



IT'S ABOUT ENGAGEMENT

**A Qualitative Evaluation of Kennesaw State University's
Quality Enhancement Plan, *It's About Engagement***

Report for Academic Year 2019-2020

Submitted:
October 25, 2020

Prepared by:

Ann M. Bennett, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Education Research
Quality Enhancement Plan Assessment Coordinator
Kennesaw State University
Department of Secondary & Middle Grades Education
Kennesaw, GA 30144
470.578.2249
ann.bennett@kennesaw.edu

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Findings.....	4
Perspectives and Experiences of Engaged Learning and the QEP	4
Goals of the QEP	5
Student Learning Outcomes of the QEP.....	6
Objectives of the QEP.....	7
Suggestions for Modifications to the QEP.....	10
Limitations of the Evaluation and Future Directions.....	11
Description of Kennesaw State University’s Quality Enhancement Plan	12
Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, and Objectives of the QEP.....	12
Description of the Evaluation	14
Evaluation Questions	15
Evaluation Methodology.....	15
Participants.....	15
Design and Procedure	18
Evaluation Findings	20
Perspectives and Experiences of Engaged Learning and the QEP	20
Deans.....	20
Faculty.....	22
QEP Steering Committee.....	24
QEP Goal 1	25
Deans.....	25
Faculty.....	26
QEP Steering Committee.....	27
QEP Goal 2	28
Deans.....	28
Faculty.....	29
QEP Steering Committee.....	31
QEP Student Learning Outcome 1.....	31
QEP Student Learning Outcome 2.....	32
QEP Student Learning Outcome 3.....	33
QEP Student Learning Outcome 4.....	33

QEP Objective 1	34
Deans.....	35
Faculty.....	36
QEP Steering Committee.....	37
QEP Objective 2	38
Deans.....	39
Faculty.....	39
QEP Steering Committee.....	41
QEP Objective 3	41
Deans.....	43
Faculty.....	43
QEP Steering Committee.....	45
Suggestions for Modifications to the QEP.....	49
Limitations of the Evaluation and Future Directions.....	52
References.....	53
Appendices.....	54
Appendix A: Internships and Cooperative (Co-op) Education Definition	55
Appendix B: Internship & Co-op Taxonomy	56
Appendix C: Service-Learning Definition.....	60
Appendix D: Service-Learning Taxonomy.....	61
Appendix E: Undergraduate Research Definition	65
Appendix F: Undergraduate Research Taxonomy.....	67
Appendix G: <i>It's About Engagement</i> Comprehensive Assessment Plan.....	70
Appendix H: <i>It's About Engagement</i> Critical Reflection Rubric	74
Appendix I: Original Student Focus Group Protocol	76
Appendix J: Original Faculty Focus Group Protocol	78
Appendix K: Original Administration & QEP Steering Committee Focus Group Protocol ..	80
Appendix L: Interview and Focus Group Protocol Alignment with QEP	81
Appendix M: Student Interview Protocol (Non-Enrolled)	83
Appendix N: Student Interview Protocol (Enrolled)	84
Appendix O: Faculty Interview Protocol.....	86
Appendix P: Administration Focus Group Protocol.....	89
Appendix Q: QEP Steering Committee Focus Group Protocol.....	91

Executive Summary

The purpose of this evaluation was to evaluate both the process and progress of the implementation of Kennesaw State University's (KSU) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) in its pilot academic year, 2019-2020. This evaluation was initiated due to the *It's About Engagement* Comprehensive Assessment Plan's (Appendix G) indication that focus groups are to be used as an assessment measure of the QEP for all student learning outcomes and objectives. It is important to note that this evaluation did not evaluate the QEP document itself. Instead, the evaluation assessed the perceptions and experiences of stakeholders of the implementation of the QEP, specifically, faculty, administration, and the QEP Steering Committee, in order to determine the successes and challenges of the QEP by considering implementation processes and in-progress outcomes in relation to the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives.

Findings

Findings from this evaluation were separated into four major areas: perspectives and experiences of engaged learning and the QEP, goals of the QEP, student learning outcomes of the QEP, and objectives of the QEP.

Perspectives and Experiences of Engaged Learning and the QEP

- In general, all stakeholders found engaged learning opportunities to be a valuable activity and an activity that should be included in the undergraduate experience.
- Engaged learning opportunities allowed students to participate in real world experiences and to apply knowledge and skills learned in their respective fields.
- Engaged learning opportunities provided students with the chance to interact with the community, industry, and research, which presented them with possible career trajectories that they might not have previously considered.
- Engaged learning opportunities created better career retention rates and encouraged students to consider continuing their education by enrolling in a graduate program.
- Engaged learning opportunities produced positive effects for underserved and underrepresented students and contributed to diversity, equity, and inclusion at the university.
- Students who were successful in engaged learning opportunities tended to be high-achievers who were self-motivated and could manage team dynamics.
- Faculty who offered engaged learning opportunities in their courses are those who have had past experience with engaged learning opportunities through their own education, due to the nature of their discipline, or through their experience in industry or with the community.
- When deciding whether to offer engaged learning courses, faculty gave consideration to the effects on their Annual Reviews and progress toward meeting Promotion and Tenure requirements.
- Faculty tended to favor undergraduate research over internships or service-learning, because undergraduate research allowed for an alignment of their teaching with their own

research agenda, and they felt that research was the area in which they have had the most experience.

- The QEP Steering Committee favored undergraduate research due to the opportunity being well-supported prior to the implementation of the QEP, the existing structures and funding already in place to support this opportunity, and the intellectual potential that faculty brought to this area.
- The QEP provided a mechanism that allowed for more structure surrounding engaged learning opportunities across colleges and the university that created a shared language and culture that aided in reducing variability in engaged learning opportunities.
- The QEP validated the work done regarding engaged learning opportunities in which some colleges had already been involved. This was particularly important for colleges given that many of the accreditation processes in the colleges' respective fields currently possess similar engaged learning requirements.
- Some challenges have been shifting the culture around and approach to engaged learning opportunities in some colleges and defining what engaged learning opportunities looked like in particular disciplines, as well as ensuring that there was an understanding of the time commitment necessary to facilitate these courses.

Goals of the QEP

- The Deans believed that their colleges were offering a significant number of opportunities for students to participate in engaged learning opportunities, but they also saw space for the development of more high-quality opportunities.
- Faculty have used Faculty Learning Communities to create interest within their colleges and departments for more engaged learning courses.
- Some colleges or departments have Promotion and Tenure requirements that favor faculty involvement in undergraduate research.
- The culture of some colleges and departments strongly encouraged faculty to offer courses with engaged learning opportunities.
- Community and industry partnerships could create engaged learning opportunities due to the specific requests surrounding their proposed projects.
- The QEP Steering Committee saw the lack of faculty incentives, specifically, compensation and recognition in Promotion and Tenure requirements, as one of the greatest barriers to the successful implementation of the QEP.
- Some challenges in increasing the number of engaged learning opportunities related to the ability to effectively manage community and industry partnerships, the lack of faculty compensation or incentives that recognize their time and effort, the lack of additional support regarding managing team dynamics and formal mentoring, the lack of a reputation for KSU in some disciplines, faculty who did not understand engaged learning opportunities or might not recognize that their courses currently included engaged learning opportunities, and possibly inhibiting academic freedom.
- Colleges and departments have several common approaches to increasing student participation in engaged learning opportunities, including advertisement through advisors, websites, and social media, as well as partnerships with Registered Student Organizations.

- Faculty have advertised their engaged learning courses in their own courses and the courses of colleagues.
- Individual programs, departments, and colleges have student list-servs or newsletters that allow them to directly advertise engaged learning opportunities to students.
- Some colleges and departments have created special events or orientations designed to get students interested in engaged learning opportunities.
- Some challenges in increasing student participation in engaged learning opportunities related to the effects of and the uncertainty surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, maintaining funding for associated costs related to engaged learning opportunities, financial support for students involved in engaged learning opportunities, the lack of access to needed external resources to ensure that engaged learning opportunities continue to be high-quality, the lack of a system to effectively manage community and industry partnerships, the time involved in participating in engaged learning opportunities for both faculty and students, the lack of student incentives to participate due to zero and one credit hour courses, and the lack of value that students placed on engaged learning opportunities.

Student Learning Outcomes of the QEP

- Faculty stated that students found engaged learning opportunities meaningful and valuable due to the preparation that these courses provided for their future careers. In particular, faculty referenced lessons in conflict management, navigating group dynamics, participating in professional conferences, writing or publishing reports and research, becoming viewed as an expert on a project, establishing career and professional goals, the development of soft skills, interacting or working with potential employers, and the developments of strong bonds with other students who are on a similar career path as contributing to the students' perception of how meaningful and valuable they found their engaged learning courses.
- Faculty mentioned that one of the challenges that they faced in their engaged learning courses was students who determined during the engaged learning opportunity that this was no longer what they desired for their career trajectory. However, although this could be challenging in terms of maintaining student engagement, faculty believed that the engaged learning course was still a meaningful and valuable experience, as it allowed the student to reflect on their next steps in their undergraduate education.
- Faculty also observed students making strong connections between what they have learned in the classroom and what occurs during their engaged learning opportunities. Participating in conferences, writing or publishing reports or research, managing and engaging in a community or industry project, and utilizing practices learned from group dynamics and conflict management were all cited by faculty as praxis that originated from theory learned in the classroom.
- Many of the activities mentioned by faculty as contributing to student connections between the classroom and their engaged learning opportunities were also mentioned as ways to help students build on prior knowledge and meet the challenges of their engaged learning opportunities. What was learned in the classroom provided students with a foundation for reflection as they participated in these activities.

- Faculty stated that professional and personal growth due to participation in engaged learning opportunities occurred in thirteen areas: socialization, identity, confidence, communication, perceptions of their own influence, leadership, self-motivation, self-efficacy, conflict management, accountability, social awareness, critical consciousness, and critical thinking.
- Faculty were unsure of whether or not engaged learning opportunities could shift student values, as many faculty members stated that students held similar values to the faculty member when they entered their course. Thus, it might be that students who chose to participate in engaged learning opportunities might already possess the values necessary to be successful in those opportunities.

Objectives of the QEP

- The Deans viewed the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as essential to the structure that the QEP has created due to the potential role of the office in the development of procedures and processes that can enhance or correct the implementation of the QEP.
- The Deans perceived their own status within the structure of the QEP as facilitating the implementation of the QEP by addressing concerns regarding resources, support, and accreditation. However, they also thought that it was important for departments and academic programs to take ownership of engaged learning opportunities.
- Faculty stated that they have had little to no interaction with Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding their engaged learning courses. However, they did see this office as an essential contributor to the QEP due to the influence on support that the office possessed and the policies and procedures that could be enacted, including funding and the recognition of the time and effort involved in engaged learning opportunities through additional compensation, incentives, or modified workload models and Promotion and Tenure requirements.
- Depending on the college to which the faculty member belonged, perspectives of their Deans' contribution shifted. This was not due to any particular actions (or lack thereof) by the Deans. Instead, many colleges have found themselves in a period of transition with Interim Deans or permanent Deans in their first year still acclimating to their new positions.
- For faculty who did speak to the contributions of their Deans, they stated that their Deans have been very supportive in terms of fulfilling minor funding requests, providing needed equipment, and offering compensation for course redesigns.
- Faculty would like some sort of mechanism to address student success in engaged learning opportunities, but they were unsure if this mechanism should exist within the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or at the college-level.
- The QEP Steering Committee perceived the role of the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as the office that generated the messaging and culture of the QEP.
- The QEP Steering Committee thought that the function of the Deans was an administrative role that assisted in facilitating the QEP

- The Deans thought that the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) offered faculty an opportunity to obtain professional development on engaged learning opportunities, which could be included in Annual Reviews.
- The Deans asserted that it was important to consider the faculty's ability to participate in offerings from the CETL due to increased workloads and the transition to remote work brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- The Deans appreciated the work of support units and often sought additional information on what specific resources and support were available from each office in order to provide that information to faculty. This might be made easier if faculty interactions occurred more organically with these units, as opposed to faculty seeking out the support units.
- Faculty were very conflicted regarding their perspectives of and experiences with the CETL. The overall perception of the CETL was that it was an essential resource and source of support to better understand learning outcomes and pedagogy, in general. Indeed, faculty often cited the CETL as a major contributor to their understanding of best practices in higher education. What the faculty thought the CETL lacked were resources and support that were applicable to their specific discipline.
- One challenge repeatedly mentioned by faculty was managing group dynamics among students in engaged learning courses. Faculty would like to see training available that assists them in addressing group dynamics and conflict management, and the CETL was suggested as the support unit that could provide that training.
- The Department of Career Planning and Development was discussed as an important resource that provided students with opportunities to develop their Curriculum Vitae or résumé, practice interviews, and prepare for career fairs. Similar to the CETL, faculty would like to see more discipline specific resources and support made available.
- The Office of Undergraduate Research was mentioned by several faculty members as a secondary source of needed funding outside of their colleges and departments that allowed them to offer more successful undergraduate research experiences. Additionally, the support provided to the students from this office in the form of travel funding, equipment funding, and grant assistance facilitated student participation in all aspects of the research process.
- The Department of Student Leadership and Service was cited by faculty as essential in helping them find community and industry partners. However, faculty would also like to see this office provide support and resources in how to effectively manage community and industry partnerships.
- The QEP Steering Committee thought that the CETL was a strong contributor to the successful implementation of the QEP by providing faculty with resources, support, and funding and that the unit assisted in providing explanations regarding engaged learning opportunities and components of the QEP that no other position, office, or resource could.
- Regarding key support units, the QEP Steering Committee thought that each unit was providing the needed support and resources necessary to ensure that both students and faculty experienced successful engaged learning courses. However, funding to the Department of Student Leadership and Service should increase given its essential function and the limitations found in faculty knowledge in the area of service-learning.

- The Deans have had little to no experience with the HIP taxonomies, as the sharing of these taxonomies was a task typically managed by QEP liaisons.
- The Deans stated that they or their faculty have several concerns regarding the critical reflection assignment, including the difficulty of organic inclusion of the assignment in courses, faculty perceptions of the assignment as an evaluation of faculty or their courses, and the limitations the assignment could place on faculty offering undergraduate research experiences.
- Faculty stated that the HIP taxonomies were not developed in time for inclusion in their engaged learning courses. Additionally, some faculty members were still not aware of their existence. For those faculty who had encountered the HIP taxonomies, they stated that they did intend to review them for inclusion in future courses in order to integrate best practices.
- The critical reflection assignment generated the most discussion in all faculty interviews. These discussions focused on the announcement of the assignment and rubric after courses had already started for the Spring semester of 2020, a perception of the assignment as an evaluation of the faculty member or their course, the artificial nature of the assignment in relation to their discipline or course, a lack of understanding of the purpose and objectives of the assignment, the inability to integrate current course assignments and rubrics with the critical reflection assignment, the lack of both general and discipline specific examples for the assignment, students not understanding the purpose and objectives of the assignment, the lack of feedback by faculty in the development of the assignment, the lack of using existing and validated measurement tools for reflection, and the reflection assignment leading to their own reflection.
- Overall, faculty desired to see greater communication. Many faculty members stated that they were simply unaware of the support offices associated with the QEP and the role of the HIP taxonomies and critical reflection assignment, which could be resolved through better communication channels. Often, faculty were directed to the Engagement website or their QEP liaisons, but neither of these resources provided the answers that they were seeking.
- The QEP Steering Committee perceived the committee's status within the QEP as a body that researches, generates, and debates ideas and concepts surrounding engaged learning opportunities and the development and implementation of the QEP.
- The QEP Steering Committee asserted that a "turning point" for the implementation of the QEP was the decision to create the position of Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan and, subsequently, placing Dr. Scott Reese into that role.
- The QEP Steering Committee recognized the difficulties that faculty were having in accessing and understanding the HIP taxonomies, specifically, the inability to locate needed information and the fact that they were written using academic language.
- The critical reflection assignment generated the most discussion in the QEP Steering Committee focus group. This discussion focused on faculty identification within the assignment, the perceived evaluation of faculty and their courses, needed general and discipline specific guidelines to support faculty development of the assignment, utilizing the website as a hub for information on the assignment, emphasizing that the assignment is part of HIPs and not in addition to, changing the name of the assignment, providing additional support in completing the assignment to students and faculty participating in

undergraduate research, the assignment as the sole metric for measuring student learning outcomes, and reflection as a powerful tool.

- The QEP Steering Committee asserted that the greatest challenges influencing the implementation of engaged learning opportunities were communication and the COVID-19 pandemic. In terms of communication, the committee was not clear on where the breakdown in communication was occurring. The QEP Steering Committee is concerned about the effects that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on the QEP and how this will affect the university's accreditation.

Suggestions for Modifications to the QEP

- Continue the systematic approach to engaged learning experiences to address issues of variability and quality across engaged learning courses.
- Provide additional resources and support to address variability and quality.
- Provide training regarding the concepts and shared language of the QEP.
- Provide training on managing team dynamics, formal mentoring, and conflict management.
- Balance suggestions on how to improve engaged learning opportunities with respecting the courses and space that faculty have created.
- Rethink the zero and one credit hour model for engaged learning opportunities.
- Include a standard description for engaged learning opportunities in the undergraduate catalog.
- Label all engaged learning courses in the undergraduate catalog.
- Maintain funding for associated costs related to engaged learning opportunities.
- Provide financial support to students involved in engaged learning courses, particularly, those courses that include internships.
- Increase efforts to assist students in seeing the value of engaged learning opportunities.
- Implement strategies at the university-level that colleges and faculty have been using to promote engaged learning.
- Recognize the time and effort that faculty contribute to engaged learning courses in their Annual Reviews and Promotion and Tenure requirements.
- Recognize all forms of engaged learning opportunities in Promotion and Tenure requirements.
- Provide training, resources, and support that are discipline specific.
- Improve communication to dispel the lack of knowledge regarding internships and service-learning.
- Continue to provide resources and support that allow engaged learning courses to maintain or exceed their current standard of quality.
- Enact policies and procedures that support the implementation of the QEP and the additional work that is being done by faculty.
- Increase messaging articulating the importance of engaged learning opportunities and the QEP.
- Adapt the implementation of the QEP to focus on the specific strengths of colleges.
- Develop a mechanism at the university- or college-level to address (the lack of) student success in engaged learning opportunities.

- Develop methods in key support units to work more organically with faculty in the resources and support that they provide.
- Provide faculty with assistance in effectively managing community and industry partnerships.
- Increase funding to the Department of Student Leadership and Service to provide increased support to faculty and students in the area of service-learning.
- Develop better pathways for communication.
- Modify the Engagement website to make navigation and locating information easier.
- Modify the critical reflection assignment and how it is implemented.
- Engage in detailed discussions with faculty of the critical reflection assignment as an instrument.
- Solicit feedback from faculty about the critical reflection assignment.
- Create summary sheets for the HIPs taxonomies and critical reflection assignment.
- Consider alternatives to the critical reflection assignment.

Limitations of the Evaluation and Future Directions

Future evaluations of the QEP should ensure diversity in sampling, increase the sample size, and include participants from all stakeholder groups. Additional evaluations are needed to establish the credibility of the findings from the pilot year. The pilot interview and focus group protocols need to be administered again in future evaluations to establish the validity and reliability of these protocols.

Description of Kennesaw State University's Quality Enhancement Plan

In the Fall of 2015, as part of its accreditation process with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), Kennesaw State University (KSU) began to develop the initial topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) in coordination with representatives from shared-governance groups who formed the first QEP Selection Committee. From the Fall of 2015 through the Spring of 2018, the QEP Selection Committee, as well other QEP committees and sub-committees that evolved to assist in the development and implementation of the plan, worked toward finalizing the QEP. After a call for proposals for possible concepts for the QEP from the university community, an evaluation process following the Accrediting Standards of the SACSCOC, town hall meetings, faculty focus groups, literature reviews, and other activities, it was determined that KSU's QEP would focus on high impact practices, specifically, engaged learning opportunities that included internships, service-learning, and undergraduate research (Kennesaw State University [KSU], 2019; See Appendix A-F for definitions and taxonomies for internships, service-learning, and undergraduate research).

The purpose of KSU's QEP is to “[advance] KSU's mission of student success by focusing on the dynamic nature of engaged learning in each of the academic colleges and the university overall” (KSU, 2019, p. 4). Through the use of engaged learning opportunities, the QEP intends to create a space where students can engage in both theory and praxis. Students obtain general and theoretical knowledge of a particular concentration or field in the classroom while also acquiring “real world experience” through engaged learning. Additional benefits outlined in the QEP include increased critical thinking and communication skills due to students having more opportunities to engage in problem-solving. The QEP seeks to ensure that this purpose is reached by setting specific goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives that can be assessed during the implementation of the QEP (KSU, 2019; See Appendix G for Comprehensive Assessment Plan).

Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, and Objectives of the QEP

The QEP contains two goals, four student learning outcomes, and three objectives. The goals of the QEP focus on increasing the number of and participation in engaged learning opportunities. The goals of the QEP are:

- increase the number of opportunities for students to engage in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the University as a whole; and
- increase the number of students engaging in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning opportunities in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the University as a whole. (KSU, 2019, p. 3)

The student learning outcomes of the QEP focus on students finding connections between theory and praxis, integrating these connections, meeting the challenges of engaged learning, and demonstrating professional and personal growth. The student learning outcomes of the QEP are:

- Students will cite meaningful and valuable connections of their HIP experiences to their overall educational preparation.
- Students will gain new insights on the connectedness and integration of the academic preparation of their disciplines of study to the applied settings of their HIP experiences.
- Students will build upon prior knowledge and experiences to respond effectively to the new and challenging demands of their HIP settings.
- Students will demonstrate growth in professional and personal core values and sense of self as a result of their HIP experiences. (KSU, 2019, p. 3-4)

The objectives of the QEP focus on support for implementation of the QEP by various KSU offices, supporting units, and the QEP Steering Committee. The objectives of the QEP are:

- KSU will assess the extent to which the Provost and the Academic Affairs staff, and the Deans were engaged sufficiently in overseeing the QEP's overall implementation and using the incentive funds for rewarding faculty contributions.
- KSU will assess the extent to which the key supporting units effectively managed their reallocated workloads and accomplished their QEP support tasks.
- KSU will assess the extent to which the Engagement Steering Committee functioned effectively in supporting the QEP's successful implementation. (KSU, 2019, p. 327-328)

Description of the Evaluation

This evaluation was completed as a process evaluation. A process evaluation focuses on the implementation of a program. Specifically, it seeks to document and monitor implementation as the program occurs in order to ascertain the need for improvement to the implementation process (formative evaluation) or to assess the progress of the program in meeting its goals (progress process evaluation; Posavac, 2015). The formative aspect of the evaluation sought to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the QEP and its implementation. The progress aspect of the evaluation aimed to determine the effects of the QEP and progress made toward meeting the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives. The intent is to continue this evaluation as an ongoing process throughout the QEP's implementation to monitor and improve the plan.

The purpose of this evaluation was to evaluate both the process and progress of the implementation of KSU's QEP in its pilot academic year, 2019-2020. This evaluation was initiated due to the *It's About Engagement* Comprehensive Assessment Plan's (Appendix G) indication that focus groups are to be used as an assessment measure of the QEP for all student learning outcomes and objectives. It is important to note that this evaluation did not evaluate the QEP document itself. Instead, the evaluation assessed the perceptions and experiences of stakeholders of the implementation of the QEP, specifically, faculty, administration, and the QEP Steering Committee, in order to determine the successes and challenges of the QEP by considering implementation processes and in-progress outcomes in relation to the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives.

Further, the need for this evaluation was supported by KSU's accreditation process with the SACSCOC. The SACSCOC is the accrediting body for institutions of higher education within the Southern region of the United States. KSU is currently seeking reaffirmation of accreditation with the SACSCOC. As part of this reaffirmation process, KSU must demonstrate that the university:

1. has a mission appropriate to higher education,
2. has resources, programs, and services sufficient to accomplish and sustain that mission, and
3. maintains clearly specified educational objectives that are consistent with its mission and appropriate to the degrees it offers, and that indicate whether it is successful in achieving its stated objectives. (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges [SACSCOC], 2018, p. 5)

The Mission Statement of KSU asserts,

At Kennesaw State, we serve as a powerful example of the impact a student-centered, research-driven university education can deliver. We help students succeed through exploration, collaboration, and rigor, uniting a diverse spectrum of backgrounds and talents. At KSU, students become the individuals who people want as colleagues and leaders. (KSU, 2020)

The QEP is designed to demonstrate the university's commitment to its mission, outline plans for sustaining and assessing progress toward meeting the goals of the mission, and, through an emphasis on engaged learning opportunities, align educational objectives to the university's mission.

Evaluation Questions

In order to evaluate both the process and progress of the implementation of KSU's QEP in its pilot academic year, the following questions guided the evaluation:

- What are the perceptions and experiences of stakeholders of the QEP in terms of implementation and progress toward the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives?
- What improvements or enhancements are needed to the QEP and its implementation process in order to meet or exceed the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives?

Evaluation Methodology

The process evaluation was conducted using a qualitative approach that focused on interviews and focus groups with stakeholders of the QEP. KSU's Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this evaluation on April 28, 2020 (Study 20-504: Evaluation Study of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan, *It's About Engagement*). Recruitment began immediately following IRB approval, and data collection began on May 26, 2020.

Participants

Data was collected from a sample of faculty and administration who were involved in the implementation of the QEP during its pilot academic year. An attempt was made to recruit students who were enrolled in courses associated with the QEP. However, only one student participated in the evaluation. Because of this, the data collected from this student will not be discussed in this evaluation. Instead, it will be retained for inclusion in future evaluations when data saturation for this particular group can be reached.

Twelve faculty members participated in this evaluation. The faculty participants were recruited through an email invitation sent by the Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan, Dr. Scott Reese. These faculty members represented seven of the twelve colleges at KSU, including the Coles College of Business, College of Architecture and Construction Management, College of Computing and Software Engineering, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Science and Mathematics, Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering & Engineering Technology, and Wellstar College of Health and Human Services (See Table 1). At this time, the sample is not large enough for analyses of demographic characteristics of participants to occur. Thus, specific demographic characteristics of faculty are not reported. Additionally, due to some colleges and departments being represented by a single faculty member, no references to particular colleges or departments will be included in the analysis in order to protect the confidentiality and privacy of faculty.

Eight Deans participated in this evaluation. The Deans were recruited through an email invitation sent by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Kathy Schwaig, with assistance from Danielle Buehrer, Executive Director of Institutional Quality and Accreditation. These Deans represented eight of the twelve colleges at KSU. It should be noted that the eight colleges represented by the Deans did not align with the seven colleges represented

by the faculty. The Deans represented the Bagwell College of Education, Coles College of Business, College of Architecture and Construction Management, College of the Arts, College of Computing and Software Engineering, College of Science and Mathematics, Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering & Engineering Technology, and Wellstar College of Health and Human Services. Thus, although the Deans added perceptions and experiences from the perspective of the Bagwell College of Education and College of the Arts, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences was not represented in data collected from the Deans. As the Deans represent specific colleges, no references to particular colleges or departments will be included in the analysis in order to protect the confidentiality and privacy of the Deans.

Eight members of the QEP Steering Committee participated in this evaluation. The committee participants were recruited through an email invitation sent by Dr. Scott Reese. The committee is composed of fourteen individuals that represent offices, academic units, and support units across the university. Three members of the committee are students, but the student members did not participate in this evaluation. The Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan, Dr. Scott Reese, was interviewed individually, instead of as a member of the QEP Steering Committee, in order to avoid possible influence on focus group responses due to his position. The analysis of Dr. Scott Reese's interview has been integrated with the analysis of the QEP Steering Committee's focus group in order to protect his confidentiality and privacy.

Table 1***College and Department Representation by Faculty***

College	Represented Departments	Faculty Participants
Coles College of Business	Department of Marketing and Professional Sales	1
College of Architecture and Construction Management	Department of Architecture	1
College of Computing and Software Engineering	Department of Analytics and Data Science	2
College of Humanities and Social Sciences	School of Communication & Media	2
	Department of Psychological Science	
College of Science and Mathematics	Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry	1
Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering & Engineering Technology	Department of Systems and Industrial Engineering	
	Department of Civil and Construction Engineering	4
	Department of Mechatronics Engineering	
	Department of Mechanical Engineering	
Wellstar College of Health and Human Services	Wellstar School of Nursing	1

Design and Procedure

As stated previously, this evaluation was completed as a process evaluation using a qualitative approach that focused on interviews and focus groups with stakeholders of the QEP. The first step of this evaluation was to design the interview and focus group protocols to be used with participants in the evaluation. Prior to this evaluation, the QEP Steering Committee composed a set of focus group protocols to be administered to students, faculty, and administration and the QEP Steering Committee (Appendix I, J, & K). These protocols were analyzed to determine their alignment with the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives in order to ascertain if the protocols were a sufficient assessment measure for in-progress outcomes (Appendix L). Based on this analysis, it was determined that, although the protocols could obtain data that could establish in-progress outcomes, the protocols did not probe in-depth regarding these outcomes, and an evaluation of the implementation process of the QEP was limited. Hence, new protocols were developed to ensure that both process and in-progress outcomes were evaluated and that the protocols were strongly aligned to the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives.

For example, in the original faculty focus group protocol, in order to evaluate in-progress outcomes for the QEP's student learning outcomes, one question was asked of faculty, "From your perspective as the instructor of record, to what extent were each of those four SLOs achieved by the majority of your students as a function of their HIP experience?" (Appendix J). In the protocols created for this evaluation, the faculty are asked six separate questions regarding and using the language of the QEP's student learning outcomes with follow-up questions asking about improvements or enhancements to better meet these outcomes (See *Section 3: Student Learning Outcomes* of Appendix O). During the data collection period, the new protocols were refined in terms of language in order to provide more clarity for certain questions. It is not believed that this additional refinement of the protocol affected data collection, as the evaluator conducted the interviews and focus groups as semi-structured, which allows for follow-up questions when needed, including reframing questions when it is apparent that the participant did not understand the intent of the question, and the evaluator also clarified any confusion on the intent of a question when asked by a participant. The protocols found in the Appendices are the final protocols after refinement (Appendix M-Q).

Furthermore, after the creation of the new protocols for this evaluation, it was also decided to hold interviews with students and faculty, as opposed to focus groups. This decision was made for three reasons. First, an interview would generate more detailed data from those stakeholders that are most affected by the implementation of the QEP. Second, given the different focus of each college, as well as the foci of departments, a focus group might have suppressed a discussion of the nuances found in teaching engaged learning opportunities in particular fields in favor of a more general discussion. Finally, this evaluation began following the move to remote learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic in Spring semester of 2020. Organizing focus groups, even those that would occur in online environments, became an almost impossible endeavor. Faculty were much more accessible when they could schedule an individual meeting time with the evaluator.

Interviews and focus groups occurred from May of 2020 through September of 2020. Each faculty had one interview that lasted no more than 90 minutes with most faculty interviews averaging between 45 and 60 minutes. The focus group with the Deans occurred in a single one-hour session. The focus group with the QEP Steering Committee required two sessions totaling two and a half hours. The interview with the Director of the QEP was completed in a single 90-minute session.

All interviews and focus groups took place in Microsoft Teams and were recorded using the native recording function of Microsoft Teams. In order to protect the identity of participants, Adobe Premiere Pro was used to separate the audio from the video in each recording. The video recording was destroyed, and the audio recording was retained for transcription. Otter.ai, an online artificial intelligence transcription program, was used to transcribe all interviews and focus groups (Otter.ai, 2020), and the evaluator verified the accuracy of all transcripts. NVivo 12, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis program, was used for data analysis (QSR International, 2020).

As the evaluation focused on the process and progress of the implementation of the QEP, the data was initially coded using the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives as *a priori* constructs (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). Furthermore, each transcript was analyzed using open coding for any further insights regarding the perspectives and experiences of the participants. Utilizing axial coding, these codes were then collapsed into categories that generated one theme (Saldaña, 2015).

Evaluation Findings

Findings from this evaluation were separated into four major areas: perspectives and experiences of engaged learning and the QEP, goals of the QEP, student learning outcomes of the QEP, and objectives of the QEP.

Perspectives and Experiences of Engaged Learning and the QEP

In general, all stakeholders found engaged learning opportunities to be a valuable activity and an activity that should be included in the undergraduate experience. Stakeholders believed that engaged learning opportunities offered students a space where they could apply knowledge and skills to real world situations due to close interactions with faculty and community and industry partners. Engaged learning courses also provided students with a chance to explore future career trajectories, including enrolling in graduate education. Stakeholders also believed that engaged learning opportunities produced positive effects for underserved and underrepresented students and contributed to diversity, equity, and inclusion at the university. Although creating high-quality engaged learning opportunities has led to challenges, addressing these challenges has improved variability across engaged learning courses.

Deans

Overall, the Deans spoke very positively about engaged learning opportunities. They viewed engaged learning opportunities as a way to provide students with “*real world experience*” and a “*meaningful experience*”. One Dean suggested that engaged learning opportunities offer the “*practical application of learned knowledge and skills*” that cannot be obtained through other means. Engaged learning opportunities were also thought of as “*different modalities*” of instruction that enhance the overall educational experience of students. There also seemed to be consensus on the perception of engaged learning opportunities as transformative learning. A Dean asserted,

It's plainly evident to me, at least, that, that they have a transformative experience that is different from students who have not engaged with those activities. So, we hope that the QEP will charge us forward to create the structures to, to provide those opportunities to more students.

The consideration of engaged learning opportunities as a transformative act was one of the reasons why the Deans were supportive of the QEP.

Additionally, participation in the QEP revealed issues with the level of quality found in their colleges' engaged learning courses. The Deans agreed that engaged learning opportunities are “*not foreign to our enterprise*”, but there was “*great variability between units in our college*” and across the university. When discussing variability, one Dean stated,

I would say that we were shocked to find out how variable our experiences were. That some [courses] didn't have a syllabus, even though the student was registering for an undergraduate research experience course, you know. We, so, we didn't have the closure, you know, the reflection on anything. So, so basically, the QEP is going to add value for sure and keep us from, you know, having a quality control problem with the wildfire variability that we had in what we were counting, because when we were first asked to

count [the number of engaged learning courses we offered], we were like, “Oh, look at all these that we do!”. And then when we said, “Okay, so how many of these have these [engaged learning opportunity] components?”. Our number dwindled way down, because they didn’t have the quality components they needed.

The Deans saw the QEP as a means to enhance the engaged learning opportunities that already existed in their colleges by providing resources to assess quality and enhance content to remove the challenge of variability, a challenge whose existence was not apparent until the implementation of the QEP.

The Deans also indicated that, although nothing has fundamentally changed in their colleges regarding the implementation of engaged learning opportunities, the QEP has provided a needed university-level structure. For instance, one Dean asserted,

Prior to the, the QEP, we didn’t have a very well-thought out structure of engaging students in these different modalities. It was occurring in a more organic way. And I think it’s more systematized where we hope for it to be more systematized.

This systematization has also assisted the Deans in shifting the culture around engaged learning opportunities. Engaged learning opportunities were already built into their programs due to accreditation processes in their fields. Accreditation processes have often placed an extra burden upon colleges in terms of the development of learning outcomes, syllabi, and course content. However, with the systemization created through the QEP, a shared language around engaged learning opportunities has developed, and this “*shared language across the institution is useful, because then we actually learn from each other rather than within our own disciplines*”, which can make complying with field-based accreditation processes more straightforward and less complicated.

The shared language and processes of the QEP, however, have also created issues for colleges. Although the Deans stated that they have not necessarily instituted considerable changes due to the QEP, owing to accreditation processes that were already in place, what has occurred is a shift in approach and perspective regarding courses with engaged learning opportunities. For instance, in order to solve the issue of variability and move toward shared language, “*it’ll take retraining of faculty to think about how to design these types of projects moving forward. So, so, the hesitation is the training and the development and the prep work to get that level of consistency*”. Shared language and processes have also posed challenges for course development. This seemed particularly true for undergraduate research experiences when a Dean shared,

The one challenge that I remember us chatting about is research experiences...for undergraduates and forcing it into some sort of academic syllabus with outcomes...it doesn’t mean that you can’t develop something, but if you, if you, if all the research experiences have to be done in an independent study fashion with some sort of syllabus, some outcome, or presentation, in the end, it becomes a challenge, you know. In the model of an R1 institution, that’s not exactly how it works. You get volunteers, you work with them, they get in there when they can, and they gradually get there. So, forcing everything into a credit hour model is not always easy.

Although the shared language introduced by the implementation of the QEP has produced a systemization that is supportive of accreditation processes, at the course-level, the QEP has also

presented challenges around conceptualizing what quality engaged learning opportunities look like and how to create that quality in the courses in their colleges.

Regardless of the challenges, the Deans agreed that engaged learning opportunities have a profound effect on the educational experiences of students. A Dean summarized this effect when he stated that students “*don’t remember many of the courses. They, they remember their [engaged learning opportunities]. And a lot of times it can, can win them a job almost immediately*”. In their respective fields, the Deans have observed better career retention rates when students have participated in engaged learning opportunities. Moreover, they have witnessed students return to KSU for graduate education, post-doctoral positions, and even professorial positions due to the positive experiences that they have had with undergraduate engaged learning opportunities.

Faculty

Like the Deans, faculty found engaged learning opportunities to be a valuable activity and an activity that should be included in the undergraduate experience. In particular, faculty thought that engaged learning opportunities allow students to participate in real world experiences and to apply knowledge and skills learned in their respective fields. One faculty member stated that engaged learning opportunities

Provide not only content based, based knowledge, but also skills-based knowledge. And that is, particularly for [my field], really important in terms of preparing students for future careers, for additional professional development, like, or like graduate school, post, post-secondary degrees. So, I think they’re one area that we really want to try to enhance. I also think that they’re one of the things that Kennesaw State does really well in terms of undergraduate education.

The idea that engaged learning opportunities provided a trajectory for students’ lives and careers in their fields was echoed by several faculty members. Engaged learning opportunities provided students with a glimpse into what “*they’re going to be expected to do after they graduate*”.

Engaged learning opportunities also provided students with the chance to interact with the community, industry, and research, which presented them with possible career trajectories that they might not have previously considered. Working with community and industry partners “*gives students a perspective that they don’t get in the classroom by themselves if they don’t have that opportunity...work[ing] in industry and see[ing] what, what a real job looks like day in and day out*”. Even in the area of undergraduate research, community and industry partners were often involved in those projects. Interacting with these partners showed some students that, although they were passionate about research, an alternative to academia was a better fit for their research interests. However, not all students deviated from the research path after working with community and industry partners. For some students, the faculty believed that engaged learning opportunities served as a reinforcement of their desire to continue their education and enroll in a graduate program.

Faculty found that students who were successful in their engaged learning opportunities tended to be those students who were high-achievers, self-motivated, and could manage team dynamics. Initially, some faculty were hesitant regarding the students’ abilities to effectively

participate in engaged learning projects and would ask themselves “*can this student really handle the project?*”. What they found, however, was that students wanted the challenge. Indeed, community and industry partners were often impressed with the deliverables that were produced by the undergraduate students. Faculty did mention that there were occurrences in which the community and industry partners were disappointed with the results of the project, but faculty did not believe that this was the result of the work by the students. Instead, it was the result of the partners “*not giving the students what they needed*” in order to produce a successful project or the expectations of the partners not being communicated effectively. In the area of research, faculty found that, because the students were high-achievers and self-motivated, they demonstrated passion and enthusiasm for faculty research projects. One interesting side effect of this has been the need to teach students that it was okay to make mistakes. The faculty believed that high-achieving students perceived mistakes as a form of failing. Given the often tumultuous nature of the research process, it was important to faculty to teach students that mistakes were a part of that process. One faculty member stated it best by saying,

These students really don't like to make mistakes. And sometimes it works out well to have a student like that, because you can really show them like, “hey, look, you can make a mistake in [research], and we're gonna roll with it. We're gonna work with it”. Like, it doesn't go perfectly, and it's still okay. Like, it's okay to not do it perfectly right out of the gate.

One potential area for mistakes to occur was managing group dynamics and conflict resolution. Faculty expressed that teaching students group dynamics was an area of weakness for them. Thus, the most successful students were those who could navigate working with peers and partners on projects without requiring additional assistance when encountering those spaces and situations.

Faculty also discussed those students who were not successful in engaged learning opportunities. These students tended to be individuals who were close to graduation and only needed one or two (elective) credit hours and enrolled in their courses due to the fact that many of the engaged learning courses are offered for one credit hour. Another scenario that faculty discussed was having students in their courses who did not understand the expectations and commitment required to participate in engaged learning. Faculty often had to stress that failing to meet those expectations and the commitment meant not only failing a course, but it also meant failing a community or industry partner.

Despite the potential for unsuccessful experiences, faculty were enthusiastic about participating in engaged learning opportunities with students. Faculty became involved in engaged learning opportunities due to their own backgrounds and previous experiences. Indeed, many of the faculty were teaching engaged learning courses that they themselves were involved in as undergraduate students or through their discipline (i.e., engaged learning was the primary instructional modality due to accreditation and certification processes or past experiences in industry prior to entering academia). They desired to translate their positive experiences with engaged learning into high-quality opportunities for students. A secondary consideration by faculty was the effects on their Annual Reviews and progress toward meeting Promotion and Tenure requirements. This was particularly true for junior faculty. The shift to R2 standards has significantly increased faculty workloads in terms of research output. Faculty viewed offering

engaged learning opportunities, particularly, undergraduate research, as a way to meet these new R2 requirements by combining teaching and research.

