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1 Executive Summary

Introduction
The Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee was formed in fall 2004. At that time the mission of the Steering Committee was established: to oversee the development, preparation, and submission of a Quality Enhancement Plan that would result in the long-term improvement of student learning at Eastern Kentucky University (EKU). The goals, established by the Steering Committee in fall 2004, were to 1) engage the campus community in developing a focus and description of a QEP, 2) analyze the context and best practice in relation to the focus, and then 3) provide implementation plans for programs or initiatives to begin in fall 2007.

During 2004-2005, EKU students, faculty, and staff participated in assessing student learning needs. Data from a variety of sources and information from faculty, staff and student focus groups were used to determine the student learning needs. Three broad areas were identified, including critical thinking, communication and diversity. The University community provided both written and oral feedback on the three broad areas. Considering this input within the context of and in a dynamic relationship with a revised University Strategic Plan, the Steering Committee chose the theme and focus statements. This QEP will guide our efforts toward the Eastern Kentucky University vision of “holding national distinction as a leading, comprehensive university focused on students and learning.”

THEME TITLE
Eastern Kentucky University will develop informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.

The primary focus of the QEP is the development of students who use higher-order thinking skills to explore, evaluate, expand, and express ideas, which is encapsulated as E4.

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN FOCUS
Explore (identify, discover) and use relevant information in order to gain knowledge and solve problems.
Evaluate (analyze) information and ideas using appropriate methods.
Expand (develop) and generate their own ideas and express them effectively.
Express (clearly articulate) a point of view and develop it with awareness of alternatives.
The Infrastructure
The commitment made by the University to develop a focus that was creative and vital to the long-term improvement of student learning, and the enthusiasm of the University community for significant change, lead to the development of a complete and complex infrastructure. The infrastructure is designed to assure that the University meets the significant goal of the QEP to develop students who use higher-order thinking skills to explore, evaluate, expand, and express ideas.

The Steering Committee proposed a four-part infrastructure to guide program development and assessment over the five-year duration of the project. These methods were further discussed with the University community in the spring of 2006 and integrated into the plan. The infrastructure is composed of four broad undertakings defined briefly here and described more fully in Sections 6-10.

1. A Center for Quality Enhancement is designed to assure that the organization and management of the QEP will effectively implement and coordinate all aspects of the QEP. In addition, a marketing plan will assure that the University community is made aware of the ongoing operation of the Quality Enhancement Programs.
2. A professional development plan will assure that faculty, staff, and students have the skills and abilities to increase the number and quality of informed critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.
3. An assessment plan will assure the implementation of a university-wide process of measuring our progress toward the development of informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.
4. A variety of initiatives will implement programs across campus that are designed to give students the ability to be informed, creative and critical thinkers who communicate effectively.

In order to achieve its goal of educating students to be critical and creative thinkers who can explore, evaluate, expand, and express ideas and information, the Eastern Kentucky University community is dedicated to the implementation of the many initiatives that are involved in the Quality Enhancement Plan.
2 Description of EKU

Eastern Kentucky University is a regional public institution of higher education that offers general and liberal arts programs and pre-professional and professional training in education and various other fields at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Located in Richmond, Kentucky, EKU has a distinguished record of one hundred years of educational service to the Commonwealth.

EKU’s Mission
Eastern Kentucky University is a student-centered, comprehensive public university dedicated to high-quality instruction, scholarship, and service.

History of Eastern Kentucky University
The Kentucky General Assembly of 1906 enacted legislation establishing the Eastern Kentucky State Normal School. In 1922, Eastern became a four-year institution known as the Eastern Kentucky State Normal School and Teachers College. In 1928, the College was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In 1966, the institution was renamed Eastern Kentucky University. During this period of time, Eastern Kentucky University has increased rapidly in size and stature. Beginning with a few students engaged in short review and certificate courses, the University today serves thousands of Kentuckians. The curriculum leads to associate and baccalaureate degrees. EKU also houses an expanding graduate program that currently offers degrees at the master's level in many fields, including the well-established Master of Arts degree in Education, and various fifth- and sixth-year leadership programs in education, psychology, and technology. In addition to these programs, EKU offers cooperative doctoral programs with cooperating institutions in education and rehabilitation sciences.

While Eastern Kentucky University continues to recognize its historic function of preparing quality teachers for the elementary and secondary schools of the Commonwealth, a strong liberal arts curriculum leading to appropriate degrees, together with pre-professional courses in several areas and graduate programs, enable EKU to serve the Commonwealth as a regional university. The faculty and staff of EKU are dedicated to the Appalachian service area but at the same time recognize a much broader role for EKU in the years ahead. EKU believes that the commitment to extend our regional focus will not diminish the strength of EKU’s commitment to the Appalachian region.

EKU has always made educating students its top priority. In the 1959-60 Eastern Kentucky State College catalogue, the Purpose Statement, a precursor to our modern mission statement, listed “preparing only worthy teachers” first among its obligations to its service area and the
Commonwealth. Although much has changed in four decades, the word “student-centered” is included in EKU’s current Mission Statement as a reminder that students and their education still come first.

EKU also recognizes the importance of scholarship and service for a educational culture that strives to create the best possible learning environment for students. Universities function best when the creation, discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge happen in concert. The members of the EKU community always strive for the highest possible quality in all their undertakings.

*Eastern Kentucky University Today*

The EKU’s 2006-2010 Strategic Plan is built upon the 2003-2006 document, with adjustments that reflect the role that EKU will play in the years ahead in Appalachia, the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world. The Strategic Plan also includes objectives and key performance indicators to measure the progress of each academic unit toward the QEP goal of educating students who will explore knowledge, evaluate information, expand on ideas, and express themselves clearly.
3 Developing the QEP

Overview
The Mission of the QEP Steering Committee was to oversee the development, preparation and submission of a Quality Enhancement Plan that would result in the long-term improvement of student learning. The QEP Steering Committee was charged with the following responsibilities: to work with the Strategic Planning Committee to define a QEP that supports the University’s mission and vision as defined in the Strategic Plan; to define a QEP that will have a positive impact on student learning; and to elicit involvement from the entire University community.

The requirement that the QEP seek consensus among key constituency groups regarding a forward-looking plan for improving student learning presented a unique challenge. As part of the preparations for SACS reaffirmation, the QEP Steering Committee worked with the Public Relations and Communication Committee to facilitate communication with the University community and all other constituencies. The Public Relations and Communication Committee was charged with the responsibility to ensure that the institutional community was engaged in the SACS Reaffirmation process, especially the development of the QEP, by providing timely information and means of communication such as forums, meetings, websites, surveys, and newsletters.

Over the course of three years, the QEP Steering Committee employed a university-wide, problem-solving process in order to arrive at a final theme and focus statement. The process of arriving at a consensus across the whole community was complex and reiterative. At each point of development, the Steering Committee engaged the University community in in-depth conversations about the quality of student learning. The phases included: 1) exploring the current context at EKU; 2) identifying a vision and action plan; 3) seeking University community involvement in developing programs that would help us achieve our goals; and 4) finalizing preparations for implementation of the QEP in 2007. The chronological activities of the Steering Committee are outlined below.

**PHASE I: EXPLORING THE CURRENT ENVIRONMENT AT EKU**

In 2004-2005, the Steering Committee decided on the mission of the QEP Steering Committee and established its goals. The SACS criteria for the QEP were used as the foundation for the Vision, Mission and Goals described below.

The Vision of the QEP Steering Committee is: “The QEP will significantly enhance the quality of students’ learning experience at EKU.”
The **Mission** of the QEP Steering Committee is: “The QEP Steering Committee, with input from appropriate campus constituencies, will oversee the development, preparation, and submission of a Quality Enhancement Plan with a focus vital to the long-term improvement of student learning at Eastern Kentucky University. The plan will be submitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in February 2007.”

The **Goals** of the QEP Steering Committee are:

- To develop a focus that is creative and vital to the long-term improvement of student learning and to develop a definition of student learning appropriate to that focus.
- To collect and provide evidence that all campus constituencies have been engaged throughout the QEP development process.
- To develop a description of the QEP that will help others understand its value and appropriateness to the institution.
- To identify specific and well-defined goals related to an issue of substance and depth, expected to lead to observable results.
- To provide evidence of careful analysis of the institutional context in which the goals will be implemented and of consideration of best practices related to the QEP’s topic or issues.
- To provide viable implementation and evaluation plans.

The SACS committees are delineated in **Appendix A**. The QEP Steering Committee received its charge from the SACS Leadership Team. The Communications and Public Relations Committee assured that the university community was informed about progress on the development of the QEP. The QEP Steering Committee Phase I co-chairs completed a draft of a research plan that was submitted to the SACS Leadership Team for approval. The hallmark of the plan was a faculty survey to be administered during spring 2005 semester. The research plan became the guiding process for the first phase of the QEP development (**Appendix B**).

The research plan was designed to gather data concerning the current state of student learning at EKU and the opinions of the University community about what kinds of student learning should be happening. A variety of procedures were used to collect the data, and efforts were made to ensure the inclusion of as many University constituents as possible. An iterative process was used, gathering data on increasingly specific ideas, in order to base decision making on constituent feedback and data results. These research activities coincided with the revision of the University Strategic Plan, and both processes were coordinated by the SACS Leadership Team.

**Initial Data Collection**

A series of focus groups with students, staff, and faculty were formed, and an initial survey was distributed to establish areas which would be used for the development of a more targeted University-wide survey (**Appendix C**). The focus groups revealed that faculty, staff, and students ranked as the top priorities: written communication; critical thinking, analysis, and decision making; oral communication; and reading with understanding. The QEP Steering Committee condensed the responses into three broad areas: communication; critical thinking; and enabling student engagement in global to local contexts.

The Steering Committee developed a second survey which was designed to elicit more specific input from faculty, staff, and students. The goal of the second survey was to specify a focus area
for the QEP. The survey data (Appendix D) revealed that faculty and staff ranked critical thinking as the first priority and communication as the second. Alternately, students ranked communication as the first priority and critical thinking second. All groups ranked global contexts last. The Steering Committee therefore dropped global contexts from consideration. Because the Steering Committee views critical and creative thinking and communication as inexorably linked learning processes, both were included in the theme. The final theme was approved by the Steering Committee as: “EKU will develop informed critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively”

In addition to the environmental scan provided by the surveys and focus groups, the committee reviewed a variety of local and national data that validated the need for higher-order thinking skills in our students.

**IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction Fall 2001 – Fall 2005**

EKU has used the IDEA evaluation for more than 10 years in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. The instrument provides information about which objectives faculty select for their courses relative to the progress students report they are making on these objectives. The averages for 2001 through 2005 are revealing. Instructors of fewer than 40% of course sections at EKU selected those course objectives that best relate to the QEP theme (developing creative capacities; learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view; and developing skills in expressing oneself orally or in writing), while 78% focused on factual knowledge. These data support the need for increased focus on the higher-order thinking skills targeted by the QEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives Identified by Faculty as Essential on the IDEA Questionnaire</th>
<th>Course Sections 2001-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Developing skills in expressing myself orally or in writing</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring an interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Developing creative capacities (writing, inventing, designing, performing in art, music, drama)</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Objectives directly related to improvement of creative and critical thinking

**The National Survey of Student Engagement 2002-2003**

Data from the National Survey of Student Engagement 2000-2003 (NSSE) also support the need for improving students’ critical and creative thinking and communication skills at EKU. The NSSE was designed to assess student engagement in empirically-derived, good educational practices. The NSSE also measures student perceptions about their college experiences. NSSE was administered to a representative sample of freshmen and seniors each spring semester from 2000 to 2003 and again in 2005. Eleven questions on the NSSE have a direct relationship with the EKU QEP. These questions are listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic/Question</th>
<th>Relationship to Focus Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources</td>
<td>Explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1i</td>
<td>Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Course Work Emphasis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Memorizing facts, ideas to repeat in rote form</td>
<td>Explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships</td>
<td>Expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, methods</td>
<td>Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Applying theories or concepts to practical problems</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Institutional Contribution to Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>Institution contributed to skills in writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d</td>
<td>Institution contributed to skills in speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e</td>
<td>Institution contributed to skills in thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11j</td>
<td>Institution contributed to skills in learning effectively on your own</td>
<td>Expand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The longitudinal data reported by the Offices of Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research indicate that over the course of their EKU careers, student respondents move from course activities emphasizing memorization and recall to those involving more synthesis, analysis, integration, and development of new ideas from existing information. While EKU respondents are frequently required to integrate information from various sources, they do not integrate ideas from different courses as often as students from peer institutions. Both EKU seniors and freshmen indicate positive contributions from the institution in writing and speaking abilities, with seniors reporting a slightly higher contribution in speaking than freshmen. Regarding critical and analytical thinking, the trend over time indicates a decrease in positive contributions from the institution for seniors, although seniors still indicate greater contributions in this area than freshmen. While students perceive growth in critical and creative thinking and communication, it is evident that further growth is needed in these areas if students are to meet the demands of employers.

**National Data Trends**

In addition to the local data, several national reports support the QEP focus. In Measuring Up 2004, the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education reports on the progress that the states and the nation have made since the early 1990s. In Kentucky, although the percentage of adults demonstrating high-level literacy skills (including quantitative prose, and document skills) has increased as much as 5% from 1994 to 2004, only 21% of Kentucky adults exhibit these skills. Significantly, in comparison with national averages, Kentucky residents perform 13-25% below national averages for prose, document, quantitative, problem solving, and writing skills.

According to the National Association Colleges and Employers 2005 Job Outlook report, employers rank oral and written communication skills and analytical skills among the most important qualities in job candidates. Furthermore, every year since the 1999 Job Outlook report, communication skills have topped the list of qualities employers deem important in job
candidates. This increasing demand for employees who think critically and communicate effectively further supports the need to focus on higher-order thinking skills and communication at EKU.

Conclusion
The data collected from faculty, students, and staff—as well as the IDEA reports and national trends—support the need to focus on informed critical and creative thinking and communication. The next challenge for the Steering Committee was to arrive at more specific student learning outcomes and implementation plans.

**PHASE II: IDENTIFYING THE E4 FOCUS AND ACTION PLAN**

In Phase II, the QEP Steering Committee embarked on the process of specifying focus statements or student learning outcomes that fit with the theme. These plans were reviewed by the University community and the SACS Leadership Team through a variety of public relations events (Appendix E). In addition, there were presentations at University-wide convocations, a University-wide discussion on the web, and at smaller presentations to faculty/staff and student groups.

In this second phase, the Steering Committee defined the focus statements. Trends in student learning areas based on results of the faculty survey, focus groups and other data sources were discussed. The Steering Committee reviewed the current literature and sought formal training to increase their knowledge of teaching informed critical and creative thinking and communication skills. In fall 2005, the Steering Committee arrived at the specification of our focus statement.

**QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN FOCUS**

*Explore* (identify, discover) and use relevant information in order to gain knowledge and solve problems.

*Evaluate* (analyze) information and ideas using appropriate methods.

*Expand* (develop) and generate their own ideas and express them effectively.

*Express* (clearly articulate) a point of view and develop it with awareness of alternatives.

**PHASE III: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

The focus statements provide a vision of what we want our students to accomplish as a result of the efforts by the University to enhance student learning. In Phase III, the methods we would use to accomplish our vision were specified.

At a retreat in January 2006, the Steering Committee devised the infrastructure for implementing the QEP. The Steering Committee then split into four subgroups, each taking responsibility to design the four components: the management structure, professional development, the assessment process, and program implementation. The subcommittees drafted their plans with input from key stakeholders in the processes, e.g., Institutional Research, Institutional Effectiveness, the Associate Vice President of University Programs, the Teaching and Learning...
Center staff, faculty, staff and students. Each plan was brought back to the Steering Committee for review and feedback.

The most complex aspect of this designing process was the program development. The Steering Committee recognized that in order for the QEP to be a success, the University community would need to be engaged at the course and program levels. The first and most straight-forward approach was to ask programs to include a learning outcome and key performance indicator focusing on critical and creative thinking in their strategic plans. Many programs did this in their 2003-2006 plans. All programs will be required to have these outcomes identified by 2008. Level three of the Program Initiatives is designed to track and interpret data collected from these program-level outcomes.

