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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DIGITAL NATIVE, DIGITAL IMMIGRANT, DIGITAL DIVIDE
What do these terms mean in the context of higher education in general and the community college in particular? Our digital natives, while exposed to technology from birth, often do not possess the digital skills necessary to succeed in an academic or workforce setting. Our digital immigrants need help making the transition to technology. Additionally, Tallahassee Community College (hereafter referred to as TCC or the College) has done little to mitigate the digital divide between students with strong exposure to digital literacy skills and those with very limited exposure due to socio-economic factors. The reality is that all students need development in digital literacy. The community college is strategically positioned to address these digital literacy issues across all of these areas in a deliberate and systematic manner to ensure that all students have access to and the best opportunity for academic and workforce success.

The TCC mission, “to prepare students for success in a global economy,” and the TCC strategic plan both focus on student access, student success and technology. Our Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) topic allows us to focus on digital literacy as one of the most important and fundamental skills needed by all students for access and success. TCC students would have a hard time registering for classes and developing a learning plan without some level of digital literacy. Increasingly, teaching methods are moving towards blended or completely Web-based modalities, making access even more dependent on digital literacy. Academic and workforce success in a global economy also relies increasingly on digital literacy. Until now our approach to digital literacy has been ad hoc. TCC’s QEP Digital FOCUS creates a framework that provides exposure to discipline-specific digital literacy skills for students across the curriculum and measures their attainment of digital competencies.

The goal of TCC’s QEP Digital FOCUS is to improve students’ ability to do, think and relate in a digital environment within all academic disciplines. Research on best practices has shown that the most successful approach to increasing digital literacy in students is a cross-disciplinary applied strategy. Students cannot achieve the kind of multi-faceted and flexible literacy needed to succeed in one or two computer classes. They need exposure in multiple applied situations. The approach within courses will be to focus on the following learning outcomes in a discipline-specific manner:

1. **Doing** – Students will find, operate and utilize relevant digital tools for academic and professional purposes.
2. **Thinking** – Students will use digital tools to create content.
3. **Relating** – Students will use digital tools to share content effectively.

The College will measure the achievement of our goals comprehensively using both direct and indirect assessment measures. First, the College will administer a basic digital literacy assessment to all First-Time-in-College (hereafter referred to as FTIC) students before registration to identify any functional digital literacy needs. Second, a random sample of students will be measured in a first-semester course and again before graduation using the Educational Testing Service (ETS) iSkills diagnostic tool. Finally, our direct measures of student learning outcomes will focus on the use of a Common Digital Literacy Assessment Rubric (hereafter referred to as “the rubric”), which all instructors will use to
measure the digital literacy student learning outcomes in each of their courses during each semester. The rubric will be carefully calibrated during faculty implementation workshops with all implementing faculty to ensure consistency of ratings. Plan implementation will focus on training approximately 30 faculty members from across all disciplines each semester (Fall, Spring, Summer). The training workshops will provide faculty with support in developing or adapting appropriate assignments and in the use of the rubric. Monthly meetings with faculty will follow to allow feedback and to ensure proper assessment and documentation. The QEP Committee will continually evaluate the data and make adjustments to the plan as needed and will create a database of best practices for faculty and students.

A key aspect of implementation will be to integrate our QEP practices into the College’s structure. The QEP Coordinator will work with the Academic Planning Committee, academic program areas, the Educational Technology Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to ensure that digital literacy is integrated into TCC students’ learning outcomes assessment process. In this manner the College will ensure that all students, present and future, are systematically supported in achieving digital literacy skills across the curriculum.
INTRODUCTION TO DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION
AND EVIDENCE OF COMPLIANCE
INTRODUCTION:
DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

The process of developing a QEP for our Southern Association of Colleges and Schools/Council on Colleges (SACSCOC) reaffirmation of accreditation has taught us much about our institution. The college-wide process has demonstrated and strengthened our ability to identify broad-based student learning challenges and opportunities, to collectively choose a topic based on institutional data, and to develop a research-based plan that will ultimately impact all students at TCC. The development of our QEP has been full of growth opportunities, challenges, successes and roadblocks. The end product, TCC’s QEP Digital FOCUS: Find, Operate, Create, Utilize and Share, is a meaningful plan that will directly address student learning in a measureable manner for many years to come.

Chapter 1: Institutional Process
This chapter describes the institutional process that identified key issues emerging from institutional assessment in order to choose the focus of our QEP. Key institutional assessment data and contextual information that informed the process of choosing our topic are included here. In this chapter the College provides a clear, precise and thorough description of the methods used to identify our topic and to develop our plan.

Chapter 2: Literature and Best Practices Review
This chapter presents our literature and best practices review, which was used to develop the definitions, goals and structure of our QEP. Our QEP focus is derived from both this research and institutional assessment data.

Chapter 3: Focus of the Plan
This chapter provides details concerning the focus of our QEP. In this chapter the College defines its goals as they relate to student learning and accomplishing the mission of the College. Specific potential benefits of the QEP are provided, as well as evidence of consensus among constituency groups.

Chapter 4: Implementation and Institutional Capability
This chapter contains the implementation framework and timeline, including a plan to involve all relevant campus constituencies in the implementation process. Institutional capability is demonstrated by a thorough description of human resources, financial and physical resources, implementation activities, and assessment. The College provides evidence of sufficient resources and ongoing institutional commitment to ensure the sustainability of our plan through completion.

Chapter 5: Assessment
This chapter describes our plan for assessing our QEP. The College identifies internal and external measures that will be used to evaluate the plan and continually monitor our progress. The use of both internal (common digital literacy rubric) and external (SmarterMeasure and ETS iSkills) assessment measures will provide a wealth of data with which to monitor the plan at all stages of implementation. The assessment plan describes how results will be used to improve student learning and to track the progress and success of our plan.
The following tables present evidence supporting TCC’s compliance with SACSCOC Core Requirement 2.12. and Comprehensive Standard 3.3.2. The College used the SACSCOC Guidelines during the development of the QEP.

Table 1: EVIDENCE FOR COMPLIANCE SACSCOC CORE REQUIREMENT 2.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Requirement</th>
<th>Exceptional Rating from SACSCOC QEP Guidelines</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Chapter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.12 (1.A) An institutional process</td>
<td>Plan is directly related to institutional planning efforts. Topic selection involved process that generated information and specific ideas from a wide range of constituents. Selection of topic determined by representative process that considered institutional needs and viability of plan.</td>
<td>QEP Topic Selection Committee and QEP Design Committee representing all campus constituencies. QEP topic and plan developed in conjunction with strategic planning, considering institutional needs and viability of the plan.</td>
<td>Chapter One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.12 (1.B) Key issues identified that emerge from institutional assessment</td>
<td>A direct and strong relationship of QEP topic to institutional needs; clear how accomplishment of QEP would directly improve institutional/student performance</td>
<td>Key issue identified by examining: Internal and external data, other ongoing campus initiatives, campus-wide focus groups, campus-wide surveys. QEP assessment plan developed to measure improved student performance in digital literacy</td>
<td>Chapters One, Three, Four and Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.12 (2.A) Focus on learning outcomes and accomplishing the mission of the institution</td>
<td>Detailed student learning outcomes tied directly to institutional needs.</td>
<td>Key issue identified by examining: Internal and external data, other ongoing campus initiatives, campus-wide focus groups, campus-wide surveys. QEP assessment plan developed to measure improved student performance in digital literacy</td>
<td>Chapters One, Three, Four and Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.12 (2.B) Focus on the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution</td>
<td>A clear relationship between activities of QEP and the improvement of student learning, all tied to established institutional needs.</td>
<td>Goals of QEP tied directly to improved student learning outcomes and clearly tied to institutional needs as demonstrated by institutional assessment data</td>
<td>Chapters One, Three and Four</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2: EVIDENCE FOR COMPLIANCE SACSCOC COMPREHENSIVE STANDARD 3.3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Standard</th>
<th>Exceptional Rating from WSACSCOC QEP Guidelines</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Chapter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 (3.A)</strong></td>
<td>Capability To Initiate The Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very detailed budget information, institutional commitment of funds clearly indicated. If individuals are not yet identified, detailed job descriptions provided that indicate the specific skills and abilities needed for key personnel. Organizational structure shows clear reporting responsibilities and oversight structures.</td>
<td>Demonstrated capability to initiate the plan: - Detailed Budget - Key Personnel Identified With Job Descriptions - Organizational Structure With Clear Reporting Responsibilities And Oversight Structures In Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 (3.B)</strong></td>
<td>Capability To Implement And Complete The Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very detailed timetable for year-by-year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment processes. Timetable indicates clearly that QEP can be realistically implemented and completed in five years.</td>
<td>Demonstrated Capability To Implement And Complete The Plan: - Detailed Timetables - Actions - Reporting Structures - Assessments - Budgetary Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 (4.A)</strong></td>
<td>Broad-Based Involvement Of Institutional Constituencies In The Development Of The Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process used ensured input from all relevant constituencies in developing the plan.</td>
<td>QEP Design Committee And Subcommittees Represent All Relevant Constituencies Of The College. Focus Groups In All Academic Program Areas To Guide Development And Implementation Practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 (4.B)</strong></td>
<td>Broad-Based Involvement Of Institutional Constituencies In The Proposed Implementation Of The Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapters One, Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All relevant constituencies have direct involvement in implementation.</td>
<td>All Academic Program Areas Have Direct Involvement In Implementation. The Academic Planning Committee, Academic Deans, Directors And QEP Advisory Committee Have A Direct Involvement In Continuous Evaluation And Improvement Of QEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 (5.A)</strong></td>
<td>Identified Goals For The Quality Enhancement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapters Three And Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals are clearly stated and lead to specific, measurable outcomes.</td>
<td>All Academic Program Areas Have Direct Involvement In Implementation. The Academic Planning Committee, Academic Deans, Directors And QEP Advisory Committee Have A Direct Involvement In Continuous Evaluation And Improvement Of QEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS 3.3.2 (5.B)</strong></td>
<td>A Plan To Assess The Achievement Of The Goals Of The Quality Enhancement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment is based on clear outcomes; assessment methods are related to outcomes and are direct measures of those outcomes.</td>
<td>Assessment Plan Focuses On Direct Measures Of Clearly Defined Digital Student Learning Outcomes, Including Internal And External Assessment Tools. Additionally, Assessment Will Track Effective Implementation And Support As Well As Continuous Improvement Of The QEP Overall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS
FOR TOPIC SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT
CHAPTER 1
INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS FOR TOPIC SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

DESCRIPTION OF TALLAHASSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
A two-year public community college, TCC opened in 1966 to serve the postsecondary education needs of Gadsden, Leon and Wakulla counties. The College has two locations in addition to our main campus: the Florida Public Safety Institute and the Ghazvini Center for Healthcare Education. The mission of the College is to provide a learning environment that prepares students for success in a global economy by offering higher education pathways, workforce opportunities and civic engagement experiences. Our strategic plan and priorities focus on student access, student success, technology and demand driven programs (Appendix 1). The College offers the Associate in Arts (A.A.) degree, as well as many Associate in Science (A.S.) degrees and certification programs related to workforce readiness (Appendix 2).

Total enrollment (unduplicated headcount) for Fall 2013 was 19,887. In the last five-year period, 61.3% of our students were 21 or under, with 47.9% full-time and 52.1% part-time. The majority of our students seek an A.A. degree (72.5%). 97.8% of our students are from within the state of Florida, with 59.2% coming from within our tri-county service area. More than 40% of TCC students graduate within four years (Appendix 3).