This alignment of their teaching with their own research agenda was one of the reasons why many faculty members preferred to offer undergraduate research opportunities in lieu of internships or service-learning opportunities in their engaged learning courses. Of the three opportunities, faculty also felt that research was the area with which they were most familiar. In turn, faculty found it easier to create high-quality courses using best practices in undergraduate research, because they could utilize their knowledge of best practices in research, generally, as a foundation for the course. It should be noted that it was not a just preference for undergraduate research that caused faculty to offer more engaged learning courses in this area. There was an admitted lack of familiarity with internships and service-learning that prevented faculty from developing those types of engaged learning courses. Given the considerations that faculty were making regarding Promotion and Tenure requirements, faculty felt that they would have to “*pull back somewhere else*” if they decided to familiarize themselves with and develop engaged learning courses for internships and service-learning.

QEP Steering Committee

The QEP Steering Committee held similar views to the Deans and faculty regarding the benefits of engaged learning opportunities. The committee thought that engaged learning opportunities were “*really impactful pedagogical structures in our courses*” and “*really effective ways to engage students in the learning process*”. One committee member stated that engaged learning opportunities “*get students out of formal classrooms structures. I think that’s something that a lot of students are yearning for, that blended model of something that’s engaging but also some lecture*”. This point was expanded upon by another committee member who stated,

[Engaged learning opportunities] are a better pedagogical format than lecture. All things being equal, you can have a good lecture, you can have a bad lecture, you can have a good internship, you can have a bad internship, but, all things being equal, [engaged learning opportunities] have more impact in terms of not just the learning that happens, but the ability to actually apply it and use it and find situations in real life where you see that your knowledge is applied and advanced, and it makes, it make a difference.

Interestingly, the committee discussed an effect of engaged learning opportunities that the Deans and faculty did not address. The committee recognized the positive effects of engaged learning opportunities for underserved and underrepresented students. One committee member summarized this idea by stating,

[The] framework has these compensatory effects, that they can have a compensatory effect for underserved and underrepresented students in terms of getting them involved in undergraduate research right away and seeing the power of that and, and turning their academic career upside down, which feeds into our progression, retention, completion, graduation, and placement goals.

Thus, although the committee was in agreement with the Deans and faculty regarding the positive attributes of engaged learning opportunities, the committee also examined these opportunities beyond the more apparent effects and considered the role of engaged learning opportunities in contributing to diversity, equity, and inclusion at the university.

The QEP Steering Committee also favored undergraduate research, but the committee's reasoning was different from the reasons advanced by the faculty. The committee observed that undergraduate research was an engaged learning opportunity that was well-supported prior to the implementation of the QEP, and, because of this, there were already structures and funding in place to support this opportunity. Hence, after the implementation of the QEP, undergraduate research was easier for faculty, in particular, and the university, in general, to navigate. Indeed, given the emphasis on transitioning to a strong R2 university, the committee saw faculty selecting to participate more in this opportunity as a natural progression. One committee member stated,

*The most important thing here on campus is the intellectual potential of the faculty. And that shows up really well when we conduct research with our students. The other things, [internships and service-learning], I thought, I think those are all really good ideas...but those are external. We're relying on external resources, especially the internships outside of campus. But, as faculty first and foremost, I like to demonstrate and show off. *laughs* No, the intellectual capability of me and my colleagues, I think that to me, that's the most important thing.*

This sentiment was reflective of why faculty tended to favor undergraduate research, as they stated that this opportunity allowed them to integrate their teaching with their research, which is the area in which they have had the most experience. Therefore, although faculty recognized that research was a primary focus of their positions, the committee realized that research was a primary focus of their positions due to the intellectual potential that they brought to this area.

QEP Goal 1: Increase the number of opportunities for students to engage in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the university as a whole.

The Deans believed that their colleges were offering a significant number of opportunities for students to participate in engaged learning opportunities, but they also saw space for the development of more high-quality opportunities. Faculty have used Faculty Learning Communities as a means to create interest within their colleges and departments for more engaged learning courses with the culture of some colleges and departments supporting this effort by strongly encouraging faculty to offer these courses. However, there were challenges in increasing the number of engaged learning opportunities, including the ability to effectively manage community and industry partnerships, the lack of faculty compensation or incentives that recognize their time and effort, the lack of additional support regarding managing team dynamics and formal mentoring, the lack of a reputation for KSU in some disciplines, faculty who did not understand engaged learning opportunities or might not recognize that their courses currently included engaged learning opportunities, and possibly inhibiting academic freedom.

Deans

Given that the Deans indicated that the implementation of the QEP has not led to considerable changes in college practices due to accreditation processes, the Deans also felt that the number of opportunities available to students to participate in engaged learning was appropriate. However, this does not mean that the Deans thought that there was not space for additional opportunities within their colleges. Indeed, one Dean stated that a personal goal for his

college was to continue to grow these opportunities at each unit-level. The Deans also expected to increase quality expectations in conjunction with their growth expectations. The goal was not to simply add more opportunities, but, instead, to develop processes that would create more high-quality opportunities. Several approaches to meeting this goal were currently in process or being developed, including the creation of coordinator positions for each or all of the available engaged learning opportunities and a proposal process for faculty who desired to teach courses with these opportunities.

Faculty

In terms of increasing the number of opportunities available to students, faculty have taken a proactively role in promoting the development of engaged learning courses within their own colleges and departments. Faculty have even used Faculty Learning Communities to create interest within their colleges and departments for more engaged learning courses. They have shared their positive experiences with other faculty, as well as the general knowledge that they possessed regarding the benefits of engaged learning opportunities for students. Faculty deemed the sharing of this information to be critical, as they believed that one challenge to increasing the number of opportunities available to students was faculty knowledge regarding engaged learning opportunities, including not recognizing that their courses currently included engaged learning opportunities. Indeed, one faculty member stated that she became part of a Faculty Learning Community on service-learning “*to try to figure out who else is doing service-learning*” already and who could assist in “*increas[ing] service-learning within our college*” based on the standards of the QEP. Another faculty member shared that the intent of the Faculty Learning Community in her college was to

Kind of get an idea, idea of how, of how, you know, many faculty are doing this type of engaged work, and then kind of say, “hey, by the way, you’re doing service-learning. Let’s, Let’s pick that up and track that”.

Faculty also observed that, despite using Faculty Learning Communities, the difficulty in promoting engaged learning courses to other faculty members originated from the lack of faculty compensation or incentives that recognized their time and effort. Although faculty discussed incentives that existed within their own departments and colleges, including credit for contact hours versus credit hours and course reassignments after teaching a specified number of engaged learning courses, given that the nature of some disciplines required that all tenure-track faculty offered engaged learning courses, faculty stated that there were not any strong considerations for this extra workload. Outside of Promotion and Tenure requirements that favored faculty involvement in undergraduate research due to general research requirements and not any promotion of engaged learning courses, faculty stated that the university and their colleges lacked a mechanism to reward faculty for participation in these opportunities.

Increasing the number of engaged learning opportunities was made slightly easier, however, because of community and industry partnerships that created engaged learning opportunities due to the specific requests surrounding their proposed projects. Nevertheless, faculty believed that increasing opportunities was difficult when they had to manage these partnerships on their own. A faculty member illustrated this difficulty by stating,

The way that I ran the class for the fall, I ended up managing 13 different community partners. And logistically, it was just too much. So I had decided for this fall...to try a

different model of using one community partner per section, and having the students kind of work on the same project and see if that works better, if it, if it has the same positive learning outcomes and positive results from the reflections without as much logistical work on my side.

Management of partnerships was not the only issue. Communicating with partners effectively about expectations and what students could actually produce in a semester was also a daunting task. Faculty wanted to know

How do you communicate with the community to come up with some rules or deliverables, or what like, what is the etiquette of this, or what is the procedures...that I should know when I contact [them],

and they had no idea where to obtain support for these kinds of issues. Indeed, one faculty member stated that “*the [lack of] reputation of the university [in certain disciplines] was holding me back a little bit, because they automatically go to Georgia Tech, Emory, Georgia State*”, and this made communicating with partners more difficult.

One consistent concern raised by several faculty members was the lack of resources or support regarding managing team dynamics and formal mentoring. Although many faculty members wanted to offer more engaged learning courses, this concern caused hesitation. This concern was summarized by a faculty member when she stated,

I have some natural ability to work with people. But like, I don't necessarily know all the aspects of like, being a good manager...I've never had any formal training and...I feel like, I'm far enough along that I would benefit from that...there were multiple students that were clearly dealing with massive personal challenges that were affecting their emotional, their emotional state. And that was bleeding over into the research...And I felt very ill equipped to handle that. And so, you know, I was trying to figure out how to deal with that the best way, but it was really hard. I mean, I had students yelling at each other, and I had students bursting into tears and, like, I just didn't exactly know how to navigate that. And I did the best I could.

This sentiment was echoed by several faculty members. They all loved being a part of the engaged learning process, but they also realized that many of their students were still developing in terms of socialization. The pressures of these “*real world experiences*” deeply affected some students, and these were issues that faculty had not faced since their own tenure as undergraduate students. In the end, faculty felt that it was essential that some sort of training be created to help them effectively manage team dynamics and formal mentoring. With this training available, faculty felt that they could increase their own participation in engaged learning opportunities.

QEP Steering Committee

When considering strategies to increase the number of engaged learning opportunities, the QEP Steering Committee focused on the need for faculty incentives to increase participation. Faculty saw the lack of incentives as challenge, but the committee discussed it as a significant problem, particularly, regarding the lack of compensation and recognition in Promotion and Tenure requirements. One committee member stated,

At first, it was money. There was gonna be money. They asked us to put together a “blue sky budget”, and then there's like, there's no money. And then, if there were, there was talk of like, you know...time or money or rewards for Tenure and Promotion. There were

promises that, that we would have conversations in the colleges about how this, that this work would be counted and would definitely, would be valued and rewarded in different ways. We have so many opportunities to do that kind of rewarding, and I don't think those conversations have happened at all.

Many committee members recounted discussions to “open up P & T documents in order to add value to this work”, but no committee member could recall these conversations occurring at the college- or university-level. The committee saw the lack of faculty incentives as one of the greatest barriers to the successful implementation of the QEP.

The committee also considered academic freedom to be a possible limiting factor on the number of engaged learning opportunities offered by faculty. One committee member stated, *I know that, any, anything that touches on a faculty member's teaching space, causes them to potentially have a lot of discomfort. Right? Like somebody's trying to push them in a direction that they don't want to go...I mean, if we think about it, what a faculty member does for their research...that is like the culmination of their career path. And to have any suggestion that what they are currently doing isn't right, even if that's not what [the committee] is saying, that's what they're hearing. That caused [the committee] a lot of concern, right, going into this space...[The] potential for discomfort from the changes that are being asked of [faculty].*

Hence, the committee has been attempting to balance offering suggestions on how to improve engaged learning opportunities with respecting the courses and space that faculty have created.

QEP Goal 2: Increase the number of students engaging in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning opportunities in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the university as a whole.

Colleges and departments have several common approaches to increasing student participation in engaged learning opportunities, including advertisement through advisors, websites, and social media, as well as partnerships with Registered Student Organizations (RSOs), with individual programs, departments, and colleges utilizing student list-servs or newsletters that allowed them to directly advertise engaged learning opportunities to students. Faculty have also advertised their engaged learning courses in their own courses and the courses of colleagues. Some colleges and departments have created special events or orientations designed to get students interested in engaged learning opportunities. Some challenges in increasing student participation in engaged learning opportunities relate to the effects of and the uncertainty surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, maintaining funding for associated costs related to engaged learning opportunities, financial support for students involved in engaged learning opportunities, the lack of access to needed external resources to ensure that engaged learning opportunities continue to be high-quality, the lack of a system to effectively manage community and industry partnerships, the time involved in participating in engaged learning opportunities for both faculty and students, the lack of student incentives to participate due to zero and one credit hour courses, and the lack of value that students placed on engaged learning opportunities.

Deans

Approaches to increasing student participation in engaged learning opportunities varied by college. In addition to more universal, traditional approaches, such as college-level advisors informing students of available opportunities, the Deans indicated that they have considered less traditional ways to advertise courses with engaged learning opportunities. Some colleges have open sessions and workshops coordinated by faculty while others have found a way to align their opportunities with RSOs. Special events and sessions have been held with internship and service-learning partners, as well as support units at KSU, such as the Department of Career Planning and Development, the Office of Undergraduate Research, and the Department of Student Leadership and Service, to advertise engaged learning opportunities. Finally, the Deans have also taken advantage of their college and departmental websites for promotion of specific courses or opportunities in order to increase enrollment.

The greatest and most immediate concern for the Deans regarding the QEP was the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic. Engaged learning opportunities inherently required students to participate in some sort of site placement, whether that is at a company for an internship, a non-profit for a service-learning project, or in a lab conducting research with a professor. When engaged learning opportunities were first implemented in the colleges, many Deans and faculty made a conscious decision to not offer these opportunities as online opportunities opting instead for experiences that were more aligned with “*real world experiences*”. The COVID-19 pandemic has forced some colleges to rethink this approach and allow students to participate in engaged learning opportunities remotely. This has not been possible for all colleges, however, and students have had to adapt to social distancing requirements in the field. The Deans hoped that this did not continue to be a concern moving forward due to the association between engaged learning opportunities and college- and university-level accreditation processes.

Another primary concern for the Deans was funding. Often, site placements for internships and service-learning have associated costs, and participation in undergraduate research has the potential to add to the overall cost of a research project. These costs could include having the equipment needed to complete a service-learning project for a community or industry partner, compensating mentors for offering their time, and site placements requesting funding for student use of their facilities or equipment. All of the Deans indicated that they want to avoid passing the costs to students. However, this might require that the additional funding needed to offer engaged learning opportunities come from the university.

Faculty

Across the university, strategies that colleges and departments used to increase student participation in engaged learning opportunities were robust. Colleges and departments have several common approaches to increasing student participation, including advertisement through advisors, websites, and social media, as well as partnerships with RSOs. Individual programs, departments, and colleges have student list-servs or newsletters that allowed them to directly advertise engaged learning opportunities to students. Faculty have also advertised their engaged learning courses in their own courses and the courses of colleagues. Some colleges and departments have created special events or orientations designed to get students interested in engaged learning opportunities.

However, challenges to increasing student participation in engaged learning opportunities existed across all colleges and departments. The most salient challenge for faculty was the effects of and the uncertainty surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty stated that, when they developed their engaged learning courses, they avoided including virtual engaged learning opportunities, as they thought that this would detract from students obtaining real world experiences. The shift to remote learning in March of 2020 and the continued faculty desire to offer hybrid or online courses until the conclusion of the pandemic has forced faculty to reconsider their stance on virtual engaged learning opportunities. The challenge has been determining what this looks like and how to continue to offer high-quality experiences. Some faculty members have experienced success in creating virtual engaged learning opportunities, but they attribute this to luck more than anything else. For instance, one faculty member stated,

I just got really lucky that I had [a research project] that I could do as like a [remote project]. And so, so, even though they had to do part of the, like, engaged part at home, we were able to get them [equipment], and it actually worked really pretty well. We used Collaborate Ultra, and I put them into breakout rooms...that was something that I felt like I could definitely do again, as like a remote experience, and it would totally work.

As evidenced by this faculty member, it was not just a matter of luck, but it was also a matter of access to needed resources.

Resources, both tangible and intangible, affected faculty perspectives on student participation in engaged learning opportunities. While the Deans were concerned about maintaining funding for associated costs related to engaged learning opportunities, faculty were concerned about financial support for students involved in engaged learning opportunities and the lack of access to needed external resources to ensure that engaged learning opportunities continued to be high-quality. Financial support became particularly important after the switch to remote learning. One faculty member stated,

I wish I could support them, especially economically. I wish I could be able to, you know, at least for the hours they work. [During the early period of the COVID-19 pandemic], their parents lost their jobs. So, I had one student, for example, who couldn't [continue his internship], who was excellent in the beginning, and then he disappeared.

The limitations of tangible university resources also posed a challenge for student participation. Faculty were not always able to obtain all the equipment they needed for particular projects. In some instances, it was simply a lack of access to specific journals through the library that prohibited project progression. Faculty believed that a greater investment in resources was needed in order to provide high-quality experiences for students, which should, in turn, increase the number of students involved in engaged learning opportunities.

Faculty repeated their concerns about the lack of a system to effectively manage community and industry partnerships and the time involved in participating in and committing to engaged learning opportunities in the context of student participation. However, they also added the lack of student incentives to participate due to zero and one credit hour courses. One faculty member asserted,

I think the challenge is that these classes are also really time consuming. So, the pushback is not necessarily in the value. It's in the like, "I don't have enough time to do this", or "I don't want to put as much time into this". And, in that case, it's not so much about the learning outcomes for them. It's about the number of credit hours they're

getting for that class. So, like, you know, they feel like, well, even if I get an A in this course, it's only worth what, like, how it affects their GPA. Right? So, I think that's one of the things that's challenging about this, because it doesn't count as much.

Faculty recognized that reconsidering the credit hour model would definitely pose problems for many academic programs. Nevertheless, they wanted students to receive recognition for time and effort that they were delivering in these courses.

QEP Steering Committee

The QEP Steering Committee believed that, in order to increase student participation in engaged learning opportunities, student concerns regarding the value and purpose of these opportunities needed to be addressed. One committee member asserted,

We've had trouble getting the students to see the value of these things. And we've talked to them. We've done focus groups...but we never got anywhere...so, when we did the first round of voluntary, our pilot, reflections, I think I got a handful back, like a literal handful. I'm like, "why don't, this is never going anywhere?" ...I think it was three reflections I got back from the students voluntarily.

It appeared that students valuing their participation in engaged learning opportunities was an issue that was twofold. First, students needed to see the value in the opportunities prior to enrolling in engaged learning courses. Second, if they did enroll, students needed to appreciate the value of the assignments associated with the engaged learning opportunities. Otherwise, they had little to no motivation to complete them.

QEP Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will cite meaningful and valuable connections of their HIP experiences to their overall educational preparation.

Faculty stated that students find engaged learning opportunities meaningful and valuable due to the preparation that these courses provided for their future careers. In particular, faculty referenced lessons in conflict management and navigating group dynamics, which was a recurring theme in almost every discussion of the QEP with faculty. One faculty member stated,

If you have, if your students are working with a team of four, let's say, always, two students will be complaining about the other two, "we are doing the work and they are doing nothing" ...This is a, this is the same kind of complaint we hear every semester, but, in, in our team, we kind of circulate this homogeneously. I want to share the work within the team, so that each student, even though they're working as a team, has different responsibilities, but, in the end, they mix it, mix it up. So, they come to consensus.

This consensus was often reached due to the real world aspects of engaged learning opportunities. Faculty believed that the value students placed on the opportunities to participate in professional conferences, write or publish reports and research, and be viewed as an expert on a project assisted students in addressing issues with group dynamics.

Faculty also believed that establishing career and professional goals, the development of soft skills, interacting or working with potential employers, and the development of strong bonds with other students who are on a similar career path contributed to student perceptions of how meaningful and valuable they found their engaged learning courses. Students realized that,

through their participation in these activities, they were one step closer to achieving their goals after graduation. One faculty summarized these thoughts by stating,

The number of students who've gotten into graduate programs or into internship programs that they were interested in, or even gotten hired for jobs, I think I have a, I think there's a really good track record of that. And again, I think that's because you know, from day one, we get into the [project]...the research is just as important as helping them figure out, out what their career or professional goals are.

Faculty even stated that they believed community and industry partners viewed engaged learning opportunities as being valuable in the same way that students did. For instance, a faculty member asserted that *"The reason the company wants to [become a partner] is because they're, they're seeing it as a 15-week job interview. So, they're using the course as a way to assess potential students for, for a job opening"*. Thus, the value of engaged learning opportunities for many students and partners seemed to be what the opportunity could provide to students after they have graduated from KSU.

Faculty mentioned that one of the challenges that they faced in their engaged learning courses was students who determined, during the engaged learning opportunity, that this was no longer what they desired for their career trajectory. However, although this can be challenging in terms of maintaining student engagement, faculty believed that the engaged learning course was still a meaningful and valuable experience, as it allowed the student to reflect on their next steps in their undergraduate education. A faculty member stated that

I've only had one student out of close to 50 who's ever said, "Well, this kind of showed me I don't want to do research". And she was very honest about it, and actually I don't think that it wasn't a meaningful experience for her. I just think that it became clear to her, like, that wasn't what she wants to do.

Hence, even in those situations where it appeared that students did not have successful engaged learning experiences, students still obtained meaning from the experience.

QEP Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will gain new insights on the connectedness and integration of the academic preparation of their disciplines of study to the applied settings of their HIP experiences.

Faculty also observed students making strong connections between what they had learned in the classroom and what occurred during their engaged learning opportunities. One faculty member stated,

So, one of the things we do early on is we have a day where I talk about project management, and I bring in [an expert], and he talks for like five minutes and, and, and then they get to do a project management exercise to kind of put together a baby project plan related to the project. So, they're there right away kind of applying [the discipline] to a real world project that they each have, and they want to solve.