In addition to the individual program outcomes, a process was devised to enlist interested individuals in designing specific programs and courses. A call went out for program proposals (Appendix F). These proposals were reviewed and seven were accepted for implementation as part of the QEP. The proposals and budgets are presented in chapter 9.

The initial budget was drafted based on the input from the program participants and QEP Steering Committee. The budget received tentative approval from the SACS Leadership Team in summer 2006.

**Phase IV: Finalizing the Plan**

The final phase of the QEP focused on getting the word out to the University community and finalizing the QEP document and budget. A targeted public relations campaign was designed and implemented for fall 2006 (Appendix E), including the Steering Committee making presentations to faculty and staff groups, student groups and the Board of Regents. Meetings were held with the authors of the program proposals to prepare for implementation of the programs in fall 2007. Preparations were made for the implementation of the infrastructure and resources were established to allow for programs to begin in fall 2007. The budget was approved by the EKU Board in January 2007.

In November 2006, the Steering Committee determined that all of its original goals were met. The Steering Committee explored the current and ideal states of student learning through both the QEP and Strategic Planning processes. The rationale and infrastructure were described in depth, with a realistic action plan and budget. In addition the University community was informed and involved in each step of the process. The QEP Steering Committee, with broad University representation, developed a focus that is creative and vital to the long-term improvement of student learning. We believe that the QEP theme, focus statements, and plan will change the culture at EKU. This learning culture will support improvement of student critical and creative thinking and communication skills.
4 Description of the QEP

THEME TITLE
Eastern Kentucky University will develop informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN FOCUS
Explore (identify, discover) and use relevant information in order to gain knowledge and solve problems.
Evaluate (analyze) information and ideas using appropriate methods.
Expand (develop) and generate their own ideas and express them effectively.
Express (clearly articulate) a point of view and develop it with awareness of alternatives.
THE ROLES OF CRITICAL AND CREATIVE THINKING IN SOCIETY AND AT EKU

The National Trends Toward Valuing Critical and Creative Thinking

The Quality Enhancement Plan at EKU is a reflection of growing national recognition that institutions of higher education must do a better job of teaching students to think critically and creatively. Derek Bok (2005), President Emeritus of Harvard, states, “Ninety-five percent of all American universities believe that developing the powers of critical thinking of their students is not just a, but the most important objective of a college education” (Address, 2005 SACS/COC meeting). This concern for developing critical thinking in students has been noted by many contemporary educators, federal and state governments, and educational agencies. Both past and emerging literature in education support the development of higher-order thinking skills in students (Bloom, 1956; Paul & Nosich, 1992; Paul, Elder & Bartell, 1997; Anderson, 1980; Halpern 1993; Jih, 2003). The “Goals 2000: Educate America Act,” passed by Congress in 1994 (U.S. Congress, 1994), includes a goal to increase students’ ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems. This trend is also reflected in higher education accrediting agencies that now require an emphasis on critical thinking skills (Association of American Colleges, 1985; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2006; Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, 2005; Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education, 2000).

Furthermore, the workplace demands employees who can think on their feet, innovate, and solve problems effectively. Employers complain that American universities fail to teach students how to think and solve problems (Halpern, 1993; John J. Heldrich Center, 2005). As noted in the EKU initial data described in Phase I, while alumni report critical thinking as essential to their work life, critical thinking is rarely identified as significant in course objectives. There is clearly a mismatch of instructors’ goals and student needs.

The primary focus of the QEP at EKU is the development of students who use higher-order thinking skills and who take responsibility for their own learning as they explore, evaluate, expand, and express information and ideas. Many professionals view critical thinking, learning, problem solving, creative thinking, and effective communication as an interrelated set of higher-order thinking skills (Anderson, 1980; Halpern, 1993; Hayes, 1989; Jih, 2003). The QEP proposal recognizes that these higher-order skills are essential to life-long learning, effective citizenship, and the real-world problem solving necessary for success of EKU students.

In addition, the QEP addresses the recent tectonic shift in higher education from the teaching to the learning paradigm. Barr and Tagg (1995) describe this paradigm shift from teaching to learning as changing higher education’s mission and purpose from quality of instruction to quality of learning. Teaching will focus on problem solving, communication, collaboration, information access, and expression (Campbell & Smith, 1997). This paradigm shift further validates critical and creative thinking and communication as integral to the future of higher education. Critical and creative thinking provide foundational skills for student-centered active learning.
Critical and Creative Thinking in the Context of EKU’s Priorities

The QEP is a natural outgrowth of the University’s Strategic Plan, which is grounded in the Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Core Values, and Institutional Goals.

Our Mission Statement is: “Eastern Kentucky University is a student-centered, comprehensive public university dedicated to high-quality instruction, scholarship, and service.” The focus of the QEP is primarily upon students, and the implementation of the QEP theme will result in high-quality instruction that will in turn lead to high-quality scholarly and creative activities and service.

Our Vision Statement is: “Eastern Kentucky University will hold national distinction as a leading, comprehensive university focused on students and learning.” Once again, the implementation of the QEP will be one way for EKU to make giant strides toward earning national distinction and becoming a leading comprehensive university.

Our Core Values are: Civic Responsibility and Civility, Dignity and Diversity, Excellence and Innovation, Opportunity and Access, Shared Governance and Collaboration, and our most central value, Student Success. Certainly, students who become critical and creative thinkers who can communicate effectively will not only reflect these values, but also help perpetuate them.

Our Institutional Goals are:

- To promote and support an inclusive climate that respects and celebrates diversity by attracting, developing, and educating a diverse student, faculty, and staff population.
- To continuously assess and improve the services and infrastructure of the University to support and maintain high-quality programs.
- To promote learning through high-quality programs, research, and support services.
- To develop and enhance an environment facilitating intellectual curiosity, cultural opportunities, and problem-solving abilities for members of the University community.
- To increase and enhance external and internal constituency engagement, while maintaining a connection with the southeastern region of Kentucky.

The Integration of the QEP in the Strategic Plan

Strategic Direction 3.6, “develop and implement a Quality Enhancement Plan involving faculty, staff, and students,” provided the impetus for the QEP. However the QEP does not stand alone. The integration of the QEP to the overall goals and activities of the University is viewed as essential. The QEP was therefore developed in tandem with the 2006-2010 University Strategic Plan and is consistent with the revised general education program. These relationships are further discussed below and illustrated on the Venn diagram.

The University Strategic plan acts as a foundation for the three areas that focus on the development of critical and creative thinking and communication: QEP, Assessment, and General Education. The QEP theme that “EKU will develop informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively” is consistent with the first two goals of the general education program. The first goal is that students will be able to communicate effectively by applying skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening and through appropriate use of information technology. The second goal is that students will be able to use appropriate methods
of critical thinking and quantitative reasoning to examine issues and to identify solutions. These two goals overlap with the QEP goals and each support the other in facilitating student learning.

The Assessment process is essential to the University Strategic plan and will report progress made on the goals and strategic directions at all levels of the University. Shared assessment of critical and creative thinking and communication between the QEP and general education programs will provide ongoing, accurate feedback on how students are achieving learning outcomes. These assessment data will then provide feedback to the University’s progress toward fulfilling its Strategic Plan.

In summary, our QEP theme is underpinned by the initial data at EKU, reflects current research in the field, and supports the 2006-2010 Eastern Kentucky University Strategic Plan. When implemented, the QEP has the potential to unite the University community as never before and to move us forward together.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON CRITICAL AND CREATIVE THINKING

There is little consensus among scholars about the definition of critical thinking. However, all definitions imply a more complex, advanced, reflective, or creative mode of thinking.

How Scholars Define Critical Thinking
Richard Paul and Linda Elder begin with the premise that all thinking is not of equal quality, and that thinking can be made more critical through self-reflection, questioning, learning, and disciplined re-thinking. They believe that “critical thinking is a process by which the thinker improves the quality of his or her thinking by skillfully taking charge of the structures inherent in thinking and imposing intellectual standards upon them” (2005, p. 1). They point to philosophers, artists, musicians, and scientists—Plato, Aristotle, Beethoven, Curie, Da Vinci, Galileo, Michelangelo, Newton, Darwin, and Einstein—as figures whose greatness can not be attributed to innate ability alone, but whose inborn intellectual capacity was honed by attention, tutoring, and training (2004, p. 14-21). According to Paul and Elder, a well-cultivated critical thinker: identifies and articulates vital questions; gathers, interprets, and evaluates relevant information, using appropriate terms and abstracts concepts; draws and tests well-thought-out conclusions and solutions; can solve problems with flexibility in alternative systems of thought, with an awareness of the assumptions and implications of such systems; and communicates effectively with others in collaborative settings (2005, p. 1).

It is imperative that critical thinking not only be defined, but also that we explore how it can be taught and assessed. Peter A. Facione observes that the heart of a liberal education, both K–12 and post-secondary, is “in the processes of inquiry, learning and thinking rather than in the accumulation of disjointed skills and senescent information” (1990, p. 1). In the Delphi Report, Facione documents a series of six moderated conversations, in which a panel of experts identified six cognitive skills that are central to critical thinking, although they also acknowledge that not all of the skills will be equally developed in any given person, even if the person is an excellent critical thinker. The six cognitive skills are interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation, and self-regulation (1990, p. 6). The Delphi Report concludes, “We understand critical thinking to be purposeful, self-regulatory judgment which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference, as well as explanation of the evidential, conceptual, methodological, criteriological, or contextual considerations upon which that judgment is based. [Critical thinking] is essential as a tool of inquiry” (1990, p. 14).

How EKU Defines Critical Thinking
We believe that critical thinking is a dynamic process and not just an outcome. Learners are active participants in intellectual pursuits who ask questions and are motivated to seek information. The most fundamental and powerful characteristics of critical thinking are a well-defined methodology, self-awareness, assessment, and transferability.
The critical thinker employs a well-defined process with a purpose in mind.

Self-Awareness
The critical thinker is metacognitive, conscious of the methodology.

Assessment
The critical thinker judges the results of the methodology’s use.

Transferability
The critical thinker can apply the methodology to various situations, problems, questions, and bodies of information.

The QEP is founded on the assumption that these characteristics are essential to meeting our goals of educating students to explore knowledge, evaluate information, expand on ideas, and express themselves clearly. Students who possess these characteristics of critical thinking will have the foundational skills necessary to be the innovative and effective thinkers which today’s society demands.

How Scholars Distinguish Creative Thinking from Critical Thinking
Many scholars define creative thinking similarly to critical thinking as discussed above, e.g., in terms of mental agility, problem solving skills, analytic skills, or self-evaluation. However, other scholars see a stronger distinction between critical and creative thinking, with creative thinking requiring a higher degree of cognitive facility. Although Paul and Elder acknowledge that critical and creative thinking are “both achievements of thought,” they make an important distinction between the two: “Creativity masters a process of making or producing, criticality a process of assessing or judging” (2004, p. 4). Similarly, Guilford (1992) stresses that critical and creative thinking involve complementary mental processes, known as “convergent” and “divergent” thinking. Convergent or critical thinking focuses narrowly on a particular notion to assess it. Divergent or creative thinking searches for possibilities in all directions.

Aaron Thompson expands on the distinction between the two thought processes: “To think creatively is to produce something new or different, whether it may be a tangible product, an idea, a methodology, or a strategy. In contrast to critical thinking, which leads you to ask the question, ‘Why?’ (For example, ‘Why are we doing it this way?’), creative thinking leads you to ask the question, ‘Why not?’ (For example, ‘Why not try this different way of doing it?’). When you think critically, you look ‘inside the box’ and evaluate the quality of its particular content; when you think creatively, you look ‘outside the box’ to imagine other possible packages containing different types of content” (2007, p. 21).

How EKU Defines Creative Thinking
We believe that critical thinking and creative thinking are interconnected and serve to compliment one another. The most fundamental and powerful characteristic of creative thinking is a well-defined method which produces a result that is significant and original.
Methodology  The creative thinker employs a well-defined process with a purpose in mind.

Significance  The creative thinker demonstrates the highest cognitive domain.

Originality  The creative thinker arrives at something new.

Result  The creative thinker produces something.

The QEP is designed to guide EKU in creating an educational environment that will foster the higher-order thinking skills necessary for our students to be independent participants in their civic and professional communities. To this end, we seek to develop in our students creative thinking skills that will help them expand on ideas, generate new ideas, and ultimately produce innovative solutions to problems.

**Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Communication**

Communication is the way by which the critical and creative processes are transmitted from the thinker to an audience. Facione, like Paul and Elder, reminds us that one can think without thinking well—that the opposite of a *good* critical thinker is a *poor* critical thinker. The implications of this observation are that one can live without critical thinking skills, and that critical thinking skills can be improved incrementally. The same holds true for communication. One can use language without using language well. As Paul and Elder write, “Nothing in the way we ordinarily learn to speak a language forces us to use concepts carefully, or prevents us from making unjustifiable inferences while engaged in their use” (2004, pp. 34-35).

For Paul and Elder, communication stands in a reciprocal relationship to critical and creative thinking, and to improve one, the other must also be improved. They write, “Purposeful thinking requires both critical and creative thinking. […] Whenever our thinking excels, it excels because we succeed in designing or engendering, fashioning or originating, creating or producing results and outcomes appropriate to our ends in thinking” (2004, p. 5). Paul and Elder hold that communication—namely reading, writing, speaking, and listening—are the “windows” whereby we evaluate, understand, and judge a person’s critical and creative thinking process.

Thompson states that communication becomes the medium for students to demonstrate that they are critical and creative thinkers. Thompson argues, “Although creative and critical thinking represent different forms of higher-level thinking, they go hand-in-hand. […] If critical thinking reveals that the quality of what we’ve created is poor, then shift back to creative thinking to generate something that’s new and improved. Or, we may start by using critical thinking to evaluate an old idea or approach and come to the judgment that it’s not very good” (2007, p. 21).

**EKU’s Emphasis on Communication**

Critical and creative thinking are cognitive processes which together will result in the production of an argument, whether written, oral or artistic. The combined emphasis on critical thinking, creative thinking, and communication is articulated in the E4 focus of the QEP. Our goal is to provide an educational environment that encourages students to hone their higher-order thinking skills in order to explore, evaluate, expand, and express ideas.
Explore (identify, discover) and use relevant information in order to gain knowledge and solve problems.
Evaluate (analyze) information and ideas using appropriate methods.
Expand (develop) and generate their own ideas and express them effectively.
Express (clearly articulate) a point of view and develop it with awareness of alternatives.

Conclusion
The scholarship on critical and creative thinking supports EKU’s Quality Enhancement Plan. In order to better prepare our students to be intelligent citizens and well-prepared employees in their professions, EKU will implement a variety of initiatives across campus, all designed to give students multiple opportunities to transfer, practice and strengthen their critical thinking, creative thinking, and communication skills in a manner consistent with scholarship and best practices.
5 Infrastructure Rationale

In order to implement broad and inclusive initiatives, an infrastructure was designed to ensure that the University meets the goal of the QEP. The goal is to develop students who use higher-order thinking skills to explore, evaluate, expand and express ideas. After the theme and focus statements were defined, the QEP Steering Committee, with input from the University community, identified professional development, program development and overall assessment as infrastructural elements that will be integral to the success of the QEP. In order to coordinate these diverse initiatives and assure the continuation of a strong QEP, a management structure was also developed.

The four-part infrastructure is designed to guide program development and assessment over the five-year duration of the QEP. The infrastructure comprises four broad initiatives.

- **A Management Plan**: The Center for Quality Enhancement will assure the effective implementation, coordination and marketing of all aspects of the QEP.
- **Professional Development**: The Staircase to Critical and Creative Thinking will provide faculty and staff opportunities to hone their knowledge and skills, in order to help them establish an ideal environment for students to become informed critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.
- **An Assessment Plan**: An ongoing university-wide assessment and planning process was designed to ensure the continued quality of the QEP.
- **Program Initiatives**: A variety of initiatives were designed to implement programs across campus that would develop students who can meet the goal being creative and critical thinkers who communicate effectively.

