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I. Executive Summary

CONNECT! Campus and Community: ASU’s Plan to Enhance Learning through Community Engagement (CONNECT!) is Angelo State University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for 2013 submission to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. This initiative reinforces the university’s commitment to higher learning and community engagement by CONNECTING the students, faculty, and staff on our campus with local, regional, national, and global communities to enhance student learning and better serve those communities.

CONNECT! aligns with ASU’s Mission Statement, which says, “In a learning-centered environment distinguished by its integration of teaching, research, creative endeavor, service, and co-curricular experiences, ASU prepares students to be responsible citizens [emphasis added] and to have productive careers.” Research conducted for this initiative indicates that the student learning focus of CONNECT! should be Social Responsibility, which is also one of the Core Objectives of the new Texas Core Curriculum. Social Responsibility is “to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in the regional, national, and global communities.” (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2012)

CONNECT! proposes to address Social Responsibility through three high-impact pedagogical CONNECTIONS: a) service-learning, b) internships and other community-based practica, and c) community-based research. As faculty members in all of the undergraduate colleges use these and other related pedagogies, co-curricular units across campus will reinforce student learning by offering additional community engagement activities. Therefore, the CONNECT! focus statement is as follows.

CONNECT! Focus Statement:
CONNECTED students become socially responsible citizens!
Angelo State University

Founded in 1928 as a junior college, Angelo State University (enrollment 6,888), a member of The Texas Tech University System, has a long and distinguished history of service to San Angelo, Texas (pop. 93,000), and the surrounding region known as the Concho Valley. The institution's growth and success are dependent on a strong and vibrant San Angelo and Concho Valley. A strong and vibrant San Angelo and Concho Valley depend on a university that produces graduates who can \textit{CONNECT!} with and meet the challenges of a dynamic, diverse, and global community.

In recent years, ASU’s student body has become more diverse. In 2009, ASU was designated a \textbf{Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI)}. Research indicates that community-engaged pedagogies and activities have a positive impact on all students and an even greater impact on Hispanic students.

Through the years, reciprocal partnerships between ASU and the community have developed and prospered. Some involved students. Some did not. Those that did involve students were usually associated with particular programs of study and not widely accessible to the student population as a whole. As ASU draws closer to its centennial celebration, \textit{CONNECT!}, with its emphasis on student learning, will serve as a focal point for ASU’s broader and strategic community engagement initiative. By focusing our community engagement resources on student learning, the enterprise most central to ASU’s mission, these mutually beneficial partnerships will expand and blossom. Most importantly, these partnerships will better enable ASU to prepare students of all backgrounds to be responsible citizens in San Angelo, the Concho Valley, and beyond.

\textit{CONNECT!} will be administered in the newly established Center for Community Engagement. The Center will assist faculty in developing courses that incorporate the curricular, pedagogical, and assessment strategies necessary for students to demonstrate their relative achievement of the stated learning goal. The Center will also interact with relevant co-curricular units and community partners to coordinate appropriate sites and activities as well as coordinate contracts, memoranda of understanding, etc. Additionally, the Center will assist faculty in the production of community engagement scholarship for publication and/or presentation. The Center will track and evaluate all of these activities, but the direct measurement of student learning will be emphasized.
II. Process Used to Develop the QEP

FIGURE 2.1: THE QEP Development Process

Phase 1: Planning and Topic Selection

A. Preliminary Planning

In January 2010, the QEP Action Committee (See Appendix A for committee charge and roster) was formed. The committee was charged with submitting recommendations to the Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs regarding appropriate actions for successful QEP development. The committee submitted recommendations (QEP Action Committee Report, March 26, 2010) that included the following:

Committee Recommendation #3- The QEP Development Director should be appointed by the Provost per the following guidelines:

- The Provost/VPAA will post a Call for Nominations by April 1, 2010, in which current faculty members are encouraged to nominate qualified colleagues.
- A sub-committee of the current QEP Action Committee will draft the Call for Nominations to be approved by the Provost/VPAA, vet nominees, and nominate no more than three finalists to the Provost for his consideration.
- The Call for Nominations will include information related to the term of office, compensation, duties and expectations, and other items necessary to communicate the critical nature of this appointment.
Committee Recommendation #6: A QEP Development Committee must be established to work with the Director as part of the planning process. This committee will need to be compromised of at least one faculty member from each college, a college dean, a representative from the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and Student Senate, and at least two additional staff representatives from key support departments. Also, at least one community member needs to be on the QEP Development Committee to ensure appropriate community involvement throughout the QEP process.

Per these recommendations, Dr. Doyle Carter, Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Kinesiology, was appointed to the 0.5 FTE position of QEP Director on June 1, 2010. Dr. Carter stepped down as department head but continued his 0.5 teaching load. During the summer of 2010, the QEP Development Committee (QEPDC) was formed and began planning QEP development activities for the time period leading to the reaffirmation on-site visit in 2013 (See Appendix B for the QEPDC and other rosters).

B. Topic Selection

Concurrent with the beginning of the 2010 fall semester, the QEPDC initiated a three-step process for topic selection (See FIGURE 2.2). This process allowed the university to begin broadly, to systematically narrow the QEP focus, and to select an appropriate QEP topic by the end of the 2011 spring semester.

FIGURE 2.2: Narrowing the QEP Focus

Step 1: What’s Your BIG Idea? The first step of the QEP topic selection process was to conduct the What’s Your BIG Idea? campaign and needs assessment that was intended to achieve two broad goals:
- Inform the campus and community about the QEP and solicit their input; and
- Identify the learning needs of ASU students.

Step 2. BIG Ideas about ASU’s QEP
- Report the results of the needs assessment
- Call for Topic Proposals

Step 3. The BIG Idea
- Evaluate the proposals
- Select & announce the topic

August – November, 2010
November, 2010
December, 2010 – May, 2011
The campaign began during the days just prior to the start of the 2010 fall semester. Additionally, the QEP website (www.angelo.edu/qep) was created and the QEP Director made a brief informational presentation during faculty meetings of each respective college. At the conclusion of these presentations, each faculty member was given a paper version of the “What’s your BIG Idea?” survey and was asked to write a response to two broad questions:

1. What should ASU graduates know?
2. What should ASU graduates be able to do?

This same format was used to inform and solicit input from numerous staff, student, and community groups. Additionally, an electronic version of the survey was distributed to all faculty, staff, students, and ASU Alumni Association members. Informational meetings and the survey were supported by email and RamPort (campus portal) announcements, Ram Page (student newspaper) articles, banners, table tents, and lapel pins. A total of 1,459 surveys were returned.

Qualitative survey analysis indicated responses to the two questions did not vary significantly. After incomplete and illegible responses were culled, 977 responses were usable. Responses were sorted into meaningful, discrete categories by a participant’s first response if he/she provided multiple responses. Results are reported in **TABLE 2.1**.

**TABLE 2.1: Results of the What’s your BIG Idea? Survey** *(Bold, italicized font indicates an association with Social Responsibility.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Responses by Respondents</th>
<th>Students (n=480)</th>
<th>Faculty, Deans, Dept.Hds. (n=255)</th>
<th>Staff, Admin. (n=120)</th>
<th>Community (n=122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apply learning to future endeavors</strong></td>
<td>202 (42%)</td>
<td>26 (10%)</td>
<td>29 (24%)</td>
<td>32 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral and written communication</strong></td>
<td>34 (7%)</td>
<td>33 (13%)</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribute to community/society, leadership &amp; intercultural skills</strong></td>
<td>24 (5%)</td>
<td>28 (11%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning in core curriculum &amp; academic major</strong></td>
<td>96 (20%)</td>
<td>59 (23%)</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
<td>25 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical/creative thinking and problem solving</strong></td>
<td>24 (5%)</td>
<td>69 (27%)</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding and using resources and technology</strong></td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>17 (7%)</td>
<td>18 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifelong learning, personal growth/skills</strong></td>
<td>91 (19%)</td>
<td>23 (9%)</td>
<td>29 (24%)</td>
<td>15 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four community focus groups were also interviewed to ascertain their perceptions of the leaning needs of ASU graduates. Individuals were grouped according to their occupation and/or relationship to ASU. The four focus groups were composed of: 1) alumni and friends, 2) government partners, 3) education partners, and 4) business and industry. The qualitative analysis of their input yielded two major themes. Community members are interested in ASU graduates who demonstrate: 1) professionalism and 2) the ability to apply learning to the “real world.” The two major themes that emerged from the focus groups are reported in TABLE 2.2.

TABLE 2.2: Results of the Community Focus Groups (Bold, italicized font indicates an association with Social Responsibility.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communication skills: interpersonal, verbal, written, technical, and interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional behavior: manners, loyalty, dress, office decorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal/career management: self-discipline, knowledge of professional expectations, management skills, career options/goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2: Apply learning to the “real world”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Practical knowledge/skills (specific to career)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem solving/critical reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge of the “real world” from interacting with professionals and clients in classroom and community while in college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concurrent to the information campaign, survey and focus group interviews, members of the QEPDC began to review the literature. The preliminary review yielded some significant findings. Immediately prior to and during the first decade of the twenty-first century, educators and others interested in higher education had begun to consider the kinds of learning that would be needed by college graduates of the twenty-first century. The Essential Learning Outcomes (AAC&U, 2007), which serves as the basis of the new Texas Core Curriculum, approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in 2011, were of significant interest. The new Texas Core will be implemented in 2014 at ASU and all public two- and four-year institutions. Both the Essential Learning Outcomes and the Texas Core Curriculum are described in more detail in Section V: Literature Review and Best Practices. Both are highlighted in TABLE 2.3 to demonstrate their similarities.
TABLE 2.3: Significant Findings from the Preliminary Review of Literature

Also as part of the needs assessment, institution-level direct and indirect measures of student learning were analyzed. ASU means for direct measures of student learning were found to be consistently at or below national means, but no one area (verbal, quantitative, reading, writing, critical thinking) was consistently lower than the other areas measured on these tests. While these results are less than desirable, no singular student learning need was established from an analysis of these data. Indirect measures of student learning indicated that ASU student means were significantly below national means in twelve areas. Please see TABLES 2.4A and 2.4B for a summary of institution-level student learning.

TABLE 2.4A: Mean Comparisons: Institution-Level Direct Measures of Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Measures of Student Learning (Institution-Level)</th>
<th>ASU Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT English</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Math</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Verbal</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Mathematics</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPP Critical Thinking</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>111.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPP Reading</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>118.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPP Writing</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>114.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPP Mathematics</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>113.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAT Verbal</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAT Quantitative</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAT Analytical Writing</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE Verbal</td>
<td>426.2</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE Quantitative</td>
<td>513.0</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE Analytical Writing</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ASU Office of Institutional Research and Accountability

ACT and SAT scores = First-time, Degree-Seeking Mean (Fall, 2009); MAPP scores = Juniors (2007); GMAT and GRE scores = ASU students seeking admission to ASU graduate school (September, 2006-August, 2010)
TABLE 2.4B: 2009 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Indicators in which ASU means were significantly lower than national means (*Bold, italicized* font indicates an association with Social Responsibility.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Notes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Worked on a project that required integrated ideas or information from various sources (SR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Included diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments (FY, SR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Used email to communicate with instructor (SR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information or experiences into new more complex interpretations and relationships (FY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages (FY, SR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of written papers or reports of &lt;5 pages (FY, SR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of problem sets that take &lt;1 hour to complete (FY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his/her perspective (FY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Foreign language course work (FY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project/thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.) (SR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Acquired broad general education (FY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Voting in local, state, or national elections (FY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY = First-Year Students; SR = Seniors

Source: ASU Office of Institutional Research and Accountability

Step 2: **BIG Ideas about ASU’s QEP.** The second step of the QEP topic selection process, **BIG Ideas about ASU’s QEP,** was intended to achieve two goals:

- Report the results of the needs assessment to the campus and community; and
- Issue a Call for QEP Topic Proposals to faculty-led teams.

By early November 2010, the QEPDC completed the analysis of the results of the survey, focus groups, preliminary review of literature, and preliminary institutional data assessment. These were then compiled into reports and published on the QEP website. Additionally, the QEP Director presented the results at two “town-hall” style meetings on November 9, 2010. Local media covered the afternoon town-hall meeting, resulting in articles published by the local and campus newspapers and stories on local television news broadcast. The PowerPoint presentation used to facilitate these town-hall meetings was also published on the QEP website.

During the town-hall meetings and through other media, the QEPDC issued a Call for QEP Topic Proposals. Included in the call for proposals was information regarding eligibility, format, deadlines, incentives, and evaluation procedures for the proposals. Faculty-led teams of three to four individuals, including at least one staff member and one student, were asked to submit abstracts by December 3, 2010. Abstracts approved for further development were due on March 4, 2011.
Step 3: *The BIG Idea*. The third step of the QEP topic selection process, *The BIG Idea*, was intended to achieve two goals:

- Evaluate the QEP topic proposals submitted by faculty-led teams; and
- Select and announce the topic for ASU’s QEP.

In the two weeks that followed the town hall meetings, the QEP director conducted four “QEP Topic Proposal Q&A’s.” Through various media, campus and community members were invited to attend these sessions to learn more about the QEP and the topic proposal process.

Six QEP Topic Proposal Abstracts were submitted by the December 3, 2010, deadline. These proposals were immediately made available electronically to the members of the QEP Topic Proposal Review Subcommittee (See Appendix B) for review and evaluation. The subcommittee met on December 10, 2010, and approved five of the abstracts for further development. The subcommittee saw merit in each of the approved abstracts and decided to retain the option of recommending a topic that included aspects of one or more of the full proposals submitted by the deadline.

While the faculty-led teams were developing their respective proposals for submission, the QEP Topic Proposal Review Subcommittee began to focus its research on topics represented in these proposal abstracts. Initially, these five abstracts were placed into the following four categories given that two proposals were similar:

- Academic and career advising,
- Active learning,
- Community-based learning, and
- Problem-solving.

As the subcommittee’s research progressed, an overlap in the literature on active learning and community-based learning became evident. Of particular interest was the significant body of literature published by the Association of American College and Universities (AAC&U) regarding the “LEAP Project,” which was also cited in some of the approved abstracts. This is of particular significance given that the Texas Core Curriculum has been revised and aligns with LEAP concepts, particularly, the *Essential Learning Outcomes* (AAC&U).

Five QEP Topic Proposals were submitted by the March 4, 2011, deadline. These proposals were immediately made available electronically to the members of the QEP Topic Proposal Review Subcommittee for review and evaluation. The subcommittee met on March 23, 2011, to discuss their individual evaluations and formulate a decision and recommendation. The subcommittee unanimously...
recommended Community-Engaged Active Learning as the topic for ASU’s QEP. This recommendation, which constitutes a synthesis of two proposals, was submitted to and unanimously approved by the full QEP Development Committee on April 6, 2011, and the Reaffirmation Leadership Team (President, Provost, SACS Liaison, and Faculty Representative) on April 11, 2011.

On May 4, 2011, approximately nine months after the topic selection process was initiated, the QEP topic, Community-Engaged Active Learning, was announced to the campus and community as ASU’s BIG Idea. The entire campus and community was invited to the announcement/celebration. Media coverage resulted in an article published in the local newspaper and a story broadcast on the local television news program.

Phase 2: Research and Development

Phase 2 began in June 2011. A subcommittee of the QEPDC was formed to begin the process of researching and developing a QEP based on the selected topic. The work of the subcommittee was organized around five interrelated themes: a) continuation of the literature review, b) interaction with a benchmark university, c) other research activities, d) refining the QEP focus, and e) drafting and vetting the QEP document.

A. Continuation of Literature Review

The subcommittee continued the literature review process that began during Phase 1. The literature review focused on four research themes:

1. National Context
2. Institutional Context
4. Best Practices: Infrastructure Supporting Desired Student Learning

B. Interaction with Benchmark University

As part of the research conducted to select a QEP topic, several previously submitted QEP’s were reviewed. In doing so, researchers noted that several institutions had developed relationships with another institution that was implementing a similar QEP. Therefore, the University of North Florida (UNF) was identified as having a QEP of similar topic and scope to ours. Further investigation led us to conclude that UNF could serve as our benchmark university. UNF has an extensive history of and places a high value on community engagement. This is evidenced by its commitment of significant resources to a spectrum of community engagement activities, their QEP topic: Community-Based Transformational Learning, their achievement of the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement, and most importantly the administrative advocacy and support necessary for such an initiative.

Dr. Mark Falbo, Director of the Center for Community-Based Learning/QEP Director at UNF, was contacted. Two members of the QEPDC visited the UNF campus in June 2011. Meetings were arranged with senior administrators, deans, directors, and others. The visit yielded practical advice, relevant programming information, and promotional planning materials.
In July 2011, a video-conference was conducted that included members of the ASU QEP Research and Development Subcommittee and UNF personnel. In December 2011, at the SACSCOC Annual Meeting, several ASU and UNF personnel met for dinner so that more personal interaction could take place.

C. Other Research Activities

Numerous other research activities took place during Phase 2 and are highlighted below.

1. QEP Q&A’s
The QEP Director conducted “QEP Q&A’s” with academic departments and other campus groups during fall 2011. In spring and summer 2012, these Q&A’s were expanded to include community groups. Participants were encouraged to provide input into the QEP.