QEP TOPIC SELECTION
The process of choosing the topic for our QEP was directly related to institutional planning efforts ensuring that all aspects of our QEP support the mission and strategic priorities of the College. In January 2013 TCC began the process of preparing for SACSCOC reaffirmation of accreditation. The College identified a lead faculty member and a committee structure to conduct the selection of a QEP topic for the College. It was determined that the College would employ a QEP Topic Selection Committee comprised of 32 members from across all campus constituencies to develop an institutional and representative process that would identify an appropriate topic for our QEP (Appendix 4).

The QEP Topic Selection Committee reviewed institutional assessment data and conducted focus groups across campus. The following institutional data were studied:
- TCC Fact Book, 2012-2013
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CSSEE) results
- Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) results
- National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP) Report, 2012
- Educause’s E-Car – Survey of Undergraduate Students and Information Results
- IC3 Fast Track Digital Literacy Assessment
- SmarterMeasure Digital Readiness Assessment
- TCC Focus Groups

Focus groups were conducted with faculty in each academic division, faculty in the Workforce Development division, various staff groups, administrative groups and student groups over a two-month period (Appendix 5). The QEP Topic Selection Committee compiled a list of 10 questions with which to lead the focus group discussions (Appendix 6). Eight broad topics areas emerged when the committee compiled the institutional data and the focus group data:
- Study Skills/Time Management
- Great Expectations in the Classroom
- Engaged Teaching and Learning
- Information Literacy
- Digital Literacy
- Contextual Learning
- Academic Planning
- Support for Student Learning
It was determined by the committee that some topics overlapped a great deal and could be combined. Also, some topics were already being zealously addressed by other ongoing campus initiatives. Additional topics were eliminated because they might not produce a measurable impact on student learning. A chart was created to analyze the potential topics (Appendix 7). The committee narrowed the above eight potential topics to four based on the above observations and to ensure a strong relationship to the College mission and strategic plan as follows:

- Engaged Teaching and Learning
- Strategies for Improved Learning
- Information Literacy across the Curriculum
- Digital Literacy across the Curriculum

The committee determined that the following criteria would be used to select the topic for our QEP from the remaining four topics:

- Potential Measurable Impact on Student Learning
- Potential Scope of the Topic
- Demonstrated Institutional Need
- Rank from Campus Survey
- Institutional Capability

The topic selection committee evaluated each potential topic according to the above criteria. A campus-wide survey of faculty, staff and students was conducted to rank the proposed topics. Using the rankings as part of the above predetermined criteria, our QEP Topic Selection Committee selected the topic using an elimination voting process. Digital Literacy across the Curriculum was selected as the broad topic area that would best meet institutional needs and be a meaningful and viable topic for our students and our campus.

Institutional data were a deciding factor in our QEP topic choice. Analysis of institutional data showed a significant gap in student digital literacy. Of particular interest were IC3 Fast Track data. In convenience samples of students seeking to exempt CGS1060 Computer Literacy by taking the IC3 Fast Track Diagnostic, many failed to reach the passing score of 800+. As can be seen from the table below, over the past four years, on average approximately one-third of FTIC students passed the IC3 Fast Track. The pass rate has been between 20% and 46%. Pass rates from 2011 through 2014 indicate that students are increasingly less skilled in terms of digital literacy. This negative trend merits institutional attention.

### TABLE 3: IC3 FAST TRACK DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th># STUDENTS</th>
<th>PASS % (800+)</th>
<th>FAIL % (799-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (to date)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, students who want to enroll in a distance-learning course for the first time must register for and pass a Distance Learning Orientation Workshop. The Distance Learning Orientation Workshop focuses on digital literacy skills and digital readiness. A significant number of students electing to register for online courses did not succeed in passing the Distance Learning Orientation Workshop. As Table 4 shows, on average about one third of the participants failed the workshop.

### TABLE 4: DISTANCE LEARNING ORIENTATION WORKSHOP DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total Enrolled</th>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Did Not Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,916 (Duplicated Attempts)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,766</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As a part of the Distance Learning Orientation Workshop, students take the SmarterMeasure Digital Readiness Assessment. Institutional data on the SmarterMeasure diagnostic revealed a readiness gap. SmarterMeasure is an assessment that quantifies and identifies a student’s level of readiness to take an online or technology-rich course. Students take the SmarterMeasure Digital Readiness diagnostic assessment as part of the Distance Learning Orientation Workshop. The data, as demonstrated in Figure 1, reveal challenges in the areas of Technical Knowledge, Technical Competency and Typing Speed in comparison to the identified SmarterMeasure norm. The SmarterMeasure norm was reported in the SmarterServices 2013 Student Readiness Report.

**FIGURE 1: SMARTERMEASURE COMPARISON DATA**

Based on our analysis of these data and the fact that no other ongoing campus initiatives were actively addressing student digital literacy in a systematic manner, the College chose Digital Literacy across the Curriculum as the focus for our QEP.
QEP DESIGN

After choosing the broad topic area of digital literacy, the QEP Topic Selection Committee was dissolved and a QEP Design Committee was assembled. Members of the QEP Topic Selection Committee were invited to remain on the committee to develop the plan. Other members were added to the committee based on their expertise in the area of technology (Appendix 4). The QEP Design Committee was divided into subcommittees as follows:

- Implementation and Institutional Capability Subcommittee
- Assessment Subcommittee
- Writing Subcommittee
- Marketing Subcommittee

The first order of business was to define technology/digital literacy in the context of our students, curriculum and higher education in order to determine the focus of the plan. The committee, using a combination of research and campus feedback, developed a working definition of digital literacy:

\[
\text{DIGITAL LITERACY} = \text{DIGITAL TOOLS} + \text{DIGITAL APPLICATION} + \text{DIGITAL COMMUNICATION}
\]

Digital literacy is the ability to use technology to find, operate, create, utilize and share content in a manner that fosters student success, creativity and life-long learning.

With a contextual definition of digital literacy in hand, the College began a literature and best practices review with the assistance of our campus librarians. The committee reviewed literature and other related QEPs to determine best practices and an appropriate focus for the QEP. After completing our research, the QEP Design Committee articulated the focus of the plan:

QEP FOCUS STATEMENT

The focus of our QEP is to actively improve student digital literacy across the curriculum by establishing measureable competencies and assessing student progress toward those competencies.

The QEP Design Committee determined that the College needed an official title or slogan for the plan in order to promote and market it across campus. Through our campus communications office the College conducted a student contest to name the QEP. Students across campus entered 542 unique naming possibilities for the QEP. The communications office narrowed those down to the two most promising names from a marketing standpoint. The College then conducted a campus-wide survey of faculty, staff and students to choose the name for the QEP from those two possibilities. The name Digital FOCUS: Find, Operate, Create, Utilize and Share was chosen. The winning student was awarded an iPad Air.

At this point the QEP Design Subcommittees got to work. The Implementation and Institutional Capability Subcommittee began working on an implementation plan that would involve all faculty and therefore impact the maximum number of students across all disciplines. Meetings were conducted in each academic program area to discuss implementation with all faculty (Appendix 8). Pilot volunteers were secured from each program area at the implementation meetings (Appendix 4). The Implementation Committee developed a timeline and a budget consistent with the goal of involving all faculty. Position responsibilities and committee responsibilities were developed for key personnel and committees that would be responsible for implementation, follow-through and reporting (Appendix 9). The committee also gave thought to how the initiatives involved in the implementation of the QEP relate to our ongoing assessment of other student learning outcomes and how our work with digital literacy student learning outcomes might ultimately fit into the larger picture on campus.

The Assessment Subcommittee was charged with putting together a rigorous assessment plan for the QEP. External measures of student digital literacy were identified and deployed. The committee focused on two particular external assessments, SmarterMeasure diagnostic tool and ETS iSkills assessment. The SmarterMeasure will be administered to all FTIC students beginning in Fall 2014. This assessment is intended to diagnose student readiness for a technology-rich learning environment. The ETS iSkills assessment will be used to assess a random sample of FTIC students at the beginning of their college career and again at the end of their college career to study the impact of our QEP on students as they move through our curriculum. The Assessment Committee designed a common rubric to be used as a direct measure of student learning. The faculty involved in the pilot implementation of the QEP will help to test and refine the rubric. The rubric will be deployed on our Learning Management System (LMS) for instructors to use to chart student progress towards our identified digital literacy competencies.
CHAPTER 2:
LITERATURE AND BEST PRACTICES REVIEW

THE DIGITAL LITERACY IMPERATIVE

Digital literacy is a requisite skill set for students as they pursue their academic and career goals. As the 2009 NMC (New Media Consortium) Horizon Report Higher Education Edition makes clear, “increasing globalization continues to affect the way the college works to collaborate and communicate ... Those who use technology in ways that expand their global connections are more likely to advance, while those who do not will find themselves on the sidelines” (Johnson, Levine, Smith & Smythe, 2009). It is predicted that 90% of new jobs will require excellent digital skills, that is, “those capabilities essential for living, learning and working in a digital society” (JISC, 2013). Improving digital literacy in a deliberate and holistic manner is a key component for developing effective and employable learners in higher education. “Digital literacy is no longer a luxury, and we simply cannot wait to build on the capacity in our students and colleagues, as well as ourselves” (Hicks & Hawley-Turner, 2013).

Community colleges, which serve the unique function of preparing students from diverse backgrounds for all manner of academic and career situations, must embrace the challenge of closing the digital divide among students with vast differences in technology exposure and digital preparation. Our student demographics point to significantly different technological skills and competencies marked by indicators such as age, urban or rural place of living, income and other socio-economic factors. Further, the open-admissions policy, which serves the community college mission of inclusiveness, creates a great diversity of digital technology skills in regard to both technology experiences and technology access. According to media theorist Douglas Rushkoff, dependence on technology in career, academic and daily life can create a new class of “haves” and “have-nots” with implications for multiple facets of life today (Riel, Christian & Hinson, 2012). Attempts to level the playing field for digital literacy attainment in the community college recognize that those skills constitute a “life-critical literacy” (Haber, n.d.)

The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) developed the ISTE Standards (formerly known as the NETS) to “set a standard of excellence and best practices in learning, teaching and leading with technology in education” (ISTE, 2012). They describe the essential conditions necessary to effectively leverage technology for learning, suggesting that a systematic and institution-wide approach to digital literacy is vital to create the culture of digital literacy necessary to embed requisite technology skills, attitudes and competencies into the college curriculum. “Technology should serve as an integrator of disciplinary work instead of a discipline in and of itself to be studied separately” (Riel et al., 2012). A curriculum that embeds core digital skills as well as subject-specific use of technology enables students to embrace a metacognitive approach to technology that will support their learning and academic goals. “By explicitly outlining criteria for technology and digital literacy student learning outcomes, instructors can create problem-based projects and assessments that highlight these objectives and develop technology competencies while emphasizing whatever disciplinary coursework is at hand” (Riel et al., 2012).

As the landscape of education and employment continues to shift to a knowledge-based and highly digitized system, the opportunities and challenges mount. The NMC Horizon
Project: Technology Outlook for Community Colleges 2013-2018 predicts the top trends and challenges for community college education within the next five years. Community colleges will use technology to diversify delivery methods so that location and time become less relevant to the learning process. Personalized learning, performance measurement, competency-based assessment and educational analytics will enable a previously unimaginable level of customizability in higher education. Community colleges will also need to focus on technology to mitigate some of the challenges on the horizon. Strategic choices must be made to continue best practices in education in the face of constrained resources. Careful use and development of campus technology infrastructure will be needed to ensure that the College keeps up with the ever-evolving needs of students. Faculty will need support as they continue to evaluate their relationship to technology and digital literacy. As with students, a strictly skills-based, passive approach to faculty development has proven to be less effective than a metacognitive change in attitude towards technology – remembering that tools and devices cannot replace effective teaching and learning (NMC Horizon Project for Community Colleges, 2013-2018).