Each of these initiatives is described in-depth in the following chapters.
6 Management of the QEP: Center for Quality Enhancement

Overview
The purpose of the Center for Quality Enhancement is to ensure the effective implementation and coordination of the QEP. The Center will assure an ongoing process of program evaluation and revision in each part of the infrastructure, based on the assessment of student learning outcomes.

The QEP theme and the focus statements, rephrased slightly to form measurable student learning outcomes, are the overall guiding vision of the Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky University will develop informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students will explore and identify main issues/concepts/problems, and retrieve and organize relevant data/evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students will synthesize, and expand on, relevant information to apply it to different situations and in different contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students will evaluate information to establish a position or interpretation and identify and discuss the implications or consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students will express and articulate a point of view with recognition of other possible perspectives while demonstrating appropriate rhetorical knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organization
The Center for Quality Enhancement will be administered by a full-time Director (Appendix G) who will report to the Associate Vice President. The Director is responsible for coordinating each of the three initiatives in the QEP—Assessment, Program Initiatives, and Professional Development—and to oversee the budget. The Director is also charged with disseminating information about the QEP to the University community, including information about assessment results, progress towards program goals, and professional development opportunities. The Director will work with an Advisory Committee, the QEP Professional Development...
Coordinator (Appendix H) and the Assessment Resource Analyst (Appendix I) to ensure the continued development and ongoing assessment of the QEP. Finally, all data and formal reports required by external agencies, such as SACS, will be collected and written by the Center’s Director.

The primary function of the Center is to assure, through an ongoing program review and planning process, that student learning outcomes are being met. The Center Director and Advisory Committee, in consultation with Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research, will analyze data collected annually by the Resource Analyst. The Advisory Committee, composed of faculty, staff and students, will work with the Director to oversee progress toward the QEP vision and goals, and it will also carry out the annual proposal review process. The results will be shared with the University community and involved program participants; and based on these results, initiatives will be revised or continued. The Assessment Plan delineates the student outcomes, measures and timeline for implementation of both formative and summative assessments.

The second function of the Center is to facilitate the professional development of faculty and staff in areas of critical and creative thinking and communication. This will be accomplished through the Professional Development Program described in chapter 7.

Organizational Chart
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operationalize a Center for Quality Enhancement at EKU</td>
<td>A Quality Enhancement Program Advisory Committee will plan for implementation of the Center.</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director will be hired.</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space for the Center will be secured.</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Advisory Committee will be formed.</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will be hired.</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An operational plan for the Center will be established, and the budget will be revised as needed</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the professional development plan, oversee Program Initiatives, and assess unit-specific learning outcomes and KPIs</td>
<td>70% faculty and 20% of staff will be involved in efforts consistent with the QEP themes by 2011.</td>
<td>Fall 2007–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the assessment and planning cycle in QEP through the Assessment Resource Analyst and assure the coordinated efforts of the Center and IE/IR.</td>
<td>Two full assessment and planning cycles will be completed on the programs in the Center.</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete all required reports for SACS</td>
<td>All SACS requirements for the development and implementation of the QEP will be fulfilled.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$77,250</td>
<td>$79,568</td>
<td>$81,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$37,080</td>
<td>$38,192</td>
<td>$39,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dev. Coordinator (.5 appt.)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$31,827</td>
<td>$32,782</td>
<td>$125,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,300</td>
<td>$10,609</td>
<td>$10,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$42,280</td>
<td>$43,548</td>
<td>$44,855</td>
<td>$30,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$193,280</td>
<td>$189,078</td>
<td>$135,795</td>
<td>$139,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;O</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office set up</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$178,000</td>
<td>$277,280</td>
<td>$146,840</td>
<td>$89,238</td>
<td>$1,009,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding for the Center for Quality Enhancement and the Professional Development Program are included in the above budget. Please note that amounts in this table have been rounded to the nearest dollar.
7 Professional Development: A Staircase to Critical and Creative Thinking

Overview
The purpose of the professional development plan is to ensure that over a five-year period faculty and staff learners will use a variety of teaching methods to foster the development of informed critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively. In addition, the professional development plan will provide a systematic way to achieve the goals of the QEP by offering educational opportunities to faculty and staff.

Method
In order to accomplish professional development, the Staircase to Critical and Creative Thinking was developed. This professional development plan will be overseen by the QEP professional development coordinator (Appendix H).

The Staircase Model was designed to meet the three goals of senior faculty development as described by Sorcinelli (2006). This best educational practice includes: creating and sustaining a culture of teaching excellence; responding to individual faculty members’ needs; and advancing new initiatives in teaching and learning. The Staircase Model will be introduced and implemented over a five-year period. Each year will have a unique focus that demonstrates recursive progress in the development of skills and expertise in teaching for critical and creative thinking.

The Staircase Model identifies five levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities that faculty and staff can develop in order to demonstrate effective critical- and creative-thinking expertise. Each level will offer a designated certification which faculty or staff can aspire to attain. Each year will build on the previous year and will offer faculty-development opportunities for each of the prior levels.
Goals and Timeline
Below is the Staircase Model that five cohorts of faculty and staff learners will go through during the program. Each year a new cohort will be created. Knowledge and skills will be reinforced and built upon for each cohort as they progress through the five levels.

Level 5: Training
Faculty will share with others this expertise in teaching critical and creative thinking (i.e., train the trainer).
Initial implementation in the 2011-2012 academic year.

Level 4: Program Assessment
Faculty and Staff Learners will assess each other’s work based on the elements and universal standards of critical thinking, as learned in level 1 (e.g., assessing faculty and staff effectiveness or program outcomes).
Initial implementation in the 2010-2011 academic year.

Level 3: Student Assessment
Faculty and Staff Learners will assess outcomes based on the elements and universal standards of critical thinking, as learned in level 1 (e.g., assessing student learning outcomes).
Initial implementation in the 2009-2010 academic year.

Level 2: Application
Faculty and Staff Learners will teach and assign projects that develop critical and creative thinking skills.
Initial implementation in the 2008-2009 academic year.

Level 1: Foundation
Faculty and Staff Learners will adopt an operational definition of critical thinking and understand the relationship between critical and creative thinking and communication.
Initial implementation in the 2007-2008 academic year.

Action Plan
The action plan will address the four major areas which are central to the QEP professional development program: informing and energizing, providing resources, training, and showcasing. The table below lists the specific actions and KPIs for each of these major areas as applicable to the goals of developing faculty and staff who can help us achieve our QEP outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Starting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective I – Informing and Energizing</strong></td>
<td>Increase awareness of the professional development program</td>
<td>Fall 2007–2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development staff will design and implement 2 forums annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective II – Providing Resource</strong></td>
<td>Operationalize the ongoing professional development program:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development staff and technical support will be hired with .5 appointments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a website focusing on critical and creative thinking and communication</td>
<td>Professional development staff will create website.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a newsletter</td>
<td>Professional development staff will create newsletter.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a resource center</td>
<td>Professional development staff will create a resource center.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective III – Training</strong></td>
<td>Develop a shared understanding of critical and creative thinking and communication activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development staff with Advisory Committee will develop an action plan and handbook to create a shared understanding of critical and creative thinking and communication.</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient new faculty to the professional development activities related to the Center for Quality Enhancement</td>
<td>Professional development staff will provide information at New Faculty Days.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the Staircase Model of Professional Development by providing one foundational workshop annually in each of the following areas:</td>
<td>• 20 Faculty will begin training in Foundational Concepts annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20 faculty will begin training in Application annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20 faculty will begin training in Student Assessment annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20 faculty will begin training in Program Assessment annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective IV – Showcasing</td>
<td>The Center for Quality Enhancement will provide faculty and staff with encouragement, awareness, and opportunities to publish, and the Center will sponsor a spring showcase.</td>
<td>2008–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate conference attendance to foster critical and creative thinking and communication expertise</td>
<td>10% of full-time faculty and staff will participate in critical thinking, creative thinking or relevant communication related conferences to improve knowledge.</td>
<td>2008–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the publication of faculty and staff research in the area of critical and creative thinking and communication</td>
<td>10% of involved faculty and staff will publish critical thinking, creative thinking or relevant communication related activities in professional journals.</td>
<td>2008–2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the exchange of ideas among faculty and staff about critical thinking, creative thinking or relevant communication related activities</td>
<td>An annual showcase will have 10% of University community participation.</td>
<td>2008–2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget**

See Chapter 6 Management of the QEP
Overview
The purpose of the QEP University-Wide Assessment Plan is to ascertain the effectiveness of EKU’s efforts to develop informed critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively. The QEP Assessment Plan will also provide on-going feedback to the Center for Quality Enhancement for dissemination to programs and the University community, in order to better meet student learning needs.

To capture comprehensive evidence of student learning, summative and formative assessment processes will be implemented, using direct and indirect assessment methods. Formative assessment is conducted during a program or course and provides immediate information for improving student learning at the course and individual level. Summative assessment is used to check the level of student learning at the end of the program. Direct methods ask students to demonstrate their learning through tools such as objective tests, essays, presentations, classroom assignments, and cooperative supervisor/employer evaluations. Indirect methods ask them to reflect on their learning through tools such as surveys and interviews.

Rationale
In preparation for the QEP, EKU hosted two expert consultants, Dr. Gerald Nosich, of the Center for Critical Thinking and Dr. Peggy L. Maki, author of Assessing for Learning (May 2005). These consultants agreed that while standardized tests are quick, easy and often cost-effective method for pre- and post-measurements, they are not the most effective method of assessing critical and creative thinking. The consultants indicated that using a rubric to score student work for specific skills is a more valid measurement of the learning outcomes of critical and creative thinking and communication. Therefore, the primary direct-measure assessment tool will be the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric and the University Written Communication Rubric (Appendices K and L), which were designed by faculty at EKU. However, to ensure overall validity in the assessment process, EKU will also use a variety of standardized, direct, and indirect measures, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), a Graduates in the Workplace survey, and department- or program-specific Strategic Planning assessment data.

Multiple Assessment Plan
The Multiple Assessment Plan (MAP) outlines and correlates the formative and summative assessment processes, as illustrated on the chart below. The top row identifies the various points at which a student will be assessed. The left-hand column indicates the student learning outcomes, based on the E³ focus: Explore, Evaluate, Expand and Express. The level of instruction of material that will move students toward the expected learning outcome is identified.
on the map as introduce (I), reinforce (R), emphasize (E), or assess only (A). Also identified are the expected levels of accomplishment by the students at each assessment point (highlighted in burgundy on the table). These levels (Beginning, Developing, Competent and Accomplished) correlate with the levels of measurement used on the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric and the University Written Communication Rubric (Appendices K and L).

**Multiple Assessment Plan (MAP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Outcomes Multiple Assessment Plan Assessment Points</th>
<th>Freshman NSSE</th>
<th>Transfer Student NSSE</th>
<th>Pre-measure (From First-year Experience Course)†</th>
<th>The Studio for Academic Creativity††</th>
<th>Communication-intensive Course I (TCAC) ††</th>
<th>Communication-intensive Course II (TCAC in the Major) ††</th>
<th>Senior Level Communication-intensive Course in the Major (TCAC) ††</th>
<th>Service Learning††</th>
<th>Science In Society Project††</th>
<th>The CACTUS Project††</th>
<th>Degree Program/Department Level</th>
<th>Post-measure (From required existing senior-level course in the major)†</th>
<th>Senior NSSE</th>
<th>Graduates in the Workplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will explore and use relevant information in order to gain knowledge and solve problems (deliver, investigate)</th>
<th>Stage:</th>
<th>A A I R R RE E R RE E RE A A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome:</td>
<td></td>
<td>B BDC B D D CA CA C C C CA CA A CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will evaluate information and ideas using appropriate methods (analyze)</th>
<th>Stage:</th>
<th>A A I R R RE E R RE E RE A A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome:</td>
<td></td>
<td>B BDC B D D CA CA C C C CA CA A CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will expand and generate their own ideas and express them effectively (develop, generate)</th>
<th>Stage:</th>
<th>A A I R R RE E R RE E RE A A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome:</td>
<td></td>
<td>B BDC B D D CA CA C C C CA CA A CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Express**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will express a point of view and develop it with awareness of alternatives (deliver, communicate)</th>
<th>Stage:</th>
<th>A A I RE R RE E R RE E RE A A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome:</td>
<td></td>
<td>B BDC B DC D CA CA D C C CA CA A CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stages: I=Introduce; R=Reinforce; E=Emphasize; A=Assessment point only

Learning Outcomes: B=Beginning; D=Developing; C=Competent; A=Accomplished

† Critical/Creative Thinking and Communication Baseline Data Collection and Pre- and Post-Measures

†† Proposed Program
FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Formative assessment will take place in each of the funded initiatives, as well as for the KPIs identified in select degree programs. Assessment results for the funded initiatives will be used to guide the implementation of the initiatives in subsequent years. Assessment results from the degree program assessments will be used to guide improvements in the degree curricula. In addition, the degree program assessments may be used for summative assessment of the QEP.

Funded Initiatives
Six initiatives will be funded to help students achieve the learning outcomes of developing critical and creative thinking and communication skills (Chapter 9). In addition to the overall summative assessment plan, each of the funded initiatives has articulated learning outcomes consistent with the overall QEP learning outcomes and has or will develop measures for assessing the effectiveness of the respective initiative in helping EKU students meet the learning outcomes.

Degree Program and Department Level
During 2007-2008 each degree program will be required, through the Strategic Planning process, to identify methods of measuring critical thinking, creative thinking, and communication skills within the individual program. Each department will be asked to identify at least one learning objective and assessment measure that relates to the QEP process.

Academic departments may measure the skills of critical and creative thinking and communication by any method they choose. Degree programs have the option of using the summative assessment prompt for their degree program assessment in their senior-level required major courses. In any case, degree programs will analyze and use the data from their degree program assessment to continuously improve student learning of critical and creative thinking and communication skills. These degree program level objectives, assessment measures, and results will be recorded in the University’s central TracDat database.

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Summative assessment data will be collected when a student enters EKU as a freshman or as a transfer student and again in the junior and senior years. Data demonstrating achievement of student learning outcomes will be gathered using direct and indirect measures. The direct measure will be assessment of student essays—written in response to a common prompt and scored using the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric and the University Written Communication Rubric. The indirect measure will be the student responses to ten questions on the NSSE, which will be administered to freshman and senior students in the spring of odd numbered years. In addition, a process will be designed by the Assessment Resource Analyst to assess critical and creative thinking and communication skills of EKU graduates in the workplace.

Pre- and Post-measures of Critical and Creative Thinking and Communication
A writing sample generated in response to a common prompt will be taken from the First-Year Experience course and scored using the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric and the
University Written Communication Rubric. The two rubrics were developed during summer 2005 as part of the assessment for the General Education program and have already been widely used for assessment at all levels of the university, providing a consistent scoring tool. The freshman writing sample will serve as a pre-measure of student abilities in critical thinking, creative thinking, and effective communication. It is anticipated that students will be functioning at a “Beginning” or “Developing” level at this point of entrance into the university.

During senior-level courses required by select majors, the post-measure will be taken; a common prompt will be used to generate student work which will be assessed using the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric and the University Written Communication Rubric. This post-measure of the QEP will be compared to the pre-measure. It is anticipated that results will indicate that after the QEP implementation students will show stronger critical thinking, creative thinking, and communication skills.

The prompt used in the First-Year Experience course will be developed by the course development committee in conjunction with the QEP Assessment Analyst. The senior-level prompt will be developed with broad-based input from EKU faculty. Care will be taken to assure comparability across disciplines while also permitting discipline-specific knowledge to be used as the basis for the writing sample. Development of the senior-level prompt will be accomplished with assistance from the University Assessment Committee.

A sample of freshman and senior work will be evaluated (sample size = 25% of the class). To successfully complete the evaluation of the pre- and post-measurement, as well as to strengthen the consistency among assessments, a core group of evaluators (20 faculty) will receive training on the application of the University rubrics. This core group will then “train the trainers” for additional evaluations with the goal of creating a substantial pool of trained evaluators within five years. Training and evaluation will occur during the summer. All evaluators will receive a stipend for their efforts.