2. Conference Attendance
The QEP Director and others involved in the QEP attended several relevant conferences. These included:
   - SACSCOC Summer Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation, Ft. Worth, TX, July 2011
   - SACSCOC Annual Meeting, Orlando, FL, December 2011
   - Texas A&M University Assessment Conference, College Station, TX, February 2012
   - SACSCOC Summer Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation, Atlanta, GA, July/August, 2012

3. Phone Conversations with Accreditation Experts and Practitioners
The QEP Director conversed by phone with experts and practitioners to discuss broad and/or specific topics related to the QEP.
   - Dr. Tara Newman, Director, Office of High Impact Practices, Stephen F. Austin State University, July 29, 2011
   - Dr. Valerie Paton, Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment, Texas Tech University, August 23, 2011
   - Ms. Irene Arellano, Service Learning Coordinator, Texas Tech University, October 4, 2011

4. Expert and Practitioner Visits to ASU
Individuals with a distinguished history of SACSCOC service and service-learning practitioners were asked to provide input regarding ASU’s QEP as a component of their visit to ASU.
   - Dr. Valerie Paton, Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment, Texas Tech University, September 15-16, 2011
   - Dr. Gerry Dizinno, Associate Professor, The University of Texas at San Antonio, September 26, 2011
   - Dr. Tim Hudson, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Texas Tech University System, September 29, 2011
   - Dr. Mark Smith, SACSCOC Vice President, January 17-19, 2012
   - Dr. Tara Newman, Director, Office of High Impact Practices, Stephen F. Austin State University, March 5, 2012
   - Dr. Micah Logan, Assistant Director, Instructional and Professional Development, Texas Tech University’s Teaching, Learning and Professional Development Center, July 11, 2012
 Ms. Irene Arellano, Service Learning Coordinator, Texas Tech University’s Teaching, Learning, and Professional Development Center, July 11, 2012

5. **Institutional Involvement in State Core Curriculum Revision and in the LEAP Texas Initiative**
   - Dr. Jeffrey Schonberg, Associate Professor of English at ASU, serves as a member of the Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee (UEAC). This committee is responsible for formulating the recommendation to revise the state’s core curriculum, which was adopted by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in October, 2011. Dr. Schonberg is keeping the campus informed regarding the UEAC and THECB discussion regarding implementation of the new core curriculum, which includes competencies associated with ASU’s QEP.
   - Dr. Doyle Carter, Professor of Kinesiology and Director of the QEP serves as ASU’s representative to the LEAP Texas Initiative, which is working with AAC&U to determine appropriate strategies for implementing the revised core curriculum in Texas.

6. **E-portfolio Action Committee**
The QEP Director chaired an ad hoc committee (See Appendix B for roster) to investigate the possibility of using e-portfolio technology for QEP-related and other student learning functions. Video-conference demonstrations were conducted with vendors or conducted by ASU e-learning personnel. The QEP Director also met with vendors at SACSCOC Annual Meeting in December, 2011.
   - Taskstream e-portfolio demonstration, October 5, 2011 (Vendor)
   - Blackboard e-portfolio demonstration, October 25, 2011 (ASU e-learning)
   - TK20 e-portfolio demonstration, October 27, 2011 (Vendor)
   - Blackboard e-portfolio demonstration, November 28, 2011 (Vendor)
   - Blackboard e-portfolio demonstration, February 6, 2012 (Vendor)

D. Refining the QEP Focus

When the QEP topic was announced to the campus in May 2011, three possible student learning goals (*Personal Responsibility, Social Responsibility, and Integrated and Applied Learning*) were included in the presentation. Research conducted by the QEP Development Committee and the faculty-led teams that submitted the top proposals indicated that elements of all three had been established as distinct student learning needs and/or institutional needs. However, as research continued during the summer, the Research and Development Subcommittee questioned the potentially negative effects that retaining all three learning goals would have on the scope of the QEP and the institution’s capacity to successfully implement and assess a QEP of that scope. *Personal Responsibility* and *Social Responsibility* each have multiple components, and each component has multiple indicators. Among the three goals, approximately 25 indicators would have to be assessed to accurately measure student learning associated with all three goals. The subcommittee decided to include all three in the first draft of the QEP document, but retain the option of reducing the number of learning goals at a later date to allow time for additional student learning assessment to take place and for a more informed decision.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was administered in the spring of 2011 according to the institution’s biennial schedule. The number of engagement indicators in which ASU mean responses
were below the national average grew from twelve in 2009 (See TABLE 2.4B, p. 8 of this document) to thirty-one in 2011 (See TABLE 2.5).

**TABLE 2.5: 2011 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Indictors in which ASU means were significantly lower than national means** (*Bold, italicized* font indicates an association with *Social Responsibility*.)  Source: ASU Office of Institutional Research and Accountability

ASU means for NSSE were significantly lower than national means in the following thirty-one areas:

1. Made a class presentation (FY)
2. Worked on a project that required integrated ideas or information from various sources (FY, SR)
3. **Included diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments (FY)**
4. Come to class without completing readings or assignments (FY)
5. Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (SR)
6. Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussion (FY, SR)
7. Used an electronic medium to discuss or complete an assignment (FY)
8. Used email to communicate with instructor (SR)
9. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (FY)
10. **Analyzing basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components (FY, SR)**
11. **Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information or experiences into new, complex interpretations and relationships (FY, SR)**
12. Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course reading (FY, SR)
13. Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages (FY, SR)
14. Number of written papers or reports of <5 pages (FY, SR)
15. **Attended an art exhibit, play, dance, music, theatre other performance (FY)**
16. **Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue (FY, SR)**
17. **Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his/her perspective (FY, SR)**
18. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or topic (FY)
19. **Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment (SR)**
20. Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together
21. **Foreign language course work (FY)**
22. Independent study or self-designed major (FY, SR)
23. Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project/thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.) (SR)
24. Time used to prepare for class (FY, SR)
25. Working for pay on campus (SR)
26. Thinking critically and analytically (SR)
27. **Working effectively with others (SR)**
28. Learning effectively on your own (FY)
29. **Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds (SR)**
30. **Solving complex real-world problems (FY)**
31. **Developing a personal code of values and ethics (FY)**

FY = First-Year Students; SR = Seniors
In February 2012, the first draft of the QEP document was submitted to Dr. Tara Newman, who served as a consultant to ASU’s QEP development process. When Dr. Newman visited campus on March 5, 2012, she recommended that ASU reduce the number of student learning goals, citing the same rationale that guided the subcommittee’s discussion the previous summer. Through discussions on that day and over the next few weeks that included an analysis of student learning data collected in the fall of 2011 (discussed below), it was determined that only one learning goal should be chosen as the focus of ASU’s QEP: Social Responsibility. Of the three possible goals, Social Responsibility is more closely aligned with ASU’s mission, values, learning goals, and other priorities. Furthermore and as is discussed below, students assessed in the fall of 2011 demonstrated a lack of sufficient proficiency in competencies associated with Social Responsibility.

The analysis of the fall 2011 data indicated that Personal Responsibility and Integrated and Applied Learning had not been specifically measured because neither is included explicitly in the ASU Undergraduate Learning Goals. However, data was collected on student learning associated with Social Responsibility, which is one of ASU’s Undergraduate Learning Goals and on Cultural Identity. Cultural identity is very similar to intercultural competence, which is a component of the new THECB definition of Social Responsibility (p. 22 of this document). The assessment was also conducted to measure student learning relative to the current Exemplary Educational Objectives of the Texas Core Curriculum. All students enrolled in COMM 2301: Public Speaking completed assignments that were assessed on a 0 to 100 scale. This multi-section course is delivered in a face-to-face (F-t-F) format and in an on-line (O-L) format. The analysis indicated that students were performing at widely disparate levels (large standard deviations) and that the institutional means for student performance were below acceptable levels. Results are summaries in **TABLE 2.6A and TABLE 2.6.B**

**TABLE 2.6A: Assessment Results from COMM 2301, Fall 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Learning Goal: Social Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will employ professional personal judgments based on ethical considerations and societal values; understand civic responsibility and leadership; demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and value of community service in advancing society.</td>
<td>F-t-F</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>68.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O-L</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas Exemplary Educational Objectives SBS #11,12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and assume one’s responsibility as a citizen in a democratic society by learning to think for oneself, by engaging in public discourse, and by obtaining information through the news media and other appropriate information sources about politics and public policy. Identify and understand differences and commonalities within diverse cultures.</td>
<td>F-t-F</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>68.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O-L</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.6B: Assessment Results from COMM 2301, Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Learning Goal: Cultural Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate respect for differences among cultures; practice the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for communicating and cooperating effectively with people of diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>F-t-F</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>69.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-L</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70.24</td>
<td>33.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas Exemplary Educational Objectives SBS #12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and understand differences and commonalities within diverse cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Academic Assessment

E. Drafting and Vetting the QEP Document

The QEP document was drafted and vetted per the following timeline.

- September 23, 2011 – Initial Draft reviewed by the Research and Development Subcommittee (RDS)
- October 6, 2011 – Initial Draft, with RDS revisions, reviewed by the QEP Development Committee (QEPDC)
- March 20, 2012 – Second Draft reviewed by the RDS
- March 28, 2012 – Second Draft, with RDS revisions, reviewed by the QEPDC
- April 20, 2012 – Second Draft, with QEPDC revisions, reviewed by the Reaffirmation Leadership Team (RLT)
- April 27, 2012 – Second Draft, with RLT revisions, published to the campus; campus forums conducted in April and May.
- September 1, 2012 – Begin finalizing QEP Document
- December 6, 2012 – QEP Document reviewed by the Community Engagement Advisory Board
- December 14, 2012 – QEP Document approved by QEP Leadership Team
- January 3, 2013 – QEP Document approved by the RLT
- February 15, 2013 – QEP Document submitted to SACSCOC
Phase 3: Pilot, Promote, and Finalize

A. Pilot

In January 2012, the first cohort (n=5) of Community-Engaged Faculty Fellows (Appendix B) was recruited per the guidelines of the Community-Engaged Faculty Fellows Program. The courses designed by these fellows served as the core of the CONNECT! pilot, which is being conducted during AY 2012-13. Additionally, the Freshman College piloted one section of a revised freshman seminar course. This course also met the criteria for CONNECT! courses. Please see the fall 2012 inventory and enrollments of pilot CONNECT! courses in TABLE 2.7.

TABLE 2.7: Inventory and Enrollments of Pilot CONNECT! Courses, Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONNECT! Courses</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA 4371: Internship</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 2344: Visual Communication</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 3351: Technical Writing (2 sections)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU 4314: Science: Instructional Strategies for Elementary/Middle School (2 sections)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 4381: Population Health</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTD 1201: Sport &amp; American Culture (Freshman Seminar)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The QEP Director and faculty fellows met as a group four times (March 23, April 27, July 11, and August 22) before the courses were deployed in the fall. This group also met monthly during the fall semester. Each meeting focused on the student learning outcomes, curricular design, pedagogy, assessment, and administrative requirements associated with CONNECT! The July 11 meeting was a day-long event that included all the fellows plus several key campus and community leaders who came together to participate in a workshop facilitated by two service-learning practitioners from Texas Tech University.

Another important aspect of CONNECT! included in the pilot was the governance and administration of the project. To that end the QEP Leadership Team (Appendix B), the Community Engagement Advisory Board (Appendix B), and the Center for Community Engagement were formed in the summer of 2012. Additionally, a website for the Center for Community Engagement (www.angelo.edu/connect) was created. Several documents pertaining to the administration of CONNECT! were drafted, vetted, and piloted. These documents are posted on the website as resources for faculty, students, campus partners, and community partners. While informal preliminary feedback is positive, formal assessment of the first semester will not be finalized until late January, 2013.

B. CONNECT! Marketing and Promotion Plan

To increase awareness and interest in CONNECT!, the Center for Community Engagement staff executed a marketing and promotion plan in fall 2012 and early spring of 2013. The plan was executed in a similar fashion to the “What’s Your BIG Idea?” Campaign that took place during Phase 1: Planning and Topic Selection. The CONNECT! Marketing and Promotion plan was developed by the Marketing
and Promotion Subcommittee (See Appendix C for roster) in the spring of 2012. Promotional items were purchased and distributed. Events and activities were developed, publicized, and executed.

Two key events were designed to promote CONNECT! to the campus and community.

1. The CONNECT! Campus and Community Student Video Contest, which was held in conjunction with ASU’s Homecoming activities in the fall 2012. This video contest has been conducted for several years and each year, a contest theme is chosen. Rules pertaining to the contest were posted in September, and students produced videos based on the theme: CONNECT! Campus and Community. Students producing the top three videos received prizes and the winning video was shown at halftime of the homecoming football game. The top three videos are posted on the Center for Community Engagement website (www.angelo.edu/connect).

2. The CONNECTED! Student Showcase was an event open to the campus and the community on November 12, 2012. During the first component of the event, students enrolled in the CONNECT! courses taught by the five Community-Engaged Faculty Fellows held concurrent presentations for one hour. The format was similar to a poster session at an academic meeting or convention. The second component of the showcase was a panel presentation of selected students and community partners. The panelists fielded questions from the moderator and the audience. Staff members from the Center for Community Engagement were also on hand to answer questions. The campus newspaper and the campus television station covered the event. Pictures from the showcase appear on the following page.

C. Finalizing the QEP Document for Submission

In September 2012, the QEP Director began finalizing the QEP document. The document was reviewed by a subcommittee of the Community Engagement Advisory Board in late November who recommended approval. The document was approved by the QEP Leadership Team on December 14, and approved by the Reaffirmation Leadership Team on January 3, 2013. CONNECT! Campus and Community: Angelo State University’s Plan to Enhance Student Learning through Community Engagement is scheduled for submission to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges on February 15, 2013.
III. Identification of the Topic

A. ASU’s Community-Engaged Mission, Values and Goals

**CONNECT! Campus and Community:** ASU’s Plan to Enhance Student Learning through Community Engagement (**CONNECT!**) focuses on relevant, twenty-first century student learning needs. Specifically, the student learning focus of **CONNECT!** is **Social Responsibility**. This focus is consistent with ASU’s mission, values, goals, and other strategic priorities. **CONNECT!** flows from these priorities and will help demonstrate their achievement. **TABLE 3.1** (p. 19) summarizes the alignment of **CONNECT!** to the strategic priorities of ASU. Only those priorities with the strongest alignment are included in the table.

As a regional institution, ASU has a long-standing commitment to serving the needs of the community. Since ASU’s founding in 1928, faculty, staff, and students have CONNECTED with the community in countless ways. Numerous curricular and co-curricular programs currently include some form of community engagement as means of helping students learn. Field placements, collaborative research projects, service-learning experiences, and many others manifestations of **CONNECT!** do take place at ASU. Empirical evidence generated at colleges and universities across the county, which will be further discussed later in this document, indicates that these experiences have a positive impact on student learning, including competencies associated with **Social Responsibility**.

Despite this institutional commitment and history, community engagement experiences are not broadly available to ASU students. Rather, they are available only in a limited number of programs and/or courses. Furthermore, the focus of these activities has been on discipline-specific and other learning outcomes rather than **Social Responsibility**. Also, faculty members are not broadly encouraged, and in some ways (large classes, minimal or nonexistent load credit for field supervision, etc.) discouraged to employ these kinds of pedagogies. Furthermore, collecting and analyzing locally generated evidence of their impact on student learning has not been an institutional priority until recently.

In 2009, ASU adopted a set of undergraduate learning outcomes. According to this document, social responsibility and cultural identity are broad and critical outcomes of the undergraduate experience. These outcomes are now being assessed. Recent analysis, which was discussed previously, indicates that students are not performing at appropriate levels. These and other factors indicate that while **Social Responsibility**, which emphasizes intercultural competence, civic responsibility, and community engagement, are clearly expressed as Texas Tech University System and/or Angelo State University priorities, it is not fully integrated into the curriculum, culture, or identity of the institution.
### TABLE 3.1: CONNECT! Alignment with System and Institutional Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Title and Focus Statement, etc.</th>
<th>Texas Tech Univ. System Priorities</th>
<th>ASU Mission Statement</th>
<th>ASU Values</th>
<th>ASU Master Goals</th>
<th>ASU Undergraduate Learning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Title:** CONNECT! Campus and Community: ASU’s Plan to Enhance Student Learning through Community Engagement  
**Focus Statement:** CONNECTED students become socially responsible citizens!  
**Student Learning Outcome:** Social Responsibility, which includes intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in the regional, national and global communities.  
**Methodology:** Embed community engagement pedagogy and activities into the undergraduate curricula and co-curricula | 1. Increase enrollment and promote student success  
2. Strengthen academic quality and reputation  
4. Further outreach and engagement | Angelo State University, a member of the Texas Tech University System, delivers undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts, sciences, and professional disciplines. In a learning-centered environment distinguished by its integration of teaching, research, creative endeavor, service, and co-curricular experiences, ASU prepares students to be responsible citizens and to have productive careers. | 1. *Learning:* Our Focus  
4. *Integrity:* Social and Ethical Responsibility  
5. *Engagement:* Participation and Community Service  
7. *Diversity:* Cultures, Peoples, and Ideas  
8. *Collegiality:* “Getting Along” | 4. Develop and expand both undergraduate and graduate curricula and co-curricula to support students’ intellectual and personal growth, to address issues relevant to society, and to meet the demands of State of Texas initiatives and the marketplace. | 4. *Social Responsibility:* Students will understand their responsibility as citizens in a complex, changing society. Students will:  
• employ professional and personal judgments based on ethical considerations and societal values;  
• understand civic responsibility and leadership;  
• demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and value of community service in advancing society.  
5. *Cultural Identity:* Students will gain insight into the ways cultural identities and experiences shape individual perspectives of the world. Students will:  
• demonstrate respect for differences among cultures;  
• practice the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for communicating and cooperating effectively with people of diverse backgrounds. |
B. Angelo State University: A Community-Engaged Institution

CONNECT! will serve as a focal point for a larger institution-wide community engagement initiative. In 2006, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching initiated an elective classification for community engagement (see definition and purpose below). This “sent a clear message that public engagement is neither a passing fad nor unique to a particular college or university. Rather it is highly valued and worthy of recognition in higher education.” (Beere, C.A., Votruba, J.C. & Wells, G.W., 2011, p. 25)

**Definition of Community Engagement**

| Community Engagement “describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in the context of partnership and reciprocity.” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2013) |

**Purpose of Community Engagement**

| “The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good.” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2013) |

Given the previously stated system and institutional priorities, ASU aspires to achieve this nationally recognized classification. Doing so will require the institution to demonstrate numerous manifestations of community engagement, including, but not limited to, the following indicators published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (2013):

- community engagement is a priority in the mission statement (vision);
- community engagement activities are documented and evaluated;
- a campus-wide coordinated infrastructure exists to support and advance community engagement;
- sufficient budgetary allocations exist to support community engagement;
- community engagement is defined and planned for in the institution’s strategic plan;
- faculty and staff receive appropriate training and development;
- the promotion and tenure system rewards the scholarship of community engagement;
- a critical mass of faculty are actively committed to the community engagement undertaking;
- community-based pedagogy is integrated into the curriculum;
- a critical mass of students participate in community-based learning opportunities;
- community-based learning is assessed; and
- community outreach and partnerships are established and sustained.
The implementation of **CONNECT!** “puts a name, and a face” on ASU’s community engagement initiative and the aspiration for achieving the Carnegie classification. These and other indicators will be addressed, ASU’s reputation will be enhanced, and most importantly, students will benefit (learn) from their experiences with the community and become socially responsible citizens (See FIGURE 3.1). Identifying a QEP topic that intersects with the institution’s aspiration to achieve this classification enhances the university’s capacity to provide the resources necessary to successfully implement and sustain **CONNECT!**.

