to their work. Students normally begin with a broad topic and explore associated conceptual schemes and questions which eventually are narrowed to a more refined description and focus. This process of moving from a general to a more narrow topic entails critical thinking skills such as selecting materials from the wealth of professional resources available, evaluating these materials for relevance to the chosen topic, and applying the information garnered to the topic.

Graduate students in particular should explore beyond the general sources found at the undergraduate research level. Graduate students are expected to consult highly credible and more advanced, specialized sources, including professional academic journals.

Successfully using specialized sources requires students to follow effective procedures which include evaluating the literature for relevance, accuracy, and application to the research topic. A second type of annotated bibliography has gained popularity as a best practice in this regard. Known as a critical annotated bibliography, this assignment includes information on how students found the entries and how useful the source was to the research topic. Students may also be asked to comment on the limitations of the material. This type of requirement goes beyond locating resources to selecting the most appropriate ones and then evaluating the information (Concordia University Libraries 2007).

Stand-alone courses are a popular way to ensure student information literacy. Introductory stand-alone courses range from one to three credits. The primary benefit of requiring an information literacy course is it builds a strong foundation for research and provides a practical skillset (Megaw & McClendon 2003; McMillan 2002). One drawback to stand-alone information competency courses is the disconnect between course requirements and the actual research needs of students. Students tend to acquire inert knowledge in stand-alone courses because of this disconnect between course and research interests. Any library training, whether it is a stand-alone course or individual class sessions, should directly link an assignment students are undertaking to the library training sessions.

A number of research videos designed to teach research strategies are now available online as fair use resources. Faculty and library staff are encouraged to use short online training videos to address common research issues for students. North Carolina State University Libraries has a number of excellent videos such as: 1) Literature Reviews: An Overview for Graduate Students; 2) Anatomy of a Scholarly Article; 3) Wikipedia: Beneath the Surface; and 4) Peer Review in 5 Minutes. Humboldt State University offers several short videos through their library website including Find Full Text Articles with Google Scholar, while the UC Berkeley Library website has a short video tutorial entitled Evaluating Scholarly Content Online. These video training tools are designed

---

8 See Hellenius (2006) for a list of institutions in California which offer stand-alone courses.
9 See http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/lit-review/.
10 See http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/scholarly-articles/.
11 See http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/wikipedia/.
12 See http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/pr/.
13 See http://library.humboldt.edu/infoservices/indexes/tutorials/googlescholar/.
14 See http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/doemoff/tutorials/scholarlycontentonline.html.
to take the student beyond just locating sources to a level of critically engaging the information and determining the credibility and value of the source for their topic.

Experts in the field of information competency agree that a significant step in the research process is for students to exhibit the ability to evaluate information and critically determine the most appropriate sources for the topic under discussion. It is not enough for students to merely locate information on a research topic. The present higher-education environment is very concerned with students applying evaluative criteria to information sources found during the course of research. Is a student able to evaluate various sources for their accuracy, validity, bias, reasonableness of conclusions, and relevance to the current research topic? These are fundamental critical thinking skills educators are seeking to develop in the current student population (Curzon 1997; Neely 2006).

A creative strategy for teaching and assessing the quality, credibility, and relevance of sources is through peer assessment. The Florida Department of Education is keen on involving student evaluation of classmate research by objective criteria (Bouchillon 1996). Students required to critically engage each other’s work have the opportunity to relax in an unbiased position and assess the choice of sources as well as their application in other peer research projects. The ensuing discussion among student researchers can benefit those on both sides of the exchange.

Student assessors need explicit criteria for the assessment activity. Germane to the exercise is requiring students to evaluate source credibility, determine if enough credible sources were included, and the degree to which the researcher accurately interpreted source information in their application. Peer assessment brings into focus alternative reasoning, develops perceptual skills, fosters positive approaches to diverse cognitive styles, and acquaints students with professional literature beyond their personal research topic. The department of Sociology at CSU Fullerton uses peer assessment because this type of best practice directly correlates with the learning goals of sociology classes to examine research data analysis and reporting, to recognize and use different sources of information, to appreciate the variety of resources available, and to improve analytical thinking and writing.  

4.3 Documenting sources per required standards

Documenting references accurately and with a consistent style is a necessary skill to be taught to each succeeding generation of higher education students. A fundamental principle of credible research is appropriate citation of all references used in a project. Colleges and universities not only articulate learning outcomes for locating and applying the professional literature, but also for accurately citing sources. Best practices include instructional actions which target competent implementation of citation styles and/or style guides for an academic department or individual course.  

15 Evaluating information and its sources critically is step three in the Information literacy competency standards for higher education delineated by the Association of College and Research Libraries.

16 See http://guides.library.fullerton.edu/infocomp/department.htm#Sociology.

17 Helmke Library of Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne outlines information literacy outcomes at: http://www.lib.ipfw.edu/1085.0.html. Individual course citation guides are provided at: http://www.lib.ipfw.edu/617.0.html.
Students should be held accountable for accurately citing and using information sources in accordance with institutional policy and chosen style requirements. Academic competence and integrity can be encouraged by faculty who provide correct bibliographic examples and communicate the importance of acknowledging sources via standard conventions. Many practices can be employed for this purpose — tutorials, online instructional aids, librarian intervention, and the use of annotated bibliographies.

5. DESIRED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The primary objective for the QEP is the improvement of student learning. The Commission on Colleges broadly defines student learning as “changes in (1) knowledge, (2) skills, (3) behaviors, or (4) values” (SACS 2010:39).

The GIAL faculty has identified the following seven student learning outcomes (SLOs):

**SLO1: Locating Resources.** *Beginning graduate students* will be able to locate appropriate research literature through a variety of ways, including institution-supplied tools and services.

**SLO2: Adequate Coverage.** *Advanced graduate students* will make use of sources with adequate coverage (amount, type, variety, and currency) of the topic in question.\(^{18}\)

**SLO3: Quality and Credibility.** *Advanced graduate students* will be able to select high quality and credible sources that are increasingly advanced and specialized.

**SLO4: Relevance.** *Advanced graduate students* will be able to evaluate the relevance of the concepts found in the literature to their own particular problem or issue.

**SLO5: Application.** *Advanced graduate students* will be able to correctly apply insights from sources to their work.

**SLO6: Documentation.** *Beginning graduate students* will be able to accurately document all referenced sources in the “Works Cited” section of a research project.

**SLO7: Standard Format.** *Beginning graduate students* will be able to consistently format references in the text and the “Works Cited” according to a standard style form.

Three SLOs (SLO1, SLO6, and SLO7) are aimed at beginning graduate students, while the other four SLOs (SLO2, SLO3, SLO4, and SLO5) are aimed at more advanced graduate students.

The three goals stated in §2 and the seven learning objectives listed in this section were identified by the faculty as they discussed academic weaknesses which they had observed among GIAL students and described what GIAL graduates should ideally be able to do.

Assessing professional sources is an initial gateway to knowledge. Students benefit immediately from activities cultivating skill in finding research literature for course research projects. The advantage gained by a student from adequately covering a research topic is an expanded awareness of issues and arguments associated with a topic. This fosters critical thinking skills in the areas of identifying and understanding main ideas, recognizing relationships between concepts, and determining whether one’s research should broaden or narrow the search strategy. Student learning yields a high

---

\(^{18}\) Presumably, advanced graduate students will be able to demonstrate their ability on all learning outcomes which are targeted towards beginning graduate students.
dividend when the ability to select credible, specialized sources most appropriate for the topic is developed. Graduate students progress from novice researchers to effective mature researchers when the ability to evaluate sources is intentionally encouraged and adopted. With the ability to evaluate the reasonableness of conclusions in sources, students can confidently join in the academic exchange concerning an issue.

6. INTERVENTIONS

In order to generate the desired student learning outcomes listed in the previous section and utilize some of the best practices outlined in §4, the following four actions will be implemented:

INT1: Teachers will compile and distribute annotated bibliographies for specific graduate courses.

INT2: Teachers of specific courses will designate a class period to guide students as they practice using search engines, excerpting services, and databases.

INT3: Graduate students will review a paper written by other students.

INT4: Graduate students will compile annotated bibliographies for specific courses.

Sections 6.1–6.4 provide the following information for each intervention: (1) a description of the intervention; (2) the purpose of the intervention; (3) a list of the Student Learning Outcome(s) that the intervention is intended to impact; (4) a list of venues — such as specific courses — in which the intervention will be introduced; (5) a timeline indicating the target date on which the intervention will be initiated; (6) an indication of how the success of the intervention will be assessed; (7) the criteria for success of the intervention; and (8) the people who will be responsible for ensuring that the intervention is successfully implemented and monitored.

6.1 Intervention 1: Annotated bibliographies compiled by teachers

In selected MA-level courses (see below) the primary instructor will distribute an annotated bibliography to the students enrolled in that course. These bibliographies will list the most important literature pertinent to the specific subfield of the concentration which the course supports. These bibliographies will be given out early in the respective courses, as soon as they become relevant to the work which students are assigned to do. These bibliographies will include at the very least the major journals in the appropriate discipline. They will also include, whenever possible, other primary resources such as books, manuscripts, websites, search engines, software, etc. Each distinct item on these lists will be accompanied by a brief description of the work, how to access it, how to use it, its relative degree of importance and usefulness to the topic, and/or any other details which may help the students evaluate the potential contribution of the resource. A preliminary example of this type of bibliography appears in Appendix III which is intended as a model. Individual teachers may structure their own bibliographies in any way they anticipate will be most helpful given the focus of their course.

Appendix IV is an intervention planning template for instructors to use in helping to plan for different interventions in their respective courses. Intervention 1 (INT1) requires instructors to prepare the annotated bibliographies themselves. The only response required on the part of the students in this intervention is to read and use these reference lists and complete Instrument A. In the remaining three interventions,
however, the students are the ones assigned to do the majority of the work, while instructors monitor and evaluate their work.

The purpose of this intervention is to help graduate students become more familiar with the relevant professional research literature. INT1 is designed to primarily impact SLO1: Locating Resources and secondarily impact SLO2: Adequate Coverage, SLO6: Documentation, and SLO7: Standard Format. Students are expected to learn how to find and cite the basic sources that are generally seen to be relevant to a course.