National Survey of Student Engagement
The NSSE is distributed to freshmen and seniors in the spring of alternating years. Ten items from the NSSE instrument relate directly to the QEP. The analysis of these ten items will serve as an entering and exiting assessment of the QEP, with the anticipation that senior data will demonstrate value-added experiences above the freshman data.

In order to capture baseline data and provide an entering and exiting assessment of transfer students, the ten NSSE items will be distributed to them as they enter the university via the Transfer Center. These data will be compared with transfer student senior data for analysis.

Graduates in the Workplace
Employers will be asked to evaluate the critical thinking, creative thinking, and communication skills of EKU graduates in their employ. To ensure compatibility with other data collected, the QEP Research Analyst will devise and implement an appropriate assessment process based upon the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric and the University Written Communication Rubric. Employers will be trained to apply the rubric consistently.
Data Collection Points and Key Performance Indicators

As evidenced on the Multiple Assessment Plan, summative data will be collected periodically during the students’ progress through the curriculum. The summative assessment data points include the following: Two freshman cohorts will be followed to examine student change before and after exposure to the full QEP. The first cohort will consist of freshmen entering EKU and completing the NSSE 2008-2009. Follow-up data from the direct measure will be collected in 2011-2012, and final data from direct and indirect measures will be collected in 2012-2013. The second cohort will consist of freshmen entering EKU and completing the NSSE in 2010-2011. Follow-up data from the direct measure will be collected in 2013-2014, and final data from direct and indirect measures will be collected in 2014-2015. Beginning in 2008-2009, entering transfer students will also complete the ten NSSE questions.

Baseline data for seniors will be collected in spring 2007-2008. Data from direct measurements of senior achievement will be collected every year while data from indirect measures will be collected in alternating years. EKU graduates will be assessed in the workplace. Baseline will be collected in 2011-2012 and compared with data collected in subsequent years.

Timeline
**Group Comparisons and Key Performance Indicators**

The following list delineates the methods of assessment and key performance indicators established to evaluate the E⁴ focus. The complete listing of outcomes, measures, and KPIs are found in Appendix I.

University-Wide Student Learning Outcome: Students will be informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.

- Freshman and transfer student groups will be compared to senior groups.
- Seniors scores will be higher than freshmen and transfer scores.
- The difference between senior and freshman scores will be greater in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 than in 2008-2009.
- The difference between senior and transfer student scores will be greater in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 than in the student’s year entering EKU.

Senior groups in subsequent years will be compared.
- Senior scores will be greater in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 than in 2007-2008.

A cohort (freshmen to senior, and transfer to senior) will be tracked over time.
- Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen or transfers.
- The change scores from freshmen to senior year or transfer year to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project.

**CLOSING THE LOOP**

The purpose of the entire assessment process is to inform improvements at all levels of the University, so that we might assist EKU students in developing skills in critical and creative thinking and communication. The summative assessments of EKU students and graduates in the workplace will be used to identify broad areas in need of improvement. The formative data collected in the funded initiatives and the academic programs will then be used, in conjunction with the summative data, to pinpoint the specific improvements to the educational process. The formative data collected in the funded initiatives and in the degree program assessments will be used to foster continuous improvement of courses, projects, curricula, and professional development. The Center will monitor and assure a continuous cycle of improvement through the assessment process.
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time resource analyst</td>
<td>An analyst will be hired.</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate QEP Assessment Processes</td>
<td>Summative and formative assessments will be completed annually.</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate assessment results to programs for follow up</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess recent graduates</td>
<td>Graduates in the Workplace Survey will be designed and implemented.</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assure that all programs have one KPI related to critical and creative thinking and communication</td>
<td>TracDat data will be compiled demonstrating that there is one KPI per program.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Resource Analyst</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$41,200</td>
<td>$42,436</td>
<td>$43,709</td>
<td>$167,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment evaluators (20 evaluators, 2 days/semester, $300/day)</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td>$11,536</td>
<td>$11,882</td>
<td>$12,239</td>
<td>$46,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td>$75,200</td>
<td>$76,736</td>
<td>$78,318</td>
<td>$79,948</td>
<td>$310,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Budget:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE cost</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MandO</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>$90,200</td>
<td>$91,736</td>
<td>$93,318</td>
<td>$94,948</td>
<td>$370,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Program Initiatives

Overview
The goal of the QEP at Eastern Kentucky University is to provide an educational environment that will foster the skills that students need to evaluate arguments, draw conclusions, evaluate ideas and plans, gauge understanding, and ultimately to articulate their critical and creative thought processes clearly and persuasively. In order to meet these goals, a variety of initiatives across campus will be implemented. These Program Initiatives are designed to give students multiple opportunities to transfer, practice and strengthen their critical thinking, creative thinking, and communication skills. Initial proposals were sought in the spring of 2006 and are included here. In addition, each year during the five-year QEP there will be an opportunity for submission of new proposals for this limited funding.

Faculty and staff proposed a variety of initiatives in spring 2006. Upon review of the submissions, the QEP Steering Committee identified two levels of programming. These included Level 1 University-wide, co-curricular programs and Level 2 individual or unit-specific pilot programs. A third level initiative was identified by the QEP Steering Committee in coordination with the strategic planning process and will coordinate the collection of assessment data from individual strategic planning units. The general overview of each level is provided below.

**Level 1: University-Wide Initiatives**
- A New First-Year Course: The Critical and Creative Thinking Foundation
- Thinking and Communicating Across the Curriculum (TCAC)
- The Studio for Academic Creativity: Developing Critical and Creative Thinking through Development of Writing, Speaking and Research
- Service Learning Project

**Level 2: Individual or Unit-Specific Initiatives**
- The CACTUS Project (Citizens’ Assembly for Critical Thinking about the United States): An Exercise in Deliberative Democracy
- The Science in Society Project: Promotion of Critical Thinking with a Thematic Interdisciplinary Focus

**Level 3: Strategic Plan Initiative: Tracking Progress Toward Learning Outcomes**
Level 1 initiatives are designed to have a very broad impact. The initiatives feature collaborations between more than one department or unit, and they have a universal, co-curricular format. They develop learning processes that are interdisciplinary in their applicability and impact. The Level 1 university-wide initiatives are the New First-Year Course, the Thinking and Communicating Across the Curriculum Project, the Studio for Academic Creativity, and the Service Learning Project.
A New First-Year Course: The Critical and Creative Thinking Foundation

The goals of A New First-Year Course program are to develop an effective first-year experience course that will aid in the transition to college for all first-year students entering EKU. The goal is to provide foundation knowledge and skills in critical and creative thinking to all first-year students that addresses the QEP, and to integrate the development of problem-solving skills into both the academic and social life of all first-year students.

Scope of the Project

The first-year experience course is designed to assist new students in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to succeed in college. Preliminary studies at EKU show that only 10% of 200-level students demonstrate college-level critical and creative thinking skills. First-year students need consistent critical and creative thinking instruction to ensure progress toward the EKU Quality Enhancement Plan goal.

EKU currently offers a one-credit-hour academic orientation course that is taught by faculty in each of the institution’s five academic colleges. Although consistent goals and learning objectives are included in course materials, the decentralization among faculty who teach the sections allows for incorporation of information regarding specific majors and career fields that are consistent with an individual college while excluding information that would assist in a more general transition to college.

A carefully designed and uniform course, designed as a “First-Year Seminar”, with a standardized curriculum and taught by trained instructors, is proposed as one strategy to enhance student success. The creation of a First-year Seminar addresses student goals for a successful first year and allows for a specific place to introduce concepts of critical and creative thinking. This course will: ease students’ transition to college; promote students’ involvement and engagement in the learning process; provide opportunities to challenge first-year students to excel academically and socially; foster sensitivity to diversity within campus communities; develop independent thinkers; aid students in their academic and social development; help students develop responsible life skills; and systematically address unacceptable rates of student attrition.

Target Population

This course is intended to provide a carefully structured learning experience that will bridge the social and academic needs of first-year students by introducing them to the concepts of critical and creative thinking. The uniformly-designed course will be required for all first-year students, with the goal of increasing student success and retention.

Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators

Students will identify, discover, and use relevant information in order to gain knowledge and solve problems.

- At least 60% of students will achieve a developing rating for the Comprehension and Identification of Evidence criteria of the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric.
Students will evaluate and analyze information and ideas using appropriate creative and critical thinking methods.

- At least 60% of students will achieve a developing rating for the Recognition of Perspectives and the Application and Analysis criteria of the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric.

Students will generate and expand their own ideas and express them effectively.

- At least 60% of students will achieve a developing rating for the Interpretation and Evaluation criterion of the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric.

Students will express and clearly articulate a point of view and develop it with awareness of alternatives.

- At least 60% of students will achieve a developing rating for the Synthesis criterion criteria of the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric.

**Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a steering committee</td>
<td>A committee consisting of a broad array of members will be established and an administrative structure will be determined.</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research the new first-year course</td>
<td>15 benchmark programs will be identified, best practices will be defined, and student learning objectives articulated.</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the instructional design</td>
<td>Key concepts, course objectives, student learning outcomes, and rubrics will be defined, and the syllabus will be developed.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify instructors and implement professional development for instructors</td>
<td>100 instructors representing at least three colleges and at least 15 programs will be recruited and trained.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the new course</td>
<td>95% of first-year students will enroll in the first-year course.</td>
<td>2008–2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess student learning outcomes</td>
<td>60% of students will score at the developing level for the relevant criteria of the University rubrics.</td>
<td>2008–2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, part-time</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$33,075</td>
<td>$34,729</td>
<td>$129,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors to teach 100 sections of the first-year course</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$8,820</td>
<td>$9,261</td>
<td>$9,724</td>
<td>$36,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,336</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,509</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MandO (Copying, Books, Journals, etc)</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$108,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                          | **$66,900** | **$66,820** | **$68,836** | **$70,953** | **$273,509** |
LEVEL 1: UNIVERSITY-WIDE INITIATIVES

Thinking and Communicating Across the Curriculum (TCAC)
The goal of this project is to achieve both the QEP and the General Education goals through a systematic program of developing skills in critical and creative thinking, written communication, and oral communication throughout a student’s baccalaureate experience.

Scope of the Project
The purpose of this project is to develop a program that encourages the development of skills in critical and creative thinking, written communication, and oral communication across the curriculum. Beginning fall 2006, EKU began phasing in a new General Education Program requiring all general education courses to build skills in critical thinking. The program also encourages faculty to help students develop skills in oral and written communication. The General Education Program Guidelines include an appendix on student learning objectives that uses Bloom’s taxonomy of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are methods of critical thinking in this classification system. Throughout the course review process, faculty are encouraged to articulate their expectations for student learning in each course using terms that indicate an emphasis on critical and creative thinking.

The QEP theme that “EKU will develop informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively” is consistent with the first two goals of the new General Education Program. The first goal is that students will be able to communicate effectively by applying skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening and through appropriate use of information technology. The second goal is that students will be able to use appropriate methods of critical thinking and quantitative reasoning to examine issues and to identify solutions. Given this commonality in goals, the new General Education Program provides the necessary foundation for the QEP theme.

This project is designed to build upon the skills developed in general education communications courses (ENG 101 and 102, ENG 105 or HON 102, and CMS 100 or 210). The program begins with a choice of one writing-intensive general education course in the second year, which will emphasize further development of skills in critical and creative thinking and written communication. Participating departments will create two communications-intensive courses during the third and fourth years. These courses will also develop skills in critical and creative thinking and written communication, as well as skills in oral communication.

The unique feature of this proposal is that it provides an effective and efficient method for assessing not only EKU’s General Education Program but also the QEP.

Target Population
This proposal has the broadest possible impact since all students from involved departments are expected to participate in the process. Students who complete all program requirements in residence at EKU will take one writing-intensive course in general education and two communications-intensive courses in the major, while students who transfer to EKU will
complete, at a minimum, the two major courses, depending on the number of hours they transfer into their program.

**Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators**

Students will demonstrate effective critical and creative thinking.

- At least 70% of students will score at the competent level on the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric in writing-intensive general education courses.
- At least 70% of students will score at the competent level in communications-intensive courses.

Students will demonstrate effective written communication.

- At least 70% of students will score at the competent level on each relevant criterion on the University Written Communication Rubric in writing-intensive general education courses.
- At least 70% of students will score at the competent level in communications-intensive courses.

Students will demonstrate effective oral communication.

- At least 70% of students will score at the competent level on an oral communication scoring rubric currently being developed and revised.
- At least 70% of students will score at the competent level in communications-intensive courses.

**Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish the TCAC Board, to serve as advisory committee during program development</td>
<td>12 individuals will be recruited.</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect information on similar programs at other institutions and consult with faculty to develop workable criteria for writing- and communications-intensive courses.</td>
<td>10 benchmark programs will be identified and 5 general criteria established.</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute criteria for writing- and communications-intensive courses, seek faculty input on criteria and potential weaknesses of TCAC program, revise criteria or TCAC program to reflect faculty input.</td>
<td>Writing-intensive courses will be created in general education, and upper division writing-intensive courses will be created in at least 6 programs.</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit a director of the TCAC Program.</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 course reassigned time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 faculty</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 faculty</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Supplementary pay</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 faculty, $3000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$1,245,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating Budget:              |        |        |        |        |           |
| Faculty Retreats               | $4,500 | $7,000 | $9,500 | $9,500 | $30,500   |
| MandO                          | $1,500 | $1,500 | $1,500 | $1,500 | $6,000    |
| Advisory Board expenses        | $2,000 | $2,000 | $2,000 | $2,000 | $8,000    |
| Total Operating Budget         | $8,000 | $10,500 | $13,000 | $13,000 | $44,500   |

| Total:                         | $163,000 | $290,500 | $418,000 | $418,000 | $1,289,500 |
LEVEL 1: UNIVERSITY-WIDE INITIATIVES

The Studio for Academic Creativity: Developing Critical and Creative Thinking through Development of Writing, Speaking and Research
Through the establishment of the Studio for Academic Creativity, students will become more articulate, learning to communicate clearly and mastering the art of critical and creative thinking.

Scope of the Project
The creation of the Studio for Academic Creativity will address the need to assist students with writing, speaking and research skills—within a shared space populated with writing and speech coaches and librarians. As stated by visiting critical thinking expert Gerald Nosich during his presentation to the EKU Community on March 9, 2006, “students don’t see education as the place where real questions are asked, and they don’t believe that they are the ones to do the asking.” Added to students’ misconceptions about their role in their own education is the problem of high expectations and inadequate facilities. Research is increasingly difficult to master in the information-age. So much is accessible that today students need help trying to decipher between the good and the bad. Although the Writing Center is dedicated to helping students improve writing skills, the facility is less than adequate. Furthermore, there is currently no place on EKU’s campus dedicated to helping students prepare oral presentations. Teaching students to think critically and creatively and then to communicate those ideas with clarity will require innovative campus initiatives. The Studio will integrate writing and speaking with diligent fact-gathering and source evaluation.

Critical and creative thinking do not occur in a vacuum. Critical and creative thinking require thoughtful analysis and interpretation, the ability to identify the arguments and consider alternative points of view, and the skill to draw conclusions and have original thoughts. Through services provided at the Studio, students will become more articulate critical and creative thinkers.

This project begins with a pilot South Campus Studio in the Stratton Building, primarily serving students in the College of Justice and Safety and the College of Business and Technology, but open to all students at EKU. The South Campus Studio will be a learning space unlike any other on campus, where students will learn to recognize how effective writing and speaking are dependent on quality research, and where highly qualified staff members will help students improve their critical and creative thinking skills through integrated writing, speaking and research instruction.