**C. CONNECTING the Campus and the Community**

But how does the institution propose to develop socially responsible citizens? The answer, in short, is by **CONNECTING the Campus and the Community**. For the purposes of ASU’s QEP, **CONNECT!** is the broad strategy used to help students become socially responsible citizens through active engagement with the local, regional, national, and global community. Curricular CONNECTIONS, including such pedagogies as service-learning, internships, and community-based research supported by an array of related co-curricular activities, will give students, faculty, staff, and community partners an opportunity to introduce, reinforce, and practice **Social Responsibility**.

ASU’s faculty is central to the implementation of **CONNECT!**. While some faculty members currently use community engagement pedagogies, many do not. The latter is especially true among full-time, tenure-track faculty. Therefore, faculty development, support, and recognition will be critical to the successful implementation of **CONNECT!** and will require significant institutional infrastructure and investment. Additionally, existing impediments to faculty participation in these pedagogies must be removed, especially for tenure-track faculty.

**FIGURE 3.1: CONNECT! Campus and Community**

Campus partners, that is, individuals and/or groups housed in non-academic units that sponsor a variety of community-based, co-curricular activities, are also critical to the success of **CONNECT!**. Student affairs units, Greek organizations, majors clubs, athletic teams, performing arts groups, and other campus entities
enrich the curriculum and campus culture of ASU. Institutionalizing CONNECT! cannot take place without including these entities in the process.

Community partners are also key players in the success of CONNECT!. Its goals cannot be sufficiently accomplished without developing reciprocal relationships with these partners. Oftentimes, community partners have programming and other needs that the university and its students can fulfill, and students have learning needs that community partners can fulfill.

CONNECTING the campus to the community will require a “matchmaker” and an appropriate infrastructure to support this function. To that end, ASU has established the Center for Community Engagement. The Center reports to the Provost and the QEP Leadership Team. The Center’s staff is supported by an advisory board.

There are many more details regarding the process of CONNECTING the Campus and community. These will be discussed more fully in subsequent sections of this document. However, the following logic model (See TABLE 3.2) is offered as a summary.

### TABLE 3.2: Logic Model for CONNECTING the Campus and the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Human Resources:</td>
<td>1. Leadership, governance, and administration</td>
<td>1. Community-Engaged Faculty Fellowship Program</td>
<td>1. Goal: CONNECTED! Students will become Socially Responsible Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>2. Human resource development and support</td>
<td>2. CONNECTED! Department Institute and Grant Program</td>
<td>2. Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Center for Community Engagement Staff</td>
<td>3. Promotion, recruitment, and recognition</td>
<td>3. Campus/Community Partner Institutes</td>
<td>a. CONNECT! will have a positive impact on student learning (Social Responsibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Community Engagement Advisory Board</td>
<td>4. Curricular/co-curricular deployment</td>
<td>4. Get CONNECTED! Student Engagement Program</td>
<td>b. CONNECT! will have a positive impact on ASU’s community engagement outcomes (per strategic plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Faculty Fellows</td>
<td>5. Assessment and evaluation</td>
<td>5. Inventory of CONNECT! Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Community Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Inventory of supporting co-curricular activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Campus Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Annual awards ceremony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Salaries/benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Annual report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Faculty incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Student incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Faculty/staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Faculty/staff/student recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Marketing/promotion materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Physical space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Office supplies, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus Statement: CONNECTED students become socially responsible citizens!
IV. Desired Student Learning Outcomes

In 1987, Ernest Boyer wrote, “the aim of the undergraduate experience is not only to prepare the young for productive careers, but also to enable them to live lives of dignity and purpose; not only to generate new knowledge, but to channel that knowledge to humane ends; not merely to study government, but to help shape citizenry that can promote the public good.” (1987, p. 297) Boyer’s statement is consistent with the ASU mission statement, which includes the following language, “ASU prepares students to be responsible citizens and to have productive careers.”

CONNECT! Campus and Community: ASU’s Plan to Enhance Student Learning through Community Engagement (CONNECT!) is consistent with ASU’s mission, core values, undergraduate learning goals, and other priorities. The student learning goal chosen to help demonstrate the achievement of these strategic priorities derives from an analysis of the national higher education context, the institutional context, and pedagogical and other best practices associated with student learning. Given this analysis, one well-defined, relevant, and measureable student learning goal has been identified for inclusion in ASU’s QEP. We believe and affirm that those students who demonstrate Social Responsibility embody the essence and achievement of ASU’s mission to prepare responsible citizens.

Therefore, the CONNECT! student learning goal is:

Students will demonstrate Social Responsibility (SR).

As mentioned previously, the Purpose Statement and Core Objectives of the new Texas Core Curriculum, which will be implemented in fall 2014, derive from AAC&U’s LEAP Project. While the AAC&U definitions and all the other supporting language are extremely valuable, ASU will define Social Responsibility as it is defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB).

Therefore, the working definition of Social Responsibility for CONNECT! purposes is:

Social Responsibility is to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities. (THECB, 2012)
From an assessment standpoint, ASU will directly measure the three interrelated components or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) of Social Responsibility that are derived from the previous definition. Each of these SLOs is further refined to include two indicators. Additional language pertaining to these indicators is included in the Social Responsibility Rubric (See Appendix G).

Therefore, the student learning outcomes and respective indicators of Social Responsibility are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR1: Students will demonstrate intercultural competence,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR1.1: Intercultural awareness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1.2: Intercultural communication;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2: Students will demonstrate knowledge of civic responsibility,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2.1: Connecting civic knowledge and responsibility,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2.2: Civic communication;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3: Students will demonstrate the ability to engage effectively in the campus, regional, national, or global communities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3.1: Connecting learning and engagement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3.2: Community action and reflection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR1, SR2, and SR3 (the program-level SLOs of ASU’s QEP) are the same program-level SLOs ASU has adopted for the Social Responsibility component of the core curriculum. These SLOs were approved by the ASU Core Curriculum Committee on June 29, 2012. Utilizing the same SLOs for both programs will allow Social Responsibility to be emphasized in upper and lower division courses across all academic disciplines.

It is important to note that this cross-disciplinary curricular goal is also to be supported by the co-curriculum. Therefore, educating students for Social Responsibility is, in fact, an institution-level goal for student learning. Furthermore, this goal can be used to shape not only the activities that promote student learning, but the very culture and identity of Angelo State University and its people. If the university expects its students to become socially responsible citizens, the people who comprise the university should be expected to do likewise.

In her literature review on educating for personal and social responsibility, Swaner (2004) wrote, “learning [in personal and social responsibility] does indeed occur in higher education, and therefore a second question can be posed: how might colleges and universities enhance personal and social responsibility through curricular and pedagogical efforts?” (p. 40). This question, as it pertains to social responsibility, guided the research presented in the literature review and best practices that follows in Section V: Literature Review and Best Practices.
V. Literature Review and Best Practices

There is a substantial body of evidence supporting CONNECT!. A small portion of that evidence is reviewed in this section. Many items are cited in this review; others are included in the list of references.

According to Ernest Boyer (1990)

> There is growing evidence that professors want, and need, better ways for the full range of their aspirations and commitments to be acknowledged. Faculty are expressing serious reservations about the enterprise to which they have committed their professional lives. This deeply rooted professional concern reflects, we believe, recognition that teaching is crucial, that integrative studies are increasingly consequential, and that in addition to research, the work of the academy must relate to the work beyond the campus [emphasis added]. (p. 75)

In an open letter to the presidents and chancellors of state universities and land-grant colleges, Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged University, the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Colleges (1999) said:

> We believe an engaged university can enrich the student experience and help change the campus culture. It can do so by enlarging opportunities for faculty and students to gain access to new knowledge and by broadening access to internships and various kinds of off-campus learning opportunities. The engaged institution must accomplish at least three things:
> 1. It must be organized to respond to the needs of today’s student and tomorrow’s, not yesterday’s.
> 2. It must enrich students’ experiences by bringing research and engagement into the curriculum and offering practical opportunities for students to prepare for the world they will enter.
> 3. It must put critical resources (knowledge and expertise) to work on the problems the communities it serves face. (pp. 9-10)

Pedagogies associated with community engagement and the infrastructure necessary to support them are expanding at colleges and universities nationwide as evidenced by the voluminous literature on the subject and the number of centers, offices, institutes, and other administrative units on college and university campuses devoted to the development and dissemination of these practices. National organizations and foundations, such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities, American Association of Community Colleges, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and Campus Compact, have likewise expended significant resources to promote community engagement.

The rationale for this growth may be summarized as follows. “In sum, student engagement has two key components that contribute to student success. The first is the amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other activities that lead to the experiences and outcomes that constitute student success.
The second is the ways the institution allocates resources and organizes learning opportunities and services to induce students to participate in and benefit from such activities” (Kuh, et.al., 2005, p.9). Kuh and his associates go on to say, “if faculty and administrators use principles of good practice to arrange curriculum and other aspects of the college experience, students would ostensibly put forth more effort…all of which would result in greater gains in such areas as critical thinking, problem solving, effective communication, and responsible citizenship [emphasis added].” (p.9)

The purpose of this literature review is to substantiate the proposition that embedding community engagement pedagogies into the Angelo State University undergraduate curriculum and creating an appropriate infrastructure to support these functions will result in positive changes in student learning specific to the stated student learning goal of this QEP: Social Responsibility. Research for the purposes of this QEP focused on four interrelated themes:

A. National Context,
B. Institutional Context,
C. Best Practices: Designing Curricula and Pedagogies to Support Desired Student Learning,

A. National Context

Higher education is being called on to renew its historical commitment to its public purposes. It is clear that American colleges and universities have always included among their core purposes responding to society’s pressing issues and preparing graduates for responsible citizenship [emphasis added]. However, in the past two to three decades, higher education’s foremost experts, together with its most outstanding critics, have been urging colleges and universities to take a leadership role in addressing our global society’s increasing problems and meeting growing human needs. (Jacoby & Associates, 2009, p.1)

Colleges and universities across the nation have responded to this call by implementing a variety of community-engagement programs. Often referred to as civic engagement, these programs are characterized by practices such as community outreach, community-based learning, and service-learning.

In addition to the problems and needs that Jacoby mentions, colleges and universities have chosen to implement community-engagement practices because of a significant shift in college student demographics and the challenges associated with that shift. A larger, more diverse student population is now attending college. Between 1999 and 2009, enrollment at degree-granting institutions increased 38%, from 14.8 million to 20.4 million. In recent years, the percentage increase in the number of students age 25 and over has been larger than the percentage increase in the number of younger students. Enrollment of students 25 and over rose 43% during that same period. From 2010 to 2019, the National Center for Education Statistics projects a 9% rise in enrollments of students under 25, and a 23% rise in enrollments of students 25 and over (US Department of Education, 2011).

The percentage of college students who are Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Black is increasing. From 1976 to 2009, the percentage of Hispanic students rose from 3% to 12%, the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander students rose from 2% to 7%, and the percentage of Black students rose from 9% to 14%. During that same period, the percentage of White students fell from 83% to 62%. Nonresident
aliens, for whom race/ethnicity is not reported, comprised 3% of the total enrollment in 2009. (US Department of Education, 2011)

However, retention, persistence, and graduation rates are not meeting expectations and many question the rigor of higher education and relevance of the learning that students attain as a result of this education. *Academically Adrift* (Arum & Roska, 2011) is the latest publication to level sharp criticism at our nation’s higher education system.

Institutions, accreditors, and higher education associations have responded to these concerns in various ways. One of the more ambitious responses came from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) when it published a National Panel Report, *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as A Nation Goes to College* (2002). The panel’s deliberations led to a “recommendation to rethink what we should expect from, and how we should provide college education in the twenty-first century” (p. iv).

The report further indicated that faculties across the nation were adopting new practices designed to enhance student success and the kinds of learning that students need for a complex world. The panel encouraged “an invigorated and practical liberal education” (pp. x-xi) and made strong recommendations about the knowledge and capacities all students should acquire – regardless of backgrounds, fields, or chosen higher education institution.

Students will continue to pursue different specializations in college. But across all fields, the panel calls for higher education to help college students become *Intentional Learners* who can adapt to new environments, integrate knowledge from difference sources, and continue learning throughout their lives. To thrive in a complex world, these intentional learners should also become:

- *Empowered* through mastery of intellectual and practical skills,
- *Informed* by knowledge about the natural and social worlds and about forms of inquiry basic to these studies, and
- *Responsible* for their personal actions and for civic values.

Collectively, these outcomes form the core of a twenty-first century liberal education – liberal not in a political sense, but in terms of liberating and opening the mind, and for preparing students for responsible action. (p. xii)

The report calls also for an end to the traditional, artificial distinction between liberal and practical education.

Liberal education in all fields will have the strongest impact when studies look beyond the classroom to the world’s major questions, asking students to apply their developing analytical skills and ethical judgment to significant problems in the world around them. By valuing cooperative as well as individual performance, diversity as a resource for learning, real solutions to unscripted problems, and creativity as well as critical thinking, this newly pragmatic liberal education will both prepare students for a dynamic economy and build civic capacity at home and abroad. (p. xii)

In 2005, AAC&U launched a decade-long project titled *Liberal Education and American’s Promise: Excellence for Everyone as a Nation Goes to College*, aka, the “LEAP Project.” In 2007, the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise released *College Learning for the New*
Global Century. The leadership council introduced the report by stating, “Across all the discussion of access, affordability, and even accountability, there has been a near-total public and policy silence about what contemporary college graduates need to know and be able to do” (p. 1).

To respond to this “silence,” the report includes a set of educational outcomes. These Essential Learning Outcomes (TABLE 2.3, p. 7 of this document) are based on extensive input from educators and employers. “Keyed to work, life, and citizenship, the essential learning outcomes recommended in this report are important for all students and should be fostered and developed across the entire educational experience, and in the context of students’ major fields” (AAC&U, 2007, p. 2).

B. Institutional Context

1. Enrollment and Demographic Trends
Enrollment trends at ASU are similar to those across the nation. Overall, enrollment has increased in recent years, as has enrollment among underserved populations. In 2009, ASU was designated a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) because the proportion of Hispanic student enrolled surpassed the federal threshold of 25%. ASU also has a significant number of first-generation college students and a significant number of students receiving financial aid. While this diversity and inclusiveness are to be celebrated, indicators of student success are a concern. First-to-second year retention rates and six-year graduation rates are less than desirable. Institution-level direct measures of student learning indicate that mean ASU scores are generally at or below national means. Please see TABLE 5.1 for a summary of selected institutional demographic trends.

Given these data and trends, research activities for the QEP included a focus on those educational practices that would meet the essential learning needs of a growing, more diverse ASU student population. Chief among our findings was the publication, High Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Them and Why They Matter (Kuh, 2008). High Impact Practices (HIPs) engage students in the kinds of activities that foster essential learning. This and other studies reviewed by Swaner and Brownell (2010) indicate that specific pedagogies such as service-learning, undergraduate research, and internships do have an impact on learning, including learning among underserved populations. Huber (2010) indicates that multiple HIPs distributed across the students’ academic career can result in significant increases in student success and persistence, especially among Latino students. This conclusion is extremely relevant to the needs of the ASU student body, particularly our Hispanic students.
### TABLE 5.1: Selected Institutional Demographic Trends (census day, fall of selected years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>6,155</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>6,856</td>
<td>7,084</td>
<td>6,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>4,206</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>4,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of total)</td>
<td>(67.2%)</td>
<td>(67.4%)</td>
<td>(66.1%)</td>
<td>(64.9%)</td>
<td>(62.8%)</td>
<td>(60.7%)</td>
<td>(58.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of total)</td>
<td>(23.2%)</td>
<td>(23.3%)</td>
<td>(23.2%)</td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td>(25.6%)</td>
<td>(27.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African Am.</strong></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of total)</td>
<td>(6.2%)</td>
<td>(6.4%)</td>
<td>(7.6%)</td>
<td>(7.6%)</td>
<td>(8.2%)</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>(8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of total)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(3.1%)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
<td>(6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% 1st Generation (Undergraduates)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Financial Aid (Undergraduates)</strong></td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean ACT/SAT (Undergraduates)</strong></td>
<td>21/950</td>
<td>21/970</td>
<td>21/976</td>
<td>21/973</td>
<td>21/969</td>
<td>21/975</td>
<td>21/973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall 1-Yr. Retention Rate</strong></td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Yr. Retention Rate- Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Yr. Retention Rate- Af. Am.</strong></td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall 6-Yr. Graduation Rate</strong></td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6-Yr. Graduation Rate- Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6-Yr. Graduation Rate- Af. Am.</strong></td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ASU Office of Institutional Research and Accountability

2. **ASU as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI)**

Unlike Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) do not have a distinct institutional type or culture. Rather than being founded for the purpose of serving African-American students or Native-American students, HSI is simply a federal designation for those institutions, regardless of mission, size, etc. in which at least 25% of the undergraduate enrollment is of Hispanic origin. Therefore, HSIs are not always culturally Hispanic. So, while many “best practices” exist regarding the learning needs of Hispanic students and the needs of the Hispanic community, it is difficult to identify a singular and exemplary community engagement practice that is peculiar to HSIs (Zlotkowski, et.al., 2005). Nonetheless, as a HSI, ASU has become very intentional about serving the needs of Hispanic students and the Hispanic community, which also serves the needs of a larger and more diverse student body.