Faculty asserted that it often was a simple process to connect course content to engaged learning opportunities due to the number of faculty who have worked in the community or industries. For example, a faculty member stated,

We do have some professors that have, have done, have worked out in the real world. Most of us and especially some of our adjunct professors, and we try to bring in those stories...So, I think bringing guest speakers in, I think going on tours...that's the closest

thing students kind of have [to engaged learning opportunities in their course content], and they come back and they're like, "Oh, now I understand".

Participating in conferences, writing or publishing reports or research, managing and engaging in a community or industry project, and utilizing practices learned from group dynamics and conflict management were all cited by faculty as praxis that originated from theory learned in the classroom.

QEP Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will build upon prior knowledge and experiences to respond effectively to the new and challenging demands of their HIP settings.

Many of the activities mentioned by faculty as contributing to student connections between the classroom and their engaged learning opportunities were also mentioned as ways to help students build on prior knowledge and meet the challenges of their engaged learning opportunities. For instance, one faculty member asserted,

I had some students who, you know, during my class when we talk about, you know, their learning outcomes, the students learn to work in a group, but we need to establish some type of model, or what does it mean to work in the group. And, so, we talked a lot about the forming, you know, forming, storming, and performing...and it's so fun to hear students come back to me and be like, "Oh, okay, yeah". I was like, "So, how's your first month been?". And, they'll be like at the job or in the internship, and they'll be like, "Oh, we're still in our forming stage", "Oh, we're definitely performing now"...That just tells me that the students are recognizing, you know, and they're picking up even [from] the first course that they took, that they're recognizing what's going on and they're able to, to temper their experiences.

What was learned in the classroom provided students with a foundation for reflection as they participated in engaged learning activities.

QEP Student Learning Outcome 4: Students will demonstrate growth in professional and personal core values and sense of self as a result of their HIP experiences.

Faculty stated that professional and personal growth due to participation in engaged learning opportunities occurred in thirteen areas: socialization, identity, confidence, communication, perceptions of their own influence, leadership, self-motivation, self-efficacy, conflict management, accountability, social awareness, critical consciousness, and critical thinking. Indeed, the growth in these areas often occurred simultaneously. For example, one faculty member recounted the story of one particular "anti-social" student:

I think working as a team changes things, because, for example, I had one student who was really antisocial. I mean, extremely, I mean, in the classroom, I could see his you know, like, he will never touch anyone. He doesn't like to speak to anyone. And he was, he was not making eye contact with me...At the end of the semester, I really was not prepared for [the student to ask to be part of the research project], because my research is always team research. So, I was like, "Are you sure? Like you really want this?" And, he was like, "Yeah, I want that". So, I put him in a team...you should have seen it in the end. [The students on the team] were laughing each other. They were making jokes at the end of the semester. They became friends.

In one semester, this particular student developed from a quiet, reserved student who rarely interacted with classmates to a student who engaged in socialization, developed confidence in his ability to conduct research, established better communication skills, and could handle conflict management. Faculty also viewed engaged learning courses as opportunities for students to see themselves as leaders and to develop social awareness and a critical consciousness about community issues. For example, one professor stated,

So, one of the things that came up in some of the reflections were their ability to make an impact on the world, that sort of thing...that they can to actually make a difference out in the nonprofit, nonprofit sector.

One professor thought that that the greatest effect of engaged learning opportunities was the shift in student identity. She stated that students “*would call themselves researchers. And, they are, to be honest, they are*”.

Faculty were unsure of whether or not engaged learning opportunities could shift student values, as many faculty members stated that students held similar values to the faculty member when they entered their course. Thus, it may be that students who chose to participate in engaged learning opportunities might already possess the values necessary to be successful in those opportunities. However, some faculty reported that they did see some shifting in values in relation to the future trajectory of students. As an example, in one faculty member’s course, a student decided that she longer wanted to pursue graduate school after participating in her engaged learning opportunity. Instead, she wanted to be a small business owner and mother. The faculty member responded by adjusting the course expectations to align with what the student valued. Sometimes, faculty could observe shifts in how students perceived certain issues. One engaged learning opportunity that took place in a faculty course involved completing a service project where the partner requested that all materials used be sustainable. At first, students thought this was an impossible task and did not understand why they could not just “*go to Home Depot and get these two by fours and, and make it simple*”. By the end of the course, however, students were integrating sustainability practices into their own lives. Hence, depending on the project, it was possible for a shift in values to occur.

QEP Objective 1: KSU will assess the extent to which the Provost and the Academic Affairs staff, and the Deans were engaged sufficiently in overseeing the QEP’s overall implementation and using the incentive funds for rewarding faculty contributions.

The Deans viewed the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as essential to the structure that the QEP has created due to the potential role of the office in the development of procedures and processes that could enhance or correct the implementation of the QEP. The Deans perceived their own status within the structure of the QEP as facilitating the implementation of the QEP by addressing concerns regarding resources, support, and accreditation. However, they also thought it was important for departments and academic programs to take ownership of engaged learning opportunities.

Faculty stated that they have had little to no interaction with Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding their engaged learning courses. However, they did see this office as an essential contributor to the QEP due to the influence on support the office possessed and the policies and procedures that could be enacted, including funding and the

recognition of the time and effort involved in engaged learning opportunities through additional compensation, incentives, or modified workload models and Promotion and Tenure requirements. Depending on the college to which the faculty member belonged, perspectives of their Deans' contribution shifted. This was not due to any particular actions (or lack thereof) by the Deans. Instead, many colleges have found themselves in a period of transition with Interim Deans or permanent Deans in their first year still acclimating to their new positions. For faculty who did speak to the contributions of their Deans, they stated that their Deans have been very supportive in terms of fulfilling minor funding requests, providing needed equipment, and offering compensation for course redesigns. Faculty would like to see the development of some sort of mechanism to address student success in engaged learning opportunities, but they were unsure if this mechanism should exist within the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or at the college-level.

The QEP Steering Committee perceived the role of the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as the office that generated the messaging and culture of the QEP. The QEP Steering Committee also thought that the function of the Deans was an administrative role that assisted in facilitating the QEP. However, they would like to see the Deans take on a more empowered role by adapting their implementation of the QEP to focus on the strengths of their respective colleges.

Deans

The Deans viewed the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as essential to the structure that the QEP has created. From the perspective of the Deans, this office originates university support and guidance for the QEP. It is a top-level structure that oversees implementation and could assist in the development of corrective procedures and processes and the reformulation of the QEP, as needed. The office was also considered the public support mechanism for the QEP, which might aid in increasing faculty and student participation in engaged learning opportunities. The Deans also discussed the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' leadership in managing the continued functioning of the university during the COVID-19 pandemic while also ensuring the implementation of the QEP.

The Deans perceived their own status within the structure of the QEP as facilitating the implementation of the QEP by addressing concerns regarding resources, support, and accreditation. However, they also thought it was important for departments and academic programs to take ownership of engaged learning opportunities. For example, one Dean stated, *For us, we push the ownership within the departments, particularly amongst the department chairs, because, in our program, coordinators, because so much ties directly to accreditation. We have to engage with our accrediting body, basically, weekly, almost, in some instances...Because this, this is inherent in how we've always operated, particularly on the internship side and the other pieces that we still need to support and grow.*

The accreditation process was not something that could be managed by any, single individual. Allowing departments and academic programs to take ownership of the implementation of the QEP also assisted in distributing the work of accreditation across all stakeholders. Distributing this work has increased in importance due to the COVID-19 pandemic. One Dean asserted,

And there's been almost unanimous consensus among the chairs and the leadership team that, that the crisis of the week took priority anytime...And there's always been something to deal with as a leadership team. So, unfortunately, this, even though [the QEP is] an important priority, it hasn't taken precedence over simply keeping our programs running. We're in survival mode. So, it's hard to focus on the QEP.

Hence, the decision made by the Deans to distribute the work of accreditation and the implementation of the QEP has also ensured the viability of academic programs, their colleges, and the university, as a whole, by allowing them to focus on continued operations in the midst of a pandemic.

Faculty

Faculty stated that they have had little to no interaction with the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding their engaged learning courses. However, similar to the perspective of the Deans, they did see this office as an essential contributor to the QEP due to the influence on support the office possessed and the policies and procedures that could be enacted. As stated previously, faculty had many concerns regarding the recognition of the time and effort involved in creating and facilitating courses with engaged learning opportunities. They hoped that the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs could begin conversations regarding additional compensation or incentives for offering engaged learning courses, including considering contact hours in their workload models in lieu of credit hours or increasing the number of credit hours of engaged learning courses. Faculty also suggested modifying workload models and Promotion and Tenure requirements to address the time and effort commitment of engaged learning courses, so that they would not have to “*pull back somewhere else*”. Suggestions differed based on the college of the faculty member, but one consistent suggestion was to rank their participation in engaged learning opportunities as high as activities considered to be more intense in their Promotion and Tenure requirements. For instance, one faculty member suggested that publishing with an undergraduate student or team should be similarly valued to the intensity of the work required for a first or single author publication due to the additional effort in teaching students how to publish that particular piece, contributing to the writing of the piece, and managing its publication.

Depending on the college to which the faculty member belonged, perspectives of their Deans' contribution shifted. This was not due to any particular actions (or lack thereof) by the Deans. Instead, many colleges have found themselves in a period of transition with Interim Deans or permanent Deans in their first year still acclimating to their new positions. For faculty who did speak to the contributions of their Deans, they stated that their Deans have been very supportive in terms of fulfilling minor funding requests, providing needed equipment, and offering compensation for course redesigns. One faculty member stated,

Whenever I needed help, for example, I needed a software immediately...And I was probably crying for it. And I was like, “I can't do anything without this software”. And then I approached my assistant dean, and she was very helpful. She just solved the problem immediately...And whenever [my research team] needed help for the travel, [the Dean's office] helped me. So, whenever I need some really little money, not too big money...I always got the help from them.

Obtaining the “*little money*” could often make the difference between the success or failure of an engaged learning project.

Faculty would like to see the development of some sort of mechanism to address student success in engaged learning opportunities, but they were unsure if this mechanism should exist within the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or at the college-level. One faculty member shared,

I notify students, but like maybe some kind of external, like, poke to students who aren't meeting the expectations, like somebody else coming in and saying, “hey, you're not doing X, Y, and Z” ...maybe that would be helpful for some of these students who aren't meeting the expectations...But that might also be something that would be you know, like, some kind of benevolent oversight. I don't want someone to be mean to us, but, at the same time, like, I do think that like, that can be helpful.

Faculty appreciated the freedom that they have in their engaged learning courses, but a few faculty members admitted that they could use assistance in keeping students engaged.

QEP Steering Committee

The QEP Steering Committee perceived the role of the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs as the office that generated the messaging and culture of the QEP. For instance, a committee member stated,

The Provost and the President, in my mind, it's their whole role at the university. Like they're not teaching the class, they're not working with the students. But their role is to set the vision and the values and what is important [at the university]...In corporate culture, their studies, it is not even enough to like send a message out to people. The [campus community] need[s] to see it three times before we register in their mind that this is a big thing for the university, for the, for the corporation, organization. So, sustained messaging.

As another committee member asserted, all stakeholders need “*messaging that really articulates how important it is to the Kennesaw community that we perform well through this Quality Enhancement Plan*”. However, the committee did not agree on approaches to this messaging. Indeed, one committee member stated that the messaging should be offered “*gingerly*”, because a more demanding message “*is not going to go over well*”. On the other hand, another committee member thought that the only way to ensure the implementation and success of the QEP is through “*a mandate*”.

The QEP Steering Committee thought that the function of the Deans was an administrative role that assisted in facilitating the QEP. However, they would like to see the Deans take on a more empowered role by adapting their implementation of the QEP to focus on the strengths of their respective colleges. For instance, one committee member shared,

The phrase that I'm hearing more and more is that the Deans are the CEOs of their colleges, and that they're sort of, the upper administration is trying to stay out of the telling all the Deans, “we're all going to do it this way”. And it's more empowering for the Deans to say, “this is how we're going to do it in this college...this is what you know, It's About Engagement is going to look like for us, and this is why it's important”. In the

sciences, it's, it's a different message than it would be in poetry or the arts, for instance.

And so, there's a lot of tailoring that, because these things by nature need to be tailored.

They believed that a consequence of this empowerment could be an increase in engaged learning by both the students and faculty.

QEP Objective 2: KSU will assess the extent to which the key supporting units effectively managed their reallocated workloads and accomplished their QEP support tasks.

The Deans thought that the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) offered faculty an opportunity to obtain professional development on engaged learning opportunities, which could be included in Annual Reviews. The Deans also asserted that it was important to consider the faculty's ability to participate in offerings from the CETL due to increased workloads and the transition to remote work brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. The Deans appreciated the work of support units and often sought additional information on what specific resources and support were available from each office in order to provide that information to faculty. This might be made easier if faculty interactions occurred more organically with these units, as opposed to faculty seeking out the support units.

Faculty were very conflicted regarding their perspectives of and experiences with the CETL. The overall perception of the CETL was that it was an essential resource and source of support to better understand learning outcomes and pedagogy, in general. Indeed, faculty often cited the CETL as a major contributor to their understanding of best practices in higher education. What the faculty thought the CETL lacked were resources and support that were applicable to their specific discipline. One challenge repeatedly mentioned by faculty was managing group dynamics among students in engaged learning courses. Faculty would like to see training available that assists them in addressing group dynamics and conflict management, and the CETL was suggested as the support unit that could provide that training. The Department of Career Planning and Development was discussed as an important resource that provided students with opportunities to develop their Curriculum Vitae or résumé, practice interviews, and prepare for career fairs. Similar to the CETL, faculty would like to see more discipline specific resources and support made available. The Office of Undergraduate Research was mentioned by several faculty members as a secondary source of needed funding outside of their colleges and departments that allowed them to offer more successful undergraduate research experiences. Additionally, the support provided to the students from this office in the form of travel funding, equipment funding, and grant assistance facilitated student participation in all aspects of the research process. The Department of Student Leadership and Service was cited by faculty as essential in helping them find community and industry partners. However, faculty would also like to see this office provide support and resources in how to effectively manage community and industry partnerships.

The QEP Steering Committee thought that the CETL was a strong contributor to the successful implementation of the QEP by providing faculty with resources, support, and funding and that the unit assisted in providing explanations regarding engaged learning opportunities and components of the QEP that no other position, office, or resource could. Regarding key support units, the QEP Steering Committee thought that each unit was providing the needed support and resources necessary to ensure that both students and faculty experienced successful engaged

learning courses. Yet, given the essential function of the Department of Student Leadership and Service and the limitations found in faculty knowledge in the area of service-learning, the committee suggested that the department could be better funded in order to provide increased support to faculty and students.

Deans

The Deans thought that the CETL offered faculty an opportunity to obtain professional development on engaged learning opportunities. One Dean stated,

The way our performance guidelines are written, any of these would be considered developmental opportunities that would be go toward [faculty] ARDS in any given year. So, faculty should be aware that this could be used as one of those opportunities in their annual review as faculty development.

The Deans recognized, however, that the faculty's ability to participate in offerings from the CETL might decrease due to increased workloads and the transition to remote work brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. A Dean shared,

You know, a lot of [the QEP] was starting to kick in around January, February, and quite rightly, the focus for the faculty has been mainly in the classroom and managing that transition working with the students. So, you may find them even slightly less engaged in training in these other areas and more focused on equipping for the immediate needs, for the interaction with the students in the class.

Indeed, faculty admitted that the transition to remote work has been a priority for them, but they did not give an indication of how this has affected their participation in activities with the CETL.

The Deans appreciated the work of support units, but they also admitted that they do not have many opportunities for close interaction with these units. Instead, the Deans would like to acquire information on what specific resources and support were available from each office in order to provide that information to faculty. One Dean stated,

It is something that I am interested in finding out more about, because I'm always looking for resources to be able to help somebody do something better. And I think the faculty understand the purpose and the process behind the QEP. But, if there's something already out there to, to assist, I want to make sure that I include that somehow.

The Deans thought that more organic faculty interactions with these units, as opposed to faculty seeking out the support units, could assist in ensuring high-quality engaged learning opportunities. They thought that the structures in place for interacting with the support units were helpful, but better integration of and pathways with these units could better support the work of faculty.

Faculty

Faculty were very conflicted regarding their perspectives of and experiences with the CETL. Conversations with faculty about the CETL often began with “*I would never say anything bad about CETL, but...*”. This conflict occurred due to faculty perception that the CETL was an essential resource and source of support to better understand learning outcomes and pedagogy, in general. Indeed, faculty often cited the CETL as a major contributor to their understanding of best practices in higher education. At the same time, what faculty hoped to obtain from the

CETL, resources and support that were applicable to their specific discipline, was not offered. One faculty member shared,

So, when you go to those general sessions, you know, the, you know, teaching sessions, I've never got help, because it was really not speaking to [my discipline]. My classes are not taught that way. So, I wish my, those teaching in our workshops were just you know...very specific to [courses in my discipline]. My classes are not like that, so you can't have those discussions. Let's say, I wish I had more support on the classes from, you know, someone from [my college speaking] to us.

Another faculty member shared,

And I wouldn't mind having [them] do or even some, somebody do college specific things, because I think that can get at little more of the disciplinary differences. And that would also sort of lead us to think about maybe doing some interdisciplinary, experiential learning type things and it would just, you know, make, give us more opportunity to really talk through what we're doing.

A few faculty members stated that the lack of disciplinary focus made it difficult to attend the CETL sessions, particularly given the length of some of the training and workshops offered. It did not behoove them to attend a six-hour CETL session if there was no connection to their discipline. On the other hand, one challenge repeatedly mentioned by faculty that they would like to see addressed was managing group dynamics among students in engaged learning courses, and the CETL was suggested as the support unit that could provide that training.

The Department of Career Planning and Development was discussed as an important resource that provided students with opportunities to develop their Curriculum Vitae or résumé, practice interviews, and prepare for career fairs. Similar to the CETL, faculty would like to see more discipline specific resources and support made available to their students. For instance, one faculty member suggested that interviewing for a community, industry, or research position required different approaches, but he was not seeing this nuance in the workshops offered by this unit. In turn, he made this a part of his engaged learning course from the perspective of his discipline.

The Office of Undergraduate Research was mentioned by several faculty members as a secondary source of needed funding outside of their colleges and departments that allowed them to offer more successful undergraduate research experiences. Additionally, the support provided to the students from this office in the form of travel funding, equipment funding, and grant assistance facilitated student participation in all aspects of the research process. Funding and equipment were not the only resources mentioned by faculty. One faculty member stated,

I encourage my students to go [to the Office of Undergraduate Research] for, like, how to give a presentation. So, I've had some of them go over there to do that. Or if we're applying for grant or something, they've gone over there to, you know, learn tips and tricks.

Several faculty members mentioned the supplemental instruction that the Office of Undergraduate Research provided through workshops, and they hoped that these workshops would continue, as they could not always cover these topics in their own courses.

The Department of Student Leadership and Service was cited by faculty as essential in helping them find community and industry partners. Some faculty stated that they have had some

difficulties acquiring community or industry partners, and the Department of Student Leadership and Service has been able to suggest possible partnerships. Faculty did state that the suggested partnerships were not always a suitable match for their engaged learning courses, and they hoped that the support unit could create a more refined process for course-partnership matching. As mentioned previously, faculty would also like to see this office provide support and resources in how to effectively manage community and industry partnerships. Providing assistance in locating partnerships made establishing projects easier for faculty, but faculty were often unsure of how to work with these partners or logistically manage multiple partnerships.

QEP Steering Committee

The QEP Steering Committee thought that the CETL was a strong contributor to the successful implementation of the QEP by providing faculty with resources, support, and funding. A committee member stated,

From [the faculty] perspective, [CETL] is doing a great job. I think there's institutes and workshops. I think there's funding, you know. I, I, I think it's all right there for you. I mean, it's, if you, if you're, if you want to learn how to do these things better, I mean, [CETL is] offering it and, and [CETL is] also offering incentives that go alongside of it, whether it's faculty learning communities or institutes, you know. Maybe there's a, maybe there's a book focus or a reading focus.

The committee also stated that CETL assisted in providing explanations regarding engaged learning opportunities and components of the QEP that no other position, office, or resource could. One committee member summarized the committee's thoughts on CETL by stating, "They're honestly people, they're people with real, honest to God, success at getting faculty to do things in ways that almost nobody else is really good at".

Regarding key support units, the QEP Steering Committee thought that each unit was providing the needed support and resources necessary to ensure that both students and faculty experienced successful engaged learning courses. The committee believed that the Department of Career Planning and Development offered students access to quality internships in multiple disciplines. On the subject of the Office of Undergraduate Research, the committee praised the resources and support provided to students and faculty, including undergraduate research symposiums, funding, workshops, and institutes. The committee asserted that the Department of Student Leadership and Service was essential in aiding faculty in understanding what service-learning is and how it could function in an engaged learning course. Given the essential function of this office and the limitations found in faculty knowledge in the area of service-learning, the committee suggested that the department could be better funded in order to provide increased support to faculty and students.