Target Population
Although the South Campus Studio will be utilized primarily by students in the College of Business and Technology and the College of Justice and Safety, it will be open to all students at EKU. The South Campus Studio will be an ideal opportunity to practice and perfect the culmination of student services that have traditionally existed separately before the larger Studio space is open. EKU is poised to help students strengthen their writing, speaking, and research skills with the creation of the South Campus Studio in the Business and Technology Building, and eventually within the Main Library located at the heart of the Richmond campus.
Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators

Note: To assess the impact of the Studio on student learning, two sections of a course will be selected. Students in the test section will be required to utilize the Studio, and students in the control section will not. Student writing, including research papers, in-class on-demand writing, and response papers, will be collected at the beginning and end of the semester and scored using the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric, the University Written Communication Rubric, and other rubrics designed for this purpose. The KPIs will measure differences in student learning between the test group and the control group.

Students will be able to demonstrate their ability to reason critically using the “elements of thought” (Paul and Elder, 2005) in a written and oral class assignment.

- The students in the test group will score 10% higher in their ability to think through an issue critically than the students in the control group, as demonstrated by a major written project collected at the end of the semester and assessed using a rubric created for this purpose.

Students will use creative thinking by generating new ideas or new ways of thinking about their existing written or oral project.

- The students in the test group will show a 10% higher rate of engaging in creative thinking related to the development of a topic and thesis than the students in the control group, as demonstrated by a comparison of thesis statements from the beginning and end of the semester and assessed using a checklist created for this purpose.

Students will have consulted library resources and gathered higher quality information when they have access to librarians and graduate tutors in the Studio.

- The students in the test group will have a higher average research level than the students in the control group, as demonstrated by a bibliography assignment and assessed using a checklist created for this purpose.

Students will improve their critical thinking and written communication skills.

- The students in the test group will show greater improvement in scores from the beginning to the end of the semester than the students in the control group, as demonstrated by a timed writing-on-demand assignment based on content from the course textbook and assessed using the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric.

Students will show improvement in their oral communication skills after utilizing the Studio. [At least 20% of students who come to the South Campus Studio for assistance with oral communication projects will be extended the request to videotape their delivery before and after working with a speech coach.]

- At least 50% of students receiving assistance in oral communication at the Studio will demonstrate improvement from the initial oral communication video to the second oral communication video, as assessed using a rubric created for this purpose.
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open South Campus Studio</td>
<td>Staff will be hired and the program will be operationalized.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify two sections of a communication-intensive course to use for assessment of the effectiveness of the Studio</td>
<td>Two sections, each enrolling at least 15 students, will be identified and appropriate assignments will be created.</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Assess impact of South Campus Studio on student learning | At least 10% of students who use the Studio will show improvement in critical and creative thinking compared to control group,
At least 10% of students who use the Studio will show improvement in written communication,
At least 50% of students who use the Studio to improve oral communication skills will show improvement | Summer 2008 |

### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$61,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$121,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 GA @ $15/hourX20 hours X 46 weeks</td>
<td>$110,400</td>
<td>$110,400</td>
<td>$110,400</td>
<td>$110,400</td>
<td>$441,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coordinator</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$41,200</td>
<td>$42,436</td>
<td></td>
<td>$123,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 UK Library Sciences TAs ($15/hour X 20 hours X 46 weeks)</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
<td>$110,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned time for 2 faculty (1 Communication and 1 English)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$28,504</td>
<td>$11,536</td>
<td>$11,882</td>
<td>$68,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td>$226,800</td>
<td>$292,304</td>
<td>$214,736</td>
<td>$216,318</td>
<td>$950,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Budget:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MandO and Travel</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Computer Set-up</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>$285,300</td>
<td>$300,304</td>
<td>$222,736</td>
<td>$224,318</td>
<td>$1,032,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEVEL 1: UNIVERSITY-WIDE INITIATIVES

Service Learning Project
The goal of this project is to promote faculty and staff engagement in projects with external partners in order to enhance student development as informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively, through service learning activities. The end result of this project will be the institutionalization of service learning at EKU.

Scope of the Project
The Service Learning Project will promote service learning activities that demonstrate clear learning outcomes in the area of critical and creative thinking. Through a university-wide call for proposals, EKU faculty and professional staff will be encouraged to work in teams to design and implement undergraduate or graduate courses that engage in service learning as pedagogy for classroom instruction. Proposal applicants will be asked to develop a service learning project that responds to an identified and complex community problem or need, and that will be addressed through the application of course material and the engagement of outside constituents. Courses will develop student learning outcomes directly related to enhancing critical and creative thinking skills among students.

The goal of developing students to be informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively is supported and enhanced when these skills are cultivated through classroom-based external service activities (Eyler and Giles 1999). Service learning activities cultivate such skills because they are developed in a real-world setting where external clients are seeking assistance with complex social problems. Guided by the faculty and staff member teaching the course, and involving the application of course materials, external client projects are selected that reinforce cognitive learning and reflection, while benefiting the client. The need for assistance on the part of the external client becomes a motivation, and the success of the project depends upon students being critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively. Throughout the process, students are engaged in problem-solving, knowledge collection and application, analysis and synthesis of information, and the communication of complex ideas. Research has consistently shown that effective service learning provides the conditions that lead students to become critical and creative thinkers (Astin and Sax 1998; Eyler and Giles 1999; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991).

Target Population
The target populate is students from all majors who would benefit from service learning. In order to serve these diverse students, an initial cohort of six faculty and staff engaged in this process will be expected to promote the integration of service learning into courses across campus through educational workshops and the mentoring of the following year’s selected faculty and staff. Departments with participating faculty/staff will commit to continue to offer a service learning course by developing a permanent course within the curriculum. Assessment of student learning will occur in those courses where service learning has been successfully implemented.

Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators
Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend information and apply concepts and theories by working on the resolution of real world problems.
• At least 85% of students completing courses will meet course student learning objectives related to applying concepts and theories to the real world.

• At least 85% of community partners will agree or strongly agree that the students demonstrated the ability to comprehend information and apply concepts and theories by working on the resolution of real world problems.

• At least 85% of students will agree or strongly agree that participating in community work helped them to better understand the course subject matter.

Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize and analyze various perspectives and ideas and apply them to a service project.

• At least 85% of students completing courses will meet course student learning objectives related to recognizing and applying various perspectives and ideas.

• At least 85% of community partners will agree or strongly agree that the students demonstrated the ability to recognize and analyze various perspectives and ideas and apply them to their project.

• At least 85% of students will agree or strongly agree with survey questions addressing their ability to recognize, analyze and apply various perspectives and ideas.

Students will demonstrate an improved understanding of the complexity of community problems.

• At least 85% of students completing courses will meet course student learning objectives related to understanding the complexity of community problems.

• At least 85% of community partners will agree or strongly agree that the students grew in their ability to understand the complexity of community problems.

• At least 85% of students will agree or strongly agree that the course improved their understanding of the complexity of community problems.

Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively express ideas to peers and external constituents through written communication.

• At least 85% of students completing courses will meet course student learning objectives related to effective written communication.

• At least 85% of community partners will report being satisfied or very satisfied with the students’ written communications.

• At least 85% of students will agree or strongly agree that the course improved their ability to express their ideas through written communication.

Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively express ideas to peers and external constituents through oral communication.

• At least 85% of students completing courses will meet course student learning objectives related to effective oral communication.

• At least 85% of community partners will report being satisfied or very satisfied with the students’ oral communications.

• At least 85% of students will agree or strongly agree that the course improved their ability to express their ideas through oral communication.
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop assessment process, tools, and administrative structure</td>
<td>Assessment process, tools and administrative structure will be clearly articulated.</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Request For Proposal application package and process</td>
<td>Application package, criteria, process and timeline will be determined.</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request and review proposals for the first year, train recipients in assessment procedures</td>
<td>6 projects will be selected for implementation in the first year and recipients will be trained.</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement year one activities during fall semester, with assessment in spring semester</td>
<td>85% of student will meet the student learning objectives, 90% of project goals will be met, and 85% level of satisfaction will be reported.</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request and review proposals for the second year, train recipients in assessment procedures</td>
<td>6 projects will be selected for implementation in the first year and recipients will be trained.</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will present on their experience</td>
<td>100% of instructors will present on their experience.</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Mentoring by experienced faculty</td>
<td>90% of instructors chosen in the first year will mentor new faculty and staff for year two implementation.</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review timeline and establish process for year three</td>
<td>Timeline and process for year three will be defined.</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned Time $2,500 (6 faculty)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistant</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
<td>$26,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Stipend (6 faculty)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>$146,880</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total:                                                                    | **$41,220** | **$41,220** | **$41,220** | **$41,220** | **$164,880** |
Level 2: Individual or Unit-Specific Initiatives

Level 2 initiatives are designed to have an impact at the unit or department level. While these programs may also demonstrate evidence of planning and implementation with other disciplines or programs, they must include a plan for dissemination across the university. The Level 2 initiatives approved for the first year are the Citizens’ Assembly for Critical Thinking about the United States (CACTUS) and the Science in Society Project.
LEVEL 2: INDIVIDUAL OR UNIT-SPECIFIC INITIATIVES

The CACTUS Project (Citizens’ Assembly for Critical Thinking about the United States): An Exercise in Deliberative Democracy

The overall goal of the CACTUS Project is to provide an arena in which students can develop the skills of critical and creative thinking particularly as it relates to their roles as engaged citizens in American democracy. Students will have the opportunity to practice compromise, consensus building, and other skills that will transfer into their public lives. They will develop reading, writing, speaking, and constructive listening skills. The assembly itself will also serve as a focal point to encourage the broader University community to increase civil awareness and engagement.

Scope of the Project

The CACTUS Project, a three-credit course in the form of a model citizens’ assembly, will provide students with the opportunity and guidance to become engaged citizens, and to introduce them to possible alternatives to “politics as usual.” Citizens’ assemblies, as instituted by the provincial governments of British Columbia and Ontario, Canada, and the government of the Netherlands, represent a new way of empowering citizens in democratic decision-making. The assemblies are based on the idea that citizens, when given adequate education and information, can reason together to make informed political decisions on a consensual basis.

The American Political Science Association’s Standing Committee on Civic Education and Engagement defines civic engagement broadly as “any activity, individual or collective, devoted to influencing the collective life of the polity.” This would include everything from voting, active protesting, lobbying, or giving money to a cause, to simply becoming educated and informed. Civic engagement has been a topic of intense debate in the United States and other mature democracies in recent years. Along with attempts to transplant democracy to former communist countries came an awareness that western democracies might be in danger of losing the very civic traits they were trying to export. Books such as Robert Putnam’s *Bowling Alone* (Simon & Shuster, 2001) helped place this concern in the public spotlight.

Deliberative democracy has been identified as a valuable form of civic engagement. The idea of a citizens’ assembly was developed in Canada with the British Columbia Citizens’ Assembly on Electoral Reform. A group, established by the provincial government of BC and consisting of 161 randomly selected citizens, excluding politicians and operating in a nonpartisan manner, met throughout 2004 to consider an alternative voting system for provincial elections. The CACTUS Project at EKU will develop and implement a citizens’ assembly model, based most closely on the British Columbia experience. The creation of a Citizens’ Assembly aligns with EKU’s QEP initiative in that deliberative democracy involves citizens in thinking critically and creatively, working together, building consensus, and solving problems. It allows groups to disagree, find points of common agreement, and seek ways to deal productively with enduring conflicts.

Target Population

The CACTUS Project would have broad impact as a course that may be offered under General Education Block VII, Breadth of Knowledge, in which students must take courses from areas not
directly related to their major. It will also be available to POL majors and those in closely related fields as an elective. This would help ensure that it attracted students from across the university.

**Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators**

Students will identify problems that create the impetus for reform and will assess the broader political, social and/or economic context of the problem.

- At least 50% of the students will perform at the level of “competent” or above on the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric, which incorporates critical thinking.

Students will evaluate alternative policies or laws proposed by academics, political leaders, advocacy groups, and citizens and will communicate those evaluations effectively orally and in writing.

- At least 50% of the students score at the developing level or above on the University Written Communication Rubric.

Students will formulate unique solutions in addressing the problem, collectively building two alternative policies and explaining the strengths, weaknesses, and trade-offs between the two.

- At least 50% of the students will score at the level of competent or above on the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric.

Students will deliberate and express their positions on the basis of shared knowledge and a commitment to achieving consensus about a solution.

- At least 50% of the students will join vocally in small group or full assembly deliberations.
- At least 50% will demonstrate that they are informed thinkers by posting knowledgeable position papers on the assembly discussion board and/or responding knowledgeably to the positions taken by others.
- At least 50% of the students will score at the competent level or above on the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric, as demonstrated by their postings on the assembly discussion board.

The assembly members, working in small groups and in the full assembly, will produce a joint report in which they describe the process, the issue, the alternatives, the final decision and steps that would need to be taken for its implementation, demonstrating creative thinking directed toward problem-solving.

- At least 50% of the reports submitted will score at the competent level or above on the University Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric.
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a general education course for CACTUS</td>
<td>POL 301 will be approved for Block VII.</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a faculty team</td>
<td>Chosen faculty will be reassigned to POL 301.</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble and train a leadership team of qualified graduate assistant and/or undergraduate discussion leaders</td>
<td>5 discussion leaders identified and trained.</td>
<td>August–September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement POL 301</td>
<td>A syllabus, including at least 1 on-campus and 1 off-campus speakers, will be developed.</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the record of student oral performance and written work.</td>
<td>At least 50% of students will meet or exceed each of the Student Learning Outcomes.</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned Time (2 faculty for 2 semesters)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 GA</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MandO</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria/Travel</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget</td>
<td>$5,875</td>
<td>$5,875</td>
<td>$5,875</td>
<td>$5,875</td>
<td>$23,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total: | $22,875 | $22,875 | $22,875 | $22,875 | $91,500 |
LEVEL 2: INDIVIDUAL OR UNIT-SPECIFIC INITIATIVES

The Science in Society Project: Promotion of Critical Thinking with a Thematic Interdisciplinary Focus
The goal of the Science in Society Project is to promote student critical and creative thinking through the development of lesson plans, learning activities, and campus events that will encourage students to discover, interpret, and analyze scientific and technological information, as well as produce creative solutions to societal problems caused by scientific and technological progress.

Scope of the Project
The purpose of the Science in Society Project is to assist EKU faculty in designing lessons that can be implemented in courses across the general education curriculum. Leaders from all levels of government and industry sectors are emphasizing the importance of increasing scientific and technological knowledge of our student population. While it is hoped that this will lead to increased numbers of students who major in science and pursue careers in science, this is not the only reason for the call for increased scientific study. The Science in Society Project will expose students to various schools of academic thought outside the realm of science and technology, such as philosophy, ethics, political science, medicine, and law, so that they may critically analyze the scientific information they discover, identify underlying assumptions, and make appropriate inferences. The project will empower students to form opinions on scientific issues and generate ideas and solutions to the resulting societal problems. Students will be encouraged to constantly challenge their observations, assumptions, and opinions and to develop an awareness of varying perspectives and alternatives. Students will also be encouraged to articulate clearly their assumptions and opinions both orally and in written form.

The Science and Society Project will provide encouragement and support to faculty in course design and implementation. The Science in Society Project will begin as a pilot project that faculty from different departments and disciplines across campus will design and teach. The purpose of this pilot course will be to develop discreet course lesson plans with coordinated faculty support services that may be later incorporated into courses throughout the general education curriculum. The Science in Society Project will also provide a lecture series and other support activities that will provide campus-wide forums in which to debate scientific and technological issues and to propose possible solutions.

Target Population
The target population is students from all majors, who, through this interdisciplinary approach to contemporary scientific, technological and social issues, may recognize the importance of critical thinking and of transferring knowledge and skills between courses. In order to serve these diverse students, an initial cohort of faculty from a variety of disciplines will pilot courses, develop lessons and materials, and prepare campus events and forums. After successful implementation of the Science in Society Project, materials and events will be available to faculty throughout the general education curriculum for incorporation into a broad range of courses.
**Student Learning Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators**

Students will discover and evaluate basic scientific concepts and apply that knowledge to the task of finding solutions to the problems caused by modern technological advancements.

- At least 75% of students will apply knowledge to solve problems, as demonstrated through pre- and post-testing.

Students will find and evaluate information about scientific and technological advancements and potential societal problems.

- At least 75% of students will find and evaluate information, as demonstrated through an open source research assignment.