3. **Revised Core Curriculum for Texas Colleges and Universities**

The previously mentioned national findings are relevant and timely to the institutional context in that in October 2011 the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) unanimously approved a revised state core curriculum. The new curriculum is based on the recommendation document: *Revising the State Core Curriculum: A Focus on 21st Century Competencies* (2011) submitted by the THECB Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee (UEAC). Implementation is to begin fall 2014. Dr. Jeffrey Schonberg, Associate Professor of English at ASU, serves as a member of this committee. The desired student learning outcomes expressed in the recommendation document are based largely on the
Essential Learning Outcomes as expressed by the LEAP Leadership Council and cited previously. The state-mandated Core Objectives include:

- Critical Thinking,
- Communication Skills,
- Empirical and Quantitative Skills,
- Teamwork,
- Social Responsibility [emphasis added], and
- Personal Responsibility.

These Core Objectives will be addressed throughout the core curriculum of every two-year and four-year public institution in Texas. Therefore, the THECB adopted a new curricular design as expressed in TABLE 5.2.

### TABLE 5.2: Texas Core Curriculum Map (UEAC, 2011, p. 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, Philosophy &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Political Science</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Option*</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Institutional Option must contain a minimum of 3 Core Objectives selected by the institution.

Furthermore, the UEAC (2011) recommendation adopted by the THECB includes the following language pertaining to pedagogy.

The third guiding parameter is pedagogy. While subject matter content is important, how the content is delivered is at least as important to ensure increased student engagement and learning. Therefore, the new Core Curriculum must directly affect how faculty members incorporate the new objectives into the classroom, to encourage students to learn actively in a participatory manner that allows them to take charge of their education. (p.8)

Also, the recommendation adopted by the THECB addresses the assessment of student learning by indicating that the process should, among other things:

- “be meaningful and improvement oriented” (UEAC, 2011, p.9),
- “use the AAC&U VALUE rubrics as guidelines for core objective assessment” (UEAC, 2011, p.11),
- “use multiple measures for effective assessment, including at least one direct measure per Core Objective.” (UEAC, 2011, p 18)
4. Modified University Seminar Course
In spring 2012, the Texas Tech University System Board of Regents approved the creation of a Freshman College at Angelo State University. A key aspect of the Freshman College is the University Seminar course. A revised version of the course was piloted in AY 2012-13. In order to address the new Texas Core Curriculum and the QEP, the revised course included Social Responsibility as one of the student learning outcomes.

5. Undergraduate Research Initiative and Funding
One of the pedagogical connections identified for inclusion in CONNECT! is community-based research, which is a specific form of undergraduate research. Community-based research is discussed more fully in the pages that follow.

Beginning Academic Year 2011-12, ASU embarked on an initiative to emphasize undergraduate research as a learning experience. To fund this initiative, all undergraduate students are charged an undergraduate research fee of $1 per semester credit hour enrolled. These monies are used to fund research grants to students and faculty, travel expenses, and other aspects of the undergraduate research experience. The undergraduate research initiative at ASU is administered in the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (CITR). A similar model is warranted in order to provide funding for student and faculty incentives to GET CONNECTED! with the community.

6. Internal Audit of Current Community-Engaged Pedagogy
An internal audit of community engagement pedagogy was conducted during fall 2011 using the ASU 2011-12 Undergraduate Catalog as the source of information. While anecdotal information and course syllabi would undoubtedly identify additional incidences of community-engaged pedagogy, the audit was conducted to determine explicit, stable (across multiple sections of the same course) information available to students prior to enrolling in a course.

The audit identified sixty-two (62) courses that explicitly expressed community-engaged pedagogy in the course title or description. “Internship” was the most commonly used term in a course title (n = 19), and all internships were senior-level courses. However, most programs did not require the internship or another community-engaged course(s) for graduation. Degrees in nursing and in education included the greatest number of community-engaged courses and semester credit hour requirements in their respective programs of study. Degrees in athletic training and in social work were the only other programs to require community-engaged course work. Degrees in nursing, education, and athletic training employ community-engaged pedagogy in lower- and upper-level courses. Results of the audit are documented in Appendix E.

C. Best Practices: Designing Curricula and Pedagogies to Support Desired Student Learning
The Cycle of Intentional Learning (AAC&U, 2004) is used as the broad educational model for ASU’s QEP (See Figure 5.1). As mentioned previously, one of the precepts of liberal education is to create an environment that enables students to become intentional learners.
To achieve intentional educational practice, at a minimum, institutions need to put in place: 1) clear goals and outcomes for student learning, 2) curricular design and pedagogical practices related to the outcomes and planned so as to advance their attainment, and 3) authentic assessment derived, first, from the outcomes and, second, from the actual work faculty ask students to undertake. A powerful cycle of improvement is created when these elements are thoughtfully implemented and data are gathered to inform revision. (Leskes & Ross, 2006, p. 4)

FIGURE 5.1: Cycle of Intentional Learning

The goals and outcomes of ASU’s QEP were discussed in Section IV: Desired Student Learning Outcomes. Therefore, only the 1) Curricular Design and 2) Pedagogy, and 3) Assessment will be discussed here.

1. Curricular Design
As illustrated in TABLE 5.3, the student learning outcomes of the QEP will be addressed in two broad areas of the undergraduate curriculum: 1) the university core curriculum and 2) introductory and advanced “majors” courses offered by the various colleges. Doing so will provide the vertical articulation needed to foster student progress over time.

Social Responsibility is a core objective of the revised Texas Core Curriculum, which is scheduled for implementation in fall 2014. By statute, this core objective must be addressed in multiple content areas of ASU’s core curriculum. Core courses that address Social Responsibility will be designated as CONNECT! courses. By the time students complete the core curriculum, Social Responsibility will have been introduced and reinforced in multiple courses, thus providing students a foundation of related knowledge and competencies before beginning their major program of study. This foundation will be built on and applied to the major in additional CONNECT! courses that students may take before
graduating. **TABLE 5.3** expresses the preliminary curriculum map and pedagogical matrix of courses as identified at the time of the submission of this document. As QEP implementation progresses, additional courses will be added to this inventory.

### Table 5.3: Preliminary Curriculum Map and Pedagogical Matrix (Pilot courses noted in red)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Pedagogical Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercultural Competence</td>
<td>Civic Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Core Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, Philosophy &amp; Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Behavioral Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 2344 Visual Communication (F’12)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM/MM 4335 Ad/PR Campaigns &amp; Cases (S’13)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 3351 Technical Writing (F’12)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 4365 Usability Testing in Tech &amp; Business Writing (S’13)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA 4371 Internship (F’12/S’13)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 4314 Science: Instructional Strategies for Elem/Mid School (F’12/S’13)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Health &amp; Human Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR 4381 Population Health Nursing (F’12/S’13)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTD 1201: Sports &amp; American Culture (F’12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This curricular design and the specific pedagogies discussed below are to be supported by an inventory of related co-curricular activities. Numerous community-engaged, co-curricular activities are part of the current learning environment at ASU. Many will continue to take place independently of **CONNECT!**. Others will be identified and/or developed in concert with **CONNECT!** courses, when appropriate.

### 2. Pedagogy

For **CONNECT!**, the pedagogies employed by faculty will fall into one of four categories. Three of these categories: a) *Service-Learning*, b) *Internships*, and c) *Community-Based Research* are well-researched, specific forms of community engagement pedagogy. Literature related to these pedagogies is quite robust and will be briefly summarized below. A representative sample of these resources is included in the list of
references at the end of this document. Additionally, a fourth category, Other, includes those pedagogies that don’t fit into the previous three, but do meet the prescribed criteria for a community-engaged course.

In addition to service-learning, internships, and community-based research, other forms of community engaged pedagogies exist, and it is often appropriate to combine several pedagogies in order to foster student learning. It is important to note here that CONNECT! is based on the principle of inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness. Excluding a course, a faculty member, or a group of students just because the proposed learning strategies did not fit neatly into a prescribed category would be ill advised. Therefore, innovative pedagogies that meet prescribed criteria for community engagement and student learning will be considered.

a. Service-Learning Literature Review Highlights
A substantial body of evidence supports the efficacy and flexibility of service-learning pedagogy and its centrality to CONNECT!. Numerous publications address the rationale, principles, implementation, and assessment of service-learning. Service-learning is applicable to a wide variety of disciplines, including but not limited to the applied sciences, behavioral/social sciences, business, creative/performing arts, education, humanities, and natural/physical sciences. Furthermore, service-learning is applicable to the traditional, residential learning environment and to technology-enhanced, distance learning environment, aka “service-elearning” (Strait & Lima, 2009, p. 155). Finally, service-learning is applicable as a component of the students’ first-year experience and subsequent years (Deans & Bacon, 2002; Gardner, 2002; Hatcher, et.al, 2002; Kindelan, 2010; Roldan, et.al, 2004; Vogelgesang, et.al., 2002; Zlotkowski, 2002).

Service-learning Defined
“Service-learning is a course-based, credit-bearing, educational experience in which students: a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility” (Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J.1995, p. 122).

Benefits of Service-Learning
According to the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSIEE), those participating in service-learning:

- develop a habit of critical reflection on their experiences, enabling them to learn more throughout life,
- are more curious and motivated to learn,
- are able to perform better service,
- strengthen their ethic of social and civic responsibility,
- feel more committed to addressing the underlying problems behind social issues,
- understand problems in a more complex way and can imagine alternative solutions,
- demonstrate more sensitivity to how decisions are made and how institutional decisions affect people’s lives,
- respect other cultures more and are better able to learn about cultural differences,
- learn how to work more collaboratively with other people on real problems, and
- realize that their lives can make a difference (cited in Kendall, 1990, p. 38-39).
Principles of Good Practice
The NSIEE also published principles of good practice for service-learning. According to the NSIEE, an effective and sustained program:

1. Engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.
2. Provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.
3. Articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.
4. Allows those with needs to define those needs.
5. Clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.
6. Matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.
7. Expects genuine, active, sustained organizational commitment.
8. Includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.
9. Insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interest of all involved.
10. Is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations (cited in Kendall, 1990, p. 40).

b. Internships Literature Review Highlights
Several terms are used in the literature to describe the educational experience that we are calling “internship.” They include cooperative education, field education, field experience, field work, and practicum. Furthermore, there is no consensus on the exact meaning of any of those terms or the expectations of the experiences. Much of this variability stems from the fact that internships are used in numerous academic disciplines and associated with a wide variety of careers and professions. There are, however, good definitions and applicable guidelines that concurrently allow for sufficient flexibility and consistency across academic programs. For the purposes of CONNECT!, only those experiences that are course-based and credit-bearing will be considered internships.

Internship Defined
An internship is “a form of experiential learning that integrates knowledge and theory learned in the classroom with practical application and skills development in a professional setting. Internships give students the opportunity to gain valuable applied experience and make connections in professional fields they are considering for career paths; and give employers the opportunity to guide and evaluate talent.” (National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2011)

Criteria for an Experience to Be Defined as an Internship
To ensure that an experience—whether it is a traditional internship or one conducted remotely or virtually—is educational, thus eligible to be considered a legitimate internship by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) definition, all the following criteria must be met:

1. The experience must be an extension of the classroom: a learning experience that provides for applying the knowledge gained in the classroom. It must not be simply to advance the operations of the employer or be the work that a regular employee would routinely perform.
2. The skills or knowledge learned must be transferable to other employment settings.
3. The experience has a defined beginning and end, and a job description with desired qualifications.
4. There are clearly defined learning objectives/goals related to the professional goals of the student’s academic coursework.
5. There is supervision by a professional with expertise and educational and/or professional background in the field of the experience.
6. There is routine feedback by the experienced supervisor.
7. There are resources, equipment, and facilities provided by the host employer that support the learning objectives/goals. (NACE, 2011)

**Principles for Success**

Inkster and Ross (1998, pp. 6-7) offer six basic working principles for building an internship that is a success for everyone concerned.

1. The primary goal of an internship is experiential learning – and both concepts, the experience and the learning, are fundamental.
2. Experiential learning needs to be supported by a clear set of learning goals, with tasks and other learning opportunities identified in relation to those goals.
3. The learning plan for an intern needs to provide and schedule systematic reflection and self-assessment for the intern.
4. Finding just the right level of responsibility for an intern will require a thoughtful audit, careful planning, and continued monitoring and some fine tuning after the internship is underway.
5. The host organization shares the responsibility to monitor, support, assess, and provide feedback to the intern throughout the internship.
6. The host organization is not just a passive host, but an active, full partner in the educational enterprise, with the potential to participate in improving the curriculum.

c. Community-Based Research Literature Review Highlights

According to Paul (2009), community-based research is a promising pedagogical approach that is at the crossroads of three core functions of higher education: undergraduate research, civic engagement, and liberal learning…. Like undergraduate research, community-based research builds students’ skills of inquiry, problem solving, teamwork, and communication. Like civic engagement, community-based research cultivates understanding of social realities and social justice, and helps students explore ways to effect change as citizens. Like liberal learning, community-based research encourages students to pursue intellectual work together with active engagement in the societal, ethical, and practical implications of their learning. (p. 196)

Some authors consider community-based research as a specialized form of service-learning. Kowalewski (2004) asserts that it is the penultimate form of service-learning so long as the research is done for and with the community rather than on the community. Much of the rationale, benefits, and principles of good practice of community-based research and service-learning are congruent (Cress, et.al, 2005; Dallimore, et.al, 2010). However, and as mentioned previously, ASU has embarked on an initiative to emphasize undergraduate research as a learning activity. Consequently for our purposes, community-based research is considered as a separate pedagogical category for CONNECT! Like other forms of community-engaged learning, community-based research is a means of combining the faculty responsibilities for teaching, service, and scholarship. Institutionally, it provides an opportunity for transformational and reciprocal partnerships.
Community-Based Research Defined
“Community-based research is collaborative, change-oriented research that engages faculty members, students, and community members in projects that address a community-identified need” (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker & Donohue, 2003, p. 5).

Central Features
Given the above definition, Strand and colleagues offer three central features that differentiate community-based research from other traditional academic research.

1. Community-based research is a collaborative enterprise between academic researchers (professors and students) and community members.
2. Community-based research seeks to democratize knowledge by validating multiple sources of knowledge and promoting the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination.
3. Community-based research has as its goal social action for the purpose of achieving social change and social justice (p. 6).

Multiple Models
The types of research projects that could be considered community-based research are seemingly limitless. According to Paul (2009):

pedagogical models of community-based research vary by the educational context of the project (course-based, independent study, senior thesis, or capstone); faculty involvement (apprenticeship model, senior thesis, independent projects); student selection (based on academic achievement, academic risk, interest in social justice); scope of the partnership; length of the partnership (a single semester, a year, or longer); and desired learning outcomes (disciplinary or multidisciplinary learning, professional training, liberal learning, student retention). (pp. 203-204)

3. Assessment
a. Authentic Assessment
Given the increased demands for accountability, much has been written regarding the assessment of student learning in higher education and the dissatisfaction with traditional assessment strategies. Wiggins (1989) called for a change in the focus of assessment: a shift from “testing” conducted at the end of instruction to document the achievement of a stated learning goal(s) local, state or national, to “authentic assessment” conducted as a central component of the learning process.

What is a true test? I propose a radical answer, in the sense of a return to the roots; we have lost sight of the fact that a true test of intellectual ability requires the performance of exemplary tasks. First, authentic assessment replicates the challenges and standards of performance that typically face writers, businesspeople, scientists, community leaders, designers, or historians. These include writing essays and reports, conducting individual and group research, designing proposals and mock-ups, assembling portfolios, and so on. Second, legitimate assessments are responsive to individual students and to the school contexts. Evaluation is most accurate and equitable when it entails human judgment and dialogue, so that the person tested can ask for clarification of questions and explain his or her answers.

A genuine test of intellectual achievement doesn’t merely check “standardized” work in a mechanical way. It reveals achievement on the essentials, even if they are not easily quantified. In other words, an authentic test not only reveals student achievement to the examiner, but also reveals to the test-taker the actual challenges and standards of the field. (pp. 703-04)
Angelo State University

Lund (2011) indicates, “The more authentic one can make the assessment (it represents something associated with the learning that a professional in the field might do or value), the greater chance that students will see the relevance of the assessment and get excited about completing it” (p. 382). According to Miller and Leskes (2005), “The best evidence of learning comes from direct observation of student work. [Furthermore,] course embedded assignments provide the most valid evidence for all levels of analysis because they are closely aligned with faculty expectations and with the teaching learning process” (p. 1). Herman, Ashbacher, and Winters (1992) identified several characteristics of what they call “alternate” or “performance-based” assessment. They are:

- Students are required to perform, create, produce or solve something;
- Students are required to use higher-level thinking and problem-solving skills;
- Tasks are used that represent meaningful instructional activities;
- When possible, real-world applications are used;
- People use human judgment to score the assessment results;
- Students are coached by teachers through the process. (pp.383-84)

b. Levels of Assessment

Formative and summative data derived from the assessment of student learning are appropriately applied at five levels (Miller & Leskes, 2005), all of which have application to CONNECT!. They are:

- Level 1: Assessing individual student learning within a course;
- Level 2: Assessing individual student learning across courses;
- Level 3: Assessing courses;
- Level 4: Assessing programs;
- Level 5: Assessing institutions.