DIGITAL LITERACY: A WORKING DEFINITION
As early as 1997, Paul Gilster suggested that digital literacy would be an increasingly important skill in the new millennium with the growing reliance on information technologies, global communications information networks and the then-nascent World Wide Web. Gilster asserted that digital literacy was more than simple acquisition of skills; in his definition digital literacy is about “mastering ideas, not keystrokes” (Gilster, 1997, p. 15). Gilster defined digital literacy as “the ability to understand and use information in multiple formats from a wide range of sources when it is presented via computers” (Gilster, 1997, p. 1).

However, since Gilster’s ground-breaking work, definitions of digital literacy have proliferated and most now include a wide range of competencies that often defy neat definitions. Indeed, there are now so many “often inconsistent definitions of digital literacy…that range from the technical aspects of operating in digital environments to the cognitive and socio-emotional aspects of work in a computer environment” (Nelson, Courier and Joseph, 2011) that the resulting ambiguity poses challenges for the effective design of learning outcomes and assessment tools. In addition, the fact of rapid and regular changes in technologies further complicates efforts at meaningful implementation.

One can begin to tease out the most common components of the various definitions if we look beyond semantics and focus on the skills under discussion. Nelson (et al., 2011) identified three principles upon which most definitions of digital literacy appear to build:

- The skills and knowledge to use a variety of digital media software applications and hardware devices
- The ability to critically understand digital media content and applications
- The knowledge and capacity to create and communicate with digital technology

Indeed most current definitions of digital literacy encompass not only the ever-evolving skills necessary to function in a digital environment, but also components of information literacy and critical thinking as well as a social/interactive component.

The work of the United Kingdom’s Open University in developing its digital and information literacy framework offered the QEP team at TCC a good model to consider. Marrying the concepts of information literacy and digital literacy, their earlier work began with an information literacy framework developed in 2009. Open University later expanded the information literacy framework to include digital literacy skills, specifically two new areas of competency: “Understand and engage in digital practices and collaborate and share digital content” (Reedy, 2013). Similarly, TCC has been developing information literacy learning outcomes in the general education curriculum for several years now and can build on that work to expand competencies into the digital literacy realm.

As part of its Digital and Information Literacy Framework, the Open University developed four levels of achievement for each competency. This recognizes the iterative nature of both information and digital literacy. In the community college “open door” environment it is essential to keep in mind the diversity of digital technology skills in regard to both previous experiences and access to technology and to develop appropriate learning outcomes, activities and assessments.

Putting together the most common components, digital literacy is the ability to use technology to find, operate, create, utilize and share content in a manner that fosters student success, creativity and lifelong learning. Conceptualized in this manner, the components of digital literacy can be superimposed over multiple disciplines and offer opportunities to reach students at many points in their academic pursuits at TCC.
DIGITAL LITERACY: A COMPETENCY-BASED FRAMEWORK
To reconcile the breadth of current definitions of digital literacy, a framework or taxonomy is required. In the 1950s Benjamin Bloom developed a taxonomy describing the relationship between higher- and lower-order thinking skills. By overlaying the concepts of digital literacy, the College can examine a model that combines the cognitive elements of Bloom’s Taxonomy with digital methods and tools (Churches, 2009).

FIGURE 2: BLOOM’S DIGITAL TAXONOMY

Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy is not about tools and technologies; these are simply the medium. It is all about using these tools, the medium of digital literacy, to traverse the continuum from lower-order thinking to higher-order thinking within the context of an academic discipline (Churches, 2009). By overlaying Bloom’s Taxonomy onto digital competencies, it is possible to realize a systematic and institution-wide approach to digital literacy wherein digital technologies serve as “an integrator of disciplinary work instead of a discipline in and of itself to be studied separately” (Riel 2012). Rather than creating an “add-on,” as is so often the case with information and digital literacy initiatives, such a construct allows for a more organic and holistic experience for students and faculty alike.
DIGITAL LITERACY: HYPOTHESES

At this time Tallahassee Community College faces interesting opportunities and challenges. As resources for higher education decline, the College continues to serve an ever-growing population of students with vast differences in their preparation for college and career. The surge of interest and growth in digital technology for education provides a platform for significant change in the landscape of education. There is great potential for individualization as modes of delivery evolve, digital tools develop and technology is embedded within traditional pedagogies. In order to leverage technology to the best advantage of educational outcomes for all students, it is imperative that the College develops a systematic, intentional approach to digital literacy for all students and all faculty. We recognize that digital literacy is much more than the sum of its parts. It is, in fact, our attitude towards technology and digital literacy that must evolve to include a devotion to lifelong learning as these new cognitive tools and concepts continue to advance at an ever-increasing pace. Only then can the College deliver the kind of education that truly prepares students for their place in the knowledge economy.

The success of this Quality Enhancement Plan will depend on our success in implementing the plan and achieving the institutional goals and outcomes described in this document. In this endeavor both quality and quantity will matter. It is important that the College delivers quality digital content to our students, which is relevant to the academic disciplines that they are engaging with. The College will need to recognize the gaps in preparation inherent in a student population such as ours and strive to move each student forward on the digital literacy continuum. Vital to the success of our plan is the concept of quantity— the College must provide many high-quality opportunities for students to develop digital literacy across the curriculum. Our faculty, indeed our campus culture, will need to embrace digital literacy as a fundamental learning outcome.

To summarize, research suggests that technology is rapidly changing the landscape of education, the workforce and the global economy in general. Digital literacy for all is an imperative that higher education cannot ignore. Students need deliberate preparation in digital literacy in order to achieve their academic and career goals across all disciplines. With that in mind this plan has been constructed to offer a wide, interdisciplinary range of curricular and co-curricular opportunities to move students forward on the literacy continuum. This premise is best summarized in the following hypotheses:

**H1** The increased availability of high quality, deliberate opportunities to develop digital literacy competencies within academic disciplines and courses will increase digital literacy in TCC students.

**H2** Participating in a wide variety of courses across the curriculum containing high quality, deliberate opportunities to develop digital literacy will increase digital literacy in TCC students.
CHAPTER 3
FOCUS OF THE PLAN
CHAPTER 3: FOCUS OF THE PLAN

After choosing the topic area of digital literacy using a broad-based representative process including the analysis of institutional assessment data, the QEP Design Committee began work on a contextual working definition for digital literacy that would underpin our plan. The committee did preliminary research and solicited faculty feedback from across campus to develop a definition of digital literacy. It was determined that the College needed a definition that would encompass a wide range of academic activities across all academic disciplines and student competencies. Care was taken to ensure that our definition of digital literacy would not overlap with our definition of information literacy, which forms the basis for another ongoing campus initiative. Additionally, faculty had concerns that a definition of digital literacy would focus solely on digital tool competency without any focus on higher-order competencies relating to discipline-specific inquiry. A definition was developed that would address both higher- and lower-order competencies.

**DIGITAL TOOLS**
+ **DIGITAL APPLICATION**
+ **DIGITAL COMMUNICATION**

**DIGITAL LITERACY**

Digital literacy is the ability to use technology to find, operate, create, utilize and share content in a manner that fosters student success, creativity and life-long learning.

Building on the research used to develop our definition, the committee, with the help of our campus librarians, conducted a literature and best practices review in order to further focus our plan. Our research suggested a cross-disciplinary approach to digital literacy to be the most effective means of increasing digital competencies for students. Students benefit most from many opportunities to apply a wide variety of digital means to actively engage with academic disciplines across the curriculum. Our QEP focus statement grew from this research:

**FOCUS STATEMENT**

The focus of our QEP is to actively improve student digital literacy across the curriculum by establishing measureable competencies and assessing student progress toward those competencies.

The Tallahassee Community College QEP, *Digital FOCUS: Find, Operate, Create, Utilize and Share*, presents a framework for engaging students in a technology-rich learning environment, while preparing them for success in a technology-driven world. Simply being able to use technology is no longer enough. Today’s students need to be fluent and adept consumers of technology in order to be able to find, operate, create, utilize and share digitally in applied situations across many fields. Digital age skills are vital for preparing students to work, live and contribute to the social and civic fabric of their communities.

With the focus of actively improving digital literacy across the curriculum, the QEP Design Committee defined three broad competency areas, based on our definition, to be addressed across the curriculum:

**DIGITAL TOOLS**
(find, operate, utilize)

**DIGITAL APPLICATION**
(create)

**DIGITAL COMMUNICATION**
/share

Three goals emerged from considering the implementation implications of our focus and competency areas. These goals were given to the QEP Implementation, QEP Institutional Capability, and QEP Assessment Subcommittees to establish detailed implementation timetables, a reporting structure, a budget and an assessment plan.
GOAL 1
Cross-Curricular Digital FOCUS Implementation
By Fall 2020, all courses in all academic program areas at TCC will have a digital literacy assignment that is discipline-specific, chosen and developed by the faculty at the course level, focusing on the competencies and assessment criteria described in the QEP. These criteria will facilitate the measurement of student performance in the common student learning outcomes that constitute our definition of digital literacy.

GOAL 2
Focused Accessible Support
Identify and communicate best practices and support services for students and faculty, using data, to meet the needs of implementing students and faculty in order to build knowledge and skills related to digital tools and their application in discipline-specific assignments.

GOAL 3
Continuous Assessment and Improvement of Digital FOCUS
Students with increased exposure to a wide variety of discipline-specific digital literacy activities across the academic curriculum, based on the guidelines developed in the QEP, will improve their digital literacy as demonstrated by external assessments. Students with increased exposure will reach or exceed performance benchmarks as measured with a common digital literacy rubric.
CHAPTER 4: IMPLEMENTATION AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Digital FOCUS: Find, Operate, Create, Utilize and Share is a five-year plan developed to measurably increase student exposure to applied digital literacy competencies across the academic curriculum. Our plan will improve student digital literacy by offering a culture where digital literacy is a conscious goal across all academic disciplines.

The implementation of TCC’s QEP Digital FOCUS is directed at achieving three goals:

GOAL 1 – Cross-Curricular Digital FOCUS Implementation

GOAL 2 – Focused, Accessible Support for Digital Best Practices and Student Digital Literacy

GOAL 3 – Continuous Cycle of Assessment and Improvement of Digital FOCUS

GOAL 1 IMPACT

Cross-Curricular Digital FOCUS Implementation

By Fall of 2020, all courses in all academic program areas at TCC will have a digital literacy assignment that is discipline-specific, chosen and developed by the faculty at the course level, focusing on the competencies and assessment criteria described in the QEP. These criteria will facilitate the measurement of student performance in relation to the common student learning outcomes that constitute our definition of digital literacy.

GOAL 1 - OBJECTIVE 1 Faculty Recruitment

Phased recruitment of faculty across all academic programs and disciplines to participate in implementation of Digital FOCUS.

Approximately 30 faculty members per semester will be recruited to begin implementation of Digital FOCUS. Both full-time and part-time faculty will participate (see Figure 3 next page)

Implementation of QEP Digital FOCUS will be added to the annual faculty assessment portfolio in the areas of Instruction and Curriculum Innovation, Professional Growth and Committee Service, as appropriate. Faculty who implement Digital FOCUS in their classrooms will create one digitally focused assignment for each of their classes. The assignment will align with both the course learning outcomes and the Digital FOCUS Student Learning Outcomes:

Digital FOCUS Student Learning Outcomes

Students will find, operate and utilize digital tool(s) for academic and professional purposes.