Students will analyze the effects of scientific and technological progress on society using multiple methods, and they will demonstrate awareness of the underlying assumptions and implications of each method.

- At least 75% of students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and synthesize information using multiple methodologies, as demonstrated through essay exams and writing assignments.

Students will draw conclusions, produce original solutions, and critically evaluate these opinions about societal problems resulting from scientific and technological advancements.

- At least 75% of students develop informed personal opinions and plausible solutions to issues discussed in the lesson plans and to evaluate their opinions and solutions logically and critically, as demonstrated through essay exams and writing assignments.

Students will express their own opinions, recognize alternative viewpoints, and articulate the strengths and weaknesses of various viewpoints in both oral and written form.

- At least 75% of students will demonstrate rhetorical competence, as demonstrated through essay exams, writing assignments, student oral presentations, and organized student debates.
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruit and train faculty, and develop pilot course syllabi</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement course and assess its effectiveness</td>
<td>Assessment will use multiple measures to determine student learning, teaching effectiveness, and student satisfaction.</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop supporting activities that will coordinate with Program lesson plans.</td>
<td>Pilot course faculty will coordinate activities in varied formats and campus settings, including guest lectures, debates, and workshops.</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare lesson plans for distribution to general education faculty for inclusion in general education courses</td>
<td>Pilot course faculty will prepare lesson plans and other course materials for posting on a centralized website and in the Teaching and Learning Center.</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting activities such as guest lectures, debates, workshops, and other related activities are offered in a variety of campus settings.</td>
<td>An average of 4 activities will be scheduled each semester and will be attended by an average of 50 students.</td>
<td>2008–2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop tools for use in general education courses to enhance student learning.</td>
<td>Pilot course faculty will create assignments and rubrics, participating faculty will be trained in the use of the rubrics, and results of the assessment will be collected.</td>
<td>2008–2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned Time $2,500 (2 faculty/2 semesters)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Pay for Faculty Course Coordinators ($500/faculty)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MandO</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$29,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $26,800 $7,000 $7,000 $7,000 $47,800
Level 3: Strategic Plan Initiatives:
Tracking Progress toward Learning Outcomes

Level 3 initiatives are unit-specific, non-funded initiatives stated as learning outcomes in strategic plans. Data from these outcomes will be collected and analyzed annually and included as a measure of success of the QEP.
Examples of Critical and Creative Thinking Student Learning Objectives from 2006-2010
Departmental Strategic Plans
Compiled by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in January 2007

Accounting
Objective
Accounting students will be able to think critically and solve complex accounting and business problems.
Assessment Measure
Term papers in ACC 425 will be evaluated by two faculty members other than the course instructor. Students must choose an asset, liability or reporting problem from the class syllabus. They are then required to write a five-page, double-spaced, typewritten paper developing a new approach to accounting about the problem they have chosen. They must provide an issue page discussing the problem and its significance, a literature review of relevant articles, and a conclusion and recommendation section. The recommendations may be creative, but must be supported and justified by concepts from the FASB Conceptual Framework. Prior to writing the paper, the students are given a hand-out explaining writing skills expectations. A scoring scheme was developed based upon work by the AICPA Board of Examiners that grades the students' writing skills using six writing skill criteria.

Agriculture
Objective
Students will demonstrate critical thinking in applying major concepts, theoretical perspectives and historical trends in agriculture.
Assessment Measure
Students will be given a Career Preparedness Assessment in their option area during their capstone course. The capstone course is AGR 411 for the BS students and AGR 305 for the AS students. The Career Preparedness Assessment was developed in conjunction with faculty and the Agriculture Advisory Committee.

Chemistry
Objective
Students will be able to solve problems through creative and critical thinking.
Assessment Measure
At least 50% of students will score at or above “Competent” in at least 50% of the categories on critical thinking and natural science rubrics. For upper division courses, student performances will be within one standard deviation of the respective national averages on standardized exams.

Computer Science
Objective
Our students will demonstrate critical thinking through identification, formulation, and implementation of computing solutions for problems.
Assessment Measures
Every student completing CSC 440 will have obtained an average score of at least 70% on all programming assignments. Cooperative education survey item on critical thinking will be positive for 70% of participating students.

Criminal Justice and Police Studies
Objective
Students enrolled in CRJ will demonstrate the ability to engage in critical thinking, evaluation, and analysis of theory, methods and the criminal justice system. Students will be able in writing to critically assess both the problem, issue or practice and the system response.

Assessment Measures
An assessment committee comprised of three faculty will write the critical scenario essay in the Fall Semester and provide it to the faculty member in whose course it will be administered. The critical scenario essay will be administered in the second week of the Spring Semester. The assessment committee will then select 10-20 essays at random from the classes in which it was administered to be read and "graded." Each essay will be read by two assessment committee members who will assign a score of 1-5 to the essay in each of the four critical areas: theory, research methods, the criminal justice system, and critical thinking. The scores will then be added together to arrive at an assessment "grade" for each of the four components and an overall score for the essay. Seniors will achieve a mean score at least 2.5 or better on this section.

English
Objective
Students in ENG 211 and 212 will critically discuss the literary and/or cultural values of a representative body of creative works.

Assessment Measure
All students enrolled in ENG 211 and ENG 212 will respond to a question on their final exams asking them to analyze literary works in terms of the literary and/or cultural values. The exams will be evaluated by a team of department faculty using the rubrics developed by the University for the assessment of humanities and critical thinking. Each essay will be evaluated twice according to the humanities rubric and twice according to the critical thinking rubric. Both instruments are 4-place rubrics. The score of each essay will be the sum of the scores of the two readers. The goals established by the Department for each objective are that 75% of the students sampled would achieve a summed score of 6 to 8.

Geography
Objective
Students will interpret, analyze, evaluate, explain, and infer concepts and ideas, such as the spatial perspective, integration of physical and human issues, use of geographic techniques to develop ideas, and synthesis of conflicting data, paradigms, and awareness and understanding of diverse global cultures and perspectives.

Assessment Measure
All geography majors will compile a portfolio in the GEO 490 course that includes a critical thinking component requiring them to interpret, analyze, evaluate, explain, and infer geographic concepts and ideas. This component will be reviewed by geography faculty. At least 75% of all students will receive a passing grade on the critical thinking component of the student portfolios.
Loss Prevention and Safety

Objective
Students shall demonstrate critical thinking and problem solving skills essential for the security function.

Assessment Measure
Students will prepare formal papers and presentations to be scored by faculty and visiting security professionals using a rubric. 80% of students will obtain a mean committee rating score of 4.0 or higher on a 1-5 scale. 85% of the students who apply into accredited graduate programs get accepted or complete professional certifications through professional security organizations.

Nursing

Objective
Graduating seniors will demonstrate critical thinking and use of the nursing process in the application of leadership skills, education strategies, and research findings.

Assessment Measure
Graduating seniors will score at or above the 50th percentile for this area on the National League for Nursing Baccalaureate Achievement Test.
APPENDIX A: COMMITTEES INVOLVED IN DEFINING THE QEP

Charges, responsibilities, and membership of the SACS committees may be also found on the web at [http://sacs.eku.edu/committee.php](http://sacs.eku.edu/committee.php).

**Committee Structure**

**SACS Leadership Team**
Co Chairs: Byron Bond, SACS Leadership Team Co-Chair
           Jaleh Rezaie, SACS Leadership Team Co-Chair
Members: Rodney Piercey, Provost and SACS Liaison
        Joanne Glasser, President
        Keith Johnson, Faculty Representative
        EJ Keeley, Associate Vice President, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
        Sherry Robinson, Document Coordinator
        Aaron Thompson, Academic Affairs Representative
        Virginia Underwood, Chief of Staff

**QEP Steering Committee**
Chair: Onda Bennett, QEP Phase II Chair, Professor Occupational Therapy
Members: Adrienne Bauer, Human Resources Representative
         Hal Blythe, College of Arts and Sciences Representative
         Bruce Bonar, College of Education Representative
         Byron Bond, SACS Leadership Team Co-Chair
         Carrie Cooper, Library Representative
         Deborah Core, College of Arts and Sciences Representative
Janet Creech, Communications Subcommittee Representative
Claire Good, Student Affairs Representative
Bonnie Gray, Honors Program Representative
Lindsey Green, Student Representative
Alban Holyoke, Student Representative
Laura Melius, Director of Career Services
Bethany Miller, Director of Institutional Research
Glenn Rainey, College of Arts and Sciences Representative
Jaleh Rezaie, SACS Leadership Team Co-Chair
Andy Schoolmaster, Academic Affairs Representative
Rob Sica, Library Representative
Stacy Street, Institutional Effectiveness, Assessment Coordinator
Charlie Sweet, College of Arts and Sciences Representative
Diba Thakali, Student Representative
Janna Vice, College of Business and Technology, Representative
Shelia Virgin, College of Health Sciences Representative
James Wells, College of Justice and Safety Representative
Kate Williams, Director of NOVA
Mary Wilson, College of Health Sciences Representative

Phase I QEP Additional Committee Members:
Colmon Elridge, Student Representative
Karen Frohoff, College of Education Representative
Liz Hansen, Department of Communication Representative
Ben Jager, Student Representative
Steve Konkel, College of Health Sciences Representative
Kari Martin, Library Representative
Sheena Moran, Student Representative
Kathryn Polmanteer, College of Education
Jayne Violette, Department of Communication Representative
John Wade, General Education Representative
Rebecca Whitehurst, Student Representative
Sara Zeigler, College of Arts and Science Representative

Communications and Public Relations Committee
Co-Chairs: Renee Everett, Chair of Department of Mass Communications
Marc Whitt, Associate VP for University Advancement
Members: Beverly Burrus, Staff Representative
Janet Creech, Director of Marketing (Public Relations and Marketing)
Keith Johnson, English and Theatre Faculty and Leadership Team Liaison
Jean Marlow, Instructional Technology Manager (ITDS)
Jerry Wallace, Director of Communications (PR and M)
Ron Yoder, Director of Web Communications (Public Relations and Marketing)

QEP and Compliance Report Editing
Sharon Bailey, Department of English (College of Arts and Sciences)
Philip Gump, Information Technology

QEP Outside Reader (Non-committee Member)
Sandy Hunter, Department of Emergency Medical Care (College of Justice and Safety)
**APPENDIX B: PHASE I RESEARCH PLAN**

More information about how the QEP theme was researched and selected may be found on the web at [http://sacs.eku.edu/qep/](http://sacs.eku.edu/qep/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Create a list of desirable knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values</td>
<td>Gather information from faculty, staff, and research sources to identify the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values we would like our students to possess at graduation</td>
<td>Faculty and staff focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Articulate a set of distinct, clearly defined, student learning domains</td>
<td>Consolidate and refine focus group results, and applying relevant literature, articulate distinct, clearly defined, student learning domains</td>
<td>March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collect campus input to evaluate the student learning domains</td>
<td>Collect detailed information to evaluate our students' current levels of proficiency in each domain and recommended, future priorities</td>
<td>Faculty survey; staff and student focus groups; university-wide assessment results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Establish campus-wide, student learning priorities</td>
<td>SPC* establishes learning priorities based on Step 3 results, reported by the QEPC*</td>
<td>April 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop alternative QEP topics</td>
<td>Planning groups will develop alternative QEP topics based on the adopted, learning priorities</td>
<td>August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Engage the campus in discussion and debate of the merits of each alternative QEP topic</td>
<td>Initiate a broad, inclusive, campus-wide dialogue about the relative merits of the alternative QEP topics</td>
<td>Series of campus-wide forums; comments submitted to the SACS web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Select the topic that will be the focus of Eastern Kentucky University's QEP</td>
<td>SPC selects the focus of EKU's QEP after reviewing Step 6 results and recommendations from the QEPC and SACS Leadership Team</td>
<td>October 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Obtain individual and/or interdisciplinary proposals</td>
<td>Review proposals regarding learning outcomes, action initiatives, and key performance indicators</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finalization and approval of the QEP</td>
<td>Write and review QEP by university community; approval of budget</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SPC = Strategic Planning Committee; QEPC = Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee
APPENDIX C: SPRING 2005 QEP SURVEY AND FOCUS GROUP RESULTS

The QEP survey and focus group results are the University's first step towards identifying the one student-learning proficiency area that will drive the University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

I. Faculty QEP Survey Results
The QEP Committee has worked diligently over the course of the fall and spring semesters to devise and implement student learning feedback from faculty, staff, and students. A number of focus groups with faculty and staff resulted in a list of 25 student learning domains for further exploration and feedback. The 25 student learning domains were captured in a faculty survey issued to all full-time, part-time (including those on retirement transition), and administrative faculty on campus. Four hundred fifty-five faculty responded to the survey.

A. Top Ten Faculty Choices for Low Student-Learning proficiency Areas by Frequency
According to the faculty who completed the survey, the ten most frequently identified areas of low student-learning proficiency were:
1. global awareness (69.8%)
2. written communication (61.9%)
3. critical thinking, analysis, and decision-making (58.4%)
4. quantitative competency (54.4%)
5. intellectual curiosity (51.8%)
6. value of broad knowledge and education (48%)
7. reading with understanding (41.6%)
8. oral communication (38%)
9. initiative and resourcefulness (37.5%)
10. time management (36.6%)

B. Top Ten Faculty Choices for Low Student-Learning proficiency Areas by Priority
Faculty were then asked to rank the same 25 learning domains by priority which resulted in the following top ten priorities, listed from highest to lowest:
1. written communication (76.1%)
2. critical thinking, analysis, and decision-making (73.7%)
3. oral communication (59.4%)
4. reading with understanding (59.2%)
5. integrity (42%)
6. respect for diverse people and points of view (36.4%)
7. intellectual curiosity (35.1%)
8. personal health and wellness (30.8%)
9. global awareness (29.5%)
10. initiative and resourcefulness (26.2%)
C. Top Three Faculty Choices for Low Student-Learning proficiency Areas by Priority

Faculty were asked to write their top three priorities for student learning. Their choices were:
1. critical thinking, analysis and decision-making (66.5%)
2. written communication (55.2%)
3. oral communication (26.2%)

II. Staff and Student Focus Group Results

Additionally, the QEP Committee solicited feedback from staff and students through focus groups. Three staff focus groups included a total of 35 staff members and five student focus groups included a total of 91 students (consisting of both traditional and non-traditional students).

Participants were asked a number of questions, all designed to generate discussion and provide information regarding the selection of a QEP topic. Groups combined previously existing learning domain categories and created new categories in their discussions. Some of these new categories were identified as a top three priority and groups with similar or related content were clustered together.

A. Top Five Staff Focus Group Choices for Low Student-Learning proficiency Areas

The top five staff priorities for student learning were as follows:
1. Communication (combined written and oral)
2. Respect for diversity/respect for individual differences (combined with global awareness and respect for environment)
3. Integrity (combined with leadership)
4. Student engagement (combined with career development, leadership, service learning and civic responsibility)
5. Intellectual curiosity (combined with lifelong learning)

B. Top Five Staff Focus Group Choices for Low Student-Learning proficiency Areas from QEP Survey

The staff also completed the faculty survey and indicated these domains as top priorities for student learning:
1. Written Communication*
2. Critical Thinking
3. Oral Communication*
4. Respect for Diversity*
5. Integrity*

C. Top Six Students Focus Group Choices for Low Student-Learning proficiency Areas

Following the same procedures, the students’ focus group discussion resulted in six priorities for learning:
1. Intellectual curiosity and initiative
2. Communication (combined oral and written)
3. Leadership
4. Interpersonal skills
5. Value of a broad education
6. Reading with Understanding
D. Top Six Students Focus Group Choices for Low Student-Learning proficiency Areas from QEP Survey

The students completed the faculty survey and indicated these as their priority learning domains:

1. Leadership*
2. Oral Communication*
3. Time Management
4. Professional Behavior
5. Financial Management
6. Interpersonal Skills* and Intellectual Curiosity*

* These categories were also identified as priorities at the conclusion of the focus group session when participants were asked to reprioritize the categories based on all of the information shared during the focus group.