Furthermore, the authors provide guidelines for each of these levels with regard to a) typical assessment questions, b) sources of evidence, c) aggregation of data, d) data uses, and e) responsibilities. Guidelines associated with Level 2: Assessing individual student learning across courses and Level 4: Assessing programs are most applicable to CONNECT! and are employed as part of the CONNECT! Assessment Plan (See Section X of this document).

c. The VALUE Project

As a subcomponent of the LEAP Project, AAC&U investigated appropriate means of assessing their Essential Learning Outcomes. The narrative regarding the VALUE Project (Validated Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) as extracted from their website is included below.

As institutions are asked to document the quality of student learning and to raise retention and graduation rates, the VALUE project began to define, document, assess, and strengthen student achievement of the essential learning outcomes in undergraduate education. Recognizing that there are no standardized tests for many of the essential outcomes of an undergraduate education, the VALUE project developed ways for students and institutions to collect convincing evidence of student learning:

- drawn primarily from the work students complete through their required curriculum and co-curriculum,
- assessed by well-developed campus rubrics and judgments of selected experts, and
• organized in electronic portfolios (e-portfolios) that can be organized and presented in ways appropriate for different audiences.

The e-portfolio is an ideal format for collecting evidence of student learning, especially for those outcomes not amenable nor appropriate for standardized measurement. Additionally, e-portfolios can facilitate student reflection upon and engagement with their own learning across multi-year degree programs, across different institutions, and across diverse learning styles while helping students to set and achieve personal learning goals. E-portfolios provide both a transparent and portable medium for showcasing the broad range of complex ways students are asked to demonstrate their knowledge and abilities for purposes such as graduate school and job applications as well as to benchmark achievement among peer institutions.

AAC&U staff, the advisory board and selected teams of faculty and other academic professionals assembled a collection of extant rubrics for ascending levels of accomplishment. Investigating the range of outcomes and the criteria considered critical for assessing student achievement of each outcome uncovered that there were similarities among campuses. By identifying outcomes in terms of expectations for demonstrated student learning among disparate campuses, a valuable basis for comparing levels of learning through the curriculum emerged. This is especially useful as students, parents, employers and policy makers seek valid representations of student academic accomplishment. (AAC&U, 2011)

d. e-Portfolios

As mentioned previously, an e-Portfolio Action Committee was formed to investigate various e-portfolio products available for possible use. The use of e-portfolios (and/or portfolios in general) as a means of documenting and assessing student learning is supported by its growing use in higher education and in the literature (Burnett & Williams, 2009; Cambridge, 2010; Cambridge, et.al., 2009; Clark & Eynon, 2009; Kuh, 2008; Miller & Leskes, 2005; Miller & Morgaine, 2009; Yancey, 2009). Light, et. al. (2012) indicates that this groundswell of interest in ePortfolios has fostered increasing connections among the global ePortfolio community including both academic institutions and corporate affiliates. Community practitioners contribute to the knowledge transfer around the use of ePortfolios to document learning, sharing results, and developing training for faculty instructors and others who are interested in using this approach to assist students to integrate their learning experiences in an engaging and effective manner. (pp. xi-xii)

Light, et.al. (2012) goes on to offer eight critical issues for e-Portfolios and student success. They are:

- Defining learning outcomes
- Understanding your learners
- Identifying stakeholders
- Designing learning activities
- Using rubrics to evaluate ePortfolios
- Anticipating external uses of evidence
- Including multiple forms of evidence
- Evaluating the impact of ePortfolios

In Section X of this document, which focuses on assessment, we discuss the rubric and the assessment processes and technologies used to collect evidence of and directly measure student learning.

D. Best Practices: Aligning Institutional Resources to Support Desired Student Learning

In addition to a review of the literature, research associated with this theme (Best Practices: Aligning Institutional Resources to Support Desired Student Learning), includes a review of QEPs submitted by
benchmark and comparable institutions, a review of institutions that emphasize community engagement, practitioner interviews, a campus visit to and video conference with ASU’s benchmark institution (UNF), video conferences with vendors, conference attendance, and other activities.

An overarching and fundamental imperative expressed in this area of research is institutional alignment. Alignment is a process. It is broad based, inclusive, yet mission/vision focused. It is technical and relational. The alignment and the resulting transformation take time, effort, and commitment. Alignment ensures that each organizational dimension (see below) is designed to support the initiative at each organizational level. Through constant attention to alignment, the mission, vision, and goals of the initiative are embedded into and permeate the university.

Beer, Votruba, and Wells (2011, p. 34) created an “Alignment Grid” that provides a systematic method of addressing institutional alignment. The grid includes four institutional levels (university, college, department or academic unit, and faculty/staff) and sixteen dimensions listed below. Some dimensions apply to all levels; others do not. These dimensions are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision, mission, and values</td>
<td>Individual incentives and rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and goal setting</td>
<td>Unit-level incentives and rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external resources</td>
<td>Rituals, awards, and ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and environment</td>
<td>Curriculum and student educational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal policies and procedures</td>
<td>Information and reporting systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership selections, evaluation, and development</td>
<td>Evaluation and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff: recruitment, selection, orientation, and professional</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of CONNECT!, aligning institutional resources to support the desired student learning rests in the hands of four significant constituencies: administration, faculty, students, and community partners. A critical mass from all groups must understand and value community engagement and view student participation and learning as the focus of the institution’s community engagement efforts. A seminal publication in this regard is Involving Colleges: Successful Approaches to Fostering Student Learning and Development Outside the Classrooms (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, Andreas, Lyons, Strange, Krehbiel & MacKay, 1991), which provides empirical rationale and numerous recommendations that affect these four constituencies.

ASU’s benchmark university, the University of North Florida (UNF), produced a very good summary of best practices for these four constituencies. UNF’s QEP: Community-Based Transformational Learning has a very similar focus to ASU’s QEP. Like ASU, UNF places a high value on the various forms of community engagement. Through their QEP, the university aligns their community engagement infrastructure on student learning. Their summary is as follows:
For Administration:
- Establishing a coordinating unit with responsibility for promoting and facilitating community-based learning on campus (hence, the [UNF] Center for Community-Based Learning);
- Integrating community-based learning with the larger mission of the university;
- Promoting community-based learning as a means to realize other institutional objectives (e.g. student learning, community engagement, teaching/research/service);
- Housing the community-based learning center in Academic Affairs to facilitate academic legitimacy and faculty involvement;
- Developing strong collaborative relations and connections with other related and complementary units including student affairs; and
- Garnering the support and involvement of three critical constituencies – faculty, students, and community.

For Faculty:
- Offering faculty development aimed at enhancing knowledge and awareness of community-based learning;
- Creating an infrastructure to support faculty participation and involvement;
- Providing faculty incentives and rewards for participation in community-based learning;
- Providing opportunities for faculty to play leadership roles in the community-based learning initiative; and
- Linking community-based learning to scholarship opportunities.

For Students:
- Raising student awareness of community-based learning opportunities;
- Creating incentives and rewards for student engagement in community-based learning opportunities; and
- Developing opportunities for students that are linked to their area of study and career aspirations.

For Community Partners:
- Developing a single, reliable point of contact with the university (hence, the Center);
- Raising community awareness of the community-based learning mission and the range of opportunities for partnership;
- Establishing a spirit and practice of reciprocity between university and community;
- Creating opportunities for community member and partner participation and representation in community-based learning planning and projects; and
- Making a positive contribution to the mission and objectives of community partners.

(UNF, 2009, p. 29)

Specific Best Practices
1. Leadership and Organizational Structure
The literature repeatedly cites support from senior administrators, especially the chief academic officer, as one of, if not the most significant factor affecting program sustainability and institutionalization in
higher education (Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Prentice, 2002; Prentice, Exley & Robinson, 2003; Strait & Lima, 2009).

According to Plater,

Academic officers at all levels – from the president or provost to department chair or director – can play major transformational roles in their colleges and universities if they become intentional about both the mission of their institutions and the way they engage with the community personally and as the symbolic representative of the academic community. Leadership is a matter of choice, and those who decide to lead have a wide range of tools and assets to use in advancing civic engagement, especially through the development of service-learning (Langseth & Plater, eds., 2004, p. 1).

However, such support and intentionality must be justified. Furco and Holland (2009) offer four maxims for securing administrative support for service-learning programming, which can be applied more broadly to all forms of community-based learning.

(Maxim One: [Community-based learning] is an institution-based not an individual-based practice. [It] should not be associated primarily with particular individuals; rather it should be associated with broader institutional practices (e.g. a vehicle for students to achieve a required learning outcome).

(Maxim Two: [Community-based learning] exists to facilitate the advancement of key institutional priorities. This maxim centers on deemphasizing [community-based learning] as the focal initiative, especially as it matures and becomes more infused in the culture of the institution. In the case of ASU, the key institutional priority (focal initiative) is community engagement.

(Maxim Three: The institutionalization of [community-based learning] is a calculated future. This suggests that time must be taken to envision what the institution will look like in the future and the ways in which [community-based learning] will feature prominently in that vision.

(Maxim Four: Evidence above passion, which calls for the establishment of a comprehensive assessment plan that measures the impacts of [community-based learning] on the outcomes and issues that are of interest to the campus leaders.

Central to the infrastructure supporting any university’s community engagement initiative is the administrative unit charged with administering the initiative. Virtually every QEP that was reviewed (See list of References) and every institution with a strong focus on community engagement that was reviewed (See Appendix D) used a Center, Office, or some similar unit to administer their program. These units or work groups were headed by a director, with titles ranging from coordinator to vice president or vice provost. Most unit heads reported to the institution’s chief academic officer or a vice provost; those that did not reported to a senior administrator that served as the institution’s SACSCOC liaison or directly to the president. Variations were undoubtedly because of the size and mission of the institution, and the scope of the community engagement/QEP initiative(s).

Given that community engagement is an institutional initiative, findings (Butin, D.W., 2010; Furco & Holland, 2004; Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring & Kerrigan, 2001; Holland, 1997; Young, Shinnar,
Acherman, Carruther, & Young, 2007) indicate the unit and/or work group assigned to administering an initiative like CONNECT! are typically responsible for fulfilling the following roles:

- Providing leadership in the coordination of all efforts (governing, programming, promoting, recognizing, internal/external funding, etc.) to institutionalize community engagement;
- Developing and coordinating community engagement opportunities and activities across the institution;
- Assisting faculty in developing community-engaged teaching, scholarly activities, and service activities;
- Establishing and maintaining appropriate community partnerships;
- Developing formal agreements and risk management policies associated with community engagement;
- Documenting and assessing community engagement activities for the purpose of continuous improvement.

Another key aspect associated with the leadership and administration of these QEP’s and other community-engagement initiatives is that of shared governance. The various constituencies affected by these initiatives are given a voice through membership on advisory boards, implementation committees, or similar bodies. The democratic ideals undergirding community engagement demand such governance.

2. Faculty Development
   a. Faculty Fellows Program
      Faculty fellows programs exist across all types of higher education institutions and organizations and were common in the community-engagement initiatives and QEP reviewed. An applicable model identified in the research is the Service-Learning and Community Engagement Faculty Fellow Program at Montclair State University. The purpose of Montclair State’s program is “to develop a cadre of teacher-scholars from a wide range of disciplines who will integrate the philosophy, pedagogy and practice of service-learning into their professional lives (i.e. teaching, scholarship, and service). The initiative is consistent with the University’s mission to infuse civic engagement across the curriculum and to provide students with opportunities to enhance their academic, civic, and personal growth.” (Montclair State University, 2011)

      Faculty members participating in the program participate in faculty development and progress through two to three phases: fellow, mentor, and scholar. Faculty members are awarded a stipend for successfully completing their responsibilities and may receive additional remuneration and recognition for generating scholarly products in the area of community-engaged learning.

   b. Engaged Department Institute
      Another best practice associated with faculty development is the process of developing engaged departments. In the late 1990s, Campus Compact, “a national coalition of over 1,100 college and university presidents … dedicated to promoting community service, civic engagement, and service learning in higher education” (Campus Compact, 2011), began hosting Engaged Department Institutes. In 2003, Campus Compact published The Engaged Department Toolkit (Battistoni, Gelmon, Saltmarsh, Wergin & Zlotkowski) so that institutions might conduct their own institute.
The purpose of an Engaged Department Institute is to help participating departments develop strategies to: 1) incorporate community-based work into their teaching and their scholarship, 2) include community-based experiences as a standard expectation for majors, and 3) develop a level of unit coherence that will allow them to successfully model civic engagement and progressive change on the department level. (Battistoni, Gelmon, Saltmarsh, Wergin & Zlotkowki, 2003, p. 15)

The authors go on to indicate that “neglecting the department more or less guarantees that the engagement efforts of all but a small number of unusually independent, secure, and/or already marginalized faculty members will not last long” (Battistoni, et.al., p. 9).

3. Curricular/Co-curricular Deployment
The review of previously submitted QEPs indicates that institutions deployed their initiatives in increments. Generally, the scope of their QEP in Year One was significantly smaller than the scope at Year Five. This practice is intricately associated with the respective institution’s capacity to implement and sustain its QEP.

**CONNECTED! Students**, fall of 2012

**Community Partner:** Mosaic Trails Therapeutic Equestrian Center, San Angelo, Texas.
VI. Actions to be Implemented

The actions to be implemented are associated with five key processes:  
A. Leadership, Governance, and Administration  
B. Human Resource Development and Support  
C. Promotion, Recruitment, and Recognition  
D. Curricular and Co-curricular Deployment  
E. Assessment and Evaluation

Both a narrative and summary (FIGURE 6.1) are offered.

A. Key Implementation Process #1: Leadership, Governance, and Administration

Action #1: Establish the QEP Leadership Team
The QEP Leadership Team is charged with overseeing the implementation and assessment of ASU’s QEP during the pilot phase (2012-13) and during the entire five-year implementation period (2013-18). Initial members are identified in Section VIII: Organizational Structure.

Action #2: Establish the Community Engagement Advisory Board
A sense of shared governance, ownership, and advocacy among the various constituent groups must be built. Therefore, a Community Engagement Advisory Board should be formed, which would bring together representatives of all affected constituencies. This body should meet quarterly and as needed. Initial members are identified in Section VIII: Organizational Structure.

Action #3: Establish the Center for Community Engagement
CONNECT! transcends the QEP and accreditation. CONNECT! operationalizes our mission and values and is the focal point of ASU’s larger community engagement initiative. CONNECT! cuts across administrative divisions and will involve a large cross-section of individuals on campus and in the community. The creation of a central, administrative unit within the Academic Affairs Division is critical to the success of CONNECT!. The Center for Community Engagement (CCE) is best located in a highly visible, first-class campus space, per the example of the Center for Community Engagement at Indiana State University, which is called “The Front Door to the University” (Indiana State University, 2011). Interested parties need to know where it is located, have easy access to the location, and perceive that the location and physical space is appropriate for the initiative that is housed there.
FIGURE 6.1: QEP Implementation Processes and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Zero</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Key Implementation Process #1: Leadership, Governance, and Administration**

Defining Quality: Well-designed system of shared governance and program administration

Actions:
1. Summer, 2012 – Establish the QEP Leadership Team (meets quarterly).
2. Summer, 2012 – Establish the Community Engagement Advisory Board (meets quarterly).

**Key Implementation Process #2: Human Resource Development and Support**

Defining Quality: Well-designed faculty, campus partner, and community partner training

Actions:
1. Annual Faculty Fellowship Program to develop and support interested faculty.
2. Annual Institutes to develop and support interested academic departments, campus partners, and community partners.
3. Biennial (beginning fall of 2014) Community Engagement Conference @ ASU.

**Key Implementation Process #3: Promotion, Recruitment, and Recognition**

Defining Quality: Well-designed processes to promote the program, and to recruit and recognize participants for their achievements

Actions:
1. Conduct a promotional campaign and pilot in Year Zero; continue promotional activities throughout implementation.
2. Appropriately fund student incentive program, faculty fellowships, partner institutes, etc. in annual budget.
3. Recognize community-engaged teaching, scholarship, and service in faculty tenure and promotion policy by AY 2013-14; annual awards banquet (spring).

**Key Implementation Process #4: Curricular/Co-curricular Deployment**

Defining Quality: Well-designed curricular/co-curricular programs that positively impact student learning

Actions:
1. Grow, over time, an inventory of CONNECT! courses and pedagogies distributed in the core curriculum and in the various majors via Faculty Fellowships and Engaged Department Institutes.
2. Grow, over time, an inventory of co-curricular activities and engagement venues via Campus and Community Partner Institutes.

**Key Implementation Process #5: Assessment and Evaluation**

Defining Quality: Well-designed system of student/program assessment and evaluation

Actions:
1. Semester by semester (December/May) assessment of student learning (direct measures) derived from faculty evaluation of student work samples.
3. Continuous administration of course, activity, and event participant surveys.
4. Annual program assessment (summer).
5. Formative program evaluation (summer of 2015).
B. Key Implementation Process #2: Human Resource Development and Support

Action #1: Annual Faculty Fellowship Program
During a two-year commitment, interested faculty progress through at least two and hopefully three stages of development: Community-Engaged Fellow (first year), Community-Engaged Mentor (second year), and Community-Engaged Scholar. A stipend will be awarded for embedding CONNECT! strategies into at least one course each long semester, assisting in the training of other faculty, and in assessing student work. Mentors will also be paid a stipend for continuing to take part in student assessment after the completion of their two-year commitment. Additionally, funds will be budgeted to award faculty for producing community engagement scholarly publications or presentations. Given that five new fellows will be recruited each year, potentially 40 faculty members will become fellows between 2012 and 2018.