Students will use digital tool(s) to create content.

Students will use digital tool(s) to share content effectively.

Faculty will deploy and assess a digitally focused assignment in each of their classes for the duration of the QEP and beyond. The digital tools and concepts used in these cross-disciplinary assignments will support the program and the learning outcomes already in place for the course.

Pilot implementation of Digital FOCUS will begin in Fall 2014. Thirty faculty members from across all program areas and disciplines will participate in the pilot implementation (Appendix 5). They will create or modify a discipline specific assignment for each of their classes. A common digital literacy rubric will be used by the faculty to assess student achievement of digital literacy student learning outcomes. The pilot faculty, QEP Coordinator and QEP Committee will work together to track the courses being impacted and the assessment data being generated.
Faculty will be recruited to participate in *Digital FOCUS* implementation as follows:

Program Area Meetings  
Campus-wide Marketing and Speakers  
“Train-the-Trainer” – Faculty Recruit Faculty

Members of the QEP Committee will attend program area meetings in their area to report on the progress of *Digital FOCUS* and to identify faculty who will participate in the program. Ongoing marketing of *Digital FOCUS* will ensure that faculty and students are aware of our plan focusing on student digital literacy across the curriculum. Speakers on digital literacy at campus-wide events will generate interest in the development of digital literacy competencies for both students and faculty (Appendix 10). Additionally, newly implementing faculty will be required to identify a fellow faculty member to begin implementation in the following semester. The implementing faculty member will mentor or assist in the training of the faculty member that he or she brings in (train the trainer).

**GOAL 1 – OBJECTIVE 2 – Training and Support**  
Training and support of implementing faculty

The QEP Coordinator and the QEP Committee will host a training workshop for each group of implementing faculty before the semester in which they will begin implementation. The workshop will orient faculty to the student learning outcomes that are at the core of *Digital FOCUS*. Faculty will be supported in developing or modifying assignments that will support both the learning outcomes already in place for their course and the digital literacy learning outcomes that are the focus of our plan. The common digital literacy assessment rubric will be introduced and implementing faculty will use the rubric during the workshop to practice assessing digital assignments to ensure consistency of rating. The QEP Coordinator and QEP Committee members will work with faculty during breakout sessions to identify specific support resources needed for faculty and students as digital assignments are developed and deployed (Appendix 11).
In their first semester of implementation, faculty will meet monthly with the QEP Coordinator and members of the QEP Committee to share assignments and student artifacts. Assessment data emerging from implementation will be analyzed as well. The purpose of these meetings is two-fold. First, the QEP Coordinator and Committee will be available to support faculty with any technical or logistical issues that may arise. The common digital literacy assessment rubric will be deployed on our learning management system (LMS). Any issues that occur with the sharing of data from assessment on the LMS can be corrected at these meetings. Implementing faculty will be able to identify any technical support needed for themselves and/or their students at these meetings well. Secondly, the QEP Coordinator and Committee will be able to collect digital best practices and sample student artifacts to share with other implementing faculty. The committee will create a database of assignments and best practices for this purpose. On-campus support services and third-party tools will be identified and shared as well, based on the needs of implementing faculty.

**GOAL 2 – SUPPORT**

Focused and accessible support for faculty and students.

Digital support for students and faculty, such as a searchable database of sample assignments and a page on the TCC website with third party digital resources, will be systematically communicated and continuously developed using data, to meet the needs of implementing faculty and students.

**GOAL 2 – OBJECTIVE 1 Collecting Data**

The QEP Coordinator and Committee will collect information from implementing faculty at workshops and monthly meetings to determine best practices in the creation and deployment of assignments focused on digital literacy. Implementing faculty will be asked to share assignments and student artifacts that will be archived in a searchable database for faculty to reference as they continue to develop assignments throughout the QEP implementation cycle.

Implementing faculty will be asked to share information about digital tools, on-campus support and third-party tools that are especially useful. They will also be assisted in finding the tools and support that they need during implementation at monthly meetings during their first semester of implementation.

External assessment data will be analyzed and shared by the QEP Coordinator and Committee to help direct support services for students. The QEP Coordinator will communicate with the Library, Learning Commons, IT Help Staff, Center for Teaching Learning and Leadership (CTLL), Center for Distance Learning (CDL) and other appropriate areas on campus to ensure that student needs identified by internal and external assessment are met.

**GOAL 2 – OBJECTIVE 2 Systematic Sharing of Support**

The QEP Coordinator and Committee will create a searchable database as a repository for assignments and student artifacts. This database will assist faculty in developing new assignments and will serve as an avenue for faculty collaboration. Additionally, the QEP Coordinator and Committee will work with other college standing committees to create an accessible list of support services. A comprehensive list of digital support services with links will be accessible on the TCC Web page. Additionally a list of frequently used third-party tools with descriptions and links will be compiled and made accessible on the TCC Web page.

**GOAL 3 ASSESSMENT**

Continuous cycle of assessment and improvement of Digital Focus

Students with increased exposure to a wide variety of discipline-specific digital literacy activities across the curriculum, based on the criteria described in the QEP, will improve their digital literacy as demonstrated by external assessments. Students with increased exposure will reach or exceed performance benchmarks as measured with a common digital literacy rubric.

**GOAL 3 – OBJECTIVE 1 – External Measures**

Identify, evaluate and deploy appropriate and effective external measures of student digital literacy.

Our research and experience have demonstrated that effective external measures of student digital literacy are hard to come by. Identifying an external measure that focuses on digital literacy holistically as opposed to simple skill testing is difficult. The most effective and rigorous external digital literacy assessments require a proctored setting, making them logistically challenging in a community college. The College has identified two external assessment tools to help identify and track student-learning gains in digital literacy: SmarterMeasure and iSkills Digital Literacy Assessment.
SmarterMeasure is a non-proctored digital readiness assessment most commonly used in distance learning to identify student readiness for the distance-learning environment. SmarterMeasure assesses student competency or readiness in five broad areas. Beginning in Summer 2014, all first-time-in-college (FTIC) students registering at TCC will be required to take the SmarterMeasure assessment as part of pre-orientation, before coming to campus for orientation and registration. The results of this assessment can be used to help identify gaps in our incoming students’ functional digital literacy. In this way, the College can identify critical skills and competencies that students need the most help with in order to function effectively in an academic setting. Support services can be provided at the front end to help students succeed. Faculty teaching gateway courses can focus their digital literacy assignments for appropriate levels of student readiness. Data from the SmarterMeasure assessment will be shared with implementing faculty to help them identify the type of needs or challenges their students may have so that digital assignments can be directed appropriately.

One of the most critical indicators of the QEP impact is the ability to improve student learning outcomes in digital literacy. The iSkills Assessment allows us to measure the impact of changes in our curriculum and teaching of digital literacy by comparing our students’ scores when they first come to TCC with the scores upon their graduation. A statistical test (t-test) will be conducted to determine whether there is a significant increase as a result of the implementation of QEP. The iSkills digital literacy assessment is a proctored assessment that measures the ability to think critically in a digital environment through a range of real-world tasks. The iSkills test will be administered to a random sample of students as they enter TCC as FTIC students and as they graduate from TCC as a means to measure broad student gains in digital literacy achieved due to increased exposure to digital literacy across the academic curriculum. Results of this assessment will be shared with implementing faculty as a means to direct efforts to affect student digital literacy toward areas where there may be gaps.

**GOAL 3 – OBJECTIVE 2 – Common Digital Literacy Rubric**

Develop and use a common digital literacy rubric across the curriculum as a direct assessment of student learning at the course level.

A digital literacy rubric was developed by the QEP Assessment Subcommittee to be used as a common assessment tool for faculty to use across the academic curriculum.

**FIGURE 4: DIGITAL LITERACY RUBRIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME</th>
<th>Students find, operate and utilize digital tool(s) for academic and professional purposes</th>
<th>Students use digital tool(s) to create content</th>
<th>Students use digital tool(s) to share content effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent 5</td>
<td>Uses the most relevant digital tool(s) expertly</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) to create, modify and manage content</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) expertly to share and communicate content effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good 4</td>
<td>Uses relevant digital tool(s) effectively</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) effectively to create, modify and manage content</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) to share and communicate content effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate 3</td>
<td>Uses relevant digital tool(s) adequately with few mistakes or inconsistencies</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) adequately to create, modify and manage content</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) adequately to share and communicate content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak 2</td>
<td>Uses irrelevant digital tool(s) or uses relevant digital tool(s) ineffectively</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) ineffectively to create, modify and manage content</td>
<td>Uses digital tool(s) ineffectively to share and communicate content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor 1</td>
<td>Cannot determine or does not find, operate or utilize digital tool(s)</td>
<td>Cannot determine or does not use digital tool(s) to create, modify and manage content</td>
<td>Cannot determine or does not use digital tool(s) to share and communicate content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rubric was designed to tease out the fundamental student learning outcomes common to robust use of digital technology across disciplines and modalities. The rubric can be used to measure student achievement in the three identified learning outcomes of digital literacy. The faculty member will measure the other course student learning outcomes for an assignment using an additional rubric. In the case of an assignment that has been modified to include digital literacy student learning outcomes, the rubric used to assess the assignment prior to modification can be used in addition to the common digital literacy rubric. With new assignments developed specifically to address digital
literacy, a rubric will be created by the faculty member or program area to assess course- or program-level student learning outcomes and will be used in addition to the common digital literacy rubric.

Assessment data from faculty will be collected using the common digital literacy rubric via the LMS. Faculty will assess student-learning outcomes with the rubric once during each semester in each class that they teach for the duration of QEP implementation. The assessment data will be shared with the QEP Coordinator and QEP Committee as well as the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The assessment data will be used to determine benchmarks and to identify gaps where additional support for student learning may be needed.

GOAL 3 – OBJECTIVE 3 Continuous Improvement
Establish benchmarks, track, analyze and share assessment data to facilitate continuous improvement of student learning

The QEP Coordinator and QEP Committee will establish benchmarks for student learning as assessed by the common digital literacy rubric. The QEP Coordinator and Committee will track assessment data emerging from both the internal (rubric) and external (SmarterMeasure and iSkills) assessments. The committee will analyze the data and share information with implementing faculty through program area meetings. Additionally the QEP Coordinator will be present at the regular meeting of the following TCC college-wide standing committees to present data and plans for intervention and continuous improvement of the QEP:

- Academic Planning Committee
- Educational Technology Committee
- Institutional Accountability Committee

In addition to facilitating reporting and feedback on the progress of the QEP, the QEP Coordinator along with the QEP Committee will seek ways in which the QEP can begin to fit organically into our ongoing measurement of all student-learning outcomes. As dialog continues on campus regarding common general education student learning outcomes and their measurement, it is anticipated that the competencies at the core of Digital FOCUS will become intrinsic in our institutional assessment cycles.

Assessment data will be used to guide faculty in implementation of Digital FOCUS. Through analysis of assessment data faculty can determine areas of need for students and focus their efforts in those directions. Assignments can be modified to concentrate on areas where gaps are present. External assessment data will be used to provide a bigger picture of where our students are with regard to digital literacy as they move through our programs.

INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY
The QEP implementation plan demonstrates institutional capacity to begin and complete our plan. Appropriate resources and personnel have been identified and allocated. The QEP is positioned strategically within the organizational structure of the College to ensure a continuous feedback loop, facilitating the ongoing analysis of our plan in order to achieve the goals of implementation, assessment and support.