III. Our Next Steps

We stress that the QEP process is in the preliminary phase. The committee will continue to analyze the data collected in the QEP Survey along with other data sources available through Institutional Research. We are beginning to see trends, themes, and ways to cluster domains. Our next steps will be to create topical areas for further discussion with the University community during the 2005 fall semester. It will be a busy summer for our committee.

We would like to thank Mike Roberson, James Wells, Josh Reynolds and Stacey Street for development and analysis of the faculty survey and Adrienne Bauer and Carrie Cooper for facilitation and analysis of staff and student focus groups. We would also like to express appreciation to Mary Wilson, Jayne Violette, Sheena Moran, Karen Frohoff, and Laura Melius for internal data analysis.
### APPENDIX D: FALL 2005 QEP SURVEY RESULTS

A second round survey seeking input from the University community in the QEP theme selection was conducted on Zoomerang in early Fall, 2005. The following table summarizes the results. More details may be found at [http://sacs.eku.edu/qep_report/](http://sacs.eku.edu/qep_report/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Student Engagement in Global to Local Contexts</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>246</strong></td>
<td><strong>519</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E: PHASE II PUBLIC RELATIONS EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Updates, Bulletin Notices, Events</td>
<td>EKU Today</td>
<td>Marc Whitt; Jerry Wallace; Karen Lynn</td>
<td>Daily, Ongoing</td>
<td>Pertinent and timely information to be issued to Faculty/Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Updates, Bulletin Notices, Events</td>
<td>EKU Today for Students</td>
<td>Renee Everett</td>
<td>Daily, Ongoing</td>
<td>Pertinent and timely information to be issued to Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Awareness</td>
<td>EKU Vehicle Parking Permits</td>
<td>Ron Yoder</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>EKU Community will have parking permits featuring QEP logo and theme for 2006-07 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Promotion</td>
<td>EKU Website</td>
<td>Ron Yoder; Philip Gump</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Feature Stories/Profiles; Guest Columns</td>
<td>EKUpdate</td>
<td>Marc Whitt; Jerry Wallace; Karen Lynn</td>
<td>Bi-weekly, Summer 2006 – Spring 2007</td>
<td>Profiles in each issue featuring SACS and QEP Committee Leadership along with those who have submitted proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board Meetings; Ongoing News Coverage; On-Air/Taped Interviews; Public Service Announcements</td>
<td>WEKU-FM</td>
<td>Marc Whitt/Renee Everett</td>
<td>June 2006 – May 2007</td>
<td>Jaleh Rezaie, Onda Bennett, Renee Everett, Janet Creech and Marc Whitt met with News Director Charles Compton for initial discussion, 6/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing book display featuring titles on creative and critical thinking; Aaron Thompson book signing to kick-off effort (his book on critical thinking)</td>
<td>EKU Bookstore</td>
<td>Marc Whitt</td>
<td>October-December 2006; March-April 2007</td>
<td>Marc Whitt and Renee Everett met with EKU Bookstore Manager to discuss logistics, promotion; as well as suggest to Aaron Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Promotion with University Community and Media</td>
<td>One-page QEP Fact Sheet</td>
<td>Onda Bennett; Marc Whitt</td>
<td>July-October 2006</td>
<td>Onda Bennett forwarded copy to Marc Whitt, who, in turn, will forward to Richard Tussey for printing purposes. Copies will be provided to Faculty/Staff in QEP Coffee Mugs; Media to receive as ongoing communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board Meetings; Ongoing News Coverage; Advertising Opportunities</td>
<td>Eastern Progress</td>
<td>Renee Everett</td>
<td>August 2006 – May 2007</td>
<td>Fall Convocation story to be pitched for initial issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Communication and Awareness</td>
<td>Various EKU Groups and Organizations</td>
<td>QEP Committee; Communications &amp; PR Committee Co-Chairs and Members</td>
<td>Ongoing, August 2006 – May 2007</td>
<td>Faculty Senate; Chairs Association; Provost Council; Staff Council; Student Government Association. Renee Everett and Marc Whitt to schedule in cooperation with Jaleh Rezaie and Onda Bennett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Coffee Mug</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Janet Creech</td>
<td>Completed August 14, 2006</td>
<td>Janet Creech to seek estimates for 2,000 mugs; mug to feature QEP logo and theme; to be distributed at Fall Convocation; Board of Regents; and SACS Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Convocation</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>President Glasser; Jaleh Rezaie</td>
<td>Completed August 16, 2006</td>
<td>Information and Mugs were distributed by EKU’s PRSSA; student group to be secured by Renee Everett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Communication and Awareness</td>
<td>Letter from President Glasser</td>
<td>Jaleh Rezaie; Onda Bennett; Virginia Underwood; Marc Whitt</td>
<td>Ongoing, August 2006, January 2007</td>
<td>President Glasser will issue a letter to members of the Faculty/Staff on Monarch-sized letterhead updating employees of ongoing SACS process, timelines, updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP T-shirt</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Janet Creech</td>
<td>In Progress, Fall 2006-Spring 2007</td>
<td>Janet Creech to seek estimates for 50/100 orders; t-shirt to feature QEP logo and Rodin’s <em>The Thinker</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of table tents promoting QEP</td>
<td>Powell &amp; Stratton Cafeterias; Food Court; Library Café; Martin Hall Blimpie</td>
<td>Renee Everett</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Renee Everett contacted Richard Tussey about printing table tents; Marc Whitt to contact EKU Dining Services to confirm logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of campus banners (facilities; campus streets; etc.)</td>
<td>Library street entranceway leading into Library Café; light poles; etc.</td>
<td>Renee Everett; Marc Whitt</td>
<td>In Progress, Spring 2007</td>
<td>Renee Everett to seek estimate on large Library banner while consulting with James Street for Fall Semester posting; Marc Whitt to seek estimate on street/light pole banners for Fall Semester posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodin’s “The Thinker” Campus Marathon</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>Marc Whitt; Renee Everett; Onda Bennett; Cari Wallace</td>
<td>In Progress, Spring 2007</td>
<td>Marathon a fun way to play off creative and critical thinking for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Forums</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>SACS Leadership Team; QEP Committee; Communications &amp; PR Committee</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Communications &amp; PR Committee to promote via University sources (e.g. EKU Today, EKU Today for Students, Eastern Progress, WEKU-FM, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java City Special “QEP Coffee Blend”</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>Marc Whitt</td>
<td>In Progress, Spring 2007</td>
<td>Marc Whitt to contact EKU Dining Services/Jim Conneely for initial discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: PHASE III CALL FOR PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Complete rationale and forms are available at http://sacs.eku.edu/docs/RFP-Submission-Form.doc

Request for Proposals

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Steering Committee seeks proposals prepared by faculty, staff and/or students at EKU that will promote student learning through the development of informed, critical, and creative thinkers who communicate effectively. Please see the QEP website for detailed information on the QEP Background, Theme and Focus Statements. Proposals should describe curricular and/or co-curricular initiatives that will have a broad impact on student learning related to critical and creative thinking. Initiatives can be one-time projects or multi-year projects that begin in Fall 2007. No monies will be available for initiatives prior to Fall 2007. Proposals may include a planning and needs assessment phase to begin in Fall of 2007. Initiatives must show change in student learning outcomes within five (5) years of implementation.

Proposal Due Date & Selection Criteria:
The proposal is due May 1st. Approved proposals will be recommended to the SACS Leadership Team by June 1st. Selection criteria will include:

- Proposal clearly describes timeline and does not request any funds prior to Fall 2007.
- Proposal will result in a significant contribution to the QEP (promoting student learning in the areas of critical and creative thinking). (See the SACS/QEP webpage for a description of the current Concept Papers and program themes.)
- Proposal will have a broad impact on student learning at EKU. Programs/initiatives can be designed in collaboration or cooperation with others or with a plan for dissemination to others. Also, see the SACS QEP web page for detail on “Broad-Based Impact.
- The objectives are well written and demonstrate a good fit between the QEP goals (focus statements) and proposed methods (activities).
- The identified resources are appropriate and justified by the project.
- An assessment of the project’s identified learning outcomes is described.

Proposal Details
The proposal is limited to no more than ten single-spaced pages in addition to the cover page and Plan of Action Table. (Fewer pages are acceptable.) Please include:

1. Proposal title in the header of every page in your proposal.
2. Cover Sheet, including: Department Name; Contact Person Name, Phone, E-mail; List of Faculty, Staff and/or Students who are submitting this proposal; Project Title.
3. Introduction / Rationale: proposal’s connection to student learning in the areas of critical/creative thinking and communication; the relationship to the University’s QEP goals and strategic plan; a clear demonstration of broad impact; and a brief discussion of relevant literature.
4. Overall goal of the project; Student Learning Outcomes; Key Performance Indicators (related to the QEP focus statements).
5. Plan of Action and Plan of Action Table: a brief narrative describing the scope of the project and completion of the attached Plan of Action Table.
6. Evaluation Plan: a brief narrative describing the outcomes assessment procedures and how the assessments will be used to improve activities and completion of the attached Plan of Action Table.
7. Budget/Resources: detailed description of projected budget needs
8. Signature page

Proposal Submittal: Submit proposal by May 1, 2006 as an electronic text document in MS Word format as an attachment in an email to: onda.bennett@eku.edu AND submit a paper copy with appropriate signatures to the SACS Office in SSB 433 (CPO 71).
APPENDIX G: DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR QUALITY ENHANCEMENT: JOB DESCRIPTION

Responsibilities:
This is a 12-month position with no required teaching load in the first year; subsequent year teaching load negotiable, but may be required to teach up to two courses per semester. The Director will report to the Associate Provost/Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

- Primary function will be to develop, enhance, and implement quality enhancement programs and initiatives. Over the next five years this effort will primarily be devoted to the University’s QEP—to develop informed, critical and creative thinkers who communicate effectively.
- Promote the inclusion of quality enhancement into the curriculum and other fabrics of the University.
- To ascertain the effectiveness of the university-wide efforts of the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) initiatives through a variety of assessment methodology, heavily focusing on student learning outcomes.
- Supervise and coordinate the daily activities of the Center, including budget and staff.
- Complete the implementation of the QEP, ensuring completion of each objective within the established schedule, during the period of the assignment.
- Provide QEP technical and operational support to departments and campuses and provide responses to requests for assistance, data, and analyses.
- Facilitate meetings and prepare University-wide communications related to QEP issues. Serve as a liaison to all QEP-related committees.
- Work closely with Institutional Effectiveness, Institutional Research, Teaching and Learning Center and other related areas in the administration and analysis for the purposes of determining issues to address for the QEP.
- Conduct assessment research as needed for benchmarking and comparability purposes and analyze data/information for QEP objectives; prepare results and findings for dissemination, as appropriate.
- Work closely with the members of the Center’s Advisory Committee and and/or other constituents to prepare for submission all required SACS QEP reports, and oversee the quality assurance process for all QEP initiatives.
- Administer faculty development program in critical and creative thinking and other quality enhancement efforts in conjunction with the Director of the Teaching and Learning Center
- Consult with administration and faculty of differing disciplines

Qualifications:
- Skill to perform effectively in interpersonal situations
- Skill to effectively plan work activities, schedules, priorities and utilization of resources
- Broad educational background and experience which demonstrates knowledge of the principles of teaching and assessment
- Facilitation and coordination skills
- Ability to clearly and effectively present ideas in meetings and in oral presentations
• Written skills to convey ideas, facts, and information effectively and accurately to students, staff, faculty and the general public
• Ability to meet deadlines for reports and assignments
• Knowledge, skills and ability to perform all essential functions of the job
• Undergraduate/graduate teaching experience
• High-level administrative experience in dealing with faculty, staff, and upper-level administration
• Expertise in critical and creative thinking
• Experience in assessment, faculty development, and instructional skills
• Working knowledge of technology (e.g., PowerPoint, Blackboard/Web CT)
• Strong interpersonal skills; ability to work collaboratively and collegially
• Demonstration of a commitment to excellence and innovation
• Strong understanding of assessment measures
• Understanding and commitment to University mission
• PhD or EdD in field related to subject matter from a regionally accredited institution.
• Five (5) years experience in combined administrative and teaching experience in higher education.
• Record of scholarship with significant publications/presentations in the areas of critical and creative thinking and quality enhancement and be appointed at the rank of associate or full professor in the appropriate academic discipline and department. Tenure is negotiable based on credentials.
APPENDIX H: QEP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR: JOB DESCRIPTION

Responsibilities:
The Coordinator will be a faculty working half-time reassignment and will report to the QEP Executive Director and will liaise with the Director of the Teaching & Learning Center to develop, implement, and evaluate a full range of faculty development services for the QEP.

- Develop and offer workshops, seminars, and written materials on a variety of QEP theme topics, including effective instruction and student learning.
- Disseminate QEP materials to the University community.
- Consult with individuals and groups on QEP-related issues.
- Create networks of support and information for faculty across disciplines and colleges.
- Plan seminars by QEP theme experts.
- Support faculty efforts for assessing and documenting QEP effectiveness.
- Present at QEP-themed conferences.
- Write promotional materials for faculty development in QEP-related areas.
- Coordinate with support services (including computer technology, instructional design, and others).
- Pursue funding opportunities such as grants and fellowships.
- Provide vision for and assessment of the QEP Center.

Qualifications:
- Doctorate or appropriate terminal degree
- Tenure
- Demonstrated successful experience involving faculty development in a diverse setting.
- Significant teaching and scholarly achievement; pedagogical publications required.
- Experience involving student learning through the use of instructional technologies.
- A demonstrated ability to communicate effectively both orally and in writing.
- Strong interpersonal skills with an ability to work collaboratively.
- Working knowledge of the assessment of classroom learning and pedagogy.
APPENDIX I: ASSESSMENT RESOURCE ANALYST: JOB DESCRIPTION

Responsibilities:
The QEP Resource Analyst provides information and analysis to support planning, assessment, and decision-making at EKU, specifically as it relates to the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). There is a special analytical emphasis on institutional outcomes like student learning, QEP focus areas and graduate destination initiatives.