INT1 will be introduced in the following graduate courses: AL5304 Applied Phonology, AL5313 Advanced Grammatical Analysis, AL5314 Culture, Language and Mind, AL5324 Principles of New Testament Exegesis, AL5325 Principles of Old Testament Exegesis, AL5395 Current Issues in Descriptive Linguistics, LD5353 Language Development and Planning, and LD5354 Language Contact. These courses are targeted since they are the ones in which a major research paper is assigned. They were also chosen because every graduate in every program must take at least two of these courses.

The implementation of INT1 will begin in the spring 2011 term. It will continue to be used in all subsequent terms during which any of the courses above are taught.

The success of this intervention will be assessed by comparing the overall mean scores on questions 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 of Instrument B: Instructor Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature (see Appendix VIII) following this intervention with overall mean scores from the baseline data for questions 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 of Instrument B for the same group of students. The criteria for success of this intervention is that, for all students who will have been impacted by it, faculty responses to questions 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 of Instrument B will be either Strong or Outstanding. This goal will be considered to have been met if this criterion is true of 80% or more for all such responses.

The people responsible for introducing this intervention are the primary instructors of each of the courses listed above. At the institutional level, the QEP Director will oversee the process of ensuring that this intervention is implemented on time, as well as the evaluation of its impact. Table 1 summarizes the features of INT1.

---

19 In order to answer question 1 of Instrument B, students in the targeted courses will need to complete Instrument A.
6.2 Intervention 2: GIAL Library practicum

Certain MA-level courses (see below) will include one designated class period in which students are introduced to and given practice in the use of search engines, excerpting services, and databases pertinent to the concentration of the course. The annotated bibliographies described in §6.1 may be used in combination with this activity. These sessions will be held in the GIAL Computer Lab and/or Library with the assistance of librarians. As part of this session, students will complete a practical exercise to determine whether or not the GIAL Library owns specific materials. A sample exercise is shown in Appendix V and sample instructions for the librarian are shown in Appendix VI. The instructing librarian will also advertise and offer designated blocks of time in which tutorial assistance will be available to any student who may benefit from personal guidance in accessing the research literature of his or her concentration. This latter time slot will be separate from and in addition to those pre-arranged, course-specific, library-oriented modules just mentioned.

The purpose of this intervention is to enable our graduate students to find the relevant professional research literature more efficiently. INT2 is designed to primarily impact SLO1: Locating Resources and secondarily impact SLO2: Adequate Coverage, and SLO3: Quality and Credibility. Students are expected to utilize all of the basic literature adequately. This involves finding and citing all the sources that are generally seen to be relevant. Students should be familiar with the primary journals in the field or concentration and how to obtain articles. Students should also demonstrate skill in using available databases and specialized search engines to find relevant literature and source documents.

Intervention 2 will take place in the Computer Lab and/or Library as part of the following graduate courses: AL5304 Applied Phonology, AL5313 Advanced Grammatical Analysis, AL5314 Culture, Language and Mind, AL5324 Principles of New Testament Exegesis, AL5325 Principles of Old Testament Exegesis, AL5395 Current Issues in Descriptive Linguistics, LD5353 Language Development and Planning, and LD5354 Language Contact. These courses are targeted since they are the ones in which a major research paper is assigned and every graduate in every program must take at least two of these courses. Because every graduate student will be exposed to library research procedures via intervention 2, we can assume that every graduate will have a minimum research ability.

The implementation of INT2 will begin in the fall 2011 term. It will continue to be used in all subsequent terms during which any of the courses above are taught.
The success of this intervention will be assessed by comparing the overall mean scores on the answers to a, d, e, and h of Instrument C: Librarian Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature (see Appendix IX) following this intervention with overall mean scores from the baseline data for a, d, e, and h of Instrument C for the same group of students.

The criteria for success of this intervention is that, for all students who will have been impacted by it, the mean scores for a, d, e, and h of Instrument C will be significantly higher than the mean score for the same items from the baseline data for these same students. This goal will be considered to have been met if this criterion is true for 90% of all impacted students.

Upon completion of the one-hour practicum, each student taking part in this intervention will fill out and hand in to the library staff a copy of his/her answers to the course-specific exercise (see Appendix V for a sample exercise.)

The people responsible for introducing this intervention are the primary instructors of each of the courses listed above, in collaboration with the Library Director. At the institutional level the QEP Director will oversee the process of ensuring that this intervention is implemented on time, as well as the evaluation of its impact. Table 2 summarizes the features of intervention 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes targeted</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Timeline for initiating</th>
<th>Assessment method</th>
<th>Criteria for success</th>
<th>People responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>designated class period to practice using search engines, excerpting services, and databases</td>
<td>enable graduate students to find relevant literature</td>
<td>SLO1, SLO2, SLO3</td>
<td>Computer Lab, in conjunction with AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, AL5325, AL5395, LD5353, LD5354</td>
<td>beginning in fall 2011 term</td>
<td>Librarian Assessment (Instr. C, answers to a, d, e, h)</td>
<td>90% of impacted students have increase Instr. C, answers to a, d, e, and h than on baseline Instr. C.</td>
<td>primary instructors, Library Director, QEP Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Intervention 3: Peer review project

In selected MA-level courses, students will be required (as part of their final grade) to review and comment on the rough draft of a paper written by one of their classmates (fellow students). These reviews will focus on the critical and effective application of the professional research literature. A tentative example of a handout that can be used to guide the reviewer in this process is included in Appendix X. This model is intended as a sample only; individual teachers may modify it as needed for their purposes. The instructor of each course will assign each student a unique paper to review. Each student will review one paper written by some other student in the course. When these reviews are finished, they will be distributed to the respective student authors so that they can make revisions to their research papers before the final product is submitted to
Thus, each student will benefit from giving suggestions about the use of a body of literature connected with a specific research topic, while also receiving critical comments and feedback about their own topic from a peer. This process will be scheduled in such a way that it does not hold up the timeline of target assignment dates in each course. For this reason, this intervention will only be used in eight-week long courses.

The purpose of this intervention is to enable our graduate students to competently analyze, evaluate, interpret, and integrate the sources that they find. INT3 is designed to primarily impact SLO4: Relevance and SLO5: Application, and secondarily impact SLO2: Adequate Coverage, and SLO3: Quality and Credibility. Graduate students are expected to be able to use sources critically (i.e., evaluate the authority and/or validity of the information that was found), and demonstrate an understanding of authors' viewpoints by selecting the most appropriate sources. Graduate students should also demonstrate skill in applying relevant literature to novel problems and scenarios.

INT3 will be introduced in the following graduate courses: AL5304 Applied Phonology, AL5313 Advanced Grammatical Analysis, AL5314 Culture, Language and Mind, AL5324 Principles of New Testament Exegesis, AL5325 Principles of Old Testament Exegesis, AL5395 Current Issues in Descriptive Linguistics, LD5353 Language Development and Planning, and LD5354 Language Contact. These courses are targeted since they are the ones in which a major research paper is assigned, and adequate time is available for students to complete the review.

The implementation of INT3 will begin in the fall 2011 term. It will continue to be used in all subsequent terms during which any of the courses above are taught.

The success of this intervention will be assessed by comparing the data collected following INT3 with the baseline data for the same group of students. Overall mean scores will be determined from three forms: (1) questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Instrument B (see Appendix VIII); (2) answers to d, e, and h of Instrument C (see Appendix IX); and (3) Instrument for Self-Assessment of Research Confidence, Pre- and Post-Assignment (see Appendix XI).

The first criterion for success of this intervention is that, for all students who will have been impacted by it, faculty responses to questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Instrument B will be either Strong or Outstanding. This goal will be considered to have been met if this criterion is true of 80% or more for all such responses.

The second criterion for success is that, for all students who will have been impacted by it, the scores on questions d, e, and h of Instrument C will have increased and will include at least two journal articles when compared to the librarian’s evaluation of these

---

20 Because graduate classes at GIAL are small, each reviewer will know the author of the paper being reviewed, and each author will know the reviewer of his/her paper.

21 We anticipate completing the intervention as planned. However, if it proves to be ineffective, we may try an alternative implementation of a peer review whereby the instructor and students simultaneously evaluate a paper written by some third party (outside the course). That way, students can directly compare their comments with those of the teacher, on the same piece of writing.

22 AL5325 Principles of Old Testament Exegesis is currently offered as a four-week intensive course. It will not include a peer review until it returns to an eight-week format.
same students’ papers in the baseline data.\textsuperscript{23} This goal will be considered to have been met if this criterion is true of 60\% or more students.

The third criterion for success is that the responses of each student who fills out the \textit{Instrument for Self-Assessment of Research Confidence, Pre- and Post-Assignment}, will be \textit{Confident} or \textit{Competent}. These goals will be considered to have been met if the corresponding criterion is true of 80\% or more for all such responses.

The people responsible for introducing this intervention are the primary instructors of each of the courses listed above. At the institutional level the QEP Director will oversee the process of ensuring that this intervention is implemented on time, as well as the evaluation of its impact. Table 3 summarizes the features of intervention 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes targeted</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Timeline for initiating</th>
<th>Assessment method</th>
<th>Criteria for success</th>
<th>People responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student review of research papers written by other students</td>
<td>enable graduate students to analyze, evaluate, interpret, &amp; integrate sources</td>
<td>SLO2, SLO3, SLO4, SLO5</td>
<td>AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, AL5325, AL5395, LD5353, LD5354</td>
<td>beginning in fall 2011 term</td>
<td>Instructor Assessment (Instr. B, questions 2, 3, 4, 5); Librarian Assessment (Instr. C, answers to d, e, h); Instr. for Self-Assessment of Research Confidence</td>
<td>80% Strong or Outstanding on Instr. B, questions 2, 3, 4, 5; 60% of students have cited two articles and have higher answers to d, e, &amp; h on Instr. C, than on baseline Instr. C; 80% Confident or Competent on Instr. for Self-Assessment of Research Confidence</td>
<td>primary instructors, QEP Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Intervention 4: Annotated bibliographies compiled by students

In selected MA-level courses, students will be required to include an annotated bibliography along with their major research paper. These bibliographies should be similar in design to those compiled by instructors (see §6.1). However, a crucial difference is that these student-compiled bibliographies are expected to be more narrowly-oriented by focusing on their specific research topic. Thus, their scope does not need to be as broad as that of the instructor-compiled bibliographies which should cover the overall general topic of the respective course. The student versions described here

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Instrument C} question (d) refers to books cited, question (e) to journal articles cited, and question (h) to articles in anthologies cited.
will target the literature of their own particular research question. In conjunction with this intervention, the primary instructor in each designated course will select one specific stylesheet which his/her students must follow. Furthermore, a portion of the final grade on this project must involve an assessment of how well the compiler has adhered to the specifications of the assigned stylesheet in formatting their bibliography items. Instructors will have the liberty of choosing any stylesheet deemed most relevant and appropriate for their course.