Action #2: Annual Institutes for Academic Departments, Campus Partners, and Community Partners
a. CONNECTED! Department Institute and Grant Program
Each year, approximately three academic departments will participate in an institute conducted by CCE staff and faculty mentors. Those successfully doing so will receive funding (dispersed over a two-year period) to enhance their curriculum by embedding CONNECT! pedagogies into courses. By having three departments complete the institute each year, all of ASU’s 15 undergraduate academic departments will have completed the institute between AY 2013-14 and AY 2017-18. Ideally, every department will have a minimum of three CONNECT! courses in their curricula by 2018. Those departments that offer core courses that address Social Responsibility would have at least one additional CONNECT! course.

b. Campus Partner Training (possibly an Institute)
Each year, interested non-academic units will complete training (institute) conducted by CCE staff. The training is designed to enhance each unit’s understanding of the guiding principles and central practices of the CONNECT! program and the resources offered by the CCE. Armed with this understanding, the units can then design and/or modify community-engagement programming that can be conducted in partnership with Engaged Departments and/or conducted independently with Community Partners.

c. Community Partner Training (possibly an Institute)
Each year, interested community agencies will complete training (possibly in the form of an institute) conducted by CCE staff. Those successfully doing so will be provided information regarding the principles and practices of CONNECT!, be provided an opportunity to join the CONNECT! Network, and begin the process of developing contracts, memoranda of understanding, etc. Faculty Fellows and Campus Partners will be asked to assist in conducting these institutes.

Action #3: Biennial Community Engagement Conference
In fall 2010, Texas Tech University hosted its first Community Engagement Conference. Several ASU faculty and administrators participated. In fall 2013, Texas Tech University is hosting the National Outreach Scholarship Conference. ASU’s QEP Director is serving on the planning committee, and ASU faculty members have been made aware of the conference and are being encouraged to participate. The first ASU Community Engagement Conference is tentatively scheduled for fall 2014. All faculty, staff, students, and community members will be invited. The possibility of the two universities hosting an annual conference on an alternating basis has also been discussed.
C. Key Implementation Process #3: Promotion, Recruitment, and Recognition

Action #1: Promotional Campaign
Conduct a promotional campaign and pilot in Year Zero; continue promotional activities throughout implementation.

Action #2: Student, Faculty, and Partner Recruitment
 Appropriately fund student incentives, faculty fellowships, internal grants, partner institutes, etc. in annual budget.

Action #3: Student, Faculty, and Partner Recognition
Recognize community-engaged teaching, scholarship, and service in faculty tenure and promotion policy by AY 2013-14; conduct annual awards banquet each spring.

D. Curricular and Co-curricular Deployment

Action #1: Curricular Deployment
Grow, over time, an inventory of CONNECT! courses and pedagogies distributed in the core curriculum and in the various majors via Faculty Fellowships and CONNECTED! Department Institutes. Given that five new fellows and three new departments will be recruited each year, the inventory of courses is expected to grow incrementally, over time. Annual curricular deployment targets (# of CONNECT! courses) are identified in Section VII: Timeline. These data will also contribute to QEP assessment. Curricular deployment will focus on upper-division courses in AY 2013-14 and will expand to both upper- and lower-division courses in AY 2014-15 to coincide with the implementation of a revised Texas Core Curriculum.

Action #2: Co-curricular Deployment
Grow, over time, an inventory of co-curricular activities and engagement venues via Campus and Community Partner Institutes. While many community-engaged, co-curricular activities exist and will continue, the focus for CONNECT! will be on those activities that directly relate to the CONNECT! curriculum.

E. Assessment and Evaluation

Action #1: Semester by Semester Assessment of Student Learning
Direct assessment will be conducted by a jury of raters (faculty fellows and institute completers) who will evaluate student work samples at the conclusion of each long semester.

Action #2: Biennial Administration of NSSE
The NSSE (indirect measure) is administered in the spring of 2013, 2015, and 2017 to provide program-level assessment of curriculum and co-curriculum.
Action #3: Continuous Administration of Event/Program Participant Surveys
Locally developed instruments will be administered to provide program level assessment of the curriculum and co-curriculum, faculty development, etc.

Action #4: Completion of the Application for Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement
The data collected for QEP assessment will contribute to this application, which is due in April 2014.

Action #5: Annual Program Evaluation
Assessment data collected each year will be used to create an annual Program report (summer).

Action #6: Formative Program Evaluation
A formative evaluation of CONNECT! will be conducted during the summer of 2015.

Action #7: Summative Program Evaluation
The QEP Impact Report, due April, 2019, will serve as the summative evaluation of CONNECT!.

RAMS READ! In 2012, the ASU Department of Intercollegiate Athletics began a new partnership with the San Angelo Independent School District.
CONNECT! Focus Statement: CONNECTED students become socially responsible citizens!

VII. Timeline

Year Zero: Academic Year 2012-13

- CCE recruits 2nd Cohort of Faculty Fellows, (n = 5); 1st Cohort of CONNECTED! Departments (n = 3), Campus and Community Partners
- CCE conducts CONNECT! Promotional Campaign
- CE Advisory Board begins investigating CONNECT! implementation strategies for core courses
- CCE conducts Phase I of QEP Pilot (5+ CONNECT! courses offered)
- CCE conducts Phase II of QEP Pilot (5+ CONNECT! courses offered)
- CCE recruits 2nd Cohort of Faculty Fellows, (n = 5); 1st Cohort of CONNECTED! Departments (n = 3), Campus and Community Partners
- CCE conducts CONNECT! Promotional Campaign
- CE Advisory Board begins investigating CONNECT! implementation strategies for core courses
- CCE conducts Phase I of QEP Pilot (5+ CONNECT! courses offered)
- CCE conducts Phase II of QEP Pilot (5+ CONNECT! courses offered)
- CCE publishes CONNECT! Course Inventory for AY 2013-14
- CCE trains 2nd Cohort of Faculty Fellows
- Faculty Raters assess CONNECT! student work samples
- QEP document finalized
- Administer NSSE (baseline)
- Faculty Raters assess CONNECT! student work samples
- Establish QEP Leadership Team
- Establish Community Engagement Advisory Board
- Establish Center for Community Engagement (CCE)
- Faculty Raters assess CONNECT! student work samples
- Administer NSSE (baseline)
- Establish QEP Leadership Team
- Establish Community Engagement Advisory Board
- Establish Center for Community Engagement (CCE)

Year Zero transitions ASU from the QEP Development Phase to the QEP Implementation Phase. During this transitional year, the programmatic and administrative aspects of CONNECT! will be piloted and promoted. Simultaneously, the QEP document will be finalized for submission to SACSCOC.
Year One: Academic Year 2013-14

Year One is this first year of QEP Implementation. Data gathered during Year Zero will be used to inform the implementation of CONNECT!. During the summer, the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) will conduct institutes for academic departments, campus partners, and community partners. At times, all three constituencies will be participating together. In the fall, ASU will begin offering student incentives and will participate in the National Engagement Scholarship Conference hosted by Texas Tech University. The inventory of CONNECT! courses will remain small during Year One, but will expand dramatically in Year Two, given that multi-section core courses will be added. These courses, which are to be submitted in 2013, will be designed per recommendations from the CE Advisory Board. CONNECT! core course design will be a significant component of faculty fellow training and engaged-department institutes.
In Year Two, CONNECT! expands significantly to include several multi-section core courses. As mentioned previously, the revised Texas Core Curriculum is implemented in fall 2014. Social Responsibility is one of the six Texas Core Curriculum objectives and the CONNECT! student learning goal.
During the summer, CCE will conduct an annual program assessment and publish the 2014-15 Annual Report. This report will serve as the formative assessment of the QEP. The Community Engagement Advisory Board will use this report and other data to formulate recommendations regarding implementation strategies for Years Three, Four, and Five.
Year Four: Academic Year 2016-17

During Year Four, the Community Engagement Advisory Board and the QEP Leadership Team will begin to focus the sustainability of CONNECT! beyond the five-year timeline of the QEP.
During Year Five, ASU will begin the process of developing the QEP Impact Report and consider the long-term sustainability of CONNECT!
VIII. Organizational Structure

A. Leadership

The president has committed to being an advocate for CONNECT! and supporting an appropriate leadership/staffing model and sufficient funding. Therefore, ASU has established a QEP Leadership Team. The team is charged with overseeing the implementation and assessment of ASU’s QEP during the pilot phase (2012-13) and during the entire five-year implementation period (2013-18). The team consists of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Executive Director of Community Engagement/QEP (or some other appropriate title), the Director of Community Relations, and one Community-Engaged Faculty Fellow.

A sense of shared governance, ownership, and advocacy among the various constituent groups must be built. Therefore, a Community Engagement Advisory Board has also been formed, which brings together representatives of all affected constituencies. A general membership list follows and the complete list as of the January 2013 is found in Appendix C. A broad operational plan for the advisory board has been composed and initiated. The plan includes a statement of purpose and function, terms of membership, meeting schedule, and rotation of membership.

Community Engagement Advisory Board (2012-13)

- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Executive Director of Community Engagement/QEP (ex officio)
- Director of Community Relations (ex officio)
- Community-Engaged Fellows, College of Arts & Sciences (2)
- Community-Engaged Fellow, College of Business
- Community-Engaged Fellow, College of Education
- Community-Engaged Fellow, College of Health & Human Services
- Faculty Senate Representative
- Staff Senate Representative
- Student Government Representatives (2)
- Campus Representatives (5 or more)
- Community Representatives (5 or more)

While many may serve as advocates, an initiative of this magnitude also needs a point person and champion. This person’s title and position in the organizational structure clearly indicates that ASU is committed to the initiative and that the point person has the authority and responsibility to carry his/her duties. Currently, Dr. Doyle Carter, Director of the QEP is fulfilling the duties associated with the
position of Executive Director of Community Engagement/QEP (exact title TBD). To assist the executive director, the university will appoint a Director of Community Partnerships (exact title TBD). This appointment will begin no later than September, 2013. Job description summaries for these positions are included as Appendix F.

B. Organizational Structure and Staffing

CONNECT! is intended to transform the institution. Therefore, the position of the QEP within the formal organizational structure is pivotal to its success. Given that CONNECT! is the focal point of the larger institutional community engagement initiative, a separate unit has been created in the Division of Academic Affairs. The title of this unit is The Center for Community Engagement. This unit is charged with administering the QEP, coordinating the larger community engagement initiative, and interfacing with deans, department heads, directors, faculty, and others who will play critical roles in implementing these initiatives. In addition to the Executive Director of Community Engagement/QEP and the Director of Community Partnerships, the Center for Community Engagement (CCE) will initially be staffed by an administrative assistant and a graduate assistant. Given their role in implementing the inventory of CONNECT! courses, Community-Engaged Faculty Fellows can also be considered part of the staff. Figure 8.1 illustrates the organizational structure for the QEP.

FIGURE 8.1: QEP Organizational Chart

![QEP Organizational Chart Diagram]
IX. Resources

A. QEP Development Budget, FY 2010-13

As previously mentioned, ASU began the process of developing its QEP in spring 2010. While no funds were budgeted in Fiscal Year 2010 (September 1, 2009 – August 31, 2010), funds were budgeted for subsequent years (FY 2011, FY 2012, FY 2013). Annual budgets for the three years of QEP Development are shown in TABLE 9.1.

TABLE 9.1: Annual Budgets for QEP Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Director Salary (~57% FTE in FY11 &amp; FY12, 75% in FY13)</td>
<td>50,970</td>
<td>*55,560</td>
<td>74,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Director Benefits</td>
<td>15,291</td>
<td>16,652</td>
<td>22,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant Salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>**25,013</td>
<td>38,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fellows Stipend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fellows Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Operations</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,001</strong></td>
<td><strong>$132,219</strong></td>
<td><strong>$191,743</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*QEP Director was promoted to Professor in 2012
**Administrative Assistant began in Jan. 2012; salary represents 8 months remaining in FY12

B. CONNECT! Five-Year Projected Annual Budgets

TABLE 9.2A, 9.2B, and 9.2C on the following pages show the projected annual budgets for QEP implementation, which is to be administered in the Center for Community Engagement. An annual 2% salary increase is projected for all employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of Community Engagement: Salary (tentative based on current QEP Director’s salary, .75 FTE)</td>
<td>76,102</td>
<td>77,624</td>
<td>79,177</td>
<td>80,760</td>
<td>82,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of Community Engagement: Benefits</td>
<td>22,831</td>
<td>23,287</td>
<td>23,753</td>
<td>24,228</td>
<td>24,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Community Partnerships: Salary</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>67,626</td>
<td>68,979</td>
<td>70,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Community Partnerships: Benefits</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>20,288</td>
<td>20,694</td>
<td>21,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant: Salary</td>
<td>39,036</td>
<td>39,817</td>
<td>40,613</td>
<td>41,425</td>
<td>42,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant: Benefits</td>
<td>11,711</td>
<td>11,945</td>
<td>12,184</td>
<td>12,428</td>
<td>12,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>7,803</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>8,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fellows: Stipends</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fellows: Benefits</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Salaries &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td>$284,079</td>
<td>$295,416</td>
<td>$306,849</td>
<td>$318,381</td>
<td>$330,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9.2B: Center for Community Engagement, Maintenance and Operations Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Supplies, Phones, etc.</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Development/Travel</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTED! Department Institute &amp; Grant Program</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/Community Partner Institutes</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Incentives</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and Awards Banquet</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Community Engagement Conference</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Maintenance and Operations Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>92,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9.2C: Five-Year QEP Implementation Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Salaries and Benefits</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$284,079</td>
<td>$295,416</td>
<td>$306,849</td>
<td>$318,381</td>
<td>$330,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Maintenance and Operations</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>79,950</td>
<td>91,450</td>
<td>92,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual QEP Implementation Budgets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$342,579</strong></td>
<td><strong>$373,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>$386,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>$409,831</strong></td>
<td><strong>$422,914</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Budget Allocation for QEP Implementation = $1,936,039.**
X. Assessment

Assessment processes are of primary consideration and have informed many components of this proposal. Given that CONNECT! is so closely aligned with the institution’s strategic plan, data derived from CONNECT! will also inform broader strategic initiatives, particularly ASU’s community engagement initiative. Therefore, student learning is the key indicator of the success of CONNECT!. Other indicators will also be addressed to gauge broader program and institutional success.

The CONNECT! assessment plan includes the following components:

A. Conceptual Framework and Focus (the Abstract)
   1. Visual Model and Logic Model
   2. Focus Statement
   3. Assessment Questions

B. Clearly Defined Expectations (the Concrete)
   1. Definitions
   2. Goal, Objectives, and Performance Indicators
   3. Assessment Instruments and Use
   4. Formative and Summative Targets and Baselines

C. Assessment Process Summary

A. Conceptual Framework and Focus

1. Visual Model and Logic Model
Models in the form of diagrams, pictures, etc. are often used to provide a broad visual representation of an initiative. The model employed to visually conceptualize CONNECT! is an example of a “bridge” model (See FIGURE 10.1). Bridges typically serve as a means of getting from “where you are now to where you want to be in the future.”

FIGURE 10.1: Simple Bridge Model

ASU’s Quality Enhancement Plan, CONNECT! proposed to give our Current Students (where we are now), expanded opportunities to be CONNECTED! Students (the bridge) thus preparing them to be Socially Responsible Citizens (where we want to be). (See FIGURE 10.2)
Data collected during the QEP development process indicated that overall student performance in Social Responsibility, as measured both directly and indirectly, was not sufficient. While an emphasis on and the assessment of Social Responsibility is rather new to ASU, the assessment embedded in COMM 2301 and NSSE did establish this student learning need. Furthermore, community engagement pedagogies are not widely used across academic disciplines.

**CONNECTED! Students**

Over the five-year QEP implementation period, CONNECT! will create expanded opportunities for ASU students to become CONNECTED! students. An extensive inventory of community-engaged courses and supporting co-curricular activities will be developed for the purpose of helping students learn Social Responsibility.

**Socially Responsible Citizens**

The expected result of CONNECT! is that CONNECTED! students will become socially responsible citizens, thus demonstrating the achievement of ASU’s mission and other strategic priorities.

In addition to the bridge model illustrated above, this plan also includes a logic model that offers more textual information about the relationship among the inputs, processes, outputs, and expected outcomes of CONNECT! (See TABLE 10.1) Simply put, this logic model expresses ASU’s investment of significant resources (inputs) to a variety of relevant processes that collectively compose the CONNECT! program (outputs). The CONNECT! program will be assessed and evaluated in light of the expected outcomes.
TABLE 10.1: The CONNECT! Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Human Resources: | 1. Leadership, governance, and administration  
2. Human resource development, and support  
3. Promotion, recruitment, and recognition  
4. Curricular/co-curricular deployment  
5. Assessment and evaluation | 1. Community-Engaged Faculty Fellowship Program  
2. CONNECTED! Department Institute  
3. Campus/Community Partner Institute and Grant Program  
4. Get CONNECTED! Student Engagement Program  
5. Inventory of CONNECT! Courses  
6. Inventory of supporting co-curricular activities  
7. Annual awards ceremony  
8. Biannual community engagement conference  
2. Objectives:  
a. CONNECT! will have a positive impact on student learning (Social Responsibility)  
b. CONNECT! will have a positive impact on ASU’s community engagement outcomes (per strategic plan) |
| a. QEP Leadership Team  
b. Center for Community Engagement Staff  
c. Community Engagement Advisory Board  
d. Faculty Fellows  
e. Community Partners  
f. Campus Partners |  |  |
| 2. Fiscal Resources: |  |  |
| a. Salaries/benefits  
b. Faculty incentives  
c. Student incentives  
d. Faculty/staff development  
e. Faculty/staff/student recognition  
f. Marketing/promotion materials  
g. physical space  
h. Office supplies, etc. |  |  |

2. Focus Statement
A focus statement is a means of sharpening or narrowing the scope of the initiative to its most central focus. This statement also serves as the CONNECT! program goal.

CONNECT! Focus Statement:
CONNECTED students become socially responsible citizens!