QEP Objective 3: KSU will assess the extent to which the Engagement Steering Committee functioned effectively in supporting the QEP's successful implementation.

The Deans have had little to no experience with the HIP taxonomies, as the sharing of these taxonomies was a task typically managed by QEP liaisons. The Deans stated that they or their faculty have several concerns regarding the critical reflection assignment, including the difficulty of organic inclusion of the assignment in courses, faculty perceptions of the assignment

as an evaluation of faculty or their courses, and the limitations the assignment could place on faculty offering undergraduate research experiences.

Faculty stated that the HIP taxonomies were not developed in time for inclusion in their engaged learning courses. Additionally, some faculty members were still not aware of their existence. For those faculty who had encountered the HIP taxonomies, they stated that they did intend to review them for inclusion in future courses in order to integrate best practices. The critical reflection assignment generated the most discussion in all faculty interviews. These discussions focused on the announcement of the assignment and rubric after courses had already started for the Spring semester of 2020, a perception of the assignment as an evaluation of the faculty member or their course, the artificial nature of the assignment in relation to their discipline or course, a lack of understanding of the purpose and objectives of the assignment, the inability to integrate current course assignments and rubrics with the critical reflection assignment, the lack of both general and discipline specific examples for the assignment, students not understanding the purpose and objectives of the assignment, the lack of feedback by faculty in the development of the assignment, the lack of using existing and validated measurement tools for reflection, and the reflection assignment leading to their own reflection. Overall, faculty desired to see greater communication. Many faculty members stated that they were simply unaware of the support offices associated with the QEP and the role of the HIP taxonomies and critical reflection assignment, which could be resolved through better communication channels. Often, faculty were directed to the Engagement website or their QEP liaisons, but neither of these resources provided the answers that they were seeking.

The QEP Steering Committee perceived the committee's status within the QEP as a body that researches, generates, and debates ideas and concepts surrounding engaged learning opportunities and the development and implementation of the QEP. They asserted that a "turning point" for the implementation of the QEP was the decision to create the position of Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan and, subsequently, placing Dr. Scott Reese into that role. The QEP Steering Committee recognized the difficulties that faculty were having in accessing and understanding the HIP taxonomies, specifically, the inability to locate needed information and the fact that they were written using academic language. Like the faculty interviews, the QEP Steering Committee focus group generated a lot of discussion on the critical reflection assignment. This discussion focused on faculty identification within the assignment, the perceived evaluation of faculty and their courses, needed general and discipline specific guidelines to support faculty development of the assignment, utilizing the website as a hub for information on the assignment, emphasizing that the assignment is part of HIPs and not in addition to, changing the name of the assignment, providing additional support in completing the assignment to students and faculty participating in undergraduate research, the assignment as the sole metric for measuring student learning outcomes, and reflection as a powerful tool. The greatest challenges that the QEP Steering Committee asserted influenced the implementation of engaged learning opportunities were communication and the COVID-19 pandemic. In relation to communication, the committee was not clear on where the breakdown in communication was occurring, but they believed that this issue might be resolved through QEP liaisons and improvements on Engagement website. Finally, the QEP Steering Committee is concerned about the effects that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on the QEP and how this will affect the university's accreditation. The committee hoped that the COVID-19 pandemic only affects this

academic year, because they believed that the QEP could still be successfully implemented otherwise.

Deans

The Deans did not have any comments regarding the effectiveness of the HIP taxonomies, as the sharing of these taxonomies was a task typically managed by QEP liaisons. The Deans stated that they or their faculty have several concerns regarding the critical reflection assignment. One Dean outlined the difficulty in organically including the assignment in courses. For example, he stated,

I think it will be most effective if we can find a way to embed it into the, into a course in a more organic kind of way. I think faculty will, will adapt to it more, in a more welcoming way than I think students will...And maybe part of it is psychological, right? So, sometimes, I think faculty and students see it as this, “oh, we have to do this added thing”. And, it’s really not an added thing. It’s actually a processing of the work that’s going on which, from a pedagogical point of view, is, is, should be part of the loop, right? Closing the loop in that learning process. I think we probably should find more organic ways of embedding it into the into the course structure and making room for it rather than it being this added thing that someone has to do.

The Deans also spoke of the “suspicions” that some faculty members had regarding the critical reflection assignment as an evaluation of faculty or their courses. A Dean shared,

We also had some people that seemed concerned that it would be used to, like, a, an evaluation of the faculty member in a way. It’s like some personal evaluation, not of something. There are some concerns that kind of surprised me that people seemed to be suspicious of the intent of the reflection, where I wouldn’t have been at all.

Interestingly, one Dean thought that the critical reflection assignment had the potential to limit engaged learning opportunities, specifically undergraduate research. He stated,

To add these layers of reflection and all these projects, it becomes actually prohibitory to top notch research. And, you know, that may sound blasphemous, but it is sort of the reality of the research world and probably an age-old debate that we’ve had in academia, research versus teaching. So, I think there’s a way to get to what we want to get to. But I think we need to keep in mind the challenges to bringing in what I would call “superstar research faculty” who’ve come from postdoctoral experiences and high pedigree degrees, that, that are really more of the R1 level type research model. That, that it could be a little bit of a shock to them. And, and so I think we, it might be a way, a good way to find out if we could streamline it or merge it and merge the experiences.

Thus, while the Deans understood the intent of the critical reflection assignment, the Deans’ comments indicated that the assignment may have led to more issues than reflection.

Faculty

Faculty stated that the HIP taxonomies were not developed in time for inclusion in their engaged learning courses. For those faculty who had encountered the HIP taxonomies, they stated that they did intend to review them for inclusion in future courses in order to integrate best practices. For instance, one faculty member stated,

But unfortunately, we had those documents in the end of the, in the middle of the semester, right this semester. So, I couldn't really design the class that way. So, you know, because I had my syllabus already set, so I couldn't even tell my students "Hey guys, you have to just now send me those reports before the end of the semester". So, I just, you know, submitted an upload in detail for the QEP and gave, you know, [the QEP] what they call that, they asked for kind of reflections. So, it was not already required in my syllabus. And then I had to ask this, ask it from students after. So if, for example, starting this fall, I will be better prepared.

The most common response from faculty was they were not aware of the existence of the HIP taxonomies. One faculty member stated that this had little to do with the HIP taxonomies and more to do with communication:

I think there's sometimes a disconnect between individual faculty members and what's going on with the QEP in communicating information. So, although we knew that reflections needed to be a part of, you know, that HIPs designation from the beginning, I don't think faculty were aware that there was a taxonomy associated with it until it was like two seconds before that was asked for.

Indeed, when faculty were asked about the HIP taxonomies, this lack of awareness became readily apparent, as many faculty members asked the evaluator to describe what the HIP taxonomies were.

The critical reflection assignment generated the most discussion in all faculty interviews. Given the expansive discussion, below is a brief list of some of the comments about the critical reflection assignment provided by faculty:

- *It's so hard to understand that [in my field], to be honest. The, the QEP or the high impact requirements or the assessments. I hope that, in the future, we will have some kind of examples, okay, provided to us. So, I can actually go and see, "hey, this is what has been done in [my college]"*
- *I don't need your help with the syllabus writing or you know, writing the assignments, I've got it. Okay, reflections? You know, like, teaching it to, speaking like I'm an elementary kid. You, someone needs to talk to me that way.*
- *Maybe more examples of, of reflection questions that we might ask or, that might be helpful...And a lot of that is stuff when you're working one on one with a student, you're kind of talking through some of those things anyways, but I think examples of questions and examples of responses too perhaps might be helpful for faculty.*
- *One of them is that the students are graded based on whether or not they say the class was engaging, so there's no reason for them not to say that the class fully engages them, because it is actually a rubric for the class that students are filling out, but then they get a grade based on whether or not they say that the class was fully engaging. Like, it doesn't make any sense to do it that way. Because it's not about how they did in the course that they're getting a grade for. They're basically scoring how I set up the course for them. And they get a grade based on how well they think I did.*
- *They did not ask for feedback from faculty before they made it. And they handed it down and basically said, "We don't care how you feel about it, we want you to do it exactly like this". And that is problematic on many levels. And for one thing, people just don't like to do it if they're being told without any input at all. And it's so, it's just frustrating, and it makes people, even if it's good, I think people are likely to try to criticize it, you know.*

So, so there were a lot of things in it that I thought were okay and I was not opposed to, but I had a lot of peers [in the meeting] who were like, “I will not give this a second thought and you can never set my classes up, because I’m not going to do it because of the way they handled it”.

- *Constantly trying to invent their own measurement tools, instead of going out and finding ones that have already been tested and that are like being implemented more widely, and that we know are robust. And so, they’re like, “No, no, we’re not going to use what anyone else has done. We’re going to make our own and we have no way of knowing if it’s good measurement tool or not”. So, I think just a little bit more, like looking at best practices and not trying to invent the wheel from scratch, but like starting from what’s already out there.*
- *I didn’t even know [about the critical reflection assignment], so I didn’t do it. I mean, we’ve just been doing this, right? We didn’t necessarily see it as part of, a part of any bigger initiative at KSU. We just been, we’ve always done it this way.*
- *And so, like I was in my head, I’m like, “Okay, I’m asking my students to reflect on their experience, I should be also reflecting with them, so that, at the end, I can go back and I can read what I failed. And then I can make changes for the next year, and then go and do it again”.*

As the QEP continues, faculty hoped to see changes in how the critical reflection assignment operates and the role that they have in its design.

One of these reasons for the strong opinions from faculty regarding the critical reflection assignment was due to the lack of communication regarding the assignment. Overall, faculty desired to see greater communication in relation to the QEP. Many faculty members stated that they were simply unaware of the support offices associated with the QEP and the role of the HIP taxonomies and critical reflection assignment, which could be resolved through better communication channels. Often, faculty were directed to the Engagement website or their QEP liaisons, but neither of these resources provided the answers that they were seeking. Faculty did not offer suggestions for how to create this communication pathway. However, one faculty member did specifically mention that the use of forwarded emails through the Deans, Department Chairs, and Program Coordinators often caused him to delete the emails without reading them, as he assumed that those emails were simply providing general information about the QEP and not specific requirements about his course or resources and support available to assist in implementation.

QEP Steering Committee

The QEP Steering Committee perceived the committee’s status within the QEP as a body that researches, generates, and debates ideas and concepts surrounding engaged learning opportunities and the development and implementation of the QEP. Many of the current committee members have been involved with the QEP since its initial conception in the Fall of 2015. One aspect of the development process that committee members pointed to as a sort of “turning point” for the implementation of the QEP was the decision to create the position of Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan and, subsequently, placing Dr. Scott Reese into that role. One committee member stated,

Scott has been amazing in making things happen. We established liaisons in every college with a specific purpose...and they have the task of talking to the people [and] getting people on board and understanding the definitions thoroughly. So, when it's time to do [the count on the number of engaged learning opportunities], we can count...So, this year, actually, we're going to have a good [count], and that's a success.

One committee member summarized the committee's thoughts on the perceived successful implementation of the QEP by stating, "Scott Reese. Two words. That's all I have to say. Seriously, um, yeah, I don't even have the words".

The QEP Steering Committee recognized the difficulties that faculty were having in accessing and understanding the HIP taxonomies. The committee thought that the Engagement website could be more "user-friendly" in assisting stakeholders in locating information, and this included the HIP taxonomies. Moreover, the committee understood how faculty could be confused by the HIP taxonomies, because, as one committee member expressed, the taxonomies were written using academic language that "a lot of professors in our university who are very applied-focused...have never been inoculated [against]". One committee member offered a suggestion for how to modify the HIP taxonomies:

I think one thing that would really help would be a coversheet that, that identified, like, the five things you have to do before you jump into the definitions. I just find that I'm getting a lot of questions back from faculty that are looking at the taxonomies and they're like, "I don't know what I'm supposed to do"...Because what I, what I'm getting back from [faculty] is "I can't figure out what those taxonomies mean...Could you just tell me really quick what are the five things I have to do?"

The committee agreed that a coversheet might also be helpful in assisting faculty in navigating the critical reflection assignment.

Like the faculty interviews, the QEP Steering Committee focus group generated a lot of discussion on the critical reflection assignment. Given the expansive discussion, below is a brief list of some of the comments about the critical reflection assignment provided by the committee:

- *One of the things that came up where there was a ton of pushback, and a lot of communication...was that professors names were identified in those reflections. And they were incredibly uncomfortable with those going [into D2L]. Because if anything negative came out, they were concerned, it was going to be, you know, aligned back with them.*
- *We need more guidance on the website or a document that helps faculty craft assignment guidelines, particularly around this idea of identifying the faculty member within the document. But also, you know, I just get asked that, like, "just tell me how to do this, don't make me start from scratch on this". And so I think if we just had stuff on the website, people would appreciate it.*
- *I also wonder if it would be useful. And I don't know how you do this, I'd have to really think about it, to explain that the, the tool that we're using for assessment isn't an extra, an extra thing you have to do. It's a part of the implementation of a high impact practice. So, I don't know how you communicate that so that it's not seen as yet another onerous thing that has to be done, but it just somehow or another, it is explained that high impact practices, you know, an essential component of those are reflection by the students.*
- *I always argue that, because I'm very practical, you know, that you need to know how to reflect, because you're going to be doing it for the rest of your life. I mean, when you're*

getting evaluated for your performance, or you'd like to be promoted, or you're interviewing for a job, you have to really reflectively and deeply pull from your experiences and what was valuable and what was not valuable.

- *I don't know who we get the pushback more from on the reflection piece. Is it faculty or is it students? But if it, if there is pushback from students or if there is an unwillingness to do a class because of reflection, is there a way, can we change the name of it so that it's more, instead of calling it a reflection, is there something else that we can call it?*
- *So I think that, from, in terms of the three areas, undergraduate research is the one that probably needs the most remedial, remediation. I think it's, I think reflection is very embedded into internships and service-learning more so than undergraduate research. And so, you know, I like the idea of kind of maybe changing the name of it...and maybe help reach the undergraduate researchers, but also to reach the faculty because I'm not sure they're buying into the importance of this 100% yet...I'd be curious to know if there's differences in the, in the quality of the reflections based on which of the three areas the, the students are writing from.*
- *Our quality metrics, relying so heavily on a single written reflection from students, is a little troubling, right? I mean, I don't know, the connection between, the connection between where the student is when they're writing the reflection, and the outcomes we're looking for, is there, but tenuous at best. And so it's going to be really dependent on how well the faculty put those things together.*
- *It depends. If [the reflection is] done right, I think it's very powerful as a tool and has a lot of potential. I don't think it's being done right yet. So, I don't think it's having the desired effect yet.*

Besides renaming the critical reflection assignment and giving consideration to how the reflection piece is integrated with the different modalities of engaged learning, the committee was unsure about how to proceed with the critical reflection assignment.

The greatest challenges that the QEP Steering Committee asserted influenced the implementation of engaged learning opportunities were communication and the COVID-19 pandemic. The committee echoed many of the issues that were discussed in the faculty interviews regarding communication. However, the committee was not clear on where the breakdown in communication was occurring. The QEP liaisons were created partially to ensure that clear communication to faculty occurred regarding the QEP. Yet, the committee has found that some faculty members were not even aware of the focus of the QEP. For instance, one committee member stated,

So [faculty] may have heard of It's About Engagement, but not realize that it's the QEP, or they may have heard of elements of the QEP and not realized that it's tied to It's About Engagement. And so, I don't know if they're just not connecting all the pieces from the different various sources of information that they've been intaking. Or I just don't know if it's completely broken down for them. And so, I think...that this probably isn't the best time for them to maybe have communication on it, like starting to do it.

The committee wanted to see better communication in relation to the QEP, and they suggested that this could be done through the Engagement website and QEP liaisons.

Finally, the QEP Steering Committee is concerned about the effects that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on the QEP. One committee member stated,

We're almost stalled because of the COVID situation, you know. We're not really allowed to promote students in person volunteering. We've found virtual opportunities, but not at the capacity that we need to respond to the actual volunteer requests coming through.

The committee is also deeply concerned about how this “stalling” will affect the university’s accreditation, specifically,

I think [the COVID-19 pandemic is] a very specific disruption to this QEP, because we picked the three HIPs that are experiential. So, we talk about how to do undergraduate research when you're home facing the computer, how to go out in the community where you should not be out in the community, and so on and so forth. It's a specific set of difficulties that needs to be named for this.

The committee hoped that the COVID-19 pandemic only affects this academic year, because they believed that the QEP could still be successfully implemented otherwise.

Suggestions for Modifications to the QEP

Overall, all stakeholders, generally, had positive perceptions and experiences of the QEP in relation to its implementation and the progress made toward the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives. However, in every area evaluated, stakeholders did offer suggestions for modification to the implementation of the QEP that could allow KSU to meet or exceed the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives.

In general, the perceptions and experiences of the QEP and its implementation indicated that stakeholders desire to see the systematic approach to engaged learning experiences found in the QEP continue to ensure the ability to address issues of variability and quality across engaged learning courses. However, additional resources and support are needed to address variability and quality. Specifically, training is needed regarding the concepts and shared language of the QEP.

In order to increase the number of opportunities for participation in engaged learning, as well as student participation in these opportunities, training should be provided on managing team dynamics and formal mentoring to generate or sustain the success of all students, as this was an area of weakness for faculty. Moreover, a balance should exist between suggestions on how to improve engaged learning opportunities and the respect given to the courses and space that faculty have created. Additionally, student participation could be increased by rethinking the zero and one credit hour model, as this model does not recognize the time and effort that students contribute to their engaged learning courses. It is also advised that a standard description for engaged learning opportunities be included in the undergraduate catalog, in addition to clear labelling of engaged learning courses, to avoid students enrolling in these courses who are not familiar with the expectations and commitment required to participate in engaged learning. As the opportunities for participating in engaged learning grow, funding should be maintained for associated costs related to engaged learning opportunities, and financial support should be provided to students involved in engaged learning courses, particularly those courses that include internships. Efforts should also be made to assist students in seeing the value of engaged learning opportunities. The university should also examine implementing the strategies that colleges and faculty have been using to promote engaged learning, including utilizing college and departmental advisors, websites, and social media, student list-servs or newsletters, and partnerships with Registered Student Organizations.

Faculty need recognition of the time and effort that they contribute to engaged learning courses included in their Annual Reviews and Promotion and Tenure requirements. Due to the shift to R2 standards in these requirements, faculty workloads have significantly increased, which is forcing faculty to align their teaching with their own research agenda in order to maintain the required research output of their colleges and departments. This alignment has created a faculty preference for offering undergraduate research opportunities in lieu of internships or service-learning opportunities. Hence, it is necessary to recognize all forms of engaged learning opportunities in Promotion and Tenure requirements, which might serve to increase the number of internships and service-learning opportunities offered to students. Moreover, instituting additional training that is discipline specific, as well better communication, to ensure faculty understand the QEP, particularly, internships and service-learning, should

dispel the lack of knowledge surrounding these opportunities and increase the number of courses offered in these areas.

In terms of student learning outcomes, it is difficult to suggest modifications, at this time, as, overall, faculty reported few, if any, challenges associated with meeting these outcomes. Faculty believed that the student learning outcomes were achievable due to the very nature of high-quality engaged learning experiences. Thus, the only suggestion to offer is to continue provide resources and support that allow engaged learning courses to maintain or exceed their current standard of quality.

Many of the suggestions for modification relate to the listed objectives of the QEP. The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs should consider enacting policies and procedures that support the implementation of the QEP and the additional work that is being done by faculty, including supplementary funding for engaged learning courses and the recognition of the time and effort involved in faculty offering engaged learning opportunities. This might include additional compensation, incentives, or modified workload models and Promotion and Tenure requirements. The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs should also increase messaging articulating the importance of engaged learning opportunities and the QEP. The Deans should take on a more empowered role by adapting their implementation of the QEP to focus on the strengths of their respective colleges. A mechanism within the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or at the college-level to address (the lack of) student success in engaged learning opportunities is needed.

Key support units, including the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Department of Career Planning and Development, Office of Undergraduate Research, and Department of Student Leadership and Service, should develop methods to work more organically with faculty in the resources and support that they provide regarding engaged learning opportunities. Furthermore, resources and support should be more discipline specific, as faculty often did not take advantage of these units due to the perception that they only addressed general pedagogical concerns. One of the greatest challenges faculty are encountering is managing group dynamics among students in engaged learning courses. Training should be made available that assists them in addressing group dynamics and conflict management with the training possibly being offered by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. Moreover, faculty need assistance in effectively managing community and industry partnerships, and this assistance should include how to navigate interactions with partners, as well as how to balance the logistics involved in management. Finally, given the essential function of the Department of Student Leadership and Service and the limitations found in faculty knowledge in the area of service-learning, the committee suggested that the department could be better funded in order to provide increased support to faculty and students.