The purpose of this intervention is to help our graduate students become more proficient at analyzing, summarizing, evaluating, and correctly citing the professional research literature. INT4 is designed to impact SLO2: Adequate Coverage, SLO3: Quality and Credibility, SLO4: Relevance, SLO6: Documentation, and SLO7: Standard Format. This intervention will demonstrate that graduate students are familiar with and able to critically use the professional research literature. Graduate students should demonstrate: 1) the ability to identify primary literature (source authors) related to their research problem or question (SLO2); 2) the ability to evaluate the quality and usefulness of given literature (SLO3); 3) the ability to summarize (annotate) relevant literature (SLO4); and 4) the ability to correctly reference sources in papers (SLO6 and SLO7).

INT4 will be introduced in the following graduate courses: AL5304 Applied Phonology, AL5313 Advanced Grammatical Analysis, AL5314 Culture, Language and Mind, AL5324 Principles of New Testament Exegesis, AL5325 Principles of Old Testament Exegesis, AL5395 Current Issues in Descriptive Linguistics, LD5353 Language Development and Planning, and LD5354 Language Contact. These courses are targeted since they are the ones in which a major research paper is assigned, and adequate time is available for students to complete the review.

The implementation of intervention 4 will begin in the fall 2011 term. It will continue to be used in all subsequent terms during which any of the courses above are taught.

The success of this intervention will be assessed by comparing the data collected following INT4 with the baseline data for these same students. Overall mean scores will be determined from two forms: (1) questions 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 of Instrument B (see Appendix VIII); and (2) responses to d, e, and h on Instrument C (see Appendix IX).

The first criterion for success of this intervention is that, for all students who will have been impacted by it, faculty responses to questions 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 of Instrument B will be either Strong or Outstanding. This goal will be considered to have been met if this criterion is true of 80% or more for all such responses.

The second criterion for success is that, for all students who will have been impacted by it, the scores on questions d, e, and h of Instrument C will have increased and will include at least two journal articles when compared to the librarian’s evaluation of these same students’ papers in the baseline data. This goal will be considered to have been met if this criterion is true of 60% or more students.

The people responsible for introducing this intervention are the primary instructors of each of the courses listed above. At the institutional level the QEP Director will oversee the process of ensuring that this intervention is implemented on time, as well as the evaluation of its impact. Table 4 summarizes the features of intervention 4.

---

24 Instrument C question (d) refers to books cited, question (e) to journal articles cited, and question (h) to articles in anthologies cited.
Table 4: Features of Interventions 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes targeted</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Timeline for initiating</th>
<th>Assessment method</th>
<th>Criteria for success</th>
<th>People responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>annotated bibliography compiled by students</td>
<td>help graduate students improve at analyzing, summarizing, evaluating, &amp; citing literature</td>
<td>SLO2, SLO3, SLO4, SLO6, SLO7</td>
<td>AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, AL5325, AL5395, LD5353, LD5354</td>
<td>beginning in fall 2011 term</td>
<td>Instructor Assessment (Instr. B, questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7); Librarian Assessment (Instr. C, d, e, h);</td>
<td>80% Strong or Outstanding on Instr. B, questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7; 60% of students have cited two articles and have higher answers to d, e, &amp; h on Instr. C, than on baseline Instr. C</td>
<td>primary instructors, QEP Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Summary

Intervention 1 (annotated bibliographies compiled by teachers) requires instructors to perform the majority of the actual work, with minimal input by the respective students. The other three interventions involve significant effort on the part of the students themselves.

7. ASSESSMENT

In order to achieve the seven student learning outcomes describe in §5, four interventions were described in §6 along with a brief description of how each intervention will be assessed. Table 5 provides a summary of the primary relationships between student learning outcomes, interventions, and the assessment instruments used to measure student learning.
Table 5: Summary of relationships between SLOs, Interventions, and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student learning outcomes</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Assessment Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO1 Locating Resources</td>
<td>INT1 Teachers’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT2 Library practicum</td>
<td>Instrument C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2 Adequate Coverage</td>
<td>INT1 Teachers’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT2 Library practicum</td>
<td>Instrument C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT3 Peer review</td>
<td>Instruments B, C, Self-Assessment of research confidence Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT4 Students’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3 Quality and Credibility</td>
<td>INT2 Library practicum</td>
<td>Instrument C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT3 Peer review</td>
<td>Instruments B, C, Self-Assessment of research confidence Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT4 Students’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO4 Relevance</td>
<td>INT3 Peer review</td>
<td>Instruments B, C, Self-Assessment of research confidence Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT4 Students’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO5 Application</td>
<td>INT3 Peer review</td>
<td>Instruments B, C, Self-Assessment of research confidence Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO6 Documentation</td>
<td>INT1 Teachers’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT4 Students’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO7 Standard Format</td>
<td>INT1 Teachers’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT4 Students’ annotated bibliographies</td>
<td>Instruments B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early in the QEP planning process, students participating in the May 2008 QEP Pizza Party indicated a high level of need for a “better grasp of which journals to use;” “knowledge of available databases/journals (and how to use them);” and “how to search for journal articles” (see Appendix II).

Intervention 2 (GIAL Library practicum) addresses these concerns via database instruction in selected courses. Furthermore, Intervention 1 (Annotated bibliographies compiled by teachers) is designed to include library web pages, instruction sheets, database-specific tutorials, and other self-directed resources.25

7.1 Background surveys

Because the three QEP goals stated in §2 and seven QEP student learning objectives described in §5 emerged from faculty discussions rather than academic assessment of student learning outcomes, a GIAL Library survey was conducted in November 2008 in order to determine if there was a clear need for this QEP (see Appendix XII for preliminary results).

GIAL has a high quality collection of print and electronic sources supporting its unique research activities. Many of these, especially journals, indexes, and bibliographies, are specialized sources for applied linguistics and language development. In order to test the hypothesis that incoming students are unfamiliar with these specialized sources, the

---

25 Librarians are expected to review these aids with course instructors.
QEP Steering Committee surveyed 51 incoming students during library orientation in July 2009. The survey responses indicated that as many as one-third of incoming students are not familiar with any of GIAL’s specialized databases (see Appendix XIII).

One way to assess familiarity and use of core databases is to conduct student surveys at the start and end of selected courses in each program (Applied Linguistics and Language Development). An “End-of-Course Student Library Survey in Field Methods (2009-Dec)” supports faculty observations that students in the final portion of the Certificate in Applied Linguistics Program or the start of a graduate degree in Applied Linguistics rely heavily on finding materials locally through the library’s catalog or finding materials on their own through internet search engines. When asked, “How often did you use the following tools in your research for this course,” 15 of 16 (93.8%) indicated at least “occasional” use of “web search engines” and 14 of 16 (87.5%) used the “GIAL Library Catalog.” This class consulted WorldCat and Academic Search Complete “Occasionally” or more often with 37.5% of the class using the former and 26.7% the latter. Table 6 shows the data from the End-of-Course Student Library Survey in Field Methods.

Table 6: End-of-Course Student Library Survey in Field Methods (14 Dec 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>% with Rarely/ Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIAL Library Catalog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIAL Library web page to find ONLINE JOURNALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIAL Library web page to find DATABASES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldCat (via FirstSearch or <a href="http://www.worldcat.org">www.worldcat.org</a>)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA &amp; ATLAS (religion databases via FirstSearch)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics Abstracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jerome’s Translation Studies Abstracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA Bibliography (via EbscoHost)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Complete (via EbscoHost)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web search engines (Google, Yahoo, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| answered question | 16 |
| skipped question  | 1  |

During AL5406 Field Methods, the first graduate course for all AL Department graduate students and many LD Department graduate students, the instructor or a librarian introduces students to selected databases related to course content. Survey results suggest that database instruction improved student confidence in locating materials.
Table 7 shows that three students moved from “With some difficulty” to “Competent,” one remained in that category, and one did not respond to the repeated question.

### Table 7: GIAL Library Survey of Field Methods (14 Dec 2009)

#### Question #7. When you received instructions on writing the first paper in this course, how would you rate your skills in the following steps of the research process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>With some difficulty</th>
<th>Not knowing how to start</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response #3. Locating what materials exist that pertain to my research question</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
skipped question | 0 |

#### Question #17. As you finish this class, how would you rate your skills in the following steps of the research process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>With some difficulty</th>
<th>Not knowing how to start</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response #3. Locating what materials exist that pertain to my research question</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
skipped question | 1 |

The survey results described in this section confirmed the impressions of faculty and librarians that students are not effectively using the research tools at their disposal, especially indexes and abstracting databases that connect users to published professional literature in academic journals which are not listed in the GIAL library catalog.

Instructors and librarians have also noticed that some students have difficulty obtaining journal articles even when the journal is known. These students must check several places to determine if the title is owned, if the library has the specific issue, if it is online in full-text, or whether it may be necessary to obtain it by interlibrary loan.

### 7.2 Baseline data collection

The surveys described in §7.1 helped determine the extent to which GIAL students currently use professional research literature. Three instruments were developed and tested in order to: 1) create and test the tools needed to assess the four pending interventions; 2) obtain baseline data; and 3) discover potential assessment problems.

*Instrument A: Student Self-Assessment of Professional Research Literature Use* is designed to indicate the extent to which students use appropriate databases (see Appendix VII). Course level metrics record the number of students (and percentage of classes) who use databases and the databases that they access. One of the purposes of *SLO1: Locating Resources* is to encourage greater use of discipline-specific databases and institution-supplied services by all graduate students. *Instrument A* can be used to track the number of appropriate databases consulted by each student and the approximate number of useful references found in each database.

*Instrument B: Instructor Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature* will be the primary tool for evaluating the central goal of the QEP – effective use of professional research literature. Section 2 describes the three major goals of the QEP.
These three goals can be summarized as finding, using, and documenting professional research literature. While none of these goals are trivial, finding and documenting literature are easier skills to acquire than effectively using the literature. The first question on Instrument B provides a limited evaluation of student efficiency in finding professional literature (see Appendix VIII). In combination with Instrument A, the instructor can see which sources the student consults while researching a topic. Questions 2-5 of Instrument B are concerned with the central goal of the QEP – effective use of professional research literature. Finally, questions 6 and 7 deal with how accurately students document professional research literature.