ASU’s QEP focuses on:
- A specific population (undergraduate students),
- A specific learning environment (community-engagement activities embedded in the curriculum and co-curriculum),
- The demonstration of a specific student learning goal (Social Responsibility). For an in-depth narrative regarding Social Responsibility, please see Section IV: Desired Student Learning Outcomes.

3. Assessment Questions
Assessment questions are composed as a means of focusing on the key expectations and summarizing the how, how much, who, what, when, where, and why of this initiative. Framing the questions helps determine the data to be collected and analyzed in order to foster continuous improvement. These questions focus on two broad areas: 1) student learning and 2) program effectiveness.
B. Clearly Defined Expectations

1. Assessment Definitions

- **Assessment** is an ongoing, systematic process of collecting, analyzing, and using qualitative and/or quantitative data for the purpose of improving student learning. Assessment is conducted at multiple levels (student-level, course-level, program-level, institution-level) and for multiple purposes (see definitions of formative and summative below). Student-level assessment informs course-level assessment, which informs program-level assessment, and so on.

- **Formative Assessment** occurs when the assessment process is conducted to monitor progress and provide corrective feedback that can be used to assist students, faculty, and program leaders in meeting their respective goals or objectives.

- **Summative Assessment** occurs when the assessment process is conducted to demonstrate or certify that a goal or objective has or has not been met.

- **Goals** are statements that provide broad philosophical and/or conceptual priorities for an institution, program, or course. For our purposes, the CONNECT! Focus Statement serves as our goal.

- **Objectives** are statements that break down an associated goal into its components to provide further explanation and analysis.

- **Performance Indicators** are specific indicators of a quality or quantity of an attribute(s) being measured to demonstrate the attainment of a goal or objective. At the student-level, these are usually direct or indirect measures (defined below) of student performance. At the course-, program- and institution-level, the indicators also include measures of student achievement and success (persistence rates, graduate/professional school acceptance rates), external reviews, cost/benefit analyses, etc.

- **Baselines** are existing levels of achievement for a given performance indicator and are used to gauge improvement over time.

- **Targets** are the predetermined performance criteria or cut-scores that indicate achievement of a goal or objective.

- **Student Learning Goals/Outcomes** are statements that indicate specific and measureable performance expectations for students.

- **Direct Measures of Student Learning** allow students to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions relative to the stated student learning goal(s) and/or outcome(s). Examples include student work samples, portfolios, essays, capstone projects, embedded test questions, and state/nationally normed tests.

- **Indirect Measures of Student Learning** allow students to report perceptions of self and learning gains. Examples include surveys, interviews, and self-evaluations.
2. Goal, Objectives, and Performance Indicators
The CONNECT! Focus Statement: connected students [will] become socially responsible citizens, also serves as the overarching program goal. Two program objectives and associated performance indicators are intended to address the previously stated assessment questions. By focusing on the institutionally identified student learning need – Social Responsibility, CONNECT! contributes significantly to student success and to the success of Angelo State University. This focus is emphasized in FIGURE 10.3.

FIGURE 10.3: CONNECT! Goal, Objectives, and Performance Indicators

3. Assessment Instruments and Use
a. Direct Measures of Student Learning (Performance Indicator 1.1)
   - Social Responsibility Rubric (Appendix G). This rubric was developed and piloted by the Community Engaged Faculty Fellows. Faculty members teaching CONNECT! courses are expected to: 1) align at least one course-level student learning outcome (documented in the course syllabus) to at least one of the indicators Social Responsibility express in this rubric, 2) align at least one assignment (documented in Blackboard) to at least one of these indicators, 3) archive (in Blackboard) an electronic version of the student product (artifact) that demonstrates his/her achievement of this/these indicator(s). Faculty raters (fellows) conduct a post hoc rating of an appropriate sample of these artifacts after the conclusion of each long semester. For a more in-depth narrative on Social Responsibility, please see Section IV: Desired Student Learning Outcomes.
• **Community Partner Evaluation of Student Learning (Appendix H).** Community Partners who engage with students are asked to complete an evaluation of student learning at the end of the semester. This evaluation is aligned with the six indicators of Social Responsibility expressed in the rubric.

b. **Indirect Measures of Student Learning (Performance Indicator 1.2)**
   - **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).** ASU administers the NSSE biennially to first year students and seniors. Ten key items (indicators) from the instrument that are closely aligned with Social Responsibility will be tracked. These items are listed on p. 68 with their associated baselines and targets.
   - **CONNECT! Student Survey (Appendix I).** Students enrolled in CONNECT! courses will complete a survey at the end of the semester. This survey is aligned with the six indicators of Social Responsibility expressed on the Social Responsibility Rubric.

c. **Measures of Institution-level Community Engagement (Performance Indicator 2.1)**
   - **Carnegie Community Engagement Indicators.** As mentioned, ASU intends to apply for the Carnegie Community Engagement Elective Classification. The application framework includes several indicators of community engagement at the institutional level. Twelve key indicators are listed on pp. 68-69 with their associated baselines and targets.

d. **Measures of Curricular Engagement and Outreach/Partnership (Performance Indicator 2.2)**
   - **Carnegie Community Engagement Indicators.** In addition to indicators of institution-level community engagement, the Carnegie application framework includes several indicators of curricular engagement and outreach/partnerships. The ten indicators are listed on pp. 69-70 with their associated baselines and targets.

4. **Baselines; Formative and Summative Targets**
   a. **Performance Indicator 1.1 – Direct Measures of Student Learning (Social Responsibility)**
      Baselines will be determined at the end of the pilot year (AY 2012-13). This may affect the targets that are listed below.

      **Formative Targets (tentative)**
      - The aggregate Social Responsibility Rating (derived from the Social Responsibility Rubric) of the exposure group (representative work sample of students having completed at least 2 lower division CONNECT! courses) is 1.5 or higher in AY 2014-15;
      - The aggregate Social Responsibility Rating (derived from the Social Responsibility Rubric) of the evaluation group (representative work sample of students having completed graduation requirements) is 2.5 in AY 2014-15;
      - The aggregate Community Partner Rating (derived from the Community Partner Evaluation of Student Learning) of the evaluation group is 2.5 in AY 2014-15.

      **Summative Targets (tentative)**
      - The aggregate Social Responsibility Rating (derived from the Social Responsibility Rubric) of the exposure group (representative work sample of students having completed at least 2 lower division CONNECT! courses) is 2.0 or higher in AY 2017-18;
- The aggregate Social Responsibility Rating (derived from the Social Responsibility Rubric) of the evaluation group (representative work sample of students having completed graduation requirements) is 3.0 in AY 2017-18;
- The aggregate Community Partner Rating (derived from the Community Partner Evaluation of Student Learning) of the evaluation group is 3.0 in AY 2017-18.

b. Performance Indicator 1.2 – Indirect Measures of Student Learning (Social Responsibility)

Baselines for NSSE appear in parenthesis (first-year mean/senior mean) after each item listed above. The baseline for the CONNECT! Student Survey ratings will be determined at the end of the pilot year (AY 2012-13), which may affect the student survey targets.

Formative Targets
- NSSE indicators most closely associated with Social Responsibility in 2011 (baseline year) improve by 10% in 2015. These indicators are:
  - NSSE 1. Academic/Intellectual Experiences- e. Included diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments (2.55/2.82);
  - NSSE 1. Academic/Intellectual Experiences- k. Participate in community-based project as part of a regular course (1.57/1.78);
  - NSSE 6. Additional Collegiate Experiences- e. Tried to understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks for his or her perspective (2.77/2.82);
  - NSSE 7. Enriching Educational Experiences- a. Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment (.06/.43);
  - NSSE 7. Enriching Educational Experiences- b. Community service or volunteer work (.40/63);
  - NSSE 10. Institutional Environment- c. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds (2.72/2.61);
  - NSSE 11. Educational and Personal Growth- b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills (2.75/3.10);
  - NSSE 11. Educational and Personal Growth- h. Working effectively with others (2.94/3.00);
  - NSSE 11. Educational and Personal Growth- l. – Understanding people of other racial or ethnic backgrounds (2.62/2.53);
  - NSSE 11. Educational and Personal Growth- o. – Contribute to the welfare of your community (2.38/2.45).
- Aggregate ratings of 3.5 across all six CONNECT! Student Survey indicators in AY 2014-15.

Summative Targets
Note: These targets may be adjusted after the formative program evaluation at the end of AY 2014-15.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) indicators most closely associated with Social Responsibility in 2011 (Baseline) improve by 20% in 2017. These indicators are the same as those expressed above.
- Aggregate ratings of 4.0 across all six CONNECT! Student Survey indicators in AY 2017-18.

c. Performance Indicator 2.1 – Institutional Indicators of Community Engagement (Carnegie)

Baseline: As of 2012, ASU has achieved 42% (5 of 12) of the institutional indicators.

Formative Targets
- 83% (10 of 12) of the Institutional Indicators of Community Engagement listed below are completed by 2014.
o Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?
o Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through campus-wide awards and celebrations?
o Does the institution have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution’s engagement with community?
o Is community engagement emphasized in the marketing materials (website, brochures, etc.) of the institution?
o Does the executive leadership of the institution (President, Provost, Chancellor, Trustees, etc.) explicitly promote community engagement as a priority?
o Does the institution have a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement?
o Are there internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?
o Does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community?
o Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?
o Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?
o Do the faculty, students, and community have a “voice” or role for input into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?
o Are there college/school/and/or department level policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?

Summative Targets
- 100% of the Institutional Indicators of Community Engagement listed above are completed by 2016 and maintained in 2018.

Performance Indicator 2.2 – Curricular Engagement and Outreach/Partnership Indicators (Carnegie)
Baseline: As of 2012, ASU has achieved 30% (3 of 10) of the Curricular Engagement and Outreach/Partnership Indicators.

Formative Targets
- 80% (8 of 10) of the Curricular Engagement and Outreach/Partnership Indicators listed below are completed by 2014.
  o Does the institution have a definition, standard components, and a process for identifying community engagement courses?
  o Are there institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students’ curricular engagement with the community?
  o Is community engagement integrated into the following curricular activities? Student Research, Student Leadership, Internships/Co-ops, Study Abroad.
  o Has community engagement been integrated with curriculum on an institution-wide level?
  o Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their curricular engagement achievements?
  o Are there outreach programs developed for the community?
  o What institutional resources are provided as outreach to the community?
  o Describe representative examples of partnerships.
Does the institution or to the departments promote attention to the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnerships?

- Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their outreach and partnerships activities?

**Summative Targets**
- 100% of the Curricular Engagement and Outreach/Partnership Indicators of Community Engagement listed above are completed by 2016 and maintained in 2018.

### C. Assessment Process Summary

This brief narrative and **TABLE 10.2** are offered to help summarize the assessment process. Valid, direct assessment of student learning is central to this assessment plan. This is augmented by indirect assessment of student learning and by the assessment of institutional, curricular, and co-curricular indicators of community engagement. These assessments are guided by:

- **Two broad Assessment Questions**
  1. *To what degree and in what ways does participation in CONNECT! activities affect student learning specific to Social Responsibility?*
  2. *To what degree and in what ways does CONNECT! contribute to the success of the institution?*

- **The CONNECT! Focus Statement/Goal**
  
  *CONNECTED students [will] become socially responsible citizens!*

- **Two Objectives**
  1. *CONNECT! will have a positive impact on student learning (Social Responsibility).*
  2. *CONNECT! will have a positive impact on ASU’s community engagement outcomes.*

- **Multiple definitions, performance indicators, baselines, and targets.**

Two interrelated factors, one human and one technological, are central to the successful implementation of this assessment plan. The first is that every person associated with the process must fulfill his/her responsibilities in a timely manner. Faculty, students, campus and community partners, faculty raters, and CCE staff all have important roles to play and must therefore understand the rationale and mechanics of their respective responsibilities. Second, a user friendly, fully functional student learning data management and assessment system must be in place. This will allow students to submit work samples, programs to assess student work, and the institution to build a body of evidence to document the achievement of student learning outcomes, institutional objectives, and curricular/co-curricular objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONNECT! Assessment Questions</th>
<th>Type of Assessment</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Time of Base Line</th>
<th>Time of Formative Evaluation</th>
<th>Time of Summative Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. To what degree and in what ways does participation in CONNECT! activities affect student learning specific to Social Responsibility?</td>
<td>F/S D</td>
<td>Work sample of students completing 4 CONNECT! courses assessed w/ Social Responsibility Rubric;</td>
<td>Conclusion of each fall and spring semester</td>
<td>End of 2012-13 Pilot</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. To what degree and in what ways does CONNECT! contribute to the success of the institution?</td>
<td>F/S D</td>
<td>Work sample of graduates assessed w/ Social Responsibility Rubric;</td>
<td>Conclusion of each fall and spring semester</td>
<td>End of 2012-13 Pilot</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F/S D</td>
<td>Community Partner Evaluation of Student Performance</td>
<td>Conclusion of each upper-division CONNECT! course</td>
<td>End of 2012-13 Pilot</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F/S I</td>
<td>NSSE Administered to First-Year Students and Seniors</td>
<td>Biennially</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F/S I</td>
<td>CONNECT! Student Survey</td>
<td>Conclusion of each CONNECT! Course</td>
<td>End of 2012-13 Pilot</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F/S NA</td>
<td>Successful completion of the various Institutional Indicators of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F/S NA</td>
<td>Successful completion of the various Curricular Engagement and Outreach/Partnership Indicators</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XI. Appendices

Appendix A. Quality Enhancement Plan Action Committee Charge and Roster (2010)
This *ad hoc* committee was formed to make recommendations to the Interim Provost related to the following:

1 – Develop a detailed timeline for the QEP process.
2 – Outline an action plan for ensuring broad based university support for the QEP.
3 – Develop recommendations for appointment of the QEP Director.
4 – Develop recommendations for documentation of the QEP process.
5 – Address leadership expectations from university administration including the President, Provost, and the academic Deans.
6 – Outline requirements of university support including financial support, clerical support, IT support, and personnel requirements.
7 – Ensure that all recommendations conform to SACS requirements regarding the QEP process. (*Quality Enhancement Plan Action Committee Report*, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dionne Bailey</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Skip Bolding</td>
<td>Director, Environmental Health, Safety and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Loree Branham</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Animal Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joel Carr</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter</td>
<td>Associate Professor and Head, Department of Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Slade Cozart</td>
<td>Technology Services Specialist, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eleanor Elkins</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maurice Fortin</td>
<td>Executive Director, Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Doug Fox</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Information Technology; CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mark Hama</td>
<td>Associate Professor of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kevin Lambert</td>
<td>Dean, College of Liberal and Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jarrett Louder</td>
<td>Student Government Association Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kelly McCoy (chair)</td>
<td>Professor and Head, Department of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joe Munoz</td>
<td>Senior Executive Assistant to the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Scott Williams</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B. Quality Enhancement Plan Development Rosters

## Quality Enhancement Plan Development Committee (2010-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Adriana Balcorta</td>
<td>Program Specialist, Multicultural Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Skip Bolding</td>
<td>Director, Environmental Hlth, Safety, Risk Mgt; Staff Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Becky Brackin</td>
<td>Director, Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Braden</td>
<td>Executive Director, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Denise Brodnax</td>
<td>Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter (Chair)</td>
<td>Professor of Kinesiology &amp; QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Cullins</td>
<td>Executive Director, Admin. Planning &amp; Special Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Dewar</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maurice Fortin</td>
<td>Executive Director, Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Corbett Gaulden</td>
<td>Dean, College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rick Greig</td>
<td>Services Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sierra Howry</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Agriculture Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Harriet Lewis</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor of Physical Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sarah Logan</td>
<td>Assistant VP for Institutional Research and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dean McIntyre</td>
<td>President, Paint Rock State Bank; Community/Alumni Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hector Romo</td>
<td>Student Government Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Julie Ruthenbeck</td>
<td>Director, Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Shumway</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sangetta Singg</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology; Faculty Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martha Sleutel</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alaric Williams (chair)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Campus Engagement Subcommittee (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Skip Bolding</td>
<td>Director, Environmental Hlth, Safety, Risk Mgt; Staff Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rick Greig</td>
<td>Services Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sangetta Singg</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology; Faculty Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alaric Williams (chair)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Community Engagement Subcommittee (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Becky Brackin</td>
<td>Director, Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Corbett Gaulden</td>
<td>Dean, College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Harriet Lewis (chair)</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor of Physical Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dean McIntyre</td>
<td>President, Paint Rock State Bank; Community/Alumni Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Phil Neighbors</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO, San Angelo Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Parsons</td>
<td>Dean of Support Services, Howard College-San Angelo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Marketing and Promotion Subcommittee (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter (chair)</td>
<td>Professor of Kinesiology &amp; QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Preston Lewis</td>
<td>Director, Communications and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Martin</td>
<td>Director of Graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bradley Petty</td>
<td>Director, University Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Research and Assessment Subcommittee (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Allan</td>
<td>Head, Library Reference Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joel Carr</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maurice Fortin</td>
<td>Executive Director, Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sierra Howry (chair)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Agriculture Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sarah Logan</td>
<td>Assistant VP for Institutional Research and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kelly McCoy</td>
<td>Professor and Head, Department of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Christina Noe</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology and Other Resources Subcommittee (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Braden</td>
<td>Executive Director, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Denise Brodnax</td>
<td>Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Cullins</td>
<td>Executive Director, Admin. Planning &amp; Special Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Dewar</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Katherine Garrison</td>
<td>Secretary, Administrative Planning &amp; Special Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Shumway</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Topic Proposal Review Subcommittee (2010-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Braden</td>
<td>Executive Director, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Skip Bolding</td>
<td>Director, Environmental Hlth, Safety, Risk Mgt; Staff Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter (Chair)</td>
<td>Professor of Kinesiology &amp; QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Dewar</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hector Romo</td>
<td>Student Government Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Julie Ruthenbeck</td>
<td>Director, Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Shumway</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sangetta Singg</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology; Faculty Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martha Sleutel</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alaric Williams</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research and Development Subcommittee (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Allan</td>
<td>Head, Library Reference Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Becky Brackin</td>
<td>Director, Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Braden</td>
<td>Executive Director, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter (Chair)</td>
<td>Professor of Kinesiology &amp; QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rick Greig</td>
<td>Services Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George Pacheco, Jr.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Vincent Perez</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Shumway</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Management; Director of Academic Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E-portfolio Action Committee (2011-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Braden</td>
<td>Executive Director, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter (Chair)</td>
<td>Professor of Kinesiology &amp; QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jackie Droll</td>
<td>Technology Services Project Manager, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stephen Emmons</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Music, Reaffirmation Leadership Team Faculty Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Janet Heisman</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rebecca Muzquiz</td>
<td>Learning Technology Support Specialist, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tim Roden</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jeff Sefcik</td>
<td>Director of Process Integration &amp; Sr. Technical Architect, Information Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Shumway</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Management; Director of Academic Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martha Sleutel</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. June Smith</td>
<td>Professor of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Wegner</td>
<td>Professor of English &amp; Director, Center for Innovation in Teaching/Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alaric Williams</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community-Engaged Fellowship Application Review Subcommittee (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter (Chair)</td>
<td>Professor of Kinesiology &amp; QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Dewar</td>
<td>Associate Professor of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maurice Fortin</td>
<td>Executive Director, Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rick Greig</td>
<td>VA Services Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sierra Howry</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Agriculture Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marketing and Promotion Subcommittee (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Allan</td>
<td>Head, Library Reference Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Becky Brackin</td>
<td>Director, Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lorri Crum</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick Dierschke</td>
<td>Coordinator of Learning and Communications Services, Information Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Martin</td>
<td>Director of Graphics, Communications and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jay Michaels</td>
<td>Vice President and General Manager, Foster Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George Pacheco, Jr.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Julie Ruthenbeck</td>
<td>Director, Career Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C. Quality Enhancement Plan Implementation Rosters