Communication was deemed the most important issue facing the implementation of the QEP. Better pathways for communication must be instituted in order for stakeholders to be aware of the support units associated with the QEP and the role of the HIP taxonomies and critical reflection assignment. The Engagement website and QEP liaisons are not sufficiently able to answer the questions that stakeholders are posing. Moreover, the Engagement website should be modified to make navigation and locating information easier. The second most

important issue is a possible modification to the critical reflection assignment and how it is implemented. Faculty need more detailed discussions of the critical reflection assignment's purpose and its use and why an existing instrument is not being used. Additionally, solicit feedback from faculty who are currently teaching engaged learning courses about the content of the critical reflection assignment, how the reflection could be integrated into courses, and how it is applicable to specific disciplines. Summary sheets should be created that break down both the HIPs taxonomies and critical reflection assignment. Finally, considerations for alternatives to the critical reflection assignment might be considered.

Limitations of the Evaluation and Future Directions

The purpose of this evaluation was to evaluate both the process and progress of the implementation of KSU's QEP in its pilot academic year, 2019-2020. The evaluation assessed the perceptions and experiences of stakeholders of the implementation of the QEP, specifically, faculty, administration, and the QEP Steering Committee, in order to determine the successes and challenges of the QEP by considering implementation processes and in-progress outcomes. This evaluation was completed as a process evaluation using a formative aspect that sought to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the QEP and its implementation and a progress aspect that aimed to determine the effects of the QEP and progress made toward meeting the QEP's goals, student learning outcomes, and objectives. However, this evaluation does possess some limitations.

As this evaluation is a process evaluation, no assumptions should be made about the overall effectiveness of the QEP. This evaluation was *not* intended to examine the final outcomes of the QEP, but, instead, the progress made toward meeting those outcomes. Moreover, although this is a qualitative evaluation, and data saturation was reached, the sample size of this evaluation (N = 23) and the lack of diversity in the sample prevent this evaluation from considering the findings representative of the university, as a whole. Furthermore, not all stakeholder groups are included in this evaluation. Students must be considered in the evaluation, as they are the stakeholders that are most affected by the implementation of the QEP. Therefore, future evaluations should ensure diversity in sampling, increase the sample size, and include participants from all stakeholder groups.

Finally, this evaluation includes two types of pilots: 1) the pilot year of the implementation of the QEP, and 2) pilot interview and focus group protocols. Due to the fact that this evaluation is intended to continue as an ongoing process throughout the QEP's implementation, findings from the pilot year limit the credibility of comparisons that could be made to future evaluations, as this year's implementation of the QEP was less static than future years will be. Additionally, the pilot interview and focus group protocols need to be administered again in future evaluations, as only one focus group for both the administration and the QEP Steering Committee occurred. A single application of protocols cannot establish the validity and reliability of these protocols.

References

- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. SAGE.
- Kennesaw State University. (2019). *Kennesaw State University's Quality Enhancement Plan*.
- Kennesaw State University. (2020). *About KSU*. <https://www.kennesaw.edu/about/>
- Otter.ai. (2020). *Otter.ai*. <https://otter.ai/>
- Posavac, E. J. (2015). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies*. Routledge.
- QSR International. (2020). *NVivo 12*. <https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home>
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE.

Appendices

Appendix A: Internships and Cooperative (Co-op) Education Definition

High-Impact Educational Practices Internships and Cooperative (Co-op) Education

Definition of Internship: "Typically one-time work or service experiences related to the student's major or career goal. The internship plan generally involves students working in professional settings under the supervision and monitoring of practicing professionals. Internships can be paid or unpaid and the student may or may not receive academic credit for performing the internship." NACE 2016 Intern/Co-op Survey. "If the internship is taken for course credit, students complete a project or paper that is approved by a faculty member." AAC&U HIPS

Definition of Cooperative Education (Co-op): "Provide students with multiple periods of work in which the work is related to the student's major or career goal. The typical program plan is for students to alternate terms of full-time classroom study with terms of full-time, discipline related employment. Since program participation involves multiple work terms, the typical participant will work three or four work terms, thus gaining a year or more of career related work experience before graduation. Virtually all co-op positions are paid and the vast majority involve some form of academic credit." NACE 2016 Intern/Co-op Survey.

- **KSU Parallel vs. Alternating Co-op:** A student who completes a parallel co-op works for at least two consecutive semesters with employers in positions that provide directly related experience to their academic majors. Students may take classes while working in a parallel co-op. A student who completes an alternating co-op works in a position directly related to their academic major for three semesters over a five-semester period, alternating between full-time work and full-time academic coursework.
- **Credit vs. Audit:** Parallel co-ops may receive academic credit for participation. Alternating co-op participants are eligible for a 12-credit audit course which keeps the student at a full-time enrollment status and serves as a placeholder on their transcript during their three working rotations. Additionally, alternating co-op participants may receive up to one semester of their working experience counted for academic credit, depending on departmental requirements.

Definition of Clinical/Field Experiences: "Field experiences are designed to provide opportunities for KSU teacher preparation candidates to learn to become effective teachers through observations and practice in the public school setting. These experiences should augment the knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained in the university classroom." RCOE Field Experience Handbook Field & clinical experiences can be applicable for any students participating in program-led field-based work.

Characteristics of a HIP Internship & Co-op Experience:

In alignment with NACE, "to be considered a legitimate internship [or co-op] by the 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 an assignment in which students reflect on their experience.
6. There is supervision by a professional with expertise and educational and/or professional background in the field of the experience.
7. There is routine feedback by the experienced supervisor.
8. There are resources, equipment, and facilities provided by the host employer that support learning

Requirements for academic credit and application process is determined by individual academic departments/colleges at the University. More information on internships and cooperative education at KSU can be found at <http://careers.kennesaw.edu/>.

Appendix B: Internship & Co-op Taxonomy

Internship & Co-op Taxonomy

ATTRIBUTE	HIGH IMPACT	HIGHER IMPACT	HIGHEST IMPACT
Internship or co-op expertise	<p>1) Instructor is new to coordinating internships or co-ops but has reviewed this taxonomy and the best practices resources cited below.</p> <p>2) Instructor is familiar with the industry (or industries) related to their program(s).</p>	<p>1) Instructor has previous experience coordinating internships or co-ops and is familiar with the best practices resources cited below.</p> <p>2) Instructor is well-versed in the industry (or industries) related to their program(s).</p> <p>3) The instructor is familiar with career development theory.</p> <p>4) The instructor has contacts in relevant industry (or industries) where students intern.</p>	<p>1) Instructor has previous experience coordinating internships or co-ops; is familiar with the best practices resources.</p> <p>2) Instructor has expert knowledge of the industry (or industries) related to their program(s).</p> <p>3) The instructor has expert knowledge in career development theory.</p> <p>4) The instructor has an established network in relevant industry (or industries) where students intern.</p> <p>5) The instructor is experienced in leading students through the process of critical reflection.</p>
Internships or co-ops apply and further grow knowledge and skills learned through classroom experiences in a professional environment.	<p>1) Student performs some menial tasks at internship or co-op site but majority of work is directly applying classroom learning, under the close supervision of a professional.</p> <p>2) The instructor includes a requirement to document experience in the course (e.g., daily journal, portfolio of work, or end of internship or co-op report). Focus is merely on what the student did during the internship or co-op.</p>	<p>1) Student performs very few menial tasks at internship or co-op site; majority of students' work is directly applying classroom learning, under the supervision of a professional.</p> <p>2) The instructor includes a requirement to document experience in the course (e.g., daily journal, portfolio of work, or end of internship or co-op report). Focus is on what the student did during the internship or co-op.</p>	<p>1) Student performs no menial tasks at internship or co-op site; students' work is directly applying classroom learning, under the supervision of a professional, but with a few opportunities for discretionary decision-making.</p> <p>2) The instructor includes a requirement to document experience in the course (e.g., daily journal, portfolio of work, or end of internship or co-op report). Focus is</p>

		<p>3) Surveys are used to gauge learning in defined areas and administered to both the student and internship or co-op supervisor at the mid-point and end of internship or co-op.</p>	<p>on what the student did during the internship or co-op.</p> <p>3) Surveys are used to gauge learning in defined areas and administered to both the student and internship or co-op supervisor at the mid-point and end of internship or co-op.</p> <p>4) Instructor conducts mid-semester visit to internship or co-op sites and discusses progress to that point and opportunities for further learning with student and internship or co-op supervisor.</p> <p>5) Instructor conducts end of internship or co-op debrief meeting with student to discuss learning that occurred during internship or co-op and steps for further learning post internship or co-op.</p> <p>6) Students present to their peers about internship or co-op experience, learning outcomes, and next steps in their academic and career plan.</p>
<p>Interpersonal Development - The ability of students to navigate social and organizational systems such that they acknowledge and respect the values of others in their interactions while creating conditions of mutual benefit for themselves and those around them</p>	<p>1) The instructor encourages the internship or co-op sites to include the student in organizational activities.</p>	<p>1) The instructor encourages the internship or co-op sites to include the student in organizational activities.</p> <p>2) Mid-point and end of internship or co-op surveys include opportunities to reflect on student's experience within the context of the organization's values and structure.</p> <p>3) The instructor provides reflective discussion forums in the D2L course sites where students share their thoughts and experience(s) as a group throughout the semester.</p>	<p>1) The instructor encourages the internship or co-op sites to include the student in organizational activities.</p> <p>2) Mid-point and end of internship or co-op surveys include opportunities to reflect on student's experience within the context of the organization's values and structure.</p> <p>3) The instructor provides reflective discussion forums in the D2L course sites where students share their thoughts and experience(s) as a group throughout the semester.</p>

			4) End of internship or co-op report prompts student to reflect on areas of growth and further development, particularly in areas of organizational communication and leadership.
Critical reflection is well integrated into student learning during the internship or co-op experience.	1) The instructor provides reflective questions and students reflect on their entire experience(s) in their end of internship or co-op report.	1) The instructor provides reflective questions and students reflect on their experience(s) in their daily journal, portfolio of work, and end of internship or co-op report. a) Student reflects on classroom knowledge and skills applied at internship or co-op. b) Student reflects on how work experience benefits classroom learning c) Student reflects on personal growth. d) Student reflects on both major related skills and transferrable skills learned during the internship or co-op. 2) Student reflects on how experience influences academic and career plans. 3) The instructor provides reflective discussion forums in the D2L course sites where students share their thoughts and experience(s) as a group throughout the semester.	1) The instructor provides reflective questions and students reflect on their experience(s) in their daily journal, portfolio of work, or end of internship or co-op report using a structured method—such as the DEAL Model (Ash & Clayton, 2009)—to guide the reflective activities. a) Student reflects on classroom knowledge and skills applied at internship or co-op. b) Student reflects on how work experience benefits classroom learning c) Student reflects on personal growth. d) Student reflects skills (major related and/or transferrable skills) learned during the internship or co-op. e) Student reflects on how experience influences academic and career plans. f) Student reflects on the benefit of the internship or co-op to the employer and the university. 2) The instructor provides reflective discussion forums in the D2L course sites where students share their thoughts and experience(s) as a group throughout the semester.

			<p>3) The instructor debriefs with the student post internship or co-op and discusses reflective outcomes and future application of learning.</p> <p>4) The student completes a presentation where they share their reflective outcomes of the internship or co-op.</p>
<p>Assessment is used for course improvement.</p>	<p>1) The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and administers a measure of <i>indirect</i> assessment to the student (e.g., a survey of self-reported learning).</p> <p>2) The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and administers a measure of <i>direct</i> assessment to the student (e.g., a final reflection paper scored with a critical thinking rubric).</p> <p>3) End of course evaluations are reviewed for student feedback.</p>	<p>1) The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and administers a measure of <i>indirect</i> assessment to the student (e.g., a survey of self-reported learning).</p> <p>2) The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and administers a measure of <i>direct</i> assessment to the student (e.g., a final reflection paper scored with a critical thinking rubric).</p> <p>3) End of course evaluations are reviewed for student feedback.</p>	<p>1) The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and administers a measure of <i>indirect</i> assessment to the student (e.g., a survey of self-reported learning).</p> <p>2) The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and administers a measure of <i>direct</i> assessment to the student (e.g., a final reflection paper scored with a critical thinking rubric).</p> <p>3) End of course evaluations are reviewed for student feedback.</p> <p>4) Instructor collaborates with internship or co-op sites to assess internship or co-op course structure and programs offered at sites. Instructor provides feedback to internship or co-op sites to aid in development of higher quality future internships or co-ops.</p>

Appendix C: Service-Learning Definition

High-Impact Educational Practices Service-Learning

Definition of Service-Learning: Service-Learning is a common pedagogical strategy used to operationalize community-based learning in curricular programs. "In these programs, field-based 'experiential learning' with community partners is an instructional strategy—and often a required part of the course. The idea is to give students direct experience with issues they are studying in the curriculum and with ongoing efforts to analyze and solve problems in the community. A key element in these programs is the opportunity students have to both *apply* what they are learning in real-world settings and *reflect* in a classroom setting on their service experiences. These programs model the idea that giving something back to the community is an important college outcome, and that working with community partners is good preparation for citizenship, work, and life" (AAC&U).

In essence, service-learning is an intentional and collaborative pedagogical practice that engages students in structured service to address an identified community need and help them "gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bringle and Hatcher, 1996, p.112).

Service-Learning Course Criteria:

Service-learning goes above and beyond community service and volunteerism. While those activities are an important part of community-based learning, service-learning differs in several ways. More specifically, service-learning:

- Is **academically integrated**—service is part of the coursework, not an unrelated "add on" requirement.
- Is purposefully designed with service projects that **focus on community needs AND academic outcomes**; the service activities address specific community needs related to the learning objectives of the course
- Uses **classroom and project experiences that build upon themselves and on the accumulation of classroom knowledge.**
- Includes an **evaluation of student work based on the learning gained from their service experience, not on the number of hours served.**
- Connects the student to a **structured reflection process** (minimally after the service project; ideally before, during, and after the service project).
- Includes S-L activity which **values community partner's knowledge and experience.** When best practiced, involves community partners in the planning of the course and service project.
- Is based on a **collaborative and a reciprocal relationship** among faculty, students, and community partners; projects are typically real-world challenges that students, community partners, and faculty attempt to overcome together. (Adapted from Coastal College of Georgia)

Appendix D: Service-Learning Taxonomy

Kennesaw State University
It's About Engagement
Service-Learning Taxonomy for Course Development and Student Learning

*Adapted from Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), Intercultural Knowledge VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), and Rubric for CCGA Service-Learning Student Learning Objectives.

Course Development Attributes	High Impact	Higher Impact	Highest Impact
Mutually Beneficial: Reciprocal partnerships and processes between university and external partner(s) shape the course design, community-based activities, and mutually-beneficial outcomes.	The instructor or designee contacts an external organization to host students and provides a brief overview of the course (e.g., learning outcomes, syllabus) and the purposes of the community-based activities.	The instructor or designee meets with the external partner(s) to discuss the course (e.g., preparation/orientation of students, learning outcomes, syllabus). Instructor and external partner develop verbal agreement about how the community-based activities can enrich student learning and benefit the organization. However, the external partner is not included as a collaborator or co-educator and no formal agreement is developed.	The instructor or designee collaborates with the external partner(s) as co-educators and co-developers to create a formal agreement about various aspects of course planning and design (e.g., learning outcomes, readings, preparation/orientation of students, reflection, assessment). The instructor and external partner work together to identify how the community-based activities will be used to enrich student learning and enhance the capacity of the organization. Faculty and students collaborate with external partners as a source for expert information gathering and/or research on topics and concepts that are pertinent to the course, the community-based project, and larger program or curricular goals.
Academic Enhancement: Community-based activities enhance academic content and assignments.	The instructor includes community-based activities as an added educational experience related to course content, and the course syllabus describes the required community-based activity but does not draw a connection	The instructor includes the community-based activity as an educational experience that provides additional insight for students' understanding of course content and their ability to complete assignments, and the course syllabus	The instructor integrates the community-based activity as critical dimensions for students' ability to understand course content and their ability to complete assignments, and the syllabus provides a

Kennesaw State University
It's About Engagement
Service-Learning Taxonomy for Course Development and Student Learning

*Adapted from Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), Intercultural Knowledge VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), and Rubrics for CCGA Service-Learning Student Learning Objectives.

	to the course learning outcomes.	<p>provides a brief description of the relationship between the community-based activity and course learning outcomes.</p> <p>Students are encouraged to draw from their service-learning activity to deepen their understanding of course content and make connections to their academic program.</p>	<p>strong rationale for the relationship between the community-based activity and course learning outcomes.</p> <p>Students are encouraged to meaningfully synthesize connections between their service-learning experience(s) and their academic program to deepen their understanding of course content, field of study, and personal points of view</p> <p>The course process facilitates students' ability to independently adapt and apply skills, abilities, theories, and/or methodologies gained from the community-based activity to new situations to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways</p>
<p>Critical Thinking and Reflection Critical reflection is well integrated into the course design and class activities</p>	<p>The instructor requires students to create reflective products about the community-based activities after the experience with little feedback from and interaction with the instructor.</p>	<p>The instructor integrates critical reflection assignments that connect the community-based activity to relevant course content before and after the community-based activity is completed.</p> <p>Periodic feedback from and interactions with the instructor about students' critical reflections are used to help students better connect relevant course</p>	<p>The instructor integrates critical reflection assignments that connect the community-based activity to relevant course content directly into the course design before, during, and after the community-based activity.</p> <p>Ongoing feedback from and interactions with the instructor about students' critical reflections throughout the semester are used to</p>

Kennesaw State University
It's About Engagement
Service-Learning Taxonomy for Course Development and Student Learning

*Adapted from Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), Intercultural Knowledge VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), and Rubrics for CCGA Service-Learning Student Learning Objectives.

		theories to social practices.	help students explicitly connect relevant course theories and social practices.
Socio-Cultural Awareness: Course content and community-based activity are used to develop students' socio-cultural awareness and enhance their understanding of deep-rooted belief systems.	The instructor, the course, and community-based activity offer students the opportunity for interactions and dialogue with diverse others, increasing students' awareness of their own cultural perspective related to the area of service.	The instructor, the course, and community-based activity engage students in periodic interactions and dialogue with diverse others, as well as interactions and dialogue with peers across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives. Interactions and dialogue with diverse others are utilized in the course to increase students' awareness of their own cultural perspective related to the area of service, as well as enhance students' ability to recognize alternative perspectives related to the area of service.	The instructor, the course, and community-based activities immerse students in frequent interactions and dialogue with diverse others, as well as interactions and dialogue with peers across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives. Interactions and dialogue with diverse others are utilized in the course to increase students' awareness of their own cultural perspective related to the area of service, and enhance their ability to recognize alternative perspectives related to the area of service. Course assignments are used to help students articulate insights about how differing socio-cultural perspectives shape their thinking about and approaches to the area of service.
Civic Learning: Civic responsibility and social competencies are enhanced by using the community-based activity to facilitate critical discussion about complex social problems and students' roles as active citizens.	The instructor and course syllabus make reference to course content with some connection to civic learning and civic competencies where relevant. The community-based activity addresses a	The instructor and course syllabus makes a direct connection between course content and civic learning and civic competencies where relevant. The community-based activity addresses a pre-determined community	The instructor and course syllabus integrates course content with civic learning and civic competencies by directly connecting the community-based activity to the civic purpose of the discipline in society.

Kennesaw State University
It's About Engagement
Service-Learning Taxonomy for Course Development and Student Learning

*Adapted from Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), Intercultural Knowledge VALUE Rubric (Association of American Colleges and Universities), and Rubrics for CCGA Service-Learning Student Learning Objectives.

	community need and students develop goals and/or strategies that are relevant to the community need.	need and students develop goals, strategies, and/or recommended actions to address the community need based on research and/or data analysis.	<p>The community-based activity addresses a pre-determined community need, and the course syllabus states clearly and describes comprehensively the significance of the community need and community-based activity.</p> <p>Students develop goals, strategies, and/or recommended actions to address the community need based on research and/or data analysis.</p> <p>Students implement actions based on research and/or data analysis and evaluate the project's impact on the identified community need.</p>
Continuous Improvement: Assessment(s) is included into course design and data used for continuous course improvement.	The instructor articulates the student learning outcomes to the class and administers an informal assessment (class discussion; discussion with external partner) of the community-activity experience at the end of the course.	The instructor articulates the student learning outcomes to the class and administers a formal measurement (survey; scored reflection paper) of the community-based activity at the end of the semester to collect data relevant to specific aspects of the service-learning component of the course.	The instructor and external partner(s) articulate the student learning outcomes to the class and administer measurements (surveys; scored reflection papers; systematic, structured observations) during and after the community-based activity to collect data relevant to the service-learning component of the course and community-based impact.