- Researches, identifies and applies a method of assessing critical/creative thinking and communication of EKU graduates in the workplace and/or in graduate/professional school.
- Works with Career Services to connect with employer base.
- Compiles and shares assessment of critical/creative thinking and communication within the General Education curriculum for QEP.
- Compiles and shares assessment results using TracDat, from departments/programs for their KPI that focuses on critical/creative thinking and communication in support of the QEP.
- Assesses QEP related data from the National Survey of Student Engagement for freshmen, seniors, and entering transfer students.
- Compiles and shares assessment results from QEP funded programs/projects.
- Assists with coordination of the overall, university-wide QEP assessment process.
- Administers Graduate Destination Surveys in cooperation with Career Services and programs/departments/colleges, using data to identify workplace destinations for QEP assessment.
- Provide information in support of state economic development initiatives and CPE issues as they relate to graduate destinations.
- Assesses QEP related data from graduating senior, graduate and alumni surveys.
- Liaises with departments for focused assessment needs particularly as it relates to QEP, accreditations and other assessments.
- Provides QEP related information to external and internal constituents, including programs, departments, government, guidebooks/media, faculty, administration, etc.
- Presents results related to QEP to various internal and external constituencies in both written and oral presentations. Represent the university at professional conferences related to assessment and graduate destination initiatives.
- Creates and assists in the maintenance of QEP related databases to store the University’s student, staff, faculty, and administrative information for recurring and future research projects.
- Work with multiple software packages, including spreadsheets, word-processing, online data collection and statistical application such as SPSS in support of QEP.
- Develop and maintain databases, reports, and queries to provide statistical information for reports, documents, and publications related to QEP.
- Present data outputs and analysis related to QEP, either quantitative or qualitative, in a user-friendly manner and work effectively and proficiently under demands associated with multiple deadlines.
- Shares data on the QEP (the results of assessments, with departments, colleges, and the university community) and assists units with improvement plans.
Qualifications:
• Knowledge of SPSS strongly preferred.
• Master’s degree required with a program emphasis in research, industrial/organizational psychology, assessment in higher education, or related field.
• One to three years experience in qualitative and quantitative analysis preferred.
## APPENDIX J: UNIVERSITY-WIDE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND KPIs

**QEP Operational Outcome:** Students will **explore** & identify main issues/concepts/problems, and retrieve & organize relevant data/evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Between-group comparisons: Freshman group vs. Senior group | • Seniors will score higher than freshmen.  
• The difference between Senior and Freshmen scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008. | • A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors will score at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimensions of the *EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking* as compared to incoming freshmen.  
   - Comprehension  
   - Identification of Evidence  
• The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of freshmen scoring at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimensions of the *EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking* will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012.  
   - Comprehension  
   - Identification of Evidence |
| Between-group comparison: Senior group vs. Senior group | • Senior scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008. | • The percentage of seniors scoring at the accomplished level on the following dimensions of the *EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking* will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.  
   - Comprehension  
   - Identification of Evidence |
| Pre-Post one-group comparison: Same cohort followed over time (freshmen to senior) | • Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen.  
• The change scores from freshman to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond. | • More students will score at the accomplished and competent levels on the following dimensions of the *EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking* when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores).  
   - Comprehension  
   - Identification of Evidence  
• Student change scores from freshmen to senior on the following dimensions of the *EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking* will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.  
   - Comprehension  
   - Identification of Evidence |

**QEP Operational Outcome:** Students will **evaluate** information to establish a position or interpretation, and identify and discuss the implications/consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Between-group comparisons: Freshman group vs. Senior group | • Seniors will score higher than freshmen.  
• The difference between Senior and Freshmen scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008.  
• Seniors will score higher than transfers. | • A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors will score at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimension of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking as compared to incoming freshmen.  
   - Interpretation and Evidence  
• The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of freshmen scoring at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimension of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.  
   - Interpretation and Evidence |
| Between-group comparison: Senior group vs. Senior group | Senior scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008. | The percentage of seniors scoring at the accomplished level on the following dimension of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.  
  - Interpretation and Evidence  
  - The percentage of seniors indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.  
  - Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories  
  - Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods |}

| Pre-Post one-group comparison: Same cohort followed over time (freshmen to senior) | Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen.  
  - The change scores from freshman to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond. | More students will score at the accomplished and competent levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores)  
  - Interpretation and Evidence  
  - Student change scores from freshmen to senior on the following dimension of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.  
  - Interpretation and Evidence  
  - More students will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following.  
  - Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories  
  - Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods |}

- The difference between Senior and Transfer scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008 (or the year entering EKU).
- A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors as compared to incoming freshmen will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following.
  - Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
  - Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of incoming freshmen indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.
  - Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
  - Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors as compared to incoming transfers will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following.
  - Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
  - Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of incoming transfers indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.
  - Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
  - Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- Between-group comparison: Senior group vs. Senior group
- Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen.
- The change scores from freshman to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond.
- More students will score at the accomplished and competent levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores)
  - Interpretation and Evidence
  - Student change scores from freshmen to senior on the following dimension of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.
  - Interpretation and Evidence
  - More students will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following.
  - Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
  - Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they transfer to EKU.

The change scores from transfer year to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond.

Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores)
- Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
- Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods

Student change scores from freshmen to senior year indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.
- Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
- Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods

More students will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized the following when they are seniors than when they transfer to EKU (change scores).
- Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
- Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods

Student change scores from transfer to senior year indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized* the following will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.
- Coursework emphasized* analyzing ideas, experiences, or theories
- Coursework emphasized* making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods

QEP Operational Outcome: Students will synthesize, and expand on, relevant information to apply it to different situations and in different contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Between-group comparisons: Freshman group vs. Senior group | Seniors will score higher than freshmen and transfers. The difference between Senior and Freshmen and Senior and Transfers scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008 (or the year entering EKU). | A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors will score at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking as compared to incoming freshmen. Application and Analysis Synthesis The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of freshmen scoring at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013. Application and Analysis Synthesis A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors as compared to freshmen will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized*, the institution contributed** to or they frequently*** did the following: Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to
practical problems
  o Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically
  o Institution contributed** to skills in learning effectively on own
  o They frequently*** worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
  o They frequently*** put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments of during class discussions

The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of incoming freshmen indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized*, the institution contributed** to or they frequently*** did the following will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.
  o Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships
  o Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems
  o Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically
  o Institution contributed** to skills in learning effectively on own
  o They frequently*** worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
  o They frequently*** put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments of during class discussions

A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors as compared to incoming transfers will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized*, the institution contributed** to or they frequently*** did the following:
  o Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships
  o Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems
  o Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically
  o Institution contributed** to skills in learning effectively on own
  o They frequently*** worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
  o They frequently*** put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments of during class discussions

The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of incoming transfers indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized*, the institution contributed** to or they frequently*** did the following will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.
  o Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships
  o Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-group comparison: Senior group vs. Senior group</th>
<th>Senior scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008.</th>
<th>The percentage of seniors scoring at the accomplished level on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical &amp; Creative Thinking will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Application and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The percentage of seniors indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized*, the institution contributed** to or they frequently*** did the following will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Institution contributed** to skills in learning effectively on own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o They frequently*** worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o They frequently*** put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments of during class discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post one-group comparison: Same cohort followed over time (freshmen to senior, transfer to senior).</td>
<td>Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The change scores from freshman to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they transfer to EKU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The change scores from transfer year to senior year will increase meaningfully over the</td>
<td>More students will score at the accomplished and competent levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical &amp; Creative Thinking when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Application and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student change scores from freshmen to senior on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical &amp; Creative Thinking will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Application and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More students will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized the following when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
length of the project and beyond.

- Student change scores from freshmen to senior year indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized*, the institution contributed** to or they frequently*** did the following will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.
  - Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships
  - Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems
  - Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically
  - Institution contributed** to skills in learning effectively on own
  - They frequently*** worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
  - They frequently*** put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments of during class discussions

- More students will indicate on the NSSE their coursework emphasized the following when they are seniors than when they transfer to EKU (change scores).
  - Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships
  - Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems
  - Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically
  - Institution contributed** to skills in learning effectively on own
  - They frequently*** worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
  - They frequently*** put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments of during class discussions

- Student change scores from transfer to senior year indicating on the NSSE their coursework emphasized*, the institution contributed** to or they frequently*** did the following will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.
  - Coursework emphasized* synthesizing and organizing ideas into new more complex relationships
  - Coursework emphasized* applying theories or concepts to practical problems
  - Institution contributed** to skills in thinking critically and analytically
  - Institution contributed** to skills in learning effectively on own
  - They frequently*** worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
  - They frequently*** put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments of during class discussions
They frequently worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources. They frequently put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions.

**QEP Operational Outcome:** Students will **express** and articulate a point of view with recognition of other possible perspectives while demonstrating appropriate rhetorical knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between-group comparisons:</td>
<td>Seniors will score higher than freshmen and transfers.</td>
<td>A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors will score at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimension of the <strong>EKU Scoring Guide for Critical &amp; Creative Thinking</strong> as compared to incoming freshmen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman group vs. Senior group</td>
<td>The difference between Senior and Freshmen and Senior and Transfers scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008 (or the year entering EKU).</td>
<td>o Recognition of Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of freshmen scoring at the competent and accomplished levels on the following dimension of the <strong>EKU Scoring Guide for Critical &amp; Creative Thinking</strong> will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Defined audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Thesis statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Discourse organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Evidence, documentation and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Demonstrate Rhetorical Knowledge</strong> dimensions of the <strong>EKU Scoring Guide for Written Communication</strong> as compared to incoming freshmen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Defined audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Thesis statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Discourse organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Evidence, documentation and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of freshmen scoring at the competent and accomplished levels on the following “Demonstrate Rhetorical Knowledge” dimensions of the <strong>EKU Scoring Guide for Written Communication</strong> will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Defined audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Thesis statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Discourse organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Evidence, documentation and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A meaningfully greater percentage of seniors as compared to incoming freshmen will indicate on the NSSE the institution contributed** to the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Institution contributed** to skills in speaking clearly and effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The difference between the percentage of seniors and the percentage of incoming freshmen indicating on the NSSE the institution contributed** to the following will increase meaningfully from AY2007-2008 to AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Between-group comparison: Senior group vs. Senior group

- Senior scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008.

### Senior scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008.

### Pre-Post one-group comparison: Same cohort followed over time (freshmen to senior)

- Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen.
- The change scores from freshman to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond.
- Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen.

### Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen.

### More students will score at the accomplished and competent levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores)

- Recognition of Perspectives
- Defined audience
- Thesis statement
- Discourse organization
- Evidence, documentation and conclusions

### More students will score at the accomplished and competent levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores)

| Between-group comparison: Senior group vs. Senior group | Senior scores will be greater in AY2011-2012 and AY2012-2013 than in AY2007-2008. | Pre-Post one-group comparison: Same cohort followed over time (freshmen to senior) | Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen. | The change scores from freshman to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond. | Students will score higher when they are seniors than when they are freshmen. | More students will score at the accomplished and competent levels on the following dimensions of the EKU Scoring Guide for Critical & Creative Thinking when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores) | Recognition of Perspectives | Defined audience |
- The change scores from transfer year to senior year will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis statement</th>
<th>Discourse organization</th>
<th>Evidence, documentation and conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Student change scores from freshmen to senior on the following “Demonstrate Rhetorical Knowledge” dimensions of the *EKU Scoring Guide for Written Communication* will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.

- More students will indicate on the NSSE the institution contributed** to the following when they are seniors than when they are freshmen (change scores).

| In yellow: Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively | In yellow: Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively |

- Student change scores from freshmen to senior year indicating on the NSSE the institution contributed** to the following will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.

| Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively | Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively |

- More students will indicate on the NSSE the institution contributed** to the following when they are seniors than when they transfer to EKU (change scores).

| Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively | Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively |

- Student change scores from transfer to senior year indicating on the NSSE the institution contributed** to the following will increase meaningfully over the length of the project and beyond as additional cohorts are measured.

| Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively | Institution contributed** to skills in writing clearly and effectively |
## APPENDIX K: UNIVERSITY CRITICAL AND CREATIVE THINKING RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>4-Accomplished</th>
<th>3-Competent</th>
<th>2-Developing</th>
<th>1-Beginning</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Clearly identifies the main issues/concepts/problems as well as subsidiary and implicit aspects</td>
<td>Identifies the main issues/concepts/problems and some of the subsidiary or implicit aspects</td>
<td>Identifies some of the main issues/concepts/problems and none of the subsidiary or implicit aspects</td>
<td>Fails to identify main issues/concepts/problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Evidence</td>
<td>Retrieves, organizes, and assesses sufficient and relevant information or evidence</td>
<td>Retrieves and organizes sufficient and relevant information or evidence</td>
<td>Retrieves some relevant information or evidence</td>
<td>Fails to retrieve relevant information or evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Perspectives</td>
<td>Addresses multiple perspectives including diverse perspectives drawn from outside sources</td>
<td>Appropriately addresses multiple perspectives, but omits at least one important perspective</td>
<td>Acknowledges that other perspectives exist, but fails to adequately present the case for these perspectives</td>
<td>Deals only with a single perspective and fails to discuss other possible perspectives, especially those salient to the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application and Analysis</td>
<td>Applies relevant concepts/theories creatively in different contexts</td>
<td>Applies relevant concepts/theories in different contexts</td>
<td>Applies relevant concepts/theories in different contexts, but in an incomplete or superficial manner</td>
<td>Fails to apply relevant concepts/theories in different contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation and Evaluation</td>
<td>Establishes a conclusive position, interpretation, or assessment through the development of a cogent line of reasoning; fully discusses implications and consequences</td>
<td>Establishes a conclusive position, interpretation, or assessment with some justification; identifies implications and consequences</td>
<td>Asserts a position, interpretation, or assessment but fails to provide adequate justification; limited identification of implications and consequences</td>
<td>Fails to establish any recognizable conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Fully synthesizes relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles in a creative manner</td>
<td>Synthesizes relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles</td>
<td>Synthesizes some relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles</td>
<td>Fails to synthesize relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX L: UNIVERSITY WRITTEN COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

**Criteria**  
4-Accomplished Exceeds Course Expectations | 3-Competent Meets Course Expectations | 2-Developing Incomplete in Meeting Course Expectations | 1-Beginning Inadequate in Meeting Course Expectations | N/A

| **Demonstrate Rhetorical Knowledge (General Education Goal 1)** |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| By focusing on a specific purpose for a defined audience | Purpose is defined and critically explicated; audience needs are addressed fully and richly | Purpose is defined and audience needs are addressed | Purpose and audience are identifiable but not directly or clearly addressed | Purpose and audience unclear |
| By constructing an effective discourse organization. | Clearly organized with explicit and effective transition signals. | Organized with mostly explicit and effective transition signals. | Adequately developed with usually adequate support some inconsistency in documentation. | Organization very difficult to follow. |
| By providing adequate and relevant supporting evidence, appropriate documentation, and clear and valid assumptions and conclusions. | Strongly developed with consistently relevant support and appropriate documentation. | Well developed with mostly relevant support and appropriate documentation. | Adequately developed with usually adequate support; some inconsistency in documentation. | Inadequately supported; many lapses in development; confusing documentation. |

<p>| <strong>Demonstrate Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing (General Education Goal 2)</strong> |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| By searching a library database and the Internet for appropriate and quality information. | Clear and substantial evidence of quality sources in the bibliography; balanced list or resources (books, articles, and academic online and print databases) directly supports thesis. | Significant evidence of quality sources in the bibliography; small reliance on information found on the Free Web. | Some evidence of quality sources in the bibliography; some attempt to balance information found on the Free Web with information in books/articles &amp; academic print &amp; online databases. | Little evidence of effective use of academic print and online databases. |
| By comprehending and summarizing the main ideas and integrating this information into their essays. | Clearly and appropriately interprets and synthesizes information into their own thinking, making new observations and discoveries. | Significant evidence of interpretation and synthesis of information, making new observations and discoveries. | Integrates some relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles. | Fails to integrate information, concepts, and principles. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>4-Accomplished Exceeds Course Expectations</th>
<th>3-Competent Meets Course Expectations</th>
<th>2-Developing Incomplete in Meeting Course Expectations</th>
<th>1-Beginning Inadequate in Meeting Course Expectations</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrate Control of Written Language (General Education Goal 1)</strong></td>
<td>By integrating their own ideas with those of others, following conventions of academic writing to construct coherent text.</td>
<td>Skillfully follows conventions of standard written English to present topics and effectively integrate supporting information through use of direct citations, paraphrases and summaries.</td>
<td>Follows conventions of topic development and support through appropriate integration of outside information. Few if any apparent breakdowns undermine text effectiveness.</td>
<td>Generally follows conventions of topic development and support through appropriate integration of outside information. Some breakdowns may be apparent and can undermine text effectiveness.</td>
<td>Little or no conformity to conventions of topic development and support through integration of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By controlling sentence structure and vocabulary appropriate to academic writing.</td>
<td>Evident and confident control of sentence-level constructions, including punctuation; vocabulary use is precise and varied.</td>
<td>General control of sentence-level constructions, punctuation usage, and appropriate vocabulary.</td>
<td>Use of sentence-level constructions, including punctuation is mostly appropriate; some imprecise vocabulary use and breakdowns in sentence grammar attract attention.</td>
<td>Little or no control of sentence-level constructions, including punctuation; frequent use of imprecise vocabulary attracts attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By using the appropriate documentation style to integrate their own ideas with those of others.</td>
<td>Accurate style with all source information included.</td>
<td>Main parts of source included but with inconsistent punctuation.</td>
<td>Main parts of source are mostly included; punctuation is inconsistent.</td>
<td>Little or no understanding of how to document sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration Across the Course (General Education Goal 2, 8)</strong></td>
<td>By appropriately synthesizing across sources and fully integrating relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles.</td>
<td>Consistently synthesizing across sources and integrates most relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles.</td>
<td>Mostly synthesizes across sources and integrates relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles.</td>
<td>Sometimes synthesizes across sources and integrates relevant information, meaningful concepts, and important principles.</td>
<td>Fails to synthesize across sources and integrate information, concepts, and principles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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