The position of QEP Coordinator was created to oversee the implementation of our QEP. This is a faculty-level position consisting of 100% reassigned time for the first three years of QEP implementation and 50% reassigned time for the remainder of implementation. It was important for the QEP Coordinator to retain faculty status, since our QEP will be implemented by faculty at the classroom level. A faculty-level status allows the QEP Coordinator to attend all Faculty Senate Meetings, thus facilitating communication with faculty across all disciplines (Appendix 9).

The QEP Coordinator will assemble and lead a QEP Committee. The membership will consist of one faculty member from each academic division (8), one representative from each teaching/learning support area (Library, Center for Distance Learning, Center for Teaching Learning and Leadership, Information Technology Learning Commons) and one representative from Student Affairs. The QEP Committee duties follow:

- Communication and support of QEP implementation to representative areas
- Support recruiting of implementing faculty across disciplines
- Assessment and development of faculty implementation workshops
- Assist with data collection and analysis
- Development of action items as necessary during the implementation of the QEP
- Collection and communication of TCC Digital FOCUS best practices

Effective implementation, assessment and continuous improvement will necessitate effective organizational
reporting procedures. The QEP Coordinator will serve as the conduit for reporting, communication and continuous improvement. The coordinator will report directly to the Provost. Additionally, the coordinator will lead the QEP Committee and serve as a member of the Academic Planning Committee, Institutional Accountability Committee and Educational Technology Committee. As a faculty member, the coordinator will also attend and report on the QEP at Faculty Senate meetings each semester.

FIGURE 5: QEP REPORTING STRUCTURE

The QEP Committee, in consultation with administration, developed a five-year QEP budget as demonstrated in Table 6 (see next page). Expenditures cover personnel, assessment, faculty training and development.

MARKETING $12,000.00
QEP Marketing will be needed as the College kicks off the Digital FOCUS: Digital Literacy Initiative in Summer/Fall 2014. Budget items include the following

- Posters $500
- Outdoor Banners/Signs $1200
- Promotional Items $7500
- Name tags $100
- Production of QEP Document $2000
- Prize for Naming Contest $700

FACULTY WORKSHOPS $1980/YEAR
The implementation of the QEP will require three workshops per year (Summer, Fall, Spring) with approximately 30 attendees per workshop for a total of 90 attendees per year. The workshop budget would provide lunch/refreshments and a speaker for the attendees (Appendix 11).

ASSESSMENT COSTS (SMARTERMEASURE) $9000/YEAR
Our QEP requires that the College administer a digital literacy diagnostic to all first-time-in-college students at TCC to capture both baseline data and to assist students, advisors and faculty in determining students’ digital readiness. The College enrolls an estimated 11,000 FTIC students annually.

COORDINATOR COST (SUMMER) $4,164/YEAR
The equivalent of six-credit-hour stipend (see QEP Coordinator Job Description).

COORDINATOR COST-FACULTY REASSIGNED TIME (FALL/SPRING) $55,351.04 or $12,000/YEAR
During regular Fall/Spring Semesters for the first three years of the QEP implementation a faculty coordinator would require 100% reassigned time (see QEP Coordinator Job Description). The equivalent of full-time masters degree base salary has been budgeted for those years. The remaining three years of QEP Implementation would require 50% faculty reassigned time. The adjunct rate for teaching the reassigned sections has been budgeted for those years.

ASSISTANT TO THE COORDINATOR $10,080/YEAR
A half-time assistant to the QEP Coordinator will be needed to assist with scheduling, collection of data and other duties.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS $10,000
Educational Testing Services iSkills Assessment to assess 500 students per academic year at $20 per test.

FALL SPEAKER $6000.00 (FALL 2014 ONLY)
To promote QEP focus on digital literacy, an expert in the area of digital literacy will speak on campus at our Student Success Summit as part of our Welcome Back activities in Fall 2014.

OFFICE EXPENSES $1000/YEAR
Miscellaneous office expenses/copying, etc.
### TABLE 5: QEP BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workshop (Food and Speaker)*</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Costs (SmarterMeasure)</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Cost (Summer term - Coordinator Stipend)</td>
<td>$4,164.00</td>
<td>$4,164.00</td>
<td>$4,164.00</td>
<td>$4,164.00</td>
<td>$4,164.00</td>
<td>$4,164.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Cost (faculty reassigned - Fall/ Spring terms)</td>
<td>$55,351.04</td>
<td>$55,351.04</td>
<td>$55,351.04</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS Staff Assistant to Coordinator</td>
<td>$10,080.00</td>
<td>$10,080.00</td>
<td>$10,080.00</td>
<td>$10,080.00</td>
<td>$10,080.00</td>
<td>$10,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Materials/Skills test</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Speaker</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TOTAL PER FISCAL YEAR** | **$109,575.04**        | **$91,575.04**         | **$91,575.04**         | **$48,224.00**         | **$48,224.00**         | **$48,224.00**         | **$437,397.12**
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CHAPTER 5: ASSESSMENT PLAN

The assessment plan details the process for evaluating the implementation and effectiveness of QEP strategies and student learning achievements in digital literacy across the curriculum. In most cases, assessment results will be used at both the course level to improve digital practices in the classroom and at the college-wide level to assess the need for system-wide interventions and/or additional support for digital teaching and learning.

A logic model (Figure 6) serves as a framework for assessing the implementation and ultimate impact of the QEP. A logic model is a graphical depiction of the relationships between the resources, strategies, outputs, and outcomes of a program and allows program implementers to assess the “if-then” (causal) relationships between components of a program. For example, if resources are available for the QEP, then the strategies can be implemented. If the strategies are implemented, then outputs and outcomes can be expected.

**FIGURE 6: QEP LOGIC MODEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>SEMESTER OUTCOMES</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What resources will be used to support the QEP?</td>
<td>How many and what sort of observable/tangible results will be achieved as a result of the strategies?</td>
<td>What will occur as a direct result of the strategies and outputs? (e.g., changes in knowledge and skills)</td>
<td>What results should follow from the initial outcomes? (e.g., changes in broader conditions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1a. Number of full-time and part-time faculty recruited and percent who implement Digital FOCUS each semester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduating students’ digital literacy skills as measured by the ETS iSkills assessment instrument will be significantly higher than students’ entry skills measured by the same instrument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Coordinator</td>
<td>1b. Number and percent of program areas and courses implementing digital literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Institutional Effectiveness Staff</td>
<td>1c. Number and type of digital literacy tools in resource library and degree they are used by faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Committees: QEP Committee, Academic Planning Committee, Educational Technology Committee, Institutional Accountability Committee</td>
<td>2. Number of faculty receiving training and reporting it is effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Commons</td>
<td>3. Number and type of digital literacy tools for academic and professional purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Distance Learning</td>
<td>4. Students will use digital tools to create content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Teaching, Learning and Leadership Library</td>
<td>5. Students will use digital tools to share content effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Help Desk</td>
<td>6. Analysis and use of results for continuous improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Funding</td>
<td>6. Annual QEP Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a formative evaluation perspective, the College will seek to answer the following general questions: “Are we implementing the QEP as planned? How effectively are we implementing the strategies as measured by the outputs and outcomes identified in the logic model?” These formative assessments will be collected each semester, analyzed and reported on annually, and then used to identify improvements. Summative evaluation will occur in year five. At that point, the College will make a judgment as to the overall effectiveness of the QEP in improving students’ digital literacy skills.

**USE FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

Analysis and communication are essential elements of our Assessment plan. The QEP Coordinator and QEP Committee will track the collection of assessment data on a continuing basis. With the QEP Committee, the QEP Coordinator will evaluate the assessment data and make recommendations for improvement to the appropriate committees. Assessment data will be shared systematically with all relevant constituencies with the goal of continuous improvement of QEP implementation and student learning. As a member of the Faculty Senate, the Academic Planning Committee, the Institutional Accountability Committee and the Educational Technology Committee, the QEP Coordinator is positioned to both make systematic recommendations and to communicate assessment results and analysis. Thus, our assessment plan integrates assessment of the QEP into the broader organizational structure of the College. Individual faculty assessment data will be immediately available for implementing faculty to use in a formative manner.

Our assessment plan focuses on measuring the impact of our actions on the three goals described in the Implementation Plan. Each of those goals and their associated objectives are assessed as follows:

### TABLE 6: DIGITAL FOCUS GOAL 1 CROSS CURRICULAR DIGITAL FOCUS IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUESTION</th>
<th>SUMMATIVE (S) OR FORMATIVE (F)</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHOD</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FIRST ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>BASELINE AND/OR TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are program areas and courses represented?</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chart faculty, program areas and course participating</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Target: 100% faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 1 OBJECTIVE 1 FACULTY RECRUITMENT**

Phased Recruitment of faculty across all academic programs and disciplines to participate in Digital Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUESTION</th>
<th>SUMMATIVE (S) OR FORMATIVE (F)</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHOD</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FIRST ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>BASELINE AND/OR TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the workshops supporting and training faculty effectively?</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faculty Workshop Engagement Survey (Appendix 12)</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Target: 85% implementing faculty perceive workshop as effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 1 OBJECTIVE 2 FACULTY TRAINING**

Training and support for implementing faculty in the development, deployment and assessment of Digital Focus assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUESTION</th>
<th>SUMMATIVE (S) OR FORMATIVE (F)</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHOD</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FIRST ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>BASELINE AND/OR TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What types of assignments in each discipline are being used to develop students’ digital literacy?</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Digital Literacy database of assignments and student artifacts</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>100% implementing faculty will submit assignments and student artifacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Fall 2020, all courses in all academic program areas will have a digital literacy assignment that is discipline-specific and chosen and developed by the faculty at the course level.
### TABLE 7: DIGITAL FOCUS GOAL 2 SUPPORT OF DIGITAL TEACHING AND LEARNING

#### GOAL 2 OBJECTIVE 1 COLLECTING DATA
Collect Digital Focus tools used by implementing faculty and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUESTION</th>
<th>SUMMATIVE (S) OR FORMATIVE (F)</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHOD</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FIRST ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>BASELINE AND/OR TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What digital tools are being used by implementing faculty and students for teaching and learning?</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>List on Digital Focus Web page on the TCC Web site</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Target: A wide range of multi-media digital tools that can be used across all disciplines collected on Digital Focus Web page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GOAL 2 OBJECTIVE 2 SYSTEMATIC SHARING OF SUPPORT
Create an accessible repository of best practices and support for students and faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT QUESTION</th>
<th>SUMMATIVE (S) OR FORMATIVE (F)</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHOD</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FIRST ASSESSMENT RESULTS</th>
<th>BASELINE AND/OR TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is Digital Focus Web page being accessed and used?</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Access as demonstrated by implementing faculty survey and Web analytics. Usage as demonstrated by evaluation of faculty assignments and artifacts</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>Target: 75% of implementing faculty visit Digital Focus Web page. Target: Implementing faculty use a wide range of multi-media digital tools for assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focused and accessible support for faculty and students
As part of the assessment plan, an annual impact report will be generated and shared with the College. A five-year impact report will provide a summation and analysis of the annual reports to be submitted to SACSCOC in 2020, as well as summative findings regarding the overall effectiveness of the QEP.
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Appendix 1
Tallahassee Community College Strategic Plan and Mission

Our Vision
To be recognized as the college of choice.

Our Mission
The mission of the college is to provide a learning environment that prepares students for success in a global economy by offering higher education pathways, workforce opportunities and civic engagement experiences.