Appendix E: Undergraduate Research Definition

High-Impact Educational Practices Undergraduate Research

Description of Undergraduate Research from AAC&U: "Many colleges and universities are now providing research experiences for students in all disciplines. Undergraduate research, however, has been most prominently used in science disciplines. With strong support from the National Science Foundation and the research community, scientists are reshaping their courses to connect key concepts and questions with students' early and active involvement in systematic investigation and research. The goal is to involve students with actively contested questions, empirical observation, cutting-edge technologies, and the sense of excitement that comes from working to answer important questions."

Definition of Undergraduate Research: KSU uses the definition from the [Council on Undergraduate Research \(CUR\)](#): "An inquiry or investigation conducted by an undergraduate student that makes an original intellectual or creative contribution to the discipline." In other words, the students participate in co-creating knowledge in the discipline, and their scholarship has the potential to make a contribution to the field by being disseminated to the academic community.

The word "research" can mean different things under different circumstances (Healy & Jenkins, 2009). For example, students can learn about research in their field in survey courses, such as Introduction to Sociology or Biological Principles. Students can develop research skills – such as using the library to locate primary source material, designing experiments, and analyzing data – in courses on methodology or statistics. They can practice conducting experiments in laboratory courses. These experiences are important for building a research foundation for students, often called "[scaffolding](#)" in the literature. However, in order to be considered a true undergraduate research experience, the course must involve students doing original research projects with a plan for dissemination (such as a publication or conference presentation).

Characteristics of an Engaged Learning Undergraduate Research Experience

1. The research is supervised by a faculty member who has the necessary skill set to effectively mentor research projects in this course.
2. The research projects meet the ethical guidelines for responsible conduct of research. Projects involving animal or human subjects must undergo IRB approval, and the faculty member and students are (or will be) certified through the appropriate CITI training. For more information, visit <http://research.kennesaw.edu/our/faculty/ethics-and-undergraduate-research.php>
3. The undergraduate research experience is appropriately scaffolded. In other words, students have learned foundational information in previous courses or research experiences (for example, research design in this discipline, statistics, lab techniques, scientific vocabulary). If they have not, there is a plan regarding how to develop these skills in the context of this course.

4. The syllabus contains a list of measurable learning outcomes geared toward undergraduate research in this discipline. A possible list of outcomes can be found here: <http://research.kennesaw.edu/our/faculty/learning-outcomes.php> (note that this list is not exhaustive, and it is unlikely that all of these would be appropriate for any given research project).
5. The syllabus contains an assignment in which students reflect on their undergraduate research experiences. More information on reflection can be found at the "It's About Engagement" [website](#).
6. There are frequent opportunities for students to receive feedback (by [peers](#) and/or the instructor) at different phases of the research.
7. If the undergraduate research is a group, rather than individual, project, then the project is structured according to [best practices for collaborative projects](#).
8. The research projects have the potential to make an original contribution to the literature in this discipline.
9. There is a tangible product at the end of the experience (paper, poster, oral presentation, etc.). There is a plan to disseminate this product publicly (peer-reviewed publication, presentation at a professional conference or on-campus symposia, etc.). It is possible that the dissemination will occur the following semester; this may preclude some students from participating. However, all students should have the opportunity for presenting or publishing their undergraduate research work.

For more information on integrating an undergraduate research experience into a course, please visit <http://research.kennesaw.edu/our/faculty/integrating-research-projects-into-a-course.php>

Appendix F: Undergraduate Research Taxonomy

Undergraduate Research Taxonomy

ATTRIBUTE	HIGH IMPACT	HIGHER IMPACT	HIGHEST IMPACT
The course instructor is well qualified (knowledge, experience)	Expertise on subject matter; no experience conducting hands-on research with undergraduate students	Expertise on subject matter; some experience leading and conducting research with undergraduate students	Expertise on subject matter; extensive experience mentoring undergraduate student-led peer-reviewed research
The teaching method(s) and course content should be aligned with student skill level	Lecture-based teaching plus interactive small group learning; problem-based learning (PBL) and/or project-based learning. Attendance at local research conferences and symposia. Teaching content may include: literature review, research methodology, data management, ethics and compliance, research history.	Lecture-based teaching plus some limited non-classroom independent research experience mostly in a team setting (lab project, field project, etc.). Attendance at local research conferences and symposia. Teaching content: as in previous level.	Some classroom but mostly independent research activity with faculty mentor(s) including but not limited to team-based research. Teaching content: as in high impact level but structured so that students have learned foundational information in previous courses or research experiences (for example, research design in this discipline, statistics, lab techniques, scientific vocabulary). If they have not, there is a plan regarding how to develop these skills in the context of this course.
Applied learning (application of current knowledge) is an essential component of research	Instructor selects research papers and provides assignments related to content; development of research questions and hypotheses related to assigned projects.	Students draft a simple research study on an assigned topic following an independent literature review.	Drafting of an independent research study to fill a knowledge gap followed by completion of the research project.
Ethics and safety in research are emphasized	Students are exposed to ethical conduct and safety in research in their discipline.	Students are trained in ethics and safety in research (e.g., complete an IRB form to be reviewed by the instructor, complete CITI training).	The research projects meet the ethical and safety guidelines for responsible conduct of research. Projects involving animal or human subjects must undergo IRB approval, and the faculty member and students are (or will be) certified through the appropriate CITI training. For more information, visit

			http://research.kennesaw.edu/our/faculty/ethics-and-undergraduate-research.php
Integration of critical and creative thinking is an essential component of research (interpret and evaluate information/data; solve problem; draw appropriate conclusions)	Critical thinking skills are learned through various activities assigned by instructor such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of current published research in the field. • Working through PBL cases and/or team-based project assignments. • Assignments associated with attendance at local research conferences and symposia. 	Critical thinking skills are improved through independent literature review and identification of knowledge gaps in the discipline.	The student is expected to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze and interpret qualitative and/or quantitative data from own research project • Consider alternative explanations of data; • Identify potential challenges in the research project and address them
Development of oral and written communication skills are integrated into the course	Facilitated in-class discussion and take-home assignments (e.g., group discussion of research papers; drafting of literature summary reports); oral and written reports of outcome of team-based projects.	Writing assignments (e.g., draft of a research study proposal); oral presentation of a paper to classmates with subsequent class discussion.	Posters, oral presentations, exhibitions, and/or public performances at local, regional or national venues; drafting of manuscripts for publication.
Critical reflection is well integrated into student learning	The instructor provides a detailed and structured template to facilitate students' reflection on their learning experience; only short answers are expected	The instructor provides limited guidance to encourage student reflection on the learning experience; some student self-assessment is expected.	The instructor requires students to critically reflect on the research experience and explore its relevance to academic content, personal growth and career aspirations. Cross-disciplinary reflection is required when appropriate (interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary projects).
Assessment is used to monitor student learning and make course improvements	Student learning and skill acquisition are assessed at the end of each learning unit related to research.	Student learning and skill acquisition are assessed more than once. A final paper is required in the form of a short research proposal draft.	Student learning and skill acquisition are assessed multiple times throughout the course. Students receive continuous feedback. The completion of multiple research drafts and a final report(s) are required. The syllabus contains a list of measurable learning outcomes geared toward undergraduate research in this discipline. A possible

			list of outcomes can be found here: http://research.kennesaw.edu/our/faculty/learning-outcomes.php (note that this list is not exhaustive, and it is unlikely that all of these would be appropriate for any given research project).
--	--	--	---

Appendix G: *It's About Engagement* Comprehensive Assessment Plan

<i>It's About Engagement</i> Comprehensive Assessment Plan				
Goal/Outcome	Assessment Method(s)	Data Collection	Assessment Timeline	Responsible Party
Goal #1: Increase the number of opportunities for students to engage in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the university as a whole.	Track the number of HIP course offerings in the Banner schedule of active course offerings by college and for the university overall	Fall, Spring, Summer Course offering data, data summaries, and trend analyses by college and the university overall	Summer	Executive Director of Institutional Quality and Accreditation
Goal #2: Increase the number of students engaging in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning opportunities in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the university as a whole.	Track student registrations in HIP courses by college and in the university overall	Fall, Spring, Summer Participation data, data summaries, and trend analyses by college and for the university overall	Summer	Executive Director of Institutional Quality and Accreditation
SLO #1: Students will cite meaningful and valuable connections of their HIP experiences to their overall educational preparation.	Assess student critical reflections using the item "educational value" in the <i>It's About Engagement</i> Critical Reflection Rubric Facilitate focus groups with students by College including self-evaluation using the "educational value" in <i>It's About Engagement</i> Critical Reflection Rubric	Fall and Spring Categorical descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage distributions across impact levels) and Chi-square, comparison of results between student and faculty rubric data Themes related to students' perceptions, experiences, and concerns by college and the university overall	Summer	Director of Assessment

<i>It's About Engagement Comprehensive Assessment Plan</i>				
Goal/Outcome	Assessment Method(s)	Data Collection	Assessment Timeline	Responsible Party
SLO #2: Students will gain new insights on the connectedness and integration of the academic preparation of their disciplines of study to the applied settings of their HIP experiences.	<p>Assess student critical reflections using the item "connectedness insights" in the <i>It's About Engagement Critical Reflection Rubric</i></p> <p>Facilitate focus groups with students by College including self-evaluation using the "connectedness insights" in <i>It's About Engagement Critical Reflection Rubric</i></p>	<p>Fall and Spring</p> <p>Categorical descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage distributions across impact levels) and Chi-square; comparison of results between student and faculty rubric data</p> <p>Themes related to students' perceptions, experiences, and concerns by college and the university overall</p>	Summer	Director of Assessment
SLO #3: Students will build upon prior knowledge and experiences to respond effectively to the new and challenging demands of their HIP settings.	<p>Assess student critical reflections using the item "integrated problem-solving" in the <i>It's About Engagement Critical Reflection Rubric</i></p> <p>Facilitate focus groups with students by College including self-evaluation using the "integrated problem-solving" in <i>It's About Engagement Critical Reflection Rubric</i></p>	<p>Fall and Spring</p> <p>Categorical descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage distributions across impact levels) and Chi-square; comparison of results between student and faculty rubric data</p> <p>Themes related to students' perceptions, experiences, and concerns by college and the university overall</p>	Summer	Director of Assessment

It's About Engagement Comprehensive Assessment Plan				
Goal/Outcome	Assessment Method(s)	Data Collection	Assessment Timeline	Responsible Party
SLO #4: Students will demonstrate growth in professional and personal core values and sense of self as a result of their HIP experiences.	<p>Assess student critical reflections using the item "values growth" in the <i>It's About Engagement</i> Critical Reflection Rubric</p> <p>Facilitate focus groups with students by College including self-evaluation using the "values growth" in <i>It's About Engagement</i> Critical Reflection Rubric</p>	<p>Fall and Spring</p> <p>Categorical descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage distributions across impact levels) and Chi-square; comparison of results between student and faculty rubric data</p> <p>Themes related to students' perceptions, experiences, and concerns by college and the university overall</p>	Summer	Director of Assessment
Objective #1: KSU will assess the extent to which the Provost and the Academic Affairs staff, and the Deans were engaged sufficiently in overseeing the QEP's overall implementation and using the incentive funds for rewarding faculty contributions.	<p>Administer the Evaluation Instrument for Faculty Teaching HIPs Courses</p> <p>Facilitate focus groups with faculty by type of HIP</p> <p>Conduct debrief focus group session</p>	<p>Spring and Summer</p> <p>Descriptive statistics by items 2-3 and 6 on the evaluation</p> <p>Themes related to the engagement from Provost, AVP, and deans and use of funding</p>	Summer	Director of Assessment and Executive Director of Institutional Quality and Accreditation

It's About Engagement Comprehensive Assessment Plan				
Goal/Outcome	Assessment Method(s)	Data Collection	Assessment Timeline	Responsible Party
Objective #2: KSU will assess the extent to which the key supporting units effectively managed their reallocated workloads and accomplished their QEP support tasks	Administer the Evaluation Instrument for Faculty Teaching HIPs Courses Facilitate focus groups with faculty by type of HIP Conduct debrief focus group session	Spring and Summer Descriptive statistics by items 7-8, 10, 13-14, 16, 19-20, and 22 on the evaluation Themes related to how the key supporting units effectively managed their workloads and accomplished their tasks	Summer	Director of Assessment and Executive Director of Institutional Quality and Accreditation
Objective #3: KSU will assess the extent to which the Engagement Steering Committee functioned effectively in supporting the QEP's successful implementation.	Administer the Evaluation Instrument for Faculty Teaching HIPs Courses Facilitate focus groups with faculty by type of HIP Conduct debrief focus group session	Spring and Summer Descriptive statistics by items 4-5, 11, 17, and 23 on the evaluation Themes related to the effectiveness of the Engagement Steering Committee in supporting implementation	Summer	Director of Assessment and Executive Director of Institutional Quality and Accreditation

Appendix H: *It's About Engagement* Critical Reflection Rubric

It's About Engagement Critical Reflection Rubric

Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Educational Value: Students will cite meaningful and valuable connections of their HIP experiences to their overall educational preparation.
2. Connectedness Insights: Students will gain new insights on the connectedness and integration of the academic preparation of their disciplines of study to the applied settings of their HIP experiences.
3. Integrated Problem-Solving: Students will build upon prior knowledge and experiences to respond effectively to the new and challenging demands of the HIP settings.
4. Values Growth: Students will demonstrate growth in professional and personal core values and sense of self as a result of their HIP experiences.

Student Learning Outcome	Little or No Impact from the HIP 1	Moderate Impact from the HIP 2	High Impact from the HIP 3	Higher Impact from the HIP 4	Highest Impact from the HIP 5
1. Educational Value	Reflection generally contains very little positive comment on or enthusiasm about the value and meaningfulness of the HIP experience compared to other aspects of the student's educational preparation.	Reflection generally contains some positive comment on or enthusiasm about the value and meaningfulness of the HIP experience compared to other aspects of the student's educational preparation, but the HIP experience is not reported to be among the more meaningful or valuable of the student's educational experiences.	Reflection generally contains substantial positive comment on or enthusiasm about the value and meaningfulness of the HIP experience compared to other aspects of the student's educational preparation, and the HIP experience is reported to be a meaningful or valuable one among the student's educational experiences.	Reflection clearly contains strong positive comment on or great enthusiasm about the value and meaningfulness of the HIP experience compared to other aspects of the student's educational preparation, and the HIP experience is reported to be among the more meaningful or valuable of the student's educational experiences.	Reflection clearly contains exceptionally strong positive comment on or great enthusiasm about the value and meaningfulness of the HIP experience compared to other aspects of the student's educational preparation, and the HIP experience is reported to be the most or nearly the most meaningful or valuable of all of the student's educational experiences.
2. Connectedness Insights	Reflection generally contains little or no new insight on the connections and integration of the student's academic preparation with the challenges of the applied setting in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection generally contains some new insight, albeit limited in depth and sophistication, on the connections and integration of the student's academic preparation with the challenges of the applied setting in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection clearly contains some new insight which is deep and sophisticated on the connections and integration of the student's academic preparation with the challenges of the applied setting in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection clearly contains many deep, substantive, and sophisticated new insights on the connections and integration of the student's academic preparation with the challenges of the applied setting in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection clearly contains an exceptionally rich array of deep, substantive, and sophisticated new insights on the connections and integration of the student's academic preparation with the challenges of the applied setting in which the HIP experience occurred.

3. Integrated Problem-Solving	Reflection generally contains little or no reference to or examples of the student's ability to build upon and transfer prior knowledge and experience to solve problems in the new applied settings in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection generally contains some reference to or a couple of examples of the student's ability to build upon and transfer prior knowledge and experience to solve problems successfully in the new applied settings in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection clearly contains notable reference to or some good examples of the student's ability to build upon and transfer prior knowledge and experience to solve problems successfully in the new applied settings in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection clearly contains much noteworthy reference to or many very good examples of the student's ability to build upon and transfer prior knowledge and experience to solve problems successfully in the new applied settings in which the HIP experience occurred.	Reflection clearly contains exceptionally strong, numerous, and noteworthy references to or excellent examples of the student's ability to build upon and transfer prior knowledge and experience to solve problems successfully in the new applied settings in which the HIP experience occurred.
4. Values Growth	Reflection generally contains little or no evidence that the HIP experience contributed to the student's growth in professionalism or personal values as well as self-confidence and self-esteem.	Reflection generally contains some evidence, albeit limited, that the HIP experience contributed somewhat to the student's growth in professionalism or personal values as well as self-confidence and self-esteem.	Reflection clearly contains some notable evidence that the HIP experience contributed substantially to the student's growth in professionalism or personal values as well as self-confidence and self-esteem.	Reflection clearly contains much noteworthy evidence that the HIP experience contributed very much to the student's growth in professionalism or personal values as well as self-confidence and self-esteem.	Reflection clearly contains exceptionally strong and much noteworthy evidence that the HIP experience contributed greatly to the student's growth in professionalism or personal values as well as self-confidence and self-esteem.

Appendix I: Original Student Focus Group Protocol

It's About Engagement: Student Focus Group Questions

Introduction

1. Explain purpose of focus group
2. Introduce the topic and how the information will be used
3. Ground rules (One person speaks at a time; no side conversations; everyone will have a chance to be heard; there are no right or wrong answers)
4. Confidentiality and Recording

Questions

1. What is your program of study?
2. Each of you was invited to this focus group because you participated in a KSU Quality Enhancement Plan project entitled, It's About Engagement, which focuses on the educational value of high-impact practices (HIPs) such as internships, undergraduate research, or service-learning experiences. Which aspects of your HIP experience in this course worked well or better than expected for you, and which aspects did not work as well as expected or needed improvement?
3. Compared to all of the other courses and educational experiences inside and outside the classroom you have had in your bachelor's degree program, how meaningful and valuable was your HIP experience?
4. What was your biggest take-away, the most important thing you learned, from your HIP experience?
5. Thinking ahead to your future community engagements, employment, and/or graduate/professional education pursuits, how are you likely to be better prepared to succeed in life than other students who have not had a HIP experience like yours?
6. (First, hand out a copy of the It's About Engagement Evaluation Rubric to each participant with two additional blanks added at the bottom of the second page.) As you can see at the top of this form, four expected student learning outcomes are identified in this project for the HIP experience. They are (recite all four):
 - a. Students will cite meaningful and valuable connections of their HIP experiences to their overall educational preparation.
 - b. Students will gain new insights on the connectedness and integration of the academic preparation of their disciplines of study to the applied settings of their HIP experiences.
 - c. Students will build upon prior knowledge and experiences to respond effectively new and challenging demands of the HIP settings.
 - d. Students will demonstrate growth in professional and personal core values and sense of self as a result of their HIP experiences.

A group of faculty members use this evaluation rubric each year to evaluate a random sample of the critical reflections students such as you wrote and submitted in their classes about their HIP experience to assess the educational impact of HIP experiences on these four student learning outcomes. Please take a few minutes to review the rubric's contents. Then do two things:

1. For each of the four student learning outcomes identified in the first column, circle the impact category (category ratings of 1 through 5) that best reflects the impact your HIP experience had on your education; and
2. Fill in the final two blank spaces at the bottom of the second page, identifying the type of HIP experience you had (internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning) and your major field of study.

Your responses will be anonymous, so please be honest about your experience. I'll be collecting your completed evaluation forms at the end of the focus group session. (Then give them time to complete this exercise silently.) Now let's share observations with one another. From your perspective, to what extent were each of those four SLOs achieved as a function of your HIP experience?

7. Of those four expected student learning outcomes listed on your copy of the evaluation rubric for the critical reflection assignment, which one would you say was most highly and least highly impacted for you personally by your particular HIP experience?
8. How could this course and its HIP experience been improved to help enhance your learning experience related to these four student learning outcomes?
9. Is there anything I did not ask you that you would like to share about your experience taking an internship, undergraduate, or service-learning course?

Collect the self-evaluations of HIP impacts of SLOs

Thank you, Closing, and Participant Questions

Appendix J: Original Faculty Focus Group Protocol

It's About Engagement: Faculty Focus Group Questions

Introduction

1. Explain purpose of focus group
2. Introduce the topic and how the information will be used
3. Ground rules
4. Confidentiality and Recording

Questions

1. How knowledgeable and experienced are you with It's About Engagement and High impact practices?
2. Each of you was invited to this focus group because you taught a High-Impact Practice (HIP) course with a focus in either internships, undergraduate research, or service learning experiences. Which aspects of that HIP course worked well or better than expected for you and your students, and which aspects did not work as well as expected or needed improvement?
3. In what ways did the HIP taxonomy and CETL resources provide helpful direction and assistance in designing your HIP course, and in what ways would you have liked to receive greater assistance in HIP course design?
4. In what ways did the critical reflection assignment for the HIP experience work well and not so well for the students' self-evaluation and your course evaluation?
5. Four expected student learning outcomes were identified in the QEP for the HIP experience. They were (recite all four):
 - a. Students will cite meaningful and valuable connections of their HIP experiences to their overall educational preparation.
 - b. Students will gain new insights on the connectedness and integration of the academic preparation of their disciplines of study to the applied settings of their HIP experiences.
 - c. Students will build upon prior knowledge and experiences to respond effectively to the new and challenging demands of the HIP settings.
 - d. Students will demonstrate growth in professional and personal core values and sense of self as a result of their HIP experiences.