Two student learning outcomes clearly related to the central goal of the QEP are SLO4: Relevance and SLO5: Application. The purpose of these two SLOs is to evaluate the relevance of ideas found in the literature and apply insights from the literature to issues in one’s own work.

Instrument C: Librarian Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature deals with the first and third goals of the QEP – efficiently finding and accurately documenting the professional research literature (see Appendix IX). Because these are ongoing concerns of librarians, it is advantageous for them to do this assessment. One student learning outcome focuses on finding resources (SLO1: Locating Resources) and two focus on documenting resources (SLO6: Documentation and SLO7: Standard Format).

Instruments A, B, and C were initially tested in four courses during the spring of 2009. Towards the end of these courses, after the research papers were finished, students were instructed to complete Instrument A, and course instructors were instructed to complete Instrument B for each research paper. Library personnel were provided with an electronic version of most research papers, and they completed Instrument C for each paper which they received. The actual process had a number of wrinkles. Some students did not submit an electronic version of their paper; other students did not complete Instrument A (which was distributed at different times in different courses); some faculty members did not use Instrument B to assess every paper; and the library staff did not use Instrument C to assess every paper. All three instruments (A, B, and C) have undergone revision as a result of this process. By the fall of 2009, the various instruments had been used approximately 100 times, with Instrument A being used least often.

### 7.3 Preliminary analysis of baseline data

A preliminary analysis of the baseline data collected using Instrument B: Instructor Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature indicated that:

1) Approximately 25% of students were unable to provide adequate coverage of the research topic (see Instrument B, question 2).

2) Approximately 33% of students were unable to evaluate the relevance of ideas in the professional research literature and apply them to their research problem (see Instrument B, questions 4 and 5).

A preliminary analysis of the baseline data using Instrument C: Librarian Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature indicated that:

1) Several students cited works which were missing from their references (see Instrument C, data points t, u, and v).
2) Almost all student papers contained references with either significant documentation errors or formatting errors.

During the QEP Steering Committee’s analysis of the baseline data, the Steering Committee discovered a lack of alignment between what students do in courses, and program learning outcomes (Allen 2004:39ff.). The Steering Committee determined that if students chose a particular course sequence, it was possible within one concentration to graduate from GIAL without having written a major research paper. After this was discovered, the Steering Committee made sure this deficiency was addressed by the faculty and appropriate changes were ratified within the AL and LD departments. They also recognized the need for a Thesis Writing course which was initiated in fall 2009 after being approved by the Academic Affairs Committee.

Baseline data will continue to be collected every term from students in AL5406 Field Methods which is most student’s first graduate course requiring a research paper. Field Methods students are provided initial guidance and instruction on the use of databases and other library resources in order to assist them in starting to use professional research literature. After students finish their first research paper, they complete Instrument A, faculty complete Instrument B, and librarians complete Instrument C. The data from these instruments serves as the baseline from which to measure each student’s development over time.

A successful QEP is one in which the initiative has sustained, long-term impact beyond the initial 5-year implementation. The choice of core courses in each department through which to promote interventions means that QEP outcomes should eventually be incorporated into regular academic assessment functions of GIAL. The faculty expects QEP assessment to be a standard school process of academic assessment. (See Appendix XIV for an overview of how QEP assessment fits into GIAL’s overall planning and assessment program.)

8. QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN TIMELINE

Table 8 shows a timeline for major QEP actions over a 5-year period.
### Table 8: 2010 – 2014 Timeline for actions to be implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Spring 2010** | - SACS on-site visit  
- QEP revision  
- Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406. |
| **Fall 2010** | - Conduct fall faculty workshop to orient faculty to QEP goals, student learning outcomes, interventions, and assessment instruments.  
- Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406.  
- Develop annotated bibliographies for AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353 to use with intervention 1 in spring 2011.  
- Library staff review annotated bibliographies for intervention 1 use in spring 2011. |
| **Spring 2011** | - Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Implement intervention 1 in AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Develop annotated bibliographies for AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354 to use with intervention 1 in fall 2011.  
- Library staff review annotated bibliographies for intervention 1 use in fall 2011.  
- Review data & procedures from 2010-2011 academic year. |
| **Fall 2011** | - Orient new faculty to QEP goals, student learning outcomes, interventions, and assessment instruments.  
- Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354.  
- Implement intervention 1 in AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354.  
- Librarians prepare practicum for intervention 2 in spring 2012. |
| **Spring 2012** | - Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Implement interventions 1 & 2 in AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Provide faculty with professional development training for peer-review process.  
- Librarians prepare practicum for intervention 2 in fall 2012.  
- Review data & procedures from 2011-2012 academic year. |
| **Fall 2012** | - Orient new faculty to QEP goals, student learning outcomes, interventions, and assessment instruments.  
- Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354.  
- Implement interventions 1, 2, & 3 in AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354. |
| **Spring 2013** | - Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Implement interventions 1, 2, & 3 in AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Review data & procedures from 2012-2013 academic year. |
| **Fall 2013** | - Orient new faculty to QEP goals, student learning outcomes, interventions, and assessment instruments.  
- Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354.  
- Implement interventions 1, 2, & 3 in AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354. |
| **Spring 2014** | - Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Implement interventions 1, 2, 3 & 4 in AL5304, AL5313, AL5314, AL5324, & LD5353.  
- Review data & procedures from 2013-2014 academic year. |
| **Fall 2014** | - Orient new faculty to QEP goals, student learning outcomes, interventions, and assessment instruments.  
- Administer Instruments A, B, & C in AL5406, AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354.  
- Implement interventions 1, 2, 3 & 4 in AL5314, AL5325, AL5395, & LD5354. |
9. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The QEP administration for *Effective Use of Professional Research Literature* is composed of a management team which includes a faculty Coordinator for the initiative, an implementation committee, and participating faculty with direct involvement in selected interventions and assessment instruments. The management team is responsible for implementing the QEP, maintaining on-going activities, and initiating revised or new interventions as indicated by assessment results. The following discussion outlines the roles and responsibilities of the QEP management team members and their relationship to the overall organizational structure of GIAL.

As shown in Figure 2, ultimate responsibility for the QEP budget, QEP management team, and the modification of the QEP plan falls under the office of the Academic Dean. However, the Dean delegates these responsibilities to the QEP Coordinator who ensures budget restraint and adherence to the established schedule. In addition, the implementation committee is charged with assessing progress and modifying the QEP plan as deemed warranted. In this way, the Academic Dean serves as an advisor to the QEP management team and a facilitator of the QEP process rather than in a governing role. The GIAL Quality Enhancement Plan is inherently faculty governed.

![Figure 2: GIAL Organizational Structure](image)

### 9.1 QEP Coordinator

Both the GIAL faculty and administration agreed that the choice of a faculty member was the most appropriate decision for coordinating oversight of the QEP project. The candidate selected is Dr. Shelley Ashdown, assistant professor, AL department. The primary function of the Coordinator is to manage and support participating faculty, staff, and students from the fall of 2010 through 2013. The responsibilities of the Coordinator are as follows:

1) Initiate and coordinate QEP workshops/forums;

2) Distribute intervention and assessment materials;
3) Monitor intervention and assessment progress throughout each term;
4) Compile and tally probes from assessment instruments each term;
5) Organize and moderate analyses of assessment instruments by participating faculty and implementation committee;
6) Serve as chairperson of the QEP implementation committee;
7) Prepare an annual report outlining analyses, conclusions, and recommendations for revised or new interventions, as well as budget requests;
8) Report QEP activities to SACS liaison, Academic Dean, and GIAL community.

The estimated time demands of the Coordinator position is approximately 123 hours per term:

1) 10 hours per term.
   - Initial instructions/workshop for interventions and distribution of assessment instruments to faculty/staff each term.
   - Gather completed instruments.
2) 40 hours each term.
   - Data entry of completed instruments.
3) 40 hours each term.
   - Prepare a report of results from assessment instruments A, B, C.
4) 3 hours each term.
   - Discuss assessment results from instruments A, B, C with implementation committee and faculty for conclusions concerning the four interventions.
   - Propose revised or new interventions based on assessment results and conclusions with assistance from faculty and implementation committee.
5) 30 hours each term.
   - Prepare a summary report of assessment results from instruments A, B, C with conclusions about the effectiveness of interventions.
   - Report QEP activities to SACS liaison, Academic Dean, and GIAL community.

A clerical assistant will be provided part time from existing staff to offer clerical support to the Coordinator.

9.2 QEP Implementation Committee

The implementation committee is chosen from members of the faculty and library staff. This committee works in concert with the Coordinator in managing the QEP process. Members of the Implementation Committee are:

1) Dr. Steve Parker (AL Department)
2) Dr. Pete Unseth (LD Department)
3) Ms. Ferne Weimer (Library Director)
4) Dr. Michael Boutin (AL Department)
Responsibilities of the implementation committee include:

1) Conduct analyses of assessment instruments each term (in February and September) in collaboration with the Coordinator;
2) Determine conclusions and make recommendations for revised or new interventions in collaboration with the Coordinator;
3) Approve yearly report prepared by the Coordinator (in March of every year) and submitted (in April) to the SACS liaison, Academic Dean, and GIAL community;
4) Budget recommendations (personnel, materials, services).

9.3 QEP Faculty (Implementation)

Instructors of selected M.A. level courses are considered primary faculty for the QEP with the responsibility to implement interventions 1-4 and complete appropriate assessment instruments in their courses. The following teachers act as course head for these selected classes:

1) Dr. Steve Parker, AL5304 Applied Phonology;
2) Dr. Paul Kroeger, AL5313 Advanced Grammatical Analysis;
3) Dr. Robert Reed, AL5314 Culture, Language and Mind;
4) Dr. Rondal Smith, AL5324 Principles of New Testament Exegesis;
5) Dr. Andrew Bowling, AL5325 Principles of Old Testament Exegesis;
6) Dr. Paul Kroeger or Dr. Steve Parker, AL5395 Current Issues in Descriptive Linguistics;
7) Dr. Michael Boutin, AL5406 Field Methods and Linguistic Analysis;
8) Dr. Pete Unseth, LD5353 Language Development and Planning;
9) Dr. Lynn Landweer, LD5354 Language Contact.