Strategic Priorities and Strategies

Student Access: Provide accessible programs, services and experiences that increase the opportunity for students to define and reach their educational and career goals.

- **Affordability.** Keep student costs competitive without weakening the quality of the education they receive and make any increases in cost gradual, moderate and predictable.
- **Comprehensive Career Advising.** Design and implement an integrated and sustainable model that assists students in early identification of academic pathways aligned with their career goals and educational needs.

Student Success: Deliver quality academic programs and learning support services with the appropriate environment and resources for learning.

- **Learning Environment.** Develop, execute and refine appropriate college policies, procedures and practices that promote a healthy and safe physical and social learning environment for students, employees and guests of the College.
- **Instructional Excellence.** Promote and enhance instruction that stimulates intellectual curiosity and communicates high expectations by designing learning experiences that engage students in active, collaborative learning appropriate to the learner and the subject matter.
- **Student Engagement.** Strengthen educational and student support services to develop early connections and increase the breadth, depth and quality of learning through student engagement and service learning both on and off campus.
- **Student Achievement.** Leverage the expertise of faculty and staff to integrate and streamline processes and strategies to facilitate student retention and progression from enrollment through goal attainment.
- **Student Learning.** Develop a continuous improvement cycle for assessing and improving student learning outcomes to assure measurable achievements of general education competencies and program outcomes.

Technology: Provide appropriate technology and services to facilitate teaching and learning as well as institutional effectiveness and efficiency.

- **Enterprise Resource Planning.** Replace the College’s existing Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software with a robust solution that meets the present and future administrative, reporting and data-driven decision-making needs of the institution.
- **Flexible Models.** Create and deploy cost-efficient and easy-to-use models for teaching and learning and for administration that encourage creativity and innovation. (Under consideration)
- **Rapid Analytics.** Provide a robust set of business intelligence tools to allow decision makers to easily access and view institutional and comparative data to improve decision-making.
Demand-driven programs: Align programs to meet academic and workforce needs.

- **Program Review.** Conduct comprehensive program reviews for all academic and non-academic areas of the College to inform decisions to continue, expand, modify and eliminate programs and services.
- **Data-driven Decisions.** Use labor market data to align existing credit and noncredit programs with market demand and improve student outcomes.
- **Forecasting Emerging Demands.** Research, develop and implement credit and noncredit programs designed to anticipate the emerging needs of the region and state.

Enrollment: Develop and implement a strategic enrollment management process designed to increase student and institutional success.

- **Strategic Enrollment Management.** Develop, implement and assess a Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) plan designed to achieve the optimum recruitment, retention, graduation and/or goal attainment rates of students.
- **Signature Programs.** Identify and market programs that the College excels at that meet the talent demand and growth needs of the region and state.
- **Cultivate Opportunities.** Increase opportunities for those groups of regional, statewide, national and international students whose representation among the College’s student body are below the College’s strategic enrollment goals.

Communications/Marketing: Develop and implement an institution-wide and data-driven strategic communications/marketing plan.

- **Internal Communication.** Provide forums for timely and relevant information among faculty, staff and students to increase their awareness of College activities, improve their effectiveness, and empower them as passionate ambassadors for the College.
- **External Communication.** Provide for timely exchange of relevant information with alumni, friends, the media, prospective students and the community at large related to the College’s mission and range of academic and career programs that enhance the College’s reputation, influence and relationships as a community institution.
- **Marketing.** Maximize the use of traditional, nontraditional, digital and social media to advance the College’s vision to be the college of choice and motivate prospective and current students to enroll.

Talent: Hire, develop and retain the best talent for the present and future needs and diversity of the college.

- **Talent Management.** Develop a talent-management program designed to attract the best people through recruitment, keep the best people through effective retention practices, and develop the best people through targeted talent-development efforts that sustain our ability to change and improve while maintaining a commitment to mirror the multicultural, racial and gender diversity in our community.
- **Culture.** Promote a culture of College-wide organizational learning that focuses on student success, fosters diversity and inclusiveness, encourages innovation and creativity, embraces continuous improvement, and delivers results.
- **Shared Governance.** Fully employ the use of standing and ad hoc committees to provide faculty and staff with meaningful opportunities to play significant roles that improve the quality of decisions affecting the College and our students and that lead to individual professional growth through the work they are asked to do.
Stewardship: Provide effective stewardship to enhance new and existing revenues and resources that promote growth and increase cost effectiveness.

- **College Culture.** Promote a culture of stewardship in which all members of the College community embrace their fiduciary responsibilities to optimize College resources in ensuring the success of the College by continuously enhancing operational efficiency and effectiveness.

- **Public Funds.** Leverage state and federal funds to demonstrate a sound return on investment that contributes to the economic growth of the region and the state and maintains sufficient financial reserves to provide security, flexibility and institutional innovation.

- **Foundation.** Ensure that the TCC Foundation produces quantifiable results in private giving from individuals, foundations and alumni through its annual fund and other efforts that support the College’s priorities.

- **Public Grants and Contracts.** Increase external funding through grants, donors, endowments, alumni and other sources.

- **Auxiliary Funds.** Increase net revenues from auxiliary enterprises of the College.

- **Entrepreneurism and Innovation.** Develop a campus climate that encourages innovation by seeking new ways to enhance organizational innovation and increase revenue from entrepreneurial endeavors.

- **The Environment.** Implement policies, procedures and practices that advance the College’s leadership role in promoting sustainable stewardship of the environment.

Partnerships: Cultivate relationships with community, state and national partners that strengthen our region’s cultural enrichment efforts and economic/workforce competitiveness.

- **Business and Community.** Advance community relationships and partnerships with business, civic, charitable, not-for-profit and community organizations at all College sites that foster student success, academic excellence and economic prosperity.

- **Education.** Partner with regional school districts, higher education institutions and other organizations to increase the number of people in our region that earn diplomas, certificates and college degrees.

- **Cultural Arts Community.** Advance partnerships with art and cultural organizations to enrich the quality of life in the region by providing support, programs, exhibits and performances that reflect the interests and diversity of our community.

- **Suppliers.** Develop relationships with vendors and suppliers to reduce operational costs to the College and also provide students with scholarship, internship and job-placement opportunities.
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Tallahassee Community College Areas of Study

Associate in Arts Degree
The Associate in Arts degree (A.A.) is designed for students who plan to transfer to a Florida public four-year institution as a junior to complete a bachelor’s degree program. The A.A. degree provides the courses of study equivalent to those offered in the freshman and sophomore years at Florida’s state colleges and universities. The A.A. degree requirements consist of 36 credit hours of general education and 24 credit hours of electives. Students should select elective courses that are required for admission to the student’s intended major at the desired college or university.

Associate in Science Degree
The Associate in Science (A.S.) degree programs prepare students to enter a specific career immediately after graduation. In most cases, they are not considered equal to the first two years of a bachelor’s degree program. However, some of the credits earned in an A.S. degree program may be transferrable to a four-year college or university.

Note: General education courses are included in all degree programs. The A.S. degree programs include at least 15 semester hours of general education; the A.A. degree includes 36 hours of general education. All degrees include at least one course from each of the following areas: communications, humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences and natural sciences/mathematics.

College-credit Certificates
Certificate programs prepare students for a specific career. Most credits earned in a certificate program are not transferrable to a four-year college or university.

Programs

Academic
- College and University Transfer, A.A. (1001)

Advanced Manufacturing
- Applied Welding Technologies, PSAV Certificate (5023)

Business Management and Accounting
- Accounting Technology Specialist Certificate (6331)
- Accounting Technology Management Certificate (6329)
- Business Management, A.S. (2109)
- Small Business Management Certificate (6319)

Office Administration
- Office Support Certificate (6336)
- Office Specialist Certificate (6335)
- Office Management Certificate (6334)
- Office Administration, A.S. (2107)

Computer Technology
- Computer Programming Specialist Certificate (6338)
- Computer Programming and Analysis Certificate (6302)
- Computer Programming and Analysis-Computer Game Design & Logic, A.S. (2158)
- Help Desk/Technical Support Certificate (6323)
- Help Desk/Technical Support, A.S. (2137)
- Web Technologies Certificate (6317)
- Web Technologies, A.S. (2128)

Graphic Design Technology
- Graphic Design Support Certificate (6340)
- Graphic Design Production Certificate (6339)
- Graphic Design Technology, A.S. (2125)

Network Services Technology
- Network Systems Technology, A.S. (2165)
- Network Infrastructure Certificate (6359)
- Network Support Technician Certificate (6358)
- Network Virtualization Certificate (6357)
Criminal Justice and Public Safety
- Criminal Justice Technology, A.S. (2138)
- Criminal Justice Technology (Barry University), A.S. (2156)
- Criminal Justice Technology (Florida Gulf Coast), A.S. (2157)
- Law Enforcement Basic Recruit PSAV Certificate (5007)
- Law Enforcement Crossover: Corrections to Law Enforcement PSAV Certificate (5006)
- Law Enforcement Crossover: Correctional Probation to Law Enforcement PSAV Certificate (5015)
- Corrections Basic Recruit PSAV Certificate (5005)
- Corrections Crossover: Law Enforcement to Corrections PSAV Certificate (5008)
- Corrections Crossover: Correctional Probation to Corrections PSAV Certificate (5016)
- Correctional Probation Basic Recruit PSAV Certificate (5012)
- Correctional Probation Crossover: Corrections to Correctional Probation PSAV Certificate (5014)
- Correctional Probation Crossover: Law Enforcement to Correctional Probation PSAV Certificate (5013)
- Firefighter PSAV Certificate (5020)
- Telecommunications PSAV Certificate (5011)
- Unarmed Private Security Officer PSAV Certificate (5021)
- Armed Private Security Officer PSAV Certificate (5021)

Paralegal and Legal Studies
- Paralegal/Legal Studies, A.S. (2112)

Early Childhood Development, Education and Management
- Early Childhood Development, Education and Management, A.S. (2123)

Recreation Management
- Recreation Management, A.S. (2124)

Engineering Technology
- Engineering Technology, A.S. (2163)
- Pneumatics, Hydraulics and Motors for Manufacturing Certificate (6349)
- Engineering Technologies Support Specialist Certificate (6350)

Environmental
- Water Quality Technician Certificate (6356)
- Environmental Science Technology, A.S. (2162)

Building Construction Technology
- Building Construction Specialist Certificate (6353)
- Building Construction Management, A.S. (2160)

Drafting and Design Technology
- CAD Foundations Certificate (6354)
- Fire Sprinkler Design Technology Certificate (6351)
- Drafting and Design Technology, Building Construction Specialization, A.S. (2135)
- Drafting and Design Technology, Surveying/GIS Specialization, A.S. (2136)

Health Information and Informatics Management
- Health Informatics Specialist Certificate (6343)
- Medical Coding and Billing Specialist Certificate (6352)
- Health Information Technology, A.S. (2159)

Healthcare
- Dental Assisting PSAV Certificate (5001)
- Dental Hygiene, A.S. (2101)
- Emergency Medical Technician Certificate (B312)
- Paramedic Certificate (6309)
- Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Technology, A.S. (2104)
- Nursing (R.N.), A.S. (2103)
- Health Profession to Registered Nursing (R.N.), A.S. (2164)
- Pharmacy Technician, PSAV Certificate (5022)
- Radiologic Technology, A.S. (2149)
- Sonography Certificate (4002)
- Respiratory Care, A.S. (2106)
- Surgical Technology Specialist Certificate (6355)
- Health Science - Surgical Technology Specialist, A.S. (2161)
- Nurse Assistant, Long Term Care PSAV Certificate (5024)
- Critical Care Transport for Emergency Medical Services Certificate (4006)
- Critical Care Transport for Nursing Certificate (4004)
- Critical Care Transport for Respiratory Care Certificate (4005)
- Central Sterile Processing Technologist Certificate (6360)
- Endoscopy Technician Certificate (6361)
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Tallahassee Community College Facts at a Glance

Did you know Tallahassee Community College...?