Here is a copy of the evaluation rubric we used to evaluate a random sample of the critical reflections our students wrote and submitted about their HIP experience. From your perspective as the instructor of record, to what extent were each of those four SLOs achieved by the majority of your students as a function of their HIP experience?

6. How can your college dean and colleagues better support you in teaching HIP courses?

7. How can Academic Affairs better support you in teaching HIP courses?
8. How can the key supporting units (Career Planning and Development, Undergraduate Research, and Student Leadership and Service) better support you with your HIP courses?
9. Is there anything I did not ask you that you would like to share about your experience teaching an internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning course?

Thank you, Closing, and Participant Questions

Appendix K: Original Administration & QEP Steering Committee Focus Group Protocol

Debrief Focus Group Session

(Engagement Steering Committee, supporting unit leaders, deans, and the Provost)

1. In thinking back over the last year, how would describe the successes of It's About Engagement?
2. What were the challenges of the past year?
3. For Career Planning and Development, Office of Undergraduate Research, and Student Leadership and Service, how well were you able to manage your workloads in order to provide necessary services and support for It's About Engagement?
4. From the Engagement Steering Committee point of view, what were the strengths and the challenges in implementing It's About Engagement?
5. In reviewing the budget report provided by CETL, how well were the QEP funds used? Are the allocations appropriate and working?
6. In reviewing the CETL workshops and resources supporting It's About Engagement, what is working well and what needs improvement?
7. Is appropriate support being provided to It's About Engagement from Academic Affairs and the college deans?
8. In reviewing the report on the growth in number of students participating and number of opportunities by internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning, what are the successes and what are the areas for improvement?
9. Are all of the colleges making appropriate progress on achieving their HIP goals?
10. For the colleges not making sufficient progress, what corrective actions need to be pursued?
11. In reviewing the report on the analysis of the student learning outcomes, what are the successes and what are the areas for improvement?
12. Based on today's discussion and debrief, what correction actions are needed and what is the plan to implement those changes?

Appendix L: Interview and Focus Group Protocol Alignment with QEP

Original Protocol	Revised Protocol
Goal 1: Increase the number of opportunities for students to engage in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the university as a whole.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student: None. • Faculty: None. • Administration/QEP Steering Committee: 1, 2, & 8-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Enrolled Student: 1.5-1.7 • Enrolled Student: 1.5-1.8 • Faculty: 1.2-1.8 & 2.1-2.5 • Administration: 1.2-1.8 • QEP Steering Committee: 1.2-1.8
Goal 2: Increase the number of students engaging in internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning opportunities in undergraduate degree programs in each of the academic colleges and for the university as a whole.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student: None. • Faculty: None. • Administration/QEP Steering Committee: 1, 2, & 8-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Enrolled Student: 1.1-1.7 • Enrolled Student: 1.1-1.8 & 2.1-2.5 • Faculty: 1.1-1.8 & 2.5 • Administration: 1.1-1.9 • QEP Steering Committee: 1.1-1.8
SLO 1: Students will cite meaningful and valuable connections of their HIP experiences to their overall educational preparation.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student: 2, 3, & 6-8 • Faculty: 5 • Administration/QEP Steering Committee: None. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Enrolled Student: 2.1 & 2.2 • Enrolled Student: 3.1 & 3.2 • Faculty: 3.1 & 3.2 • Administration: None. • QEP Steering Committee: None.
SLO 2: Students will gain new insights on the connectedness and integration of the academic preparation of their disciplines of study to the applied settings of their HIP experiences.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student: 2, 4, & 6-8 • Faculty: 1, 2, & 5 • Administration/QEP Steering Committee: 1, 2, & 9-12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Enrolled Student: 2.3 • Enrolled Student: 3.3 • Faculty: 3.3 • Administration: None. • QEP Steering Committee: None.
SLO 3: Students will build upon prior knowledge and experiences too respond effectively to the new and challenging demands of their HIP settings.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student: 2 & 4-8 • Faculty: 5 • Administration/QEP Steering Committee: None. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Enrolled Student: 2.3 • Enrolled Student: 3.4 • Faculty: 3.4 • Administration: None. • QEP Steering Committee: None.
SLO 4: Students will demonstrate growth in professional and personal core values and sense of self as a result of their HIP experiences.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student: 2 & 4-8 • Faculty: 4 & 5 • Administration/QEP Steering Committee: None. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Enrolled Student: 2.4 • Enrolled Student: 3.5 & 3.6 • Faculty: 3.5 & 3.6 • Administration: None.

Original Protocol	Revised Protocol
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QEP Steering Committee: None.
Objective 1: KSU will assess the extent to which the Provost and the Academic Affairs staff, and the Deans were engaged sufficiently in overseeing the QEP's overall implementation and using the incentive funds for rewarding faculty contributions.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student: None. Faculty: 1-7 Administration/QEP Steering Committee: 1, 2, 5, 7, & 8-12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-Enrolled Student: None. Enrolled Student: None. Faculty: 4.5 & 4.6 Administration: 2.5-2.8 QEP Steering Committee: 2.1-2.5, 3.5, & 3.6
Objective 2: KSU will assess the extent to which the key supporting units effectively managed their reallocated workloads and accomplished their QEP support tasks.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student: None. Faculty: 1-4 & 8 Administration/QEP Steering Committee: 1, 2, 3, 6, & 8-12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-Enrolled Student: None. Enrolled Student: None. Faculty: 4.2 & 4.3 Administration: 2.2 & 2.3 QEP Steering Committee: 2.1-2.5, 3.2, & 3.3
Objective 3: KSU will assess the extent to which the Engagement Steering Committee functioned effectively in supporting the QEP's successful implementation.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student: None. Faculty: 1-4 Administration/QEP Steering Committee: 1, 2, 4, 6, & 8-12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-Enrolled Student: None. Enrolled Student: None. Faculty: 4.1-4.4 Administration: 2.1-2.4 QEP Steering Committee: 2.1-2.5, 3.1-3.4

Additional questions not included in alignment from original focus group protocol:

- Student: 1 & 9
- Faculty: 9
- Administration & QEP Steering Committee: None.

Appendix M: Student Interview Protocol (Non-Enrolled)

Section 1: Perspectives on Engaged Learning Courses

Over the past year, KSU has focused on creating engaged learning opportunities that allow students to take what they learn in the classroom and apply it to the real world. This includes adding internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning components to existing and new courses. You have been invited here today, because you have the opportunity or potential to enroll in one or more courses that include an engaged learning opportunity component

1. When thinking about engaged learning opportunities, including internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning, what initial or general thoughts immediately come to mind?
2. What process and outcome expectations do you have for a course that includes an engaged learning opportunity?
3. Describe reasons why you would take a course that includes an engaged learning opportunity.
4. Describe reasons why you would **not** take a course that includes an engaged learning opportunity.
5. If you had to choose between an internship, conducting undergraduate research, or completing a service-learning project, which one would you choose?
 - a. What are your reasons for choosing this form of engaged learning?
6. In your degree program, what courses do you know of that include an engaged learning opportunity?
 - a. How do you know about this course?
7. What are some ways that your program, department, or college could communicate the availability of courses that include an engaged learning opportunity?

Section 2: Student Learning Outcomes

For the next few questions, please keep in mind your previous courses and educational experiences.

1. In what ways have your previous courses and educational experiences been meaningful?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
2. In what ways have your previous courses and educational experiences been valuable?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
3. Describe the connection between your previous courses and educational experiences and their application to your future career.
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
4. Describe the ways in which you have grown, both professionally and personally, as a result of your previous courses and educational experiences.
 - a. What were the effects on your core values and sense of self?
 - b. How could this be enhanced or improved?

Appendix N: Student Interview Protocol (Enrolled)

Section 1: Perspectives on Engaged Learning Courses

Over the past year, KSU has focused on creating engaged learning opportunities that allow students to take what they learn in the classroom and apply it to the real world. This includes adding internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning components to existing and new courses. You have been invited here today, because you are currently enrolled in one or more courses that include an engaged learning opportunity component.

1. When thinking about engaged learning opportunities, including internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning, what initial or general thoughts immediately come to mind?
2. What process and outcome expectations did you have for courses that include an engaged learning opportunity prior to your enrollment in one?
 - a. How have those expectations changed since your enrollment in a course with an engaged learning opportunity?
3. What are some hesitations you had about engaged learning opportunity courses prior to enrollment?
4. Describe the reasons why you elected to take a course that included an engaged learning opportunity.
5. In what ways did the type of engaged learning opportunities available (internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning) affect your decision to enroll?
6. After experiencing one type of engaged learning, if you had to choose one type of engaged learning opportunity (internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning), which opportunity would you choose?
 - a. What are your reasons for choosing this form of engaged learning?
7. In your degree program, what courses do you know of that include an engaged learning opportunity?
 - a. How do you know about this course?
 - b. How did you find about the course in which you are currently enrolled?
8. What are some ways that your program, department, or college could communicate the availability of courses that include an engaged learning opportunity?

Section 2: General Questions

Think about the engaged learning course in which you are currently enrolled.

1. What are your thoughts on the course overall?
2. Describe your experiences with the engaged learning aspect of the course.
3. What were your expectations for the course?
 - In what ways did the course meet these expectations?
 - In what ways did the course not meet these expectations?
 - In what ways could the course be enhanced or improved to match your expectations?
4. In what ways could the course be enhanced or improved overall?

5. Describe the impact taking an engaged learning course has had on your overall educational experience.

Section 3: Student Learning Outcomes

For the next few questions, please keep in mind your previous courses and educational experiences, as well as the engaged learning course in which you are currently enrolled.

1. In what ways have engaged learning courses been meaningful compared to your previous courses and educational experiences?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
2. In what ways have engaged learning courses been valuable compared to your previous courses and educational experiences?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
3. Describe the connection between what you learned in your engaged learning course and its application to the internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning project that you completed.
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
4. Describe the connection between your previous courses and educational experiences and their application to the internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning project that you completed.
5. Describe the ways in which you have grown, both professionally and personally, as a result of your enrollment in an engaged learning course.
 - a. What has been the effect on your core values and sense of self?
 - b. How could this be enhanced or improved?
6. Describe the ways in which you have grown, both professionally and personally, as a result of your previous courses and educational experiences.
 - a. What were the effects on your core values and sense of self?

Appendix O: Faculty Interview Protocol

Section 1: Perspectives on Engaged Learning Courses

Over the past year, KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan has focused on creating engaged learning opportunities that allow students to take what they learn in the classroom and apply it to the real world. This includes adding internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning components to existing and new courses. You have been invited here today, because you are currently teaching one or more courses that include an engaged learning opportunity component.

1. When thinking about engaged learning opportunities, including internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning, what initial or general thoughts immediately come to mind?
2. Prior to the implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan, what process and outcome expectations did you have for teaching courses that include an engaged learning opportunity?
 - a. How have those expectations changed since you began teaching the course?
3. What are some hesitations you had about engaged learning opportunity courses prior to the implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan?
4. Describe the reasons why you elected to teach a course with an engaged learning opportunity.
5. In what ways did the type of engaged learning opportunities available (internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning) affect your decision to teach an engaged learning course?
6. After teaching an engaged learning course, if you had to choose one type of engaged learning opportunity (internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning), which opportunity would you choose to include in a future engaged learning course?
 - a. What are your reasons for choosing this form of engaged learning?
7. In your department and college, what courses do you know of that include an engaged learning opportunity?
 - a. How do you know about this course?
8. What are some ways that your program, department, or college currently or could communicate the availability of courses that include an engaged learning opportunity?

Section 2: General Questions

Think about the engaged learning course you are currently teaching.

1. What are your thoughts on the course overall?
2. Describe your experiences with the engaged learning aspect of the course.
3. What were your expectations for the course?
 - a. In what ways did the course meet these expectations?
 - b. In what ways did the course not meet these expectations?
 - c. In what ways could the course be enhanced or improved to match your expectations?

- d. What resources or support would you need to make these enhancements or improvements?
4. In what ways could the course be enhanced or improved overall?
 - a. What resources or support would you need to make these enhancements or improvements?
5. Describe the impact taking an engaged learning course has had on your students' overall educational experience.

Section 3: Student Learning Outcomes

For the next few questions, please keep in mind the courses you previously taught, as well as the engaged learning course that you are currently teaching.

1. What are your perceptions of and experiences with how meaningful students find your engaged learning course to be compared to courses you previously taught?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
 - b. What resources or support would you need to make these enhancements or improvements?
2. What are your perceptions of and experiences with how valuable students find your engaged learning course to be compared to courses you previously taught?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
 - b. What resources or support would you need to make these enhancements or improvements?
3. Describe the connection between student learning in your engaged learning course and its application to the internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning project that your students completed.
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
 - b. What resources or support would you need to make these enhancements or improvements?
4. Describe the connection between the courses your previously taught and their application to the internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning project that your students completed.
5. Describe the ways in which your students have grown, both professionally and personally, as a result of their enrollment in your engaged learning course.
 - a. What has been the effect on their core values and sense of self?
 - b. How could this be enhanced or improved?
 - c. What resources or support would you need to make these enhancements or improvements?
6. Describe the ways in which your students have grown, both professionally and personally, as a result of the courses your previously taught.
 - a. What were the effects on their core values and sense of self?

Section 4: Support & Implementation

Again, think about the engaged learning course you are currently teaching and the work involved in implementing the course.

1. How did the High Impact Practices taxonomies assist you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - a. How could the High Impact Practices taxonomies be enhanced or improved?
2. How did the resources made available to you from the Center for Excellence in Teaching Learning (CETL) assist or support you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - a. How could the resources from CETL be enhanced or improved?
 - b. How could assistance from CETL be enhanced or improved, overall?
3. There are three key supporting units available to faculty to assist them in designing or modifying their engaged learning courses. These units are the Department of Career Planning and Development, the Office of Undergraduate Research, and the Department of Student Leadership and Service.
 - a. How did the Department of Career Planning and Development assist or support you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
 - b. How did the Office of Undergraduate Research assist or support you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
 - c. How did the Department of Student Leadership and Service assist or support you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
4. How did the critical reflection assignment for engaged learning opportunities assist you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - a. What are your perspectives of how effective the assignment was for the students' self-evaluation?
 - b. What are your perspectives of how effective the assignment was for your evaluation of the course?
 - c. How could this assignment be enhanced or improved?
5. How did the Provost and Academic Affairs office assist or support you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
6. How did your College Dean and the Dean's office assist or support you in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?

Appendix P: Administration Focus Group Protocol

Section 1: Perspectives on Engaged Learning Courses

Over the past year, KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan has focused on creating engaged learning opportunities that allow students to take what they learn in the classroom and apply it to the real world. This includes adding internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning components to existing and new courses. You have been invited here today, because you are currently an administrator of a College or Department that is teaching one or more courses that include an engaged learning opportunity component.

1. When thinking about engaged learning opportunities, including internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning, what initial or general thoughts immediately come to mind?
2. Prior to the implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan, what process and outcome expectations did you have for courses that include an engaged learning opportunity?
 - a. How have those expectations changed since implementation began?
3. What are some hesitations you had about engaged learning opportunity courses prior to the implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan?
4. Describe the reasons why your college or department elected to offer courses with an engaged learning opportunity.
5. In what ways did the type of engaged learning opportunities available (internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning) affect your decision to offer engaged learning courses?
6. After offering engaged learning courses, if you had to choose one type of engaged learning opportunity (internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning) as a focus for your college or department, which opportunity would you choose to focus on in future engaged learning courses?
 - a. What are your reasons for choosing this form of engaged learning?
7. How are faculty made aware of the opportunity to teach engaged learning courses in your department or college?
8. What are some ways that your department or college currently or could communicate the availability of engaged learning courses to students?
9. Describe the impact taking an engaged learning course has had on your college's students' overall educational experience.

Section 2: Support & Implementation

Again, think about the engaged learning courses you are currently offering and the work involved in implementing the course.

1. How did the High Impact Practices taxonomies assist you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. How could the High Impact Practices taxonomies be enhanced or improved?

2. How did the resources made available to you from the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) assist or support you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. How could the resources from CETL be enhanced or improved?
 - b. How could assistance from CETL be enhanced or improved, overall?
3. There are three key supporting units available to faculty to assist them in designing or modifying their engaged learning courses. These units are the Department of Career Planning and Development, the Office of Undergraduate Research, and the Department of Student Leadership and Service.
 - a. How did the Department of Career Planning and Development assist or support you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
 - b. How did the Office of Undergraduate Research assist or support you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
 - c. How did the Department of Student Leadership and Service assist or support you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
4. How did the critical reflection assignment for engaged learning opportunities assist you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. What are your perspectives of how effective the assignment was for the students' self-evaluation?
 - b. What are your perspectives of how effective the assignment was for faculty evaluation of the course?
 - c. How could this assignment be enhanced or improved?
5. How did the Provost and Academic Affairs office assist or support you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
6. FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS & QEP LIAISONS ONLY: How did your College Dean and the Dean's office assist or support you or your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing your engaged learning course?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
7. FOR DEANS ONLY: How did you, as the College Dean, assist or support your faculty in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. What resources or assistance would you need to enhance or improve your support?
8. What are perceived or identified areas of need where your college, departments, or faculty members might require additional support in order to enhance or improve the engaged learning courses in your college?

Appendix Q: QEP Steering Committee Focus Group Protocol

Section 1: Perspectives on Engaged Learning Courses

Over the past year, KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan has focused on creating engaged learning opportunities that allow students to take what they learn in the classroom and apply it to the real world. This includes adding internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning components to existing and new courses. You have been invited here today, because you are currently part of the Support Core of the QEP Steering Committee that promotes and aids in the development of courses with an engaged learning opportunity component.

1. When thinking about engaged learning opportunities, including internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning, what initial or general thoughts immediately come to mind?
2. Prior to the implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan, what process and outcome expectations did you have for courses that include an engaged learning opportunity?
 - a. How have those expectations changed since implementation began?
3. What are some hesitations you had about engaged learning opportunity courses prior to the implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan?
4. Describe the reasons why you elected to join this committee.
5. In what ways did the type of engaged learning opportunities available (internships, undergraduate research, and service-learning) affect your decision to become a member of this committee?
6. After having been a member of this committee, if you had to choose one type of engaged learning opportunity (internship, undergraduate research, or service-learning), which opportunity would you choose to promote for future engaged learning courses?
 - a. What are your reasons for choosing this form of engaged learning?
7. Across the university, what courses do you know of that include an engaged learning opportunity?
 - a. How do you know about this course?
8. What are some ways that programs, departments, or colleges currently or could communicate the availability of courses that include an engaged learning opportunity?

Section 2: QEP Steering Committee

Think about the work the committee has implemented over the last year.

1. Describe the successes of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan.
2. Describe the barriers to success and implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan.
3. Describe areas of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan that need enhancement or improvement.
4. How did the QEP Steering Committee specifically support the university in the implementation of KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan?

5. Based on the successes, barriers, areas of needed improvement, and the committee's support in implementation, how should KSU's Quality Enhancement Plan be modified?
 - a. What actions are necessary to implement this modification?

Section 3: Support & Implementation

Again, think about engaged learning courses and the work involved in implementing the courses.

1. How has the High Impact Practices taxonomies assisted the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. How could the High Impact Practices taxonomies be enhanced or improved?
2. How did the resources made available from the Center for Excellence in Teaching Learning (CETL) assist or support the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. How could the resources from CETL be enhanced or improved?
 - b. How could assistance from CETL be enhanced or improved, overall?
3. There are three key supporting units available to faculty to assist them in designing or modifying their engaged learning courses. These units are the Department of Career Planning and Development, the Office of Undergraduate Research, and the Department of Student Leadership and Service.
 - a. How did the Department of Career Planning and Development assist or support the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
 - b. How did the Office of Undergraduate Research assist or support the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
 - c. How did the Department of Student Leadership and Service assist or support the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - i. How could resources from this unit be enhanced or improved?
 - ii. How could assistance from this unit be enhanced or improved, overall?
4. How did the critical reflection assignment for engaged learning opportunities assist the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. What are your perspectives of how effective the assignment was for the students' self-evaluation?
 - b. What are your perspectives of how effective the assignment was for faculty evaluation of the course?
 - c. How could this assignment be enhanced or improved?
5. How did the Provost and Academic Affairs office assist or support the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?
6. How did College Deans and the Dean's offices assist or support the university in designing, modifying, and implementing engaged learning courses?
 - a. How could this be enhanced or improved?