### Community-Engaged Faculty Fellows (2012-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kevin Garrison</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christine Purkiss</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Janine Ray</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. June Smith</td>
<td>Professor of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sharynn Tomlin</td>
<td>Professor of Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality Enhancement Plan Leadership Team (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nancy Allen</td>
<td>Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Becky Brackin</td>
<td>Director, Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter</td>
<td>Director, Quality Enhancement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. June Smith</td>
<td>Professor of Communication (Community-Engaged Faculty Fellow)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement Advisory Board (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jamie Akin</td>
<td>Executive Director, Development and Alumni Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nancy Allen</td>
<td>Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Becky Brackin</td>
<td>Director of Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Doyle Carter</td>
<td>QEP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Cullins</td>
<td>Executive Director, Administrative Planning &amp; Special Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave Erickson</td>
<td>Executive Director, Small Business Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kevin Garrison</td>
<td>Community-Engaged Faculty Fellow, College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carol Harrison</td>
<td>Senior Vice President, United Way of the Concho Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jennifer Johnson</td>
<td>Coordinator, Greek Life &amp; Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rick Mantooth</td>
<td>Vice President and General Manager, Foster Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rebecca Muzquiz</td>
<td>E-Learning Technology Support Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Phil Neighbors</td>
<td>Executive Director, San Angelo Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Terrie Phillips</td>
<td>Advanced Academics Specialist, San Angelo ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chris Purkiss</td>
<td>Community-Engaged Faculty Fellow, College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Janine Ray</td>
<td>Community-Engaged Faculty Fellow, College of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hector Romo</td>
<td>Student Government Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Donna Gee</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. June Smith</td>
<td>Community-Engaged Faculty Fellow, College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sharynn Tomlin</td>
<td>Community Engaged Faculty Fellow, College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sara Weertz</td>
<td>Executive Director, First Year Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Wegner</td>
<td>Director, Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kristi Wolff</td>
<td>Staff Senate Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christy Youker</td>
<td>Director, Upper Colorado River Authority Water Education Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D. College and University Community Engagement Units Reviewed On-line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Unit Title</th>
<th>Director Title</th>
<th>Reports to:</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvin College <a href="https://calvin.edu/">https://calvin.edu/</a></td>
<td>Office of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Director of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin and Marshall College <a href="http://www.fandm.edu/ware">http://www.fandm.edu/ware</a></td>
<td>The Ware Institute for Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Associate Dean of the College and Director of the Ware Institute</td>
<td>Dean of the College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University <a href="http://engagement.fiu.edu/">http://engagement.fiu.edu/</a></td>
<td>Office of Engagement</td>
<td>Vice President of Engagement</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University <a href="http://www.indstate.edu/">http://www.indstate.edu/</a></td>
<td>Center for Community Engagement</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Community Engagement and Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keuka College <a href="http://experiential.keuka.edu/">http://experiential.keuka.edu/</a></td>
<td>Center for Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Dean, Center for Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar University <a href="http://www.lamar.edu/">http://www.lamar.edu/</a></td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning Enhancement</td>
<td>Director of QEP, ACES and the Center for Teaching and Learning Enhancement</td>
<td>Executive Director of Planning and Assessment (SACS Liaison)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University-Chicago <a href="http://www.luc.edu/">http://www.luc.edu/</a></td>
<td>Center for Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Director, Center for Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Associate Provost</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kentucky University <a href="https://nku.edu/">https://nku.edu/</a></td>
<td>The Scripps Howard Center for Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Executive Director, Scripps Howard Center for Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Research, Graduate &amp; Regional Stewardship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University <a href="https://www.pdx.edu/">https://www.pdx.edu/</a></td>
<td>Center for Academic Excellence</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost for Engagement</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State University <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ap/cce/">http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ap/cce/</a></td>
<td>Center for Community Engagement</td>
<td>Coordinator, Center for Community Engagement</td>
<td>Assoc. Vice Provost for Acad. Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olaf College <a href="https://wp.stolaf.edu/">https://wp.stolaf.edu/</a></td>
<td>Center for Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Director, Center for Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky <a href="http://www.uky.edu/UKHome/">http://www.uky.edu/UKHome/</a></td>
<td>University Engagement</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for University Engagement</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville <a href="http://louisville.edu/">http://louisville.edu/</a></td>
<td>Office of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Vice President for Community Engagement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida <a href="http://www.unf.edu/ccbl/">http://www.unf.edu/ccbl/</a></td>
<td>Center for Community-Based Learning</td>
<td>Director, Center of Community-Based Learning and the QEP</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Parkside <a href="https://www.uwp.edu/index.cfm">https://www.uwp.edu/index.cfm</a></td>
<td>Center for Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Executive Director, Center for Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University <a href="http://www.community.vcu.edu/">http://www.community.vcu.edu/</a></td>
<td>Division of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Vice Provost, Division of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>≈10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech University <a href="http://www.campuslife.vt.edu/">http://www.campuslife.vt.edu/</a></td>
<td>Center for Student Engagement and Community Partners</td>
<td>Director, Center for Student Engagement and Community Partners</td>
<td>Vice President for Outreach and Internat’l Affairs (in Academic Affairs)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Internships and other Community-Based Courses per 2011-12 Catalog
* Indicates that the course is required for the associated degree or certification.

1. Accounting (ACC) 4371: Accounting Internship
2. Agriculture (AG) 4091 (1-9 sch): Internship
3. Art (ART) 4371: Internships
4. Athletic Training (AT)
   *2101: Athletic Training Practicum I
   *2102: Athletic Training Practicum II
   *3101: Athletic Training Practicum III
   *3102: Athletic Training Practicum IV
   *4101: Athletic Training Practicum V
   *4102: Athletic Training Practicum VI
   *3142: Clinical Experience I – Athletic Training
   *4142: Clinical Experience II – Athletic Training
5. Business Administration (BA) 4371: Internship (course may be taken by Finance, Management or Marketing majors)
6. Communication (COM) 4379: Communication Internship
7. Computer Science (CS) 4171: Internship
8. Criminal Justice (CRIJ) 4371: Internship
9. Curriculum and Instruction or Teacher Education
   *ED 4309: Mathematics: Instructional Strategies for the Elementary and Middle School Teacher (field practicum required)
   *ED 4311: Social Studies: Instructional Strategies for the Elementary and Middle School Teacher (field practicum required)
   *ED 4314: Science: Instructional Strategies for the Elementary and Middle School Teacher (field practicum required)
   *ED 4321: Secondary School Organization and Curriculum (field experience required)
   *ED 4322: Teaching Techniques in Secondary School (field experience required)
   *ED 4630: Supervised Teaching in the Secondary School
   *ED 4699: Internship
   *ED 4972: Teaching Practicum in Grade 4 to Grade 8
   *ED 4973: Supervised Teaching in the High School
   *ED 4974: Supervised Teaching All Levels
   *RDG 4320: Reading in the Secondary School Content Areas (field experience required)
10. History (HIS) 4371: Internship in History
11. International Business (IBUS) 4371: Internship
12. Kinesiology (KIN) 4373: Internship
14. Mass Media (MM) 4379: Mass Media Internship
15. Mathematics (MATH) 4171, 4271, 4371: Internship
16. Music (MUS) 2271: Introduction to Music Instruction (field experiences are included)

17. Nursing (RNSG)
   *1160: Clinical – Nursing
   *1163: Clinical – Nursing
   *1361: Clinical – Nursing
   *1363: Clinical – Nursing
   *2260: Clinical – Nursing
   *2261: Clinical – Nursing
   *2361: Clinical – Nursing
   *2527: Clinical – Nursing
   (NUR) *3320: Adult Health Nursing I Practicum
   *4212: Obstetric and Pediatric Nursing Practicum
   *4307: Community-Based Health Promotion and Disease Prevention
   *4321: Adult Health Nursing II Practicum
   *4349: Baccalaureate Nursing Practice
   *4404: Senior Capstone Residency
   *4407: Community-Based Health Promotion and Disease Prevention
   4333: Critical Care Nursing
   4345: Care of the Child with Diabetes

18. Political Science (POLS) 4671: Internship in Political Science

19. Psychology (PSY) 4371, 4671: Internship in Psychology

    *4372: Social Work Internship II

21. Sociology (SOC) 4371, 4671: Internships in Sociology

22. Teacher Education (not included in above list with Curriculum and Instruction)
    (ECH) *2305: Socio-Cultural Influences on Child Development (field experience required)
    *3335: Play Dynamics Research (field experience required)
    (RDG) *4301: Assessment and Evaluation of Reading and Writing (field experience required)
    *4602: Reading and Language Arts in the Elementary and Middle School (field experience required)
    (SPED) *3364: Educating Individuals with High-incidence Disabilities in an Inclusive Environment (field component is required)
    *3365: Principles of Assessment (field component is required)
    *4362: Behavior and Discipline Management Theory (field component required)
    *4363: Learning Disorders (field component required)
    (ED) *4975: Teaching Practicum in Early Childhood to Grade 6

23. Honors (HON) 4373: Internship

Total number of courses = 62
Appendix F. Center for Community Engagement Job Description Summaries

1. Executive Director of Community Engagement/QEP

Job Summary
The Executive Director of Community Engagement/QEP (Executive Director) is a key member of the team charged with leading the implementation of the institution-wide strategic initiative for community outreach and engagement (Texas Tech University System Priority IV). As one of two officers in the Center for Community Engagement, the Executive Director is responsible for leading the implementation and successful completion of ASU’s QEP (CONNECT!), the central component of ASU’s community outreach and engagement initiative.

Relevant Work Experience
The Executive Director is expected to have extensive familiarity with the development of CONNECT! and its implementation plan. The Executive Director is expected to have experience interacting with the various university and system leaders, and community, governmental, and accreditation leaders in the region, state, and nation.

Primary Duties
The Executive Director is expected to:

- Oversee the operation and supervise the staff of the Center for Community Engagement;
- Lead the implementation of CONNECT!;
- Direct the Community-Engaged Fellows Program, the CONNECTED! Department Program,
- Lead the process of applying for the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement in 2015 and in subsequent application years;
- Coordinate the preparation of Annual Reports of the Center for Community Engagement and the QEP Impact Report for submission in 2019;
- Represent ASU and the Center for Community Engagement by serving on committees or boards of organizations that strengthen the relationships between ASU and other TTUS components, community and governmental agencies, accrediting agencies, and higher education organizations.

Essential Abilities
The Executive Director must have the ability to:

- Communicate effectively in all media (written, oral, visual, etc.) and make effective and persuasive presentations to TTUS personnel, campus personnel, and community members and office holders.
- Establish and maintain effective, professional relationships with students, faculty, staff, administrators, office holders, and the public;
- Plan, implement, and evaluate a complex operation using the available resources to accomplish short- and long-term goals for the unit and the institution;
- Provide guidance, training, and supervision to individuals within his/her area of responsibility;
- Organize and prioritize work while exercising independent judgment based on TTUS and ASU policies and procedures;
- Manage budget and other fiscal resources;
- Utilize computer and similar technologies.
2. Director of Community Partnerships

Job Summary
The Director of Community Partnerships (Director) is a key member of the team charged with leading the implementation of the institution-wide strategic initiative for community outreach and engagement (Texas Tech University System Priority IV). As one of two officers in the Center for Community Engagement, the Director is responsible and raising awareness of and coordinating partnerships between ASU, its departments, and the greater San Angelo community.

Relevant Work Experience
The Director is expected to have extensive familiarity with the ASU campus, San Angelo, and the Concho Valley region. The Director is expected to have experience interacting with the various media outlets, businesses, non-profit agencies, and governmental bodies in the region.

Primary Duties
The Director is expected to:
- Assist the Executive Director in the operation of the Center for Community Engagement;
- Develop strategies to increase the university's outreach and engagement with a wide range of partners including businesses, non-profit agencies, and governmental bodies;
- Serve as the primary point of contact for those at the university seeking to assist local groups in addressing issues affecting the community and for those in the community seeking a partnership with ASU;
- Direct the Campus and Community Partner Institutes and the GET CONNECTED! Student Engagement Program;
- Coordinate the assessment and tracking of ASU’s community outreach and engagement activities;
- Represents ASU and the Center for Community Engagement by serving on committees or boards of organizations that strengthen the partnerships between ASU and the greater San Angelo community.

Essential Abilities
The Director must have the ability to:
- Communicate effectively in all media (written, oral, visual, etc.) and make effective and persuasive presentations to TTUS personnel, campus personnel, and community members and office holders;
- Establish and maintain effective, professional relationships with students, faculty, staff, administrators, office holders, and the public;
- Plan, implement, and evaluate a complex operation using the available resources to accomplish short-and long-term goals for the unit and the institution;
- Organize and prioritize work while exercising independent judgment based on TTUS and ASU policies and procedures;
- Manage budget and other fiscal resources;
- Utilize computer and similar technologies.
## Appendix G. Social Responsibility Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO's/Indicators</th>
<th>Capstone (4)</th>
<th>Milestone (3)</th>
<th>Milestone (2)</th>
<th>Benchmark (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR1 Intercultural Competence</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR1.1 Intercultural Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR2 Civic Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR2.1 Connecting Civic Knowledge and Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR2.2 Civic Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR3 Community Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR3.1 Connecting Learning and Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR3.2 Community Action and Reflection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This rubric adapted from the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics for 1) Civic Engagement and 2) Intercultural Knowledge and Competence.
2. Social Responsibility is to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national and global communities. (THECB)
3. Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero (0) to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance. Leave blank if not observed.
Appendix H. Community Partner Evaluation of Student Learning

Community Partner Evaluation of Student Learning

Student Name(s): __________________________________________

The six items below correspond to the six indicators that comprise the attached Social Responsibility Rubric. Students participating in a learning experience in partnership with your agency are expected to develop some or all of these competencies. The expectations specific to this course are expressed in the course syllabus and the Memo of Understanding.

Instructions: Using the following scale, please rate the student’s/students’ level of achievement for each indicator of social responsibility.

N/O = Not Observed  1 = Rudimentary Level  2 = Emerging Level
3 = Acceptable Level  4 = Superior Level

The student(s) who participated in the learning activities associated with my agency…

A. …demonstrated awareness of the history, values, beliefs, communication styles, and other practices of another culture.

    Rating:  N/O  1  2  3  4

B. …demonstrated ability to communicate with or about another culture.

    Rating:  N/O  1  2  3  4

C. …demonstrated ability to connect knowledge from his/her study, field, or academic discipline to civic knowledge and responsibility.

    Rating:  N/O  1  2  3  4
D. …demonstrated ability to modify his/her communication strategies based on the perspective of others.

   Rating: N/O 1 2 3 4

E. …demonstrated ability to articulate what he/she learned as a result of engaging with the campus, regional, national, and/or global communities.

   Rating: N/O 1 2 3 4

F. …demonstrated the ability to be active in the community and to reflect upon what was accomplished.

   Rating: N/O 1 2 3 4

Please click the text box to add comments electronically or write them in the box and/or on the back.
Appendix I. CONNECT! Student Survey

The six items below correspond to the six indicators that comprise the Social Responsibility Rubric.

Instructions: Using the following scale, please indicate (circle) your level of agreement with the following statements. Use the back of the page for any comments that you would like to share.

1=Strongly Disagree  2= Disagree  3=Undecided  4= Agree  5= Strongly Agree

Participating in the learning activities associated with this course that addressed Social Responsibility…

A. …made me more aware of the history, values, beliefs, communication styles, and other practices of another culture.

   Rating: 1 2 3 4 5

B. …improved my ability to communicate with or about another culture.

   Rating: 1 2 3 4 5

C. …helped me connect knowledge from my own study, field, or academic discipline to civic knowledge and responsibility.

   Rating: 1 2 3 4 5

D. …helped me to modify my communication strategies based on the perspective of others.

   Rating: 1 2 3 4 5

E. …helped me to articulate what I have learned as result of engaging with the campus, regional, national, and/or global communities.

   Rating: 1 2 3 4 5

F. …helped me to be active in the community and to reflect upon what was accomplished.

   Rating: 1 2 3 4 5
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