- is #1 among two-year colleges in the U.S. for Associate in Arts degrees awarded.
- is #5 among two-year colleges in the U.S. for associate degrees awarded to African-American students.
- is the #1 transfer school to Florida State University.
- offers guaranteed admission to FSU for students who earn an A.A. degree at TCC and meet all transfer requirements.
- is the 13th largest school in the Florida College System.
- offers traditional and online classes and small class sizes with an average ratio of 1 instructor to 25 students.
- is one of the 15 Achieve the Dream Leader Colleges that received a Wal-Mart PRESS grant in 2012.

Unduplicated Annual Headcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>19,701</td>
<td>16,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>20,268</td>
<td>15,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>20,753</td>
<td>18,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>21,243</td>
<td>15,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>20,573</td>
<td>17,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes students taking courses at TCC during the summer, fall and spring terms. Students who take courses in multiple terms are counted once.
**FIRST TIME IN COLLEGE (FTIC) RETENTION RATE**

- **Fall 2008**
  - Fall to Spring: 83.1%
  - Fall to Fall: 58.6%

- **Fall 2009**
  - Fall to Spring: 83.6%
  - Fall to Fall: 55.7%

- **Fall 2010**
  - Fall to Spring: 82.3%
  - Fall to Fall: 56.2%

- **Fall 2011**
  - Fall to Spring: 82.2%
  - Fall to Fall: 54.9%

- **Fall 2012**
  - Fall to Spring: 82.6%
  - Fall to Fall: 58%

**FIRST TIME IN COLLEGE (FTIC) GRADUATION RATE**

- **Within 2 Years**
  - Fall 2005: 13%
  - Fall 2006: 11%
  - Fall 2007: 14%
  - Fall 2008: 15%
  - Fall 2009: 13%

- **Within 3 Years**
  - Fall 2005: 31%
  - Fall 2006: 31%
  - Fall 2007: 35%
  - Fall 2008: 37%
  - Fall 2009: 33%

- **Within 4 Years**
  - Fall 2005: 40%
  - Fall 2006: 44%
  - Fall 2007: 42%
  - Fall 2008: 43%

*Fall 2009 4-year graduation rate not available*
ANNUAL AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA Degree</strong></td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>2,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS/AAS Degree</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificates</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fall 2013 Student Characteristics**

Data snapshot taken on census date for credit students.

**FALL UNDUPLICATED HEADCOUNT: 2009/2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit</strong></td>
<td>14,472</td>
<td>14,756</td>
<td>15,338</td>
<td>14,613</td>
<td>13,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Credit</strong></td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>6,420</td>
<td>4,748</td>
<td>5,836</td>
<td>6,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-credit updated on 1/10/2014

**RACE AND GENDER**
ATTENDANCE STATUS AND AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or Under</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 to 25</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 35</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 or Over</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEGREE OBJECTIVE

- 0.3% Not Reported
- 8.5% Non-Degree Seeking
- 1.4% Certificate Program
- 17.3% Associate in Science Degree
- 72.5% Associate in Arts Degree
RESIDENCY

Within District: 59.2%
Out-of-District (within State): 38.6%
Out-of-State: 1.5%
Out-of-Country: 0.7%

RESIDENCY WITHIN DISTRICT

81.3% Leon County
10.6% Gadsden County
8.1% Wakulla County
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Tallahassee Community College QEP Committees, Subcommittees and Implementation Pilot Faculty

**QEP Topic Selection Committee**
Barbara Sloan, *Provost And Vice President For Academic Affairs*
Julie Baroody, *CH Faculty And QEP Coordinator*
Gareth Euridge, *CH Faculty And Academic Compliance Writer*
Anthony Jones, *SM Faculty And Faculty Senate Chair*
Gloria Mitchell, *Assistant To The Dean, HCP And Staff Council Chair*
Lei Wang, *Associate VP For Institutional Effectiveness*
Marge Banocy-Payne, *Dean, Communications And Humanities*
Harriet Abrams, *Workforce Development*
Michelle Baragona, *Workforce Development*
Kim Allen, *Director Of Public Safety And Continuing Education*
Kevin Peddie, *DCS Analyst, IT*
Ashley Paul, *Learning Commons Specialist*
Tim Roberts, *Testing Center Coordinator*
Betty Jensen, *Counselor*
Wyntress Patterson, *Director, Student Judicial Affairs*
Catherine Huntress, *Assistant Financial Aide Director*
Joel Neeley, *Director Of Budget And Cost Analysis*
Matt Littlefield, *Communications Office*
Kristal Clemons, *HSS Faculty*
Shayn Lloyd, *HSS Faculty*
Ginny Wagner, *HCP Faculty*
Melissa Olson, *HCP Faculty*
Shelly Schmucker, *Library Faculty*
Gregg Stevens, *Library Faculty*
Dave Delrossi, *ASP Faculty*
Nancy Donovan, *ASP Faculty*
David Matthews, *SM Faculty*
Margaret Cooksey, *TPP Faculty*
Susanne Wood, *TPP Faculty*
Braze Brickwidell, *CH Faculty*
Lauren Fletcher, *Program Specialist, Adjunct*
Allison Burroughs, *Student*

**QEP Design Committee**
Barbara Sloan, *Provost And Vice President For Academic Affairs*
Julie Baroody, *CH Faculty And QEP Coordinator*
Gareth Euridge, *CH Faculty And Academic Compliance Writer*
Lei Wang, *Associate VP For Institutional Effectiveness*
Barbara Gill, *Director of Educational Research*
Matt Littlefield, *Communications Office*
Lauren Fletcher, *Program Specialist, Adjunct*
Karinda Barrett, *Director, Center For Teaching Learning And Leadership*
Joel Neeley, *Director Of Budget And Cost Analysis*
Bret Ingerman, *VP For Information Technology*
Debbie Robinson, *Director Of Library Services*
Anthony Jones, *Dean Science*
Gregg Stevens, *Library Faculty*
Martin Balinsky, *SM Faculty And Faculty Senate Chair-Elect*
Margaret Cooksey, *TPP Faculty*
Mona Hamilton, *TPP Faculty*
Julie Hanowell, *ASP Faculty*
Ellenar Harper, *ASP Faculty*
Jeff Liang, *HSS Faculty*
Steve Powers, *HSS Faculty*
Li Pon, *Career Services Counselor*
Matt Albrizio, *Center For Distance Learning, Student Services*
Bruce Batton, *Program Manager, Workforce Development*
Brandi Elliot, *Learning Commons Specialist*
Patricia Heeter, *Instructional Designer*
Kim Manning, *Instructional Technologist*
Meghan Martinez, *Counseling Specialist*

*HSS - History and Social Sciences*
*HCP - Healthcare Professions*
*ASP - Academic Support*
*TPP - Technology and Professional Programs*
*SM - Science/Mathematics*
*CH - Communications/Humanities*
*LIB - Library*
QEP Subcommittees

Implementation And Institutional Capability
Kim Manning, Instructional Technologist
Gareth Euridge, CH Faculty And Academic Compliance Writer
Debbie Robinson, Director Of Library Services
Martin Balinsky, SM Faculty And Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Kim Manning, Instructional Technologist
Karinda Barrett, Director, Center For Teaching Learning And Leadership
Lauren Fletcher, Program Specialist, Adjunct
Bret Ingerman, VP For Information Technology

Assessment
Margaret Cooksey, TPP Faculty
Mona Hamilton, TPP Faculty
Julie Hanowell, ASP Faculty
Lei Wang, Associate VP For Institutional Effectiveness
Barbara Gill, Director of Educational Research
Patricia Heeter, Instructional Designer

Marketing
Meghan Martinez, Counseling Specialist
Li Pon, Career Services Counselor
Matt Littlefield, Communications Office
Jeff Liang, HSS Faculty
Matt Albrizio, Center For Distance Learning, Student Services
Brandi Elliot, Learning Commons Specialist

Writing
Gregg Stevens, Library Faculty
Steve Powers, HSS Faculty
Patricia Heeter, Instructional Designer

QEP Pilot Volunteers
Greg Loyd (CH)
Gareth Euridge (CH)
David Proctor (HSS)
Melissa Soldani-Lemon (HSS)
Andrea Oliver (HSS)
Ginny Wagner (HCP)
Lindsey Smitherman-Brown (CH)
Maria Rodriguez-Cintron (CH)
Brenda Reid (CH)
Cathryn Meyer (CH)
Vera Mayes (LC AND ASP MATH)
Julie Hanowell (ASP MATH)
Randey Burnette (ASP MATH)
Michael Ray (ASP MATH)
Martin Balinsky (SCIENCE)
Ed Kimball (SCIENCE)
Matt Remer (LIB)
Tricia Elton (LIB)
Cicely Brantley (HSS)
Donna Massey (MATHEMATICS)
Carolann Gegenheimer (HCP)
Melissa Demelio (HCP)
Eric Lee (CH)
Ljiljana Edmiston (CH)
Kim Manning (TPP)
Brittny Wells (TPP)
Julie Baroody (CH)
## Appendix 5

Tallahassee Community College **QEP TOPIC SELECTION FOCUS GROUP MEETING DATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC FORUM</td>
<td>MARCH 20</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>WD105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEANS/DIRECTORS</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>CTLLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY – DIVISIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP-SLS</td>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>March 4</td>
<td>3 p.m.</td>
<td>CH227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>February 25</td>
<td>1:15-2:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH (Dental Hyg.)</td>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>3 p.m.</td>
<td>DH123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH (Ghazvini)</td>
<td>February 26</td>
<td>3 p.m.</td>
<td>CONF. RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>March 29</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>March 5</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SM260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPP</td>
<td>March 22</td>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>February 27</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNCILS (Students/Faculty)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOR, STEM, GLOBAL</td>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>SU BALLRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF COUNCIL</td>
<td>February 27</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY SENATE (Steering Comm.)</td>
<td>March 27</td>
<td>1:30ish</td>
<td>HSS CONF. RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.S.S.</td>
<td>March 21</td>
<td>1:30ish</td>
<td>SU198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.T.</td>
<td>February 20</td>
<td>3 p.m.</td>
<td>WD105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKFORCE</td>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tallahassee Community College QEP TOPIC SELECTION

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS:
Why are students here at TCC? What does student success mean?
What do students need to succeed?
What can Tallahassee Community College do to help students succeed?
What can TCC instructors do to help students succeed?
What can students do to be more successful?
What does TCC already do to support learning?
Top 3 reasons that students come back (finish what they started)
Top 3 reasons that students leave (don’t graduate or finish their program)
Why do students choose TCC?
What is “Quality” in education?