In addition, participating faculty will be a part of the on-going conversation as members of the QEP management team in terms of implementing protocols, data analyses and conclusions, and recommendations.

10. RESOURCES REQUIRED

Institutional commitment to the success of the QEP is evidenced by GIAL’s financial support and willingness to assign personnel to the initiative. A significant feature of the QEP is the number of faculty involved, along with library staff, which can be viewed as required personnel resources. Participating faculty are implementing interventions and assessment instruments as normal actions for course preparation and class time. Existing monthly faculty/staff forums have been identified as venues for workshop/training. Identification of the time commitment and investment in professional development activities by the QEP Coordinator as well as the costs of implementing and sustaining the initiative and projected cost of materials is provided in Table 9.

The responsibilities of the QEP Coordinator position are expected to require a time commitment of approximately 250 hours per year. Estimated costs associated with printing materials to promote the QEP and conduct workshop training as well as printing of assessment instruments is included in the QEP budget. A budget of $1,000 is
projected for possible equipment needs. The school administration has designated clerical personnel from the existing administration budget to assist with record keeping and correspondence.26

Library staff members participate in the QEP in two fundamental ways. First, librarians will conduct Intervention 2 as an in-class library session with the eight classes listed in Table 2 plus Field Methods. Since Field Methods and AL5314 are offered each term, a total of eleven hours accounts for all the sessions plus an additional 1.5 hour preparation time per class brings the total to 27.5 hours per year work time by the library staff for Intervention 2. A second involvement by librarians is completing the assessment Instrument C for each research paper in the nine classes. It is estimated that completing Instrument C for each class will take four hours with a total of thirty six hours work time for the year.27

Table 9: Projected QEP Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Costs</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Coordinator, 246 hrs.</td>
<td>$6,150</td>
<td>$6,457</td>
<td>$6,779</td>
<td>$7,117</td>
<td>$7,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated printing</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>$511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible equipment (scanning, web, training)</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$1050</td>
<td>$1102</td>
<td>$1157</td>
<td>$1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Clerical personnel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Library personnel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Yearly Expenses</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,892</td>
<td>$8,304</td>
<td>$8,739</td>
<td>$9,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual QEP budget is accommodated within the GIAL budgeting system without need of outside funding. Current faculty and staff are assuming personnel roles for managing the QEP and no foreseeable heavy investment in software or equipment is projected. Thus, GIAL does not anticipate substantial changes in the annual budget through the life of the project. Unforeseen events could influence this, but the normal budgeting process is expected to accommodate any changes.

11. SUMMARY

The primary purpose of GIAL’s QEP is to facilitate the development of students who are able to more effectively use the professional research literature. GIAL’s topic – Effective Use of Professional Research Literature – is linked to the research component of its mission statement. This topic is very important for GIAL faculty preparing GIAL graduates, the majority of whom are planning to work outside of the USA in minority languages and cultures which are often undescribed or underdescribed due to a lack of prior research. In many cases, GIAL graduates are doing pioneering research.

Research is not just about collecting data. Researchers have an ethical obligation to do something with the data that they collect. They are expected to produce results which

26 The cost of clerical personnel will be funded at a rate of .4 FTE per week from the existing administrative budget.

27 A total of 63.5 hours is calculated for the library staff involvement in the QEP initiative. At a rate of $20 an hr., the total cost is estimated to be $1,270 accounted for in the existing library personnel budget.

28 QEP Coordinator salary with a 5% yearly increase.

29 Associated printing costs with a 10% yearly increase.

30 Possible equipment costs with a 5% yearly increase.
benefit the communities where they work, as well as the larger world-wide academic community. GIAL’s QEP is designed to develop students’ research and research reporting skills. The three major goals of the QEP are: 1) efficiently finding professional research literature; 2) effectively using professional research literature; and 3) accurately documenting professional research literature.

Because of the importance of research to the mission of GIAL, and because of the expectation that our graduates will produce results for indigenous minority communities and the academic world, both the GIAL faculty and administration anticipate our QEP will have a sustained, long-term impact far beyond its initial 5-year implementation.
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I. APPENDIX: QEP DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE, 2007-2009

- 12 Dec 2007 Faculty/Staff Forum: Faculty and Staff were informed about the place of the QEP in the reaffirmation timeline. The on-site reaffirmation review of GIAL by SACS will take place between January and April 2010. At that time SACS will examine the QEP. GIAL must submit a QEP six weeks before the on-site review. The submission of the QEP could place this date as early as Dec. 2009.

- 12 Dec 2007 Faculty/Staff Forum: Library Director Weimer showed a PowerPoint Presentation which provided an overview of Information Literacy as a possible QEP topic.

- 12 Dec 2007 Faculty/Staff Forum: Discussed QEP suggestions received to date and other options.
  1) Information Literacy;
  2) Distance Education – focusing on effectiveness of student-to-student interaction;
  3) New Program: World Arts concentration/Multicultural Program;
  4) Teaching student to be trainers.

- 12 Dec 2007 Faculty/Staff Forum: President Ross led a discussion asking for feedback and other ideas. He would like to see options presented at the February Faculty/Staff retreat.

- 12 Jan 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: Dean Bradshaw presented a Gantt Chart for the QEP and discussed the requirements for the QEP.

- 12 Jan 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: Library Director Weimer presented a revised version of a potential Information Literacy QEP.

- 12 Jan 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: President Ross asked certain people to prepare presentations for other QEP proposals for the Faculty/Staff retreat on 7 Feb 2008.

- 16 Jan 2008: Barbara Thomas distributed the minutes and QEP PowerPoint from 12 December meeting to faculty and staff.

- 1 Feb 2008 GIAL Board meeting: President Ross notified the Board that the QEP process was underway.

- 7 Feb 2008 Faculty/Staff retreat: QEP was a major topic. After much discussion, the faculty reached a consensus that ‘use of learning resources’ would be good topic.

- Feb/Mar 2008: In an effort to establish a baseline of current practices and demonstrate areas from which GIAL could measure improvement, the GIAL Library staff began to evaluate the “works cited” sections of GIAL theses.

- 12 Mar 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: Dean Bradshaw showed a QEP Gantt Chart illustrating how progress might occur toward completing the QEP and reaffirmation with SACS. The QEP self-study should be completed by September 2009. The QEP research proposal must be submitted to SACS by 1 December 2009. If the QEP is not approved, then GIAL will not receive reaffirmation of accreditation. A SACS site visit will be made in 2010. The QEP (except for documentation) should be completed in 2014. (Documentation must be submitted in 2015.)
12 Mar 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: Dean Bradshaw outlined how GIAL’s QEP should be organized including: Introduction, Problem Statement, Need for the Study, Hypothesis of the Study, Limitations of the Study, and the Procedure of the Study.

12 Mar 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: Library Director Weimer reported on the work done by the QEP Subcommittee on Information Literacy (Ferne Weimer, Bob Reed and Pete Unseth) since the Faculty/Staff Retreat. Ferne stated that three informal meetings and individual work were done in response to the request for more information. Starting with outcome measurements, the committee examined GIAL’s graduate programs and research.

12 Mar 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: Library Director Weimer distributed a report with sample data and initial statistical analysis after having assessed the citations in 20 completed GIAL theses. Citations were divided by media type (book, journal, collected work, websites, etc.), range of publication dates, recentness of sources to year of thesis defense, and use of internal (GIAL & SIL) versus external (non-SIL) publications.

12 Mar 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: Library Director Weimer presented SACS steps that need to be followed (e.g., forming the plan, focused topic, clear goals, adequate resources, evaluation strategies, etc.) and the eight questions that SACS wants answered. She suggested a timeline which divided the different types of studies and how they could be segmented by the two departments according to thesis and non-thesis tracks. The ensuing discussion included questions about the next steps and responsibilities.

12 Mar 2008 Academic Dean and Subcommittee on Information Literacy: An urgent need remains for a QEP proposal statement to be formulated that includes a statement of the perceived problem, the application of a treatment, and the measurement by an instrument, or instruments, to achieve set outcomes.

25 March 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: President Ross highlighted key elements of QEP planning document available at the SACS website. Members of the Steering Committee were assigned various tasks to be completed before the next meeting.

29 March 2008 AL Department meeting: Described the purpose of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Included a discussion of the GIAL’s QEP suggestions to date.

8 Apr 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Reports given by three subcommittees. New tasks were assigned to different subcommittees.

9 Apr 2008 Faculty/Staff Forum: President Ross gave a QEP status report describing the three current tasks of the QEP Steering Committee: 1) define the question; 2) establish baselines, possible interventions, and measurements of progress; and 3) community involvement. President Ross also presented a tentative QEP title: Use of the Professional Literature in Student Research.

13 May 2008: A preferred-future pizza dinner event was held to provide the GIAL student body and recent alumni an opportunity to help shape the QEP. Thirty-five of the 140 students enrolled in GIAL that term (or 25% of the student body) attended the preferred-future event. Students and alumni met in small groups (6-8 people) with a faculty/staff facilitator who asked a set of prepared questions. Responses to
four questions were compiled on posters, and both students and alumni voted on the poster themes that they considered most critical.

- 14-15 May 2008: A student volunteer and short-term volunteer compiled student and alumni responses from the preferred-future event. The results were reported to the QEP Steering Committee on 20 May.


- 20 May 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Report from the Communications Subcommittee regarding student and alumni involvement.


- 6 Aug 2008: President Ross circulated a template for QEP write-up to QEP Steering Committee.

- 15 Aug 2008: Steve Walter, Ferne Weimer, and Michael Boutin met as a QEP Subcommittee to discuss the phrase “Effective Use of the Professional Literature” and its application to potential student learning outcomes. They interpreted this phrase to mean:
  1) Familiarity with the primary journals in the field or concentration.
  2) Skill in using available search engines to find relevant literature.
  3) Increased use of advanced resources (journals, reference materials, etc.) germane to one’s field.
  4) Ability to summarize (annotate) relevant literature.
  5) Ability to interpret and apply relevant literature to novel problems and scenarios.
  6) Ability to evaluate the quality and usefulness of given literature.
  7) Ability to correctly cite or reference sources in papers, exams, and theses.

- 18 Aug 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Report from Interventions Subcommittee regarding the meaning of the phrase “Professional Literature.” Discussed six possible interventions.

- 15 Sep 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Report from Interventions Subcommittee describing eight possible interventions. Report from Measurements Subcommittee identifying assessment tools developed. Three instruments were selected for assessment.


- Sep-Oct 2008: Steve Walter and Ferne Weimer revised: A Preliminary Proposal for Measuring Progress on the GIAL QEP.

- 6 Oct 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Progress reports from Communications Subcommittee, Interventions Subcommittee and Measurements Subcommittee.
• 6 Nov 2008 AL Department meeting: Discuss graduate courses to be used to evaluate students’ use of the professional literature.

• 13 Nov 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Report from AL Department meeting. Library Director Weimer reported on the results of a citation study and results of a GIAL Library Survey.

• 4 Dec 2008 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Established an action plan for testing assessment instruments and process.

• 6 Dec 2008: Michael Boutin and Steve Parker attended SACS Workshop: QEP Assessment That Works!

• 7 Dec 2008: Michael Boutin attended SACS Session: Designing and Implementing a Quality Enhancement Plan: Suggestions “in Media Res.”

• 8 Dec 2008: Michael Boutin participated in a SACS Roundtable Discussion: Mobilize Your Campus for QEP Creativity and Communication.


• 8 Dec 2008: Michael Boutin attended SACS Session: Successfully Navigating the Assessment Highway: Using the QEP to Drive Student Learning Outcomes and Decision Making.

• 15 Dec 2008: Students in AL5406 were sent a pilot version of Instrument A: Student Self-Assessment of Professional Research Literature Use. They were asked to complete the form for the two papers they had written and return it to the course instructor.

• 8 Jan 2009 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Discussed preliminary visit of Dr. Tom Benberg on 20-21 Jan 2009.

• 12 Feb 2009 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Reviewed visit with Dr. Tom Benberg. Steve Walter distributed an analysis of assessment tools in light of the discussion during the visit. Discussed promotional opportunities, including QEP theme participation in the Homecoming Parade. Reviewed QEP Logo and Tagline submissions and selected “Quality Resources … Effective Research … Professional Results” as the tagline. Asked the winner of the logo design to modify his design to include the taglines. Awarded $50 prize to each winner (Logo and Tagline).

• 7 Apr 2009 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Reviewed updated Instruments. Minor editing changes to instruments A and B approved. Initial baseline data gathered from Session 1. Affirmed the focus of the QEP as (1) Finding the right literature; i.e., “Quality Resources;” (2) Effectively using this literature; i.e., “Effective Research;” and (3) Properly citing and referencing literature in one’s writing; i.e., “Professional Results.” These points tie nicely to the approved tagline.

• 18 Sep 2009 Talk-like-a-pirate Day activity featured QEP (Quad-Seals Eradicating Pirates). Student / Faculty interactive activity promoting the QEP.

• 1 Oct 2009 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Reviewed status and progress of project. Preliminary outline of narrative. Reviewed historical timeline prepared by Michael Boutin. Baseline data from spring term 2009 is input into database (98 separate instruments). Discussed possible interventions. Recognized possible need
for clerical assistance to help with data entry and materials tracking (follow-up required to gather, record, and store the instruments).

- 15 Oct 2009 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Courses requiring papers during the fall term were reviewed and discussed. The need for written instructions to be provided to faculty members was emphasized. Ferne agreed to undertake the task. The committee reiterated the request to get the papers in electronic format.

- 4 Dec 2009 QEP Steering Committee meeting: Reviewed analysis of baseline data including histograms. Potential interventions were derived from the data for inclusion in the QEP. A working draft of the QEP document was distributed for committee review and comment.

- 2-4 Feb 2010 SACS On-site Accreditation Team visit: On 4 February, the On-Site Review Team gave GIAL six recommendations with three of the recommendations focusing on the QEP.

- 8 Feb 2010: A QEP Revision Committee was formed at the faculty-staff meeting. The following members were appointed: Michael Boutin (chair), Shelley Ashdown, Steve Parker, Pete Unseth, and Ferne Weimer.

- 15 Feb 2010: The QEP Revision Committee reviewed the QEP documents and the list of shortcomings that the visiting SACS team had noted. It was quickly agreed that the written document that the SACS team had been given did not adequately represent what the faculty had envisioned for the QEP. The official document was too strong on the proper citation of literature, and too weak on the use of the literature.

- Feb-Apr 2010: The QEP Revision Committee met weekly to produce a document that both better reflected what the faculty had envisioned and also satisfied the other points raised by the SACS team. Each member of the committee was assigned different components of this, such as a review of the literature on helping students better access the relevant literature, designing specific interventions, and planning a system for assessing students’ growth in their use of the literature. The committee intentionally tied the student learning outcomes for the QEP to each intervention.

- Apr 2010: In addition to what the QEP Revision Committee had originally envisioned, it became clear that they should initiate the development of an organizational structure to conduct and monitor the QEP. Shelley Ashdown met with the president and presented some options. On 21 April 2010, the committee met to make decisions regarding appointing people to positions in this structure.

- Apr 2010: The QEP Revision Committee finished a draft of the revised QEP for circulation among the faculty and staff.
II. APPENDIX: STUDENT AND ALUMNI INPUT VIA QEP PIZZA PARTY

The following two tables list the most frequent suggestions and frustrations expressed by students and GIAL alumni as a result of doing research at GIAL. These responses were recorded on 13 May 2008. Afterward they were compiled and considered in developing the QEP interventions. The numbers in the right-hand column represent the extent to which suggestions and frustrations are concerns to students with the higher number indicating greater concern.

Student and alumni research-related suggestions and frustrations addressed by QEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student and alumni suggestions and frustrations</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a general overview or “walk through” of the library and its resources, but rather a mentoring process where students with specific topics/projects can ask librarians for one-on-one help; project based one-on-one; research mentor; one-on-one with librarian direction or circulate when doing in-class presentation; one-on-one mentoring</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, instructional time in the computer lab after a student has chosen his/her specific research topic when librarians and/or research assistants can teach/help students use internet/search engines; schedule a special lab session to work on research projects</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do NOT add an additional course; build learning to use library resources into other courses (I wouldn’t take a special course); incorporate within project in course; put a module in a class (like social science research design, field methods, ethnographic research); include in existing course (not a separate course)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be forced to do research; motivation (class assignment) makes me do research</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have instructors give list of appropriate journals for that class</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better grasp of which journals to use; knowledge of available databases/journals (and how to use them); how to search for journal articles</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samples of good papers/theses; would like access to GIAL theses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An hour library tour (“this is where you’ll find…); have “how to access information” between Sessions 1 and 2; Just-in-time learning = orientation when students are ready (we’re taught before we’re ready – delay library orientation post-Certificate, pre-advanced courses – less detailed orientation first, more detailed later)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a research day in class that is used to explain the databases needed for research projects in that class</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide orientations that are assignment specific for using research tools; provide training modules for using research tools</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give students information on where to start doing research; an information sheet for quick reference regarding where to find resources; suggestions for where to look first when assignment given (which journal indexes)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student and alumni research-related suggestions and frustrations not addressed by QEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student and alumni suggestions and frustrations</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time due to short modular system; compressed schedule; short class sessions; sessions too short for adequate research</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time for inter-library loans; length of course necessitated requesting interlibrary loans before you have a good grasp of need; ILL timeframes; focus of paper not known soon enough for ILL (especially 4 week course); dependence on interlibrary loan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic terms; Overview of linguistic theories (historical linguistics)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library computers on network</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get JSTOR or let students know where to access it</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to find adequate resources for specific topics (some of these resources are not in English); lack of resources; accessing hard-to-find resources; GIAL library didn’t have much available for area studies (forced to go off-campus and didn’t have car); no access to some resources</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. APPENDIX: SAMPLE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY COMPILED BY TEACHER

Applied Phonology, GIAL, Spring 2010

Some important resources for studying Optimality Theory

- *Rutgers Optimality Archive (ROA)*

  An electronic repository for manuscripts, papers, books, dissertations, etc. dealing with Optimality Theory (OT). Currently it contains over 1,028 entries, dating back to its inception in 1993. You can search by title, author, abstract, keywords, entry number, etc. Many important published works on OT began their life in a more rough form on the ROA. Its URL is [http://roa.rutgers.edu/index.php3](http://roa.rutgers.edu/index.php3).

- *Textbooks*


  A collection of papers introducing the basics of OT.


  This book is quite technical and can be heavy reading.


  Very practical and well-written.

- *Journals*

  The following journals are the most important ones that publish articles on OT, although not exclusively:

  *Linguistic Inquiry*

  *Phonology*

  *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*

  *Language*

- *Collections / Anthologies*


  A very selective reprint of some papers written primarily by people associated with U Mass.

Currently the best state-of-the-art collection of papers dealing exclusively with OT.

- **Series**

Papers in optimality theory I-III (University of Massachusetts occasional papers in linguistics. Amherst: Graduate Linguistic Student Association (GLSA)).

- **Software**
  “OTSoft is a Windows program meant to facilitate analysis in Optimality Theory by using algorithms to do tasks that are too large or complex to be done reliably by hand. It is also meant to save time and effort, particularly in word-processing.” Its URL is http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/hayes/otsoft/.

## IV. APPENDIX: INTERVENTION PLANNING TEMPLATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention title</th>
<th>Type(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement within curriculum</th>
<th>Level(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Baseline course: Field Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Core course: CLAM, Language Development, Language Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advanced course: Applied Phonology, Advanced Grammar, Principles of NT Exegesis, Principles of OT Exegesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Type(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Course-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- QEP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Computer lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- &quot;Home&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated timeframe within course</th>
<th>Level(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before syllabus distributed</td>
<td>1st quarter of session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After syllabus distributed</td>
<td>2nd quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before research project introduced</td>
<td>3rd quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ days after project introduced</td>
<td>4th quarter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time required</th>
<th>Level(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention itself: 50-minute class session(s)</td>
<td>- One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two, or ______ minutes within class</td>
<td>- Two, or ______ minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments:</th>
<th>Level(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student self-evaluation: ______ minutes</td>
<td>- In-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Outside class</td>
<td>- Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor observations and evaluation: ______ minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian observations and evaluation: ______ minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person responsible for collecting assessment data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course head is responsible (but some responsibilities may be assigned to others).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People involved in instruction</th>
<th>Assessment instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Instrument A: Student Self-Assessment of Professional Research Literature Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Instrument B: Instructor Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Instrument C: Librarian Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Instrument for Self-Assessment of Research Confidence, Pre- and Post-Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Student Exercise on Using Library Databases (Appendix V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target criteria for success</th>
<th>Target criteria for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. APPENDIX: SAMPLE STUDENT EXERCISE ON USING LIBRARY DATABASES

Your name: __________________ Course number: AL5304 Date: ______________

1. Choose one of the core journal titles for this course and determine if it is indexed in the following indexing and/or abstracting databases.

1.1 What title did you choose? ____________________________________________

Is it indexed in …

1.2 MLA Bibliography? ______ 1.3 Academic Search Complete? ______

1.4 LLBA (Linguistic and Language Behavior Abstracts)? ______

2. Using MLA Bibliography, search the phrase “Optimality Theory.”

2.1 How many results are returned? __

2.2 Briefly describe how you would limit your results by topic:

2.3 What is a more precise subject keyword for you to search for items of interest? __________

2.4 How many results do you receive from putting your subject keyword as a single search term? _____

2.5 How many results do you receive by combining your subject keyword with “optimality theory?” _____

2.6 When you display 3 or 4 full entries, do abstracts of the content appear in every entry? ______

2.7 When you use MLA Bibliography in the future, what do you think would be the most effective way to search for materials?

3. Using LLBA, search the phrase “Optimality Theory” with the keyword you chose earlier in Item 2.3.

3.1 How many results are returned? _____

4. Looking at the first 4 results, describe the type of material shown in each citation. Sample descriptors are: “Article” for a journal entry, “Chapter” for a section/article in a book, “Book” for an entire book, “Dissertation,” etc.

4.1 Entry 1: ________ 4.2 Entry 2: ________ 4.3 Entry 3: ________ 4.4 Entry 4: ________

5. Choose an article entry from these four (or any others on the page) to see if GIAL owns it.

5.1 What is the entry? (Please list all important details as if you needed to obtain it via interlibrary loan.)

5.2 When you display the exact entry, what is the “value added” content in LLBA not in MLA?

5.2 Check the GIAL Library A-to-Z list then answer: Does GIAL have online access to full text? _____

5.3 Check the GIAL Library Catalog then answer: Does GIAL have a print copy of the article? _____

5.4 If the answer is “Yes,” what is the call number of the volume?

5.5 Check: __________________________

6. If you found the article in full text online through a GIAL subscription, answer the following question.
6.1 What elements must be added to citation to show it was obtained online (e.g. URL, access date)?

7. Choose a dissertation entry from these four (or any others on the page) to see if GIAL owns it.
7.1 What is the entry? (Please list all important details as if you needed to obtain it via interlibrary loan.)

7.2 Does GIAL Library own it? ____

7.3 If the answer is “Yes,” what is the call number?

7.4 If the answer is “No,” what would you do next to obtain a copy?
VI. APPENDIX: SAMPLE LIBRARIAN INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVENTION 2

Librarian’s Instruction Outline for AL5304 Applied Phonology

Explain that by doing a keyword search in our catalog, students will find books we have on a subject. They will also find some collected works because we catalog all contents that we deem of high interest, but to find articles in journals, they must use one or more databases.

The following are core journals for this course:
- Linguistic Inquiry
- Natural Language and Linguistic Theory
- Phonology
- Language

We will demonstrate MLA and Linguistic and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA). In an exercise later we will see where the core journals are indexed.

Modern Language Association (MLA):

From A to Z page, select Academic Search Complete or MLA (both must go through Ebsco platform’s front door)

Demonstrate a search for “optimality theory” 1249 results

Narrow by Subject: Markedness 41 results

What type of material are we getting? • collected works (IN:) • dissertation • journal articles

How does one find a collected work? Demonstrate that GIAL owns: Lenition and Fortition.

How does one find a journal article? Demonstrate how to find…

By: Flack, Kathryn; Linguistic Inquiry, 2007 Fall; 38 (4): 749-58. (Journal article)

First look in GIAL Catalog by journal title to see if we have this.

Put in title. Select Material type: Serial   JN 405 L755L

Click on any one of these entries in MLA: What is missing? What might another database have?

MLA is a citation database. LLBA contains abstracts.

All databases have a way of noting records that interest you and providing a means for you to save citations to a file, print, and/or email them to yourself. In MLA, this is done by clicking on the Add to folder. To see only noted records, Go to Folder View.

Linguistic and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA):
- Search for “optimality theory”: 2133 results
- Narrow by “Markedness”: 415 results
- Edit Search: “Lenition” 9 Publications
- Note that for collected works THE TITLES ARE CAPITALIZED
- Note that clicking on title brings up an abstract which aids evaluating how useful this particular item would be for your research.

In LLBA: Check boxes to mark. In upper right-hand corner. Click on # Marked Records. Note Save, Print, Email.

What if GIAL Library does not have the item? [Handout on Interlibrary Loan.]

How does one find a dissertation?

First, see if GIAL Library has it. Search by author. Results: another work by author.

- Currently live in North America
- Yes, associated with an academic institution Continue.
- Online with credit card Continue.
- Put in author’s name and select the correct record.
- A pdf can be ordered for $30 through the Reference Librarian.
VII. APPENDIX: INSTRUMENT A
Student Self-Assessment of Professional Research Literature Use

Return to Instructor with Research Paper/Project

Date Completed: ______________ Name: ___________________________________________

Title of Paper: ___ ______________________________________________________________

Course Number: ____________ Course Title: ________________________________________

Term: __Fall __Spr Session: __1 __2-3 __4 Number of grad hours completed at GIAL: _____

Style sheet standard specified for the project: _________________________________________

My enrollment status at GIAL is: (Put “X” to the left of the item that best describes your current

status.)
__ M.A.–A.L.  __M.A.–L.D.  __Grad. student, undeclared  __Grad. student, Certificate program
__ Limited enrollment, Certificate program  __Limited enrollment  __DTS, DBU, or other coop
program  __ Other (please describe):

_____________________________________________________________

1. In your searching of professional literature for this research paper or project, what
databases did you consult and approximately how many sources did you find/consult
from each? Instruction: Write or type an approximate number on the line below “Number.” If
using a print copy, you may use “hash marks” [llll=4]. Use zero (0) to indicate that you checked
the source but did not find anything useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIAL Library-subscribed databases</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Other online database(s) you found or knew:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLA Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please list by name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA (Linguistics &amp; Language Behavior Abstracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA Religion (Index)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CD/Downloaded Collections:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS (Full text database)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Comp (EbscoHost)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translator’s Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldCat</td>
<td></td>
<td>LinguaLinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetLibrary (Source of e-books)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other CD/Downloaded database(s) you found or own:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name:
2. Name:

2. From the GIAL Library catalog/web pages, estimate how many additional sources you
found. Follow the instructions above. Zero indicates that you checked the source but did not find
anything useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIAL Library Catalog Number:</th>
<th></th>
<th>GIAL Library Web Pages Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. If you used any of the following ways of finding sources, estimate how many were
recommended or found. Follow the instructions above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Sources from …</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Bibliographies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliographies in course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another GIAL instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliographies in books I found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates or other students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliographies in journal articles I found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If you used online resource repositories (Google Books, Google Scholar, Rutgers
Optimality Archive, etc.) or general internet search tools (Google, Yahoo, etc.), estimate
how many useful sources you discovered through these web-based tools. Please, name
the resource and give an approximate number of sources as above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repositories</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Search engines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google Books and/or Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Google.com and/or Yahoo.com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name:
2. Name:

43
5. If your instructor and/or a librarian introduced/demonstrated databases to you during this class, briefly describe how useful that instruction was for your research assignment. 
Comments:

6. Also, did you feel you received adequate instruction for crafting and documenting this research project? If “yes,” please answer why; if “no,” please describe what additional help you needed. Comments:
VIII. APPENDIX: INSTRUMENT B
Instructor Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature

Instructor Evaluator: ______________________________ Date Completed: ________________
Student’s Name or Code: ________________________________________________________
Title of Paper: _________________________________________________________________
Course Number: ______ Course Title:  ________________________________________
Term: __ Fall __ Spr  Session: __ 1 __ 2-3 __ 4 Number of grad hours completed at GIAL: ___
Style sheet standard specified for the project: _________________________________________

**Efficiently find the professional research literature**

1. The student located appropriate research literature through a variety of ways, e.g. searching institution-supplied resources, consulting course materials, instructors, and/or classmates, using personal research resources and methods, etc.

   Unacceptable □  Weak □  Average □  Strong □  Outstanding □

**Effectively use the professional research literature**

2. The student provided adequate coverage of the topic in question (amount, type, variety, and date coverage).

   Unacceptable □  Weak □  Average □  Strong □  Outstanding □

3. The student selected high quality and credible sources.

   Unacceptable □  Weak □  Average □  Strong □  Outstanding □

4. The student evaluated the relevance of the ideas in the literature to his/her particular problem or issue.

   Unacceptable □  Weak □  Average □  Strong □  Outstanding □

5. The student correctly applied insights from the sources to his/her work.

   Unacceptable □  Weak □  Average □  Strong □  Outstanding □

**Accurately document the professional research literature**

6. The student accurately documented all referenced sources in the “Works Cited.”

   Unacceptable □  Weak □  Average □  Strong □  Outstanding □

7. The student correctly formatted citations and references in the text according to the specified standard.

   Unacceptable □  Weak □  Average □  Strong □  Outstanding □

**Interpretation of the code:**

Unacceptable: The indicated attribute or skill is missing or was clearly violated in almost every instance.

Weak: The indicated attribute or skill is missing or was clearly violated in many cases, or uneven in other cases.
Average: The indicated attribute or skill is present or correctly applied in some cases but is erratic in others.

Strong: The indicated attribute or skill is mostly used correctly with only a few exceptions.

Outstanding: The indicated attribute or skill is consistently and correctly applied in all or virtually all cases.
**IX. APPENDIX: INSTRUMENT C**

Librarian Assessment of Student Use of Professional Research Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian Evaluator: _____________________________</th>
<th>Date Completed: __________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student’s Name or Code: ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Paper: ___________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Number: __________</td>
<td>Course Title: ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term:__Fall __Spr Session: __1 __2-3 __4 Number of graduate hours completed at GIAL: __</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style sheet standard specified for the project: __________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relating to Instrument B, Question 2: Amount, Type, Variety, &amp; Currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Total # of Entries: _____  b) Date Range: ___________________  c) Variety of types: _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) # books: _____  e) # journal articles:  _____  f) # dissertations/theses: _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) # .pdf docs: _____  h) # articles in anthologies: _____  i) # conference papers: _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) # other: _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) % books: _____  l) % journal articles:  _____  m) % dissertations/theses: _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) % .pdf docs: _____  o) % articles in anthologies: _____  p) % conference papers: _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q) % other: _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relating to Instrument B, Question 3: Quality and Credibility (especially journals and web sources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r) List of journal titles included in references:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s) Verifiability/Credibility notes, especially related to web resources:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relating to Instrument B, Question 6: Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t) Items missing from references:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u) Number: _____  v) _____ %  Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w) Required elements that are missing or incorrect:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) Number: _____  y) Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z) Misspelled key words in author or title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa) _____  ab) Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac) Incorrect URLs for web sources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad) _____  ae) Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relating to Instrument B, Question 7: Formatting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>af) Consistency of formatting (comments):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag) Adherence to recognized standard (comments):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. APPENDIX: GUIDE FOR THE PEER REVIEW PROJECT

Course: ____________________________________________________
Name of reviewer: ____________________________________________
Title of paper: ______________________________________________
Date of review: ______________________________________________
Designated stylesheet: _________________________________________
General comments: ____________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content/substance</th>
<th>Examples of potential problems</th>
<th>Comments on paper being reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. precision</td>
<td>Are opinions confused with facts? Is there a reference for every citation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. application</td>
<td>Is the connection between theory and facts correctly evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. quotes</td>
<td>Do they support the argumentation? Are there too many?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sources</td>
<td>Are they relevant? Are there too few or too many?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. examples</td>
<td>Is an original source included for all (linguistic) data?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. references</td>
<td>Are the insights of sources correctly summarized and used here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. references</td>
<td>Is the authority and validity of the cited information overstated or understated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. references</td>
<td>Are there other works which should definitely be included?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. references</td>
<td>Is the most recent scholarship on the topic cited?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

31 This form has been adapted from Gouvêa (1997) which is based on a table by Suzanne Medina published in *The Teaching Professor*, October, 1997.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format/mechanics</th>
<th>Examples of potential problems</th>
<th>Comments on paper being reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. paragraphs</td>
<td>Do the line spacing and indentation parameters follow the designated stylesheet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. footnotes</td>
<td>Are all of these consistently placed either at the bottom of the page or at the end of the paper? Are there too many?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. references</td>
<td>Are all required elements of each reference present?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. references</td>
<td>Is every reference listed in the bibliography referred to in the body of the paper?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. references</td>
<td>Is every reference mentioned in the body of the paper listed in the bibliography?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. references</td>
<td>Is each of the references formatted correctly in terms of typeface, punctuation, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. references</td>
<td>Is the list of references alphabetized correctly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XI. APPENDIX: SELF-ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH CONFIDENCE
Instrument for Self-Assessment of Research Confidence, Pre- and Post-Assignment

The following table shows a compilation of December 2009 responses from AL5406 students’ self-assessment of research confidence. The course started in October 2009 and finished in December 2009.

Self-Assessment of Research Confidence
Pre- and Post-Assignment for AL5406 Field Methods (14 Dec 2009)

When you received instructions on writing the first paper in this course, how would you rate your skills in the following steps of the research process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>With some difficulty</th>
<th>Not knowing how to start</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying keywords, authors, or sources to pursue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and using citations to find sources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating what materials exist that pertain to my research question</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the most appropriate sources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating whether the information that I've located meets my need</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the authority and/or validity of the information that I find</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 17
skipped question 0

As you finish this class, how would you rate your skills in the following steps of the research process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>With some difficulty</th>
<th>Not knowing how to start</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying keywords, authors, or sources to pursue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and using citations to find sources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating what materials exist that pertain to my research question</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the most appropriate sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating whether the information that I've located meets my need</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the authority and/or validity of the information that I find</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 16
skipped question 1

The following table converts the results above into a numerical score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students looking back before research assignment and database introductions</th>
<th>Confident (4 pts @)</th>
<th>Competent (3 pts @)</th>
<th>With some difficulty (2 pts @)</th>
<th>Not knowing how to start (1 pt @)</th>
<th>Raw No.</th>
<th>17 responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying keywords, authors, or sources to pursue</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and using citations to find sources</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating what materials exist that pertain to my research question</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the most appropriate sources</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating whether the information that I've located meets my need</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the authority and/or validity of the information that I find</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLOR CODE: Orange = Highs, Yellow = Lows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' assessments after research assignment and database introductions</th>
<th>16 responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying keywords, authors, or sources to pursue</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and using citations to find sources</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating what materials exist that pertain to my research question</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the most appropriate sources</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating whether the information that I've located meets my need</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the authority and/or validity of the information that I find</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XII. APPENDIX: NOVEMBER 2008 GIAL LIBRARY SURVEY

Preliminary results of a November 2008 GIAL Library Survey provided the following findings in response to four key questions related to research experience and use of professional research literature:

Key Question 1: How many research papers did you write prior to GIAL? Findings: A high percentage of AL degree students completing this survey (80%) had written more than 10 research papers prior to coming to GIAL, while only 50% of LD students had written 3-5 papers and 50% responded “none that I remember.” These responses are likely related to the type of undergraduate degree received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count (all students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. In the course of these earlier studies, approximately how many research papers of at least 10 pages did you write? NOTE: For this question define a “research paper” as a document having references to sources in the text, or footnotes/endnotes, and a bibliography or “works cited” section at the end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. thesis (no need to count any others)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. major research project/paper (no need to count any others)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None that I remember</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Question #4 — Answers to “What was your undergraduate major?” LD Undergrad majors: Electrical engineering/applied math (1); civil engineering (1); Bible (1); Elementary education (1) — AL Undergrad majors: Intercultural Studies (2); Applied Linguistics (1); Biblical Theology (1); TESL (1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Question 2: How would you rate your skills in the research process? Findings: 22.2% of degree-seeking students rated themselves as having “some difficulty” with one or more steps in the research process; 33.3% rated themselves as having “some difficulty” in locating existing materials that pertain to their research question. All the respondents felt “competent” or “confident” that they could analyze and evaluate whether the information that they located meets their need. This response is interesting in light of the responses to the other questions.

Key Question 3: Are students using the most effective tools for finding journal articles? Findings: 38.9% of all respondents, including degree-seeking students, identified ineffective methods of finding journal articles for a paper; another 16.7% of all respondents were unsure or did not know how to find journal articles using available search tools.

Key Question 4: Can GIAL graduate students readily name two professional journals in an area of concentration? Findings: 75% of LD students identified specific titles while only 20% of AL students did.
XIII. APPENDIX: GIAL LIBRARY RESEARCH SURVEY

1. Identification
1. Enter your name here.

2. Please select your current enrollment status and the number of terms in attendance from the following list.
- Certificate student in 1st term
- Certificate student in 2nd term
- Certificate student in 3rd term
- Pursuing M.A.—1st term in degree program
- Pursuing M.A.—2nd term in degree program
- Pursuing M.A.—3rd term in degree program
- Pursuing M.A.—4th or later term in degree program
- Taking grad course(s)—1st term
- Taking grad course(s)—2nd term
- Other (please specify)

2. Prior Studies and Research Experience
We would like to understand the library’s clientele in relation to prior studies and research experience. We want to offer assistance and point people to instruction sheets, tutorials, etc. that may be helpful.
1. In the first box, list your undergraduate major(s). In the second, indicate any program/concentration you pursued in master’s or doctoral studies prior to attending GIAL. You may list more than one item in either box.

   Undergraduate majors
   
   Advanced degree programs/concentrations

2. In the course of these earlier studies, approximately how many research papers of at least 10 pages did you write? NOTE: For this question define a “research paper” as a document having references to sources in the text (with or without footnotes/endnotes) and a bibliography or “works cited” section at the end.
- Doctoral dissertation (no need to count any other papers)
- M.A. thesis (no need to count any others)
- M.A. research project/paper (no need to count any others)
- More than 10
- 6-9
- 3-5
- 1-2
- None that I remember
3. Research Confidence
Librarians are interested in knowing where students may need most guidance in the research process. Please answer the following two questions, including the one after the chart.

1. When you think about writing research papers at GIAL, how would you rate your confidence level in following the seven steps listed here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>With some difficulty</th>
<th>Not knowing how to start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulating a research question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and using citations to find sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating what materials exist that pertain to my research question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the most appropriate sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating whether the information I’ve located meets my need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the authority and/or validity of the information that I find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How have your prior studies & experience improved your research skills?

4. Student Use of Resource Finding Tools at GIAL
GIAL subscribes to multiple databases that may or may not be relevant to research in a specific course. Please indicate your level of familiarity with the following databases.

1. Please choose one answer for each listed database; add other databases that you’ve used in the box below the chart. Special thanks for adding comments! ☺

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Very familiar; use often</th>
<th>Quite familiar; use occasionally</th>
<th>Not very familiar; tried to use but never used it</th>
<th>Never heard of it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Search Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLA and/or ATLAS (religion database)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA (Linguistics &amp; Language Behavior Abstracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics Abstracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jerome’s Translation Studies Abstracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldCat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EbscoHost databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Research Assistance
From whom would you seek assistance when working on a research paper?
1. Please rank the order in which you would seek help from the following sources for an assigned research paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course instructor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another instructor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmate(s)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library desk clerk</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reference librarian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other &amp; please add</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment in the box</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIV. APPENDIX: OVERVIEW OF GIAL ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING

The following table outlines the various sections of the GIAL Institutional Effectiveness Plan (IEP), and its associated reporting program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEP Section</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>SACS COC reference</th>
<th>Responsibility (Approval)</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Period Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Admin &amp; Academic Support</td>
<td>CS 3.3.1.2 and CS 3.3.1.3</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Board &gt; President &gt; IEP Committee (via Director of Institutional Research)</td>
<td>Previous calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Board &gt; President &gt; Strategic Planning Committee (via Director of Institutional Research)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Academic Program Assessment</td>
<td>CS 3.3.1.1</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Academic Dean &gt; Department Heads &gt; Program Course Heads (via Coordinator of Academic Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Academic Research Assessment</td>
<td>CS 3.3.1.4</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Academic Dean &gt; Department Heads &gt; Faculty (via faculty chair)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>QEP</td>
<td>CR 2.12 and CS 3.3.2</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Academic Dean &gt; QEP Implementation Committee (via faculty chair)</td>
<td>Twice per year, compiled annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>