After collecting feedback across campus, the college will compile the data and sort it according to the following matrix and compare it to key performance indicators (KPI’s). Our topic will probably come out of area “A”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL (the College can affect)</th>
<th>SHORT-/MID-TERM (measureable)</th>
<th>LONG-TERM (harder to measure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 7

#### QEP TOPIC SELECTION CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BROAD TOPIC AREA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL THEMES RELATED TO LEARNING</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN</th>
<th>RELATED TO CAMPUS INITIATIVES</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL DATA</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDY SKILLS/ TIME MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Learning strategies, Time management specific to discipline, Work ethic (E.Q.), Motivation, Managing life and school, Learning how to learn (best practices by discipline), Addressing diverse learning styles, Test taking strategies, Reading and note taking strategies</td>
<td>Student Success (student achievement, Student Learning, student engagement), Demand Driven programs (data driven decisions, Forecasting emerging demand), Enrollment (cultivate opportunities), Partnerships (education)</td>
<td>2005 QEP SLS redesign/ requirement Learning Commons Achieving the Dream (interventions) Title III (support services)</td>
<td>SENSE 2012 Fact Book FCS:KPI Summary (goal 3) NCCBP (forms 7, 8, 12) Course redesign data Learning Commons data Early redesign data</td>
<td>Addressed by ongoing initiatives and overlaps with “Support of Teaching and Learning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT EXPECTATIONS IN THE CLASSROOM</td>
<td>Clear learning goals and objectives, Consistent consequences focused on developing excellence, Clear academic standards w/in discipline areas, curricular connections and relevancies, Improved critical reading, research, writing, thinking</td>
<td>Student Success (student achievement, student learning, student engagement), Talent (culture)</td>
<td>2005 QEP Critical Thinking Course learning outcomes</td>
<td>SENSE 2012 Fact Book 2009 CSSEE NCCBP (forms 7, 8) HSSE data</td>
<td>Addressed by ongoing initiatives and overlaps with “Engaged Teaching/ Learning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGED TEACHING/ LEARNING</td>
<td>Active hands-on learning, Learning and studying with others, Use of rubrics in student self-monitoring, Improved communication skills, Promoting engaged connection to faculty, Independent engaged learning</td>
<td>Student Success (student achievement, student learning, student engagement), Talent (culture)</td>
<td>2005 QEP (Student engagement)</td>
<td>2012 Fact Book SENSE NCCBP (form 12) 2009 CSSEE</td>
<td>Addressed by ongoing initiatives and overlaps with “Great Expectations”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION LITERACY</td>
<td>Locate, gather, evaluate and use information analytically and effectively, Creative and systematic approach to Info. Lit., Readiness for success across the curriculum, Fosters lifelong learning and problem solving</td>
<td>Student Success (student achievement, student learning, student engagement), Demand Driven programs (data driven decisions)</td>
<td>General education core requirement (SACS) Ongoing library/gen. ed initiative</td>
<td>2012 TCC Fact Book NCCBP (form 7, 8)</td>
<td>Addressed by ongoing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGITAL LITERACY</td>
<td>Integrate technology into the curriculum, Technology readiness across the curriculum (for students and faculty), Faculty as front-line tech help within discipline, Faculty with state-of-the-art tech skills, Tech literacy for classroom, studying, support, Contextual learning, Advising</td>
<td>Student Success (student achievement, student learning, student engagement), Demand Driven programs (data driven decisions), Technology (flexible models)</td>
<td>ECAR 2012 2012 TCC Fact Book CGS1060 exemption data (IC3 Fast Track) Smarter Measure Center for Distance Learning data</td>
<td>2012 TCC Fact Book</td>
<td>Not addressed by other initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXTUAL LEARNING</td>
<td>Life/workplace relevance readiness, focus on practical skills, Case-based collaborative learning experiences, Developing a “portfolio” of skills, understanding curricular relationships (programs/majors)</td>
<td>Student Success (student achievement, student learning, student engagement), Demand Driven programs (data driven decisions, forecasting emerging demand), Enrollment (cultivate opportunities), Partnerships (business &amp; community)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult to measure and overlaps somewhat with the themes in digital literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING</td>
<td>Academic goal-setting, Motivation, Self-monitoring, Academic/career connections and relevancies, Retention/completion, Measurable margin of success for students with realistic goals, Awareness of choices</td>
<td>Student Access (advising, multiple pathways), Student Success (student achievement, student learning, student engagement), Enrollment (cultivate opportunities), Partnerships (education)</td>
<td>2005 QEP (Advising Model), Achieving the Dream Strategic Enrollment Management</td>
<td>2009 CSSEE SENSE</td>
<td>Addressed by ongoing initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT FOR LEARNING</td>
<td>Individual faculty support specific to course, Practical use of office hours as resource, ID key areas of difficulty within each course and design intervention, Faculty knowledgeable of all campus support, Faculty as role model/mentor</td>
<td>Student Success (student achievement, student learning, student engagement), Talent (culture), Communication/Marketing (internal communication), Enrollment (cultivate opportunities)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCS:KPI Summary (goal 3) NCCBP (form 6A) 2009 CSSEE SENSE Learning Commons data MAT1033 use of online resources</td>
<td>Addressed by ongoing initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QEP Digital FOCUS IMPLEMENTATION MEETINGS PROGRAM AREA MEETING DATES AND TIMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Meeting Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASP (College Success/Dev. English/Dev. Reading)</td>
<td>March 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP (Dev. Math)</td>
<td>March 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH (Communications/Speech/Forensics)</td>
<td>February 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH (Humanities, Foreign Lang., Arts)</td>
<td>March 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS (History)</td>
<td>February 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS (Social Sciences, Behavioral Sciences, etc.)</td>
<td>March 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM (Science/Math/Statistics Programs)</td>
<td>March 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP (Main Campus Programs)</td>
<td>March 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP (Ghazvini Center Programs)</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPP (Computer Technology Programs)</td>
<td>March 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPP (Professional Programs)</td>
<td>April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB (Library Faculty)</td>
<td>March 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING COMMONS</td>
<td>March 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AGENDA FOR MEETINGS

- Short interactive survey re: Digital Literacy in Disciples
- Short review of QEP research/best practices in digital literacy
- Discussion re: implementation and Assessment in Classrooms
- Volunteers for pilot program
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QEP Coordinator Position Description

Responsibilities and Duties
• Facilitate and oversee the implementation of TCC’s QEP
• Revise the QEP as needed during implementation based on formative assessment data
• Produce annual impact reports for five years, culminating in the Fifth Year Interim QEP Report according to the SACS/COC guidelines
• Facilitate recruitment of implementing faculty
• Organize Implementation Workshops for cohorts of implementing faculty, updating related materials as needed
• Meet with each faculty cohort during the first semester of implementation
• Administer the QEP Budget
• Facilitate the administration of digital literacy diagnostic assessments
• With the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, monitor, evaluate and share the data emerging from implementation of the QEP
• Facilitate the collection and communication of TCC Digital FOCUS Best Practices and digital literacy assignments across disciplines
• Communicate support opportunities for students and faculty related to Digital FOCUS assignments
• Assemble, coordinate and lead the QEP Committee
• Supervise OPS Support
• Promote campus awareness of QEP Digital FOCUS
• Bring digital literacy and QEP issues to the appropriate College standing committees
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QEP Faculty Implementation Workshop
Presenter Summer 2014

DR. MICHAEL NEAL
Associate Professor Florida State University
Ph.D. University of Louisville (2001)
M.A. Ball State University (1994)
B.A. Taylor University (1993)

Neal’s research interests include writing assessment, digital composing technologies, and issues surrounding multi-media authorship. Neal teaches a variety of courses including graduate courses in composition theory, research methods in composition, visual rhetoric, and digital convergence culture as well as undergraduate courses in composition, visual rhetoric, and article and essay writing. In his work with the Center for Everyday Writing, Neal oversees the FSU Card Archive http://english3.fsu.edu/mnealomeka/, a physical and digital space that houses postcards and stereocards for research on visual rhetoric, multi-modality, historical identity construction, text circulation, etc. He has assisted in the development of the Editing, Writing, and Media major track, serves on the College Board AP Language committee, directed first-year composition, served as an ePortfolio faculty fellow, and delivered workshops and consultations on electronic portfolios, digital writing assessment, and writing across the curriculum. His current writing projects include articles/chapters on digital writing assessments, intellectual property in the digital age, and digital archiving.

Digital Literacy Keynote Speaker
TCC Welcome Back, Fall 2014

DR. JAMES MAY
Professor of English as Second Language/EAP Chair
Valencia College

Dr. James S. May teaches English as a Second Language for Academic Purposes on Valencia’s east campus. In November, he was named Florida’s Professor of the Year for colleges and universities as part of the Carnegie foundation’s U.S. Professors of the Year competition. Click here to watch the video spot of James in action. In October, James was also awarded the Association of Florida Colleges’ “Excellence in Technology” award for his presentation of “Digital, On-Demand Learning.” James got his start in the field of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) in the mid 90’s as a linguist for the U.S. Army, and has been working in digitally hybrid worlds ever since. James loves taking high tech ideas and adapting them into teaching tricks for the classroom and for various digital learning environments. He also shares these tricks through his TeacherTricks.org video blog.
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Quality Enhancement Plan Digital FOCUS: Find, Operate, Create, Utilize and Share

PILOT WORKSHOP AGENDA Session A
Thursday, May 29  8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.  Library 265

Session A Participants
David Proctor, Greg Loyd, Andrea Oliver, Ginny Wagner, Cathryn Meyer, Randey Burnette, Michael Ray, Matt Remer, Julie Hanowell, Melissa Damelio
Guests: Kim Manning, Karinda Barrett, Shelly Schmucker, Deborah Robinson

Session B Participants
Gareth Euridge, Lindsey Smitherman-Brown, Maria Rodriguez-Cintron, Brenda Reid, Martin Balinsky, Tricia Elton, Donna Massey, Carolann Gegenheimer, Eric Lee, Vera Mayes, Ed Kimball, Cicely Brantley, Kim Manning, Melissa Soldani-Lemon
Guests: Patricia Heeter, Margaret Cooksey

WORKSHOP LEARNING OUTCOMES
• Examine and evaluate a variety of digital tools in the classroom in order to build knowledge and skills related to digital tools.
• Create or modify discipline-specific assignments to accommodate the QEP Digital FOCUS Student Learning Outcomes.
• Use the QEP Digital FOCUS Common Assessment Rubric to assess discipline-specific assignments with consistency.
• Develop a list of next-steps and identify the resources necessary for fully developing course assignments

AGENDA
8:30 - 9 a.m.  Arrive, Settle-in, Coffee, ETC.
9 - 9:15 a.m.  Introductions and Workshop Overview
9:15 - 10:15 a.m. Presentation and Discussion: Digital Assignment/Project Development

10 - 10:15 a.m.  Break

10:15 - 11:45 a.m. Small Groups – Share Sample Assignments for Modification –

11:45 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. Lunch

12:30 - 1:15 p.m. Introduce Rubric and Example Assignment
1:15 - 2 p.m. Example Assignment for Norming

2 - 2:15 p.m.  Break

2:15 - 3:15 p.m. Small Groups – Assignment Modification to include Digital Literacy
3:15 - 4 p.m. Share “Best Of” from each Small Group
4 - 4:30 p.m. Next Steps
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Faculty Implementation Workshop Engagement Survey

1. Advance information provided a realistic description of workshop.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

2. The goals of the workshop were clearly stated.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

3. The workshop reflected careful planning and organization.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

4. The presenters were well prepared.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

5. Adequate time was allowed for participants to reflect on and relate material to their experience and needs.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

6. Participants’ questions and concerns were addressed effectively.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

7. The workshop helped me to be able to create appropriate digital literacy assignments for my courses.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

8. The digital literacy student learning outcomes and rubric are clear and applicable to my digital literacy assignments.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

9. The varied experiences of the participants were resources for learning.
   Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
   Comments:

10. I know where to find the support and resources I need to deploy digital literacy assignments in my classes.
    Disagree          Not Sure          Agree          Strongly Agree
    Comments: