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EXHIBIT A

WCU Mission Statement

Western Carolina University creates engaged learning opportunities that incorporate teaching, research and service through residential, distance education and international experiences. The university focuses its academic programs, educational outreach, research and creative activities, and cultural activities to improve individual lives and enhance economic and community development in the region, state and nation.
EXHIBIT B

COMMUNICATION FACULTY MISSION STATEMENT

WE the Communication faculty at Western Carolina University, in order to serve our students and region, are united and driven in our pursuit of excellence in teaching, scholarship, professional development, and service to our community and beyond.

WE offer a Bachelor of Science in Communication with intersecting concentrations of Public Relations, Broadcasting, Broadcast Sales, Print Media, Human Communication, and Training and Development.

AS a faculty dedicated to the values of open and diverse expression, we foster informed means of criticism and stress the notion that achievement is best attained through collaboration. These ideas are reflected in our core curriculum, which consists of an interdisciplinary approach well rooted in the means and methods of the social sciences and the humanities. We stress theoretically grounded communication skills that underpin professional competencies necessary for today’s “convergent” communication marketplace.

We expect our graduates to demonstrate competence in communication both orally and in writing, and to be capable of expressing themselves ethically and with clarity and concision required of today’s “global citizens.”
EXHIBIT C

COMMUNICATION DEPARTMENT INTERNSHIP SITES

The following list does not constitute an endorsement of Western Carolina University's programs by the individuals or companies listed; it is simply a list of where students did their internships.

- 94.5 FM The BUZZ - Houston, Texas
- ABC Radio Networks - Dallas, Texas
- Asheville Citizen Times - Asheville, North Carolina
- Asheville Tourists Baseball Club - Asheville, North Carolina
- The Biltmore House - Asheville, North Carolina
- CBS Radio Group - Charlotte, North Carolina
- Clear Channel Communication - Asheville, North Carolina
- Clear Channel Communication - Charlotte, North Carolina
- Clear Channel Communication - Orlando, Florida
- CNN Marketing - Atlanta, Georgia
- Duke University Athletic Department of Public Relations - Durham, NC
- Lake Junaluska Conference and Retreat Center - Lake Junaluska, NC
- Mitchell County Chamber of Commerce - Spruce Pine, North Carolina
- Mountain Youth Resources - Webster, North Carolina
- NASA - Houston, Texas
- Sports Radio 790 The Zone - Atlanta, Georgia
- The Daily Courier - Forest City, North Carolina
- Turner Broadcasting - Atlanta, Georgia
- U.S. Air Force - Qatar
- WBT News Talk Radio - Charlotte, North Carolina
- Westcare Health System - Sylva, North Carolina
- WLNK 107.9 The Link - Charlotte, North Carolina
- WLOS TV Channel 13 ABC - Asheville, North Carolina
- WPEX TV Channel 38 - New Bern, North Carolina
- WYFF TV Channel 4 NBC - Greenville-Spartanburg, South Carolina
- WBBM TV Channel 2, CBS - Chicago
- Office of U.S. Senator Saxby Chamblis, Georgia - Washington, D.C.
• **WFAE FM**, Charlotte, North Carolina

• **KFNS 590 Grand Slam Sports**, St. Louis
EXHIBIT D

COMMUNICATION CAREERS UPON GRADUATION

The following list does not constitute an endorsement of Western Carolina University’s programs by the individuals or companies listed; it is simply a list of graduates’ first positions after graduation.

- Elizabeth Luedeman - Clear Channel Group, Charlotte, North Carolina
- Tommy Peck - Smoky Mountain Center for Performing Arts, Franklin, North Carolina
- Katie Spears – Martha Stewart Omnimedia, New York
- Mark Fox – WCNC TV NBC TV Charlotte, North Carolina
- Anna Gerts – Star 94 FM Atlanta
- Kristen Boggs – CBS Radio Group Charlotte, North Carolina
- O’Neal Cauley – IBM System Sales Atlanta
- Nick Nichols – Kiss 95.1 Charlotte, North Carolina
- Sara Kepley – Free-lance Television Stage Manager
- Matt Janey – Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
- Jessica Bartley – CBS Radio Group, Charlotte, North Carolina
- Chris Lane – Katz Media New York
- Josh D'Innocenzi – Star 104.3 Asheville, North Carolina
- Adrienne Avery – Clear Channel Group, Columbia South Carolina
- Ryan Hipps – President, Stress Free Productions, Waynesville, North Carolina
- Leighton Grant – WLOS ABC TV Asheville, North Carolina
- Chad Leiser – Katz Media Atlanta
- Ricky Lanning – WLOS ABC TV Asheville, North Carolina
- Katie Chaffin – Clear Channel Group, Greensboro/Winston Salem, North Carolina
- Mike Mariner – Clear Channel Group, Raleigh, North Carolina
- Tony Vatimmo – Clear Channel Total Traffic Network, Charlotte, North Carolina
- Lauren Kaufman – CNN Marketing and Promotions Atlanta
- Chris Edmonds – WRAY TV, Raleigh-Durham-Fayetteville, North Carolina
- Brittany Harris – Clear Channel Group, Greensboro Winston-Salem High Point, North Carolina
- Samantha Saunders - Hagemeyer North America, Philadelphia
- Gena Clemmons-Davis – Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
- Adam Harris – WOXL, Saga Communications, Asheville, North Carolina
- Jenna Mills – NASA, Houston
- Will Candler – Asheville Radio Group/Saga Communications, Asheville, North Carolina
- Heidi Smathers – Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
Patrick Whelan - 1010 WINS News Radio, New York
Tyra Sitton - Public Relations Director American, LeMans Racing Series, Atlanta
Will Dillard, WPBF TV 25 ABC TV, West Palm Beach, Florida
Ryan Britland, Clear Channel Communications, Raleigh, North Carolina
Erik Malay, WXII NBC TV 12, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, High Point, North Carolina
Zach Colburn, WLOS ABC TV, Asheville, North Carolina
Lucas Mills, Hot 98.1 FM/1073 JAMZ, Cox Radio, Greenville, South Carolina
Joe Mullins - Turner Broadcasting, Atlanta
Christopher Hamilton- Master Control Operator - Sinclair Broadcast Group - WLFL TV 22, Raleigh, North Carolina
Ryan Sarda - Sportswriter - Sanford Herald, Sanford, North Carolina
Victoria Scott - TAMA Broadcasting, Savannah, Georgia
Michael Montanez - Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
Kyle McCurry - Program Director/Afternoon Host, WINGZ 104.9 WNGZ-FM, Elmira, NY
Sam Neff - CBS Radio, Charlotte, North Carolina
Samantha Daniel - WGHD Fox TV Channel 8 - Greensboro-High Point-Winston-Salem, NC
Terrence Tipps - i play Marketing Associates - Asheville, North Carolina
Bessie Dietrich Goggins - Literacy Council of Highlands, North Carolina
J. P. Good - WKGX-AM/WKVS-FM - Lenoir, North Carolina
Noelle Bown - Sunshine Sachs & Associates Public Relations, New York, New York
Sara Hayes - United Parcel Service, Asheville, North Carolina
Danielle Dulken - Sunshine Sachs & Associates Public Relations, Greensboro, North Carolina
Tyler Sellers - Clear Channel Communications, Greensboro, North Carolina
Brian Case - South Central Media, WIMZ-FM, WNFZ, Knoxville, Tennessee
Garrett Richardson - Account Executive, Clear Channel, Greensboro, North Carolina
Jared Bass - Smith Systems, Inc., Brevard, North Carolina
Brian Graham - Account Executive, Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
Ashley Fender - Account Executive, Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
Jeremy Powell - Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
Aaron D'Innocenzi - Digital Content Manager, Clear Channel Group, Asheville, North Carolina
Matt Kelley - Account Executive, KCWX, San Antonio, Texas
Adam Beatty - Clear Channel, Charlotte, North Carolina
Amanda Peralta – JSW Media Group, Charlotte, North Carolina
D’Anne Maddox – Public Relations & Marketing, Drake Software, Franklin, North Carolina
Paxton Myers – Casino Marketing Manager, Harrah’s Cherokee Casino, Cherokee, NC
Callie Utz – Communications Specialist, Highland-Cashiers Hospital, North Carolina
Tyler Tadlock – Promotions Manager, Radio Disney, Charlotte North Carolina
## Contents

**Preface** iii  
Chancellor’s Endorsement iii  
Acknowledgements v  
Quality Enhancement Plan Committee vii  
Glossary of Terms and Acronyms viii  
Listing of Tables and Figure x  
A Statement on Integrative Learning from the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching xii  

**Executive Summary** 1  
Western Carolina University 1  
The Quality Enhancement Plan 1  
Conclusion 2  

**Introduction** 3  
The Need for Synthesis at WCU 3  
The Situation at WCU 6  

**Development** 13  
Conceptualization of the Plan 13  
The University Mission 13  
Quality Enhancement Plan Committee 15  
Selection of the QEP Topic 15  

**Implementation** 17  
I. Oversight of the Plan 17  
II. Training of Faculty and Staff 19  
III. Learning Outcomes 20  
IV. QEP Pilot Study and Expansion 26  
QEP Budget 31  

**Assessment** 33  
Assessment Strategies, Protocols, and Procedures 33  
Process Evaluation and Assessment of Institutional Support and Effort 34  

**References** 45
February 1, 2007

To Members of the Western Carolina University Community:

As we complete an intense evaluation of our university as part of the review by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), I am pleased to support a plan designed to enhance student learning at our University.

The Quality Enhancement Plan, Synthesis: a Pathway to Intentional Learning, was developed as a part of the SACS Review and it is a critical initiative for preparing our graduates for life in the twenty first century. Increasingly, effective college learning must involve engaged students who participate in active education that integrates theory, methodology, and subject matter with practice and reflection—synthetical education. Our plan aims to increase the ability of Western students to synthesize their educational experiences in a way that will best serve them for life beyond college. This plan presents a coherent model for doing just that and I am pleased to endorse it.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the work of the faculty, staff, and students who contributed to the development of the Quality Enhancement Plan—their devotion of countless hours to improve the experience of students at Western Carolina University is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

John W. Bardo
Chancellor
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**Glossary of Terms and Acronyms**

The glossary of terms and acronyms that follows will assist internal and external audiences' understanding of terminology used in the Quality Enhancement Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>College of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Learning Community</td>
<td>a grouping of 2 or 3 courses around a common theme for entering students; most Learning Communities include USI 130 (see below) as a component course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Center</td>
<td>comprised of professional advisors who guide students on the Liberal Studies Program, academic majors, and other academic subjects using the case study approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP/American Democracy Project</td>
<td>a civic engagement initiative sponsored by the Association of American State Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project CAT</td>
<td>Assessment of Critical Thinking test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIST</td>
<td>Approaches and Study Skills Inventory for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCSE</td>
<td>Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>assists students with internships, co-operative education, and job placement; also offers a variety of workshops and other services on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CatWalk</td>
<td>electronic portal for newly admitted students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAP</td>
<td>College of Education and Allied Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular Transcript</td>
<td>electronic record of a student’s activities with student government, clubs, intramurals, and other co-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>Commission on Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirement</td>
<td>foundational courses of English, mathematics, oral communication, science, and wellness within the Liberal Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>center that supports faculty in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Education Briefcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Survey on Technology</td>
<td>a University of North Carolina survey of faculty use of educational technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
<td>a rigorous, integrative course intended to introduce first-year students to the intellectual life of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused Growth Institution</td>
<td>a University of North Carolina designation for the seven campuses allocated additional funding to increase enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Surveys</td>
<td>University of North Carolina assessment of first-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSE</td>
<td>Faculty Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Administration of the University of North Carolina; also Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Senior Surveys</td>
<td>University of North Carolina assessment of graduating seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERI</td>
<td>Higher Education Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Liberal Studies; the WCU General Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Cat</td>
<td>an electronic portal that provides access to a variety of university services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NACE - National Association of Colleges and Employers
NSSE - National Survey of Student Engagement
One-Stop - an express center for students offering advising, career, financial aid, registration, cashier, and other student support services
Perspective Area Requirement - a component of the Liberal Studies Program consisting of courses in the social sciences, history, the humanities, the fine and performing arts, and world cultures
QEP - Quality Enhancement Plan
RHA - Residence Hall Association
SACS - Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Service Learning Department - coordinates Service Learning activities for faculty and students on campus and the local community
SGA - Student Government Association
Sophomore Institutional Evaluation Surveys - WCU assessment instrument for second year undergraduate students
Staff Forum - campus group representing university staff
TCI - Transition to College Inventory
UAC - University Advisory Committee; comprised of students, staff, and faculty
UNC - The University of North Carolina system consisting of the following institutions:
   ASU - Appalachian State University
   ECSU - Elizabeth City State University
   ECU - East Carolina University
   FSU - Fayetteville State University
   NCA&T - North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University
   NCCU - North Carolina Central University
   NCSU - North Carolina State University
   North Carolina School of Science and Math
   UNCA - University of North Carolina at Asheville
   UNCC - University of North Carolina at Charlotte
   UNCHH - University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
   UNCG - University of North Carolina at Greensboro
   UNCP - University of North Carolina at Pembroke
   UNCW - University of North Carolina at Wilmington
   WCU - Western Carolina University
   WSSU – Winston Salem State University
Upper Level Perspective - A required 300 or 400 level Liberal Studies course outside the major; typically interdisciplinary
USI 130 - University Studies-Interdisciplinary; a one-credit hour transition/orientation course that introduces students to the university experience
WE LEAD/We Encourage Leadership Enhancement and Development - a comprehensive educational, training, and development program offered to students through Student Affairs based on the social change model of leadership development
WebCat and WebCT - web-based learning environments
YFCY - Your First College Year survey
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A Statement on Integrative Learning from the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

A statement on integrative learning

Association of American Colleges and Universities
the Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching

Fostering students’ abilities to integrate learning—across courses, over time, and between campus and community life—is one of the most important goals and challenges of higher education. The undergraduate experience can be a fragmented landscape of general education courses, preparation for the major, co-curricular activities, and “the real world” beyond the campus. But an emphasis on integrative learning can help undergraduates put the pieces together and develop habits of mind that prepare them to make informed judgments in the conduct of personal, professional, and civic life.

Integrative learning comes in many varieties: connecting skills and knowledge from multiple sources and experiences; applying theory to practice in various settings; utilizing diverse and even contradictory points of view; and, understanding issues and positions contextually. Significant knowledge within individual disciplines serves as the foundation, but integrative learning goes beyond academic boundaries. Indeed, integrative experiences often occur as learners address real-world problems, unscripted and sufficiently broad to require multiple areas of knowledge and multiple modes of inquiry, offering multiple solutions and benefiting from multiple perspectives.

Many colleges and universities are creating opportunities for more integrative, connected learning through first-year seminars, learning communities, interdisciplinary studies programs, capstone experiences, individual portfolios, advising, student self-assessment, and other initiatives. Often, however, such innovations involve only small numbers of students or exist in isolation, disconnected from other parts of the curriculum and from other reform efforts. But a variety of opportunities to develop the capacity for integrative learning should be available to all students throughout their college years, and should be a cornerstone of a twenty-first century education.

Students need programs of study that will help them understand the nature and advantages of integrative learning and assist them in pursuing their college experience in more intentionally connected ways. They also need courses designed by creative faculty that model and build integrative skills, and curricula that define pathways that encourage integrative learning within and across fields. Wider collaboration between academic and nonacademic staff, college and community, four-year and two-year institutions, higher education and K-12 will create further opportunities for integrative learning throughout students’ educational careers.

It is important for educators to work together to build knowledge about integrative learning in its many varieties, and about how it is best encouraged and assessed. Developing students’ capacities for integrative learning is central to personal success, social responsibility, and civic engagement in today’s global society. Students face a rapidly-changing and ever-more-interconnected world, in which integrative learning becomes not just a benefit... but a necessity.

This statement was developed in conjunction with the national project, Integrative Learning: Opportunities to Connect. March 2004.
Executive Summary

Western Carolina University

Western Carolina University (WCU), a constituent institution of the University of North Carolina, has a current student enrollment of almost 8,900 students. Established in 1889, the university offers more than 120 undergraduate and 50 graduate programs in the arts, humanities, sciences, education, business, engineering, and health professions. WCU is located in Cullowhee in western North Carolina, near the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Great Smoky Mountains.

The Quality Enhancement Plan

1. Overview

Synthesis: A Pathway to Intentional Learning at Western Carolina University initiates new and enhances current connections among existing programs to create a more holistic approach to educating students. WCU faculty and staff recognize that a major challenge of higher education is the need for students to synthesize their curricular and co-curricular (outside of courses) college experiences. The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) uses synthesis – the ability to integrate knowledge from different areas into an original whole – as the driving framework for teaching and learning. This emphasis on synthesis enhances students’ educational journey and helps prepare them for life beyond college. Many students may view their courses and co-curricular experiences as isolated activities to be approached in check-list fashion. The QEP fosters synthesis across the disciplines, coordinating curricular and co-curricular experiences to facilitate students’ development of a clearer purpose at the university. The plan’s implementation will impact academics, residential life, service learning, student leadership, study abroad, and career planning/education. The outcome of the plan will be students who are intentional participants in their own educational journey.

2. Learning Goals/Outcomes of the QEP

The overarching learning goal of the QEP is one where students will synthesize knowledge and skills from their academic and co-curricular experiences to become intentional participants in their own learning. Specifically, students will:

1. Identify their aptitudes, abilities, and interests and articulate their future goals and aspirations;
2. Modify behaviors and values in response to knowledge and skills gained from their academic and co-curricular experiences; and
3. Recognize the synthesis of their university experiences and evaluate those experiences relative to their future education and career goals.

3. Implementation

The successful implementation of the QEP will rely on a coordinated university effort centered on the principles of synthesis. The key elements of the plan’s implementation are:
1. The creation of a QEP oversight structure that will implement, coordinate, and monitor the plan;
2. The development of a pilot study that will enable the university to implement, assess, and fund the QEP as it expands over time;
3. An enhancement of services offered by the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to train faculty and staff to integrate the QEP into their teaching and university work;
4. An integration of the synthesis concepts into admissions, orientation, and other early academic/co-curricular services offered to students;
5. The coordination of advising, service learning, international programs, undergraduate research, and career education through the synthesis concept; and
6. The development of the “Education Briefcase”: an electronic portal through which students will be able to interact with faculty, advisors, and career counselors; it is the manifestation of the student’s learning plan.

Conclusion

Synthesis: A Pathway to Intentional Learning at Western Carolina University intends to diminish barriers that inhibit students’ abilities to identify and benefit from the interrelationships of their curricular and co-curricular experiences. The plan’s knowledge base is derived from research on learning conducted by Bloom (1956) and his successors and reflected in his taxonomy of learning and D. A. Kolb’s (1984) model of experiential learning. The plan also incorporates many precepts presented in Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-wide Focus on the Student Experience (Keeling, 2004), Learning Reconsidered 2: A Practical Guide to Implementing a Campus-wide Focus on the Student Experience (Keeling, 2006), and Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002)
Introduction

Western Carolina University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) identifies synthesis—the ability to integrate seemingly unrelated parts of experience from different areas into an original whole—as the driving framework for teaching and learning. Western’s plan will connect undergraduate academics, advising, residential living, service learning, student leadership development, and career orientation so that students will explore, discover, and strengthen their sense of educational purpose. A coordinated university effort to assist undergraduate students with synthesizing their university experiences will equip them with the intellectual and experiential skills necessary to make more informed decisions about their lives and careers. The QEP calls for undergraduates, with guidance from faculty mentors and advisors, to apply the principles of synthesis and to develop a path (conceptual framework) for their university experience. The plan will commence with a focused pilot study that will allow gradual, careful expansion.

Introduction to the principles of synthesis will begin for students with recruitment and orientation activities. Recruitment materials content, orientation presentations, and discussions in early curricular and co-curricular experiences will underscore for undergraduates the importance of synthesis in the university experience. Beginning in 2008, students in the pilot program will learn the foundational skills and concepts necessary for synthesis through coursework, advising, and other venues. Mentored reflection leading to the learning outcomes identified in the QEP will begin in specially designed sections of USI 130, a course which transitions students from secondary to post-secondary education. As sophomores, juniors, and seniors, students will build on these foundations with mentored reflection in a sequence of enhanced courses within the major. Student reflection and artifacts created for the Education Briefcase will continue the synthesis of the university experience as students make key decisions, such as choice of major and career path or graduate school. Through course experiences as well as professional and academic advising, undergraduates will be encouraged to participate in activities that foster synthesis: service learning opportunities, WE LEAD (a program that fosters student leadership development), undergraduate research, study abroad programs, residential life programs, and cooperative (co-op) education and internships. Students in the QEP pilot will be encouraged to make culminating, public presentations that synthesize the university experience and career/graduate school plans as part of the capstone or culminating academic experience.

The Need for Synthesis at WCU

The National Picture

Western Carolina University selected synthesis as a focus because, too often, college students fail to integrate individual collegiate experiences into a coherent whole that leads to understanding, direction, and a career. Colleges and universities have attempted to offer an extensive variety of programs and techniques to address this issue. While changes in curricula, advising, pedagogy, student life, and other areas have each led to some improvement, no single approach has produced significant advancement. We believe the problem results from the disjointed approach to education most students experience. As Derek Bok (2006) observes in Our Underachieving Colleges, compartmentalizing curricular and co-curricular experiences is a
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problem “because student experiences inside the classroom and out are often too closely intertwined to be kept separate” (p. 53). Undergraduates who do not synthesize their experiences tend to view their courses and co-curricular activities as isolated events and fall short of making the holistic and purposeful connections necessary to define their real world application to other related, yet disparate, events.

The Quality Enhancement Plan Committee’s identification of the disconnected experiences of undergraduates and the proposed QEP were affirmed by the January 2007 online reports from the Association of American Colleges and Universities and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Integrative Learning: Opportunities to Connect: “The undergraduate experience is often a fragmented landscape of general education, concentration, electives, co-curricular activities, and for many students, ‘the real world’ beyond campus,” stated Mary Huber, who co-directed the project. “An emphasis on integrated learning can help undergraduates find ways to put the pieces together and develop habits of mind that will prepare them to make informed judgments in the conduct of personal, professional and civic life.” The objectives of this recent report nearly mirror the overarching goals the QEP Committee established in 2005.

The development of the Quality Enhancement Plan at Western Carolina University incorporated important research conducted for Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002), Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-wide Focus on the Student Experience (Keeling, 2004), and Learning Reconsidered 2: A Practical Guide to Implementing a Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience (Keeling, 2006). Greater Expectations (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002) discusses the “misalignment of high school work with college entry expectations,” (p. 13) including the lack of any formal or informal exposition of why college-bound high school students should be prepared for an interactive or holistic approach to higher education.

Furthermore, this disconnect is often repeated in college; students typically complete a list of courses while making no connection between those courses and participate in co-curricular activities that shed little or no light on the importance of an integrated college experience. This lack of coherence in curricula and programs is underscored by the “absence of a plan for connected learning,” so that students often matriculate without understanding relationships that exist between all aspects of their college experience (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002, p. 16). Greater Expectations (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002) outlines existing barriers to meeting the goals of higher education in the 21st Century and proposes important recommendations to meet those goals. Western Carolina University’s QEP embraces the desire proposed in Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) to create a university experience for students that is “a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development processes that have often been considered separate, and even independent of each other” (p. 18).

Learning Theory and Research Support for the QEP

A challenge exists in higher education as it pertains to life or career-based education—in particular, how an institution of higher education can build upon well established pedagogical strategies and help students intentionally integrate their exploration of life and career-based choices. The QEP will function as the framework for infusing synthesis intentionally and systematically within the broader curricular and co-curricular frameworks.
The notion of synthesis is derived in part from Bloom’s *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956). The taxonomy classifies objectives and skills educators establish for student learning according to levels within affective, psychomotor, and cognitive domains.

Synthesis is here defined as the putting together of elements and parts so as to form a whole. This is a process of working with elements, parts, etc., and combining them in such a way as to constitute a pattern or structure not clearly there before. Generally this would involve a recombination of parts of previous experience with new material, reconstructed into a new and more or less well-integrated whole. This is the category in the cognitive domain which most clearly provides for creative behavior on the part of the learner. However, it should be emphasized that this is not completely free creative expression since generally the student is expected to work within the limits set by particular problems, materials, or some theoretical and methodological framework. [The student’s] efforts should yield a product – something that can be observed through one or more of the senses and which is clearly more than the materials he began to work with. It is to be expected that a problem which is classified as a task primarily involving synthesis will also require all of the previous categories [comprehension, application, analysis] to some extent. (p. 162)

Our emphasizing of synthesis builds on D. A. Kolb's (1984) model of experiential learning. Other models that have influenced this plan include the constructivist learning model of Lawson (1989), Vygotsky's model as framed by Moll (1990), and the scaffolded knowledge integration (SKI) framework developed by Linn (1995). Kolb’s (1984) framework organizes those instructional activities that best arrange synthesis into four areas: reflective observation, active experimentation, concrete experience, and abstract conceptualization (Kolb, 1984; Svinicki, 1990). Kolb’s (1984) model of experiential learning focuses on the preparation of students for lifelong learning. It also values a learner-centered approach to assessment that is contextual or goal driven so the educator can accommodate the unique needs, goals, and learning styles of the student. Our plan will focus on pedagogical strategies or other alternate instructional techniques that foster the integration of the broader learning experience within the context of application and societal factors; academic and co-curricular experiences must work together with real-life experiences.

*Greater Expectations* (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002) and previously cited works highlight the changing landscape of the American workplace – more global in nature, more reliant on “creative problem-solving, team work, and adaptability,” and heavily dependent on high-level intellectual skills, such as evaluation, synthesis, analysis, and technological prowess (p. 6). Colleges and universities also are undergoing a metamorphosis as they try to meet their rapidly multiplying missions in an increasingly complicated society. Compounding this change are the outcomes and expectations for higher education that are desired by different constituents. High school and college students believe that completing a curriculum will prepare them for a career and advancement within that career. Employers, on the other hand, expect to hire employees who are not only trained for jobs, but who are able to “perform consistently well, communicate effectively, think analytically, help solve problems, work collegially in diverse teams, and use relevant skills of the profession” (Association of
American Colleges and Universities, 2002, p. 8). Similarly, policymakers are interested in meeting local and regional needs for economic development and the workforce. Meanwhile, faculty members expect students to be active learners in their educational journey, to achieve greater intellectual understanding, and to master knowledge specific to their disciplines. They also expect students to be effective communicators and active contributors to society.

The Situation at WCU

Student Perspective

WCU baseline data, outlined as follows, indicate that students who persist at the university are satisfied with their academic and co-curricular activities. However, WCU’s retention and graduation rates, lower in comparison to UNC peer institutions, suggest that students need to connect these experiences to facilitate their learning and develop a plan that will take them through the university experience and its key decision points (for example, selection of a major, and co-curricular involvement) to degree completion and a career or further education.

Western Carolina University routinely collects and analyzes information on current students, alumni, and faculty with a variety of institutional, system, and national surveys. The Quality Enhancement Plan Committee reviewed this information, as well as institutional and national trend data, to identify the area(s) that would ultimately become the focus for the QEP. The surveys and significant results, as well as data on retention and graduation rates, are detailed. Surveys administered by organizations external to WCU are as follows:

1. Transition to College Inventory (TCI)
2. Your First College Year Survey (YFCY)
3. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
4. Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)

Surveys administered by Western Carolina University are as follows:

1. Freshman Surveys
2. Sophomore Institutional Evaluation Surveys
3. Graduating Senior Surveys
4. Faculty Survey on Technology

A recent analysis of these multiple measures of student achievement, student and faculty perceptions, and institutional performance generated significant findings related to student learning expectations and outcomes and the learning environment at Western Carolina University.

Administered to all first-time freshmen at Western in fall 2004, the Transition to College Inventory (TCI) (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2004b) underscored the first-year students’ desire to pursue an undergraduate education to launch a career (99%) and possibly prepare for graduate school (79%). Despite this strong desire, only 45% had decided on a career path at the time the inventory was administered. This finding presents an opportunity for the university to assist students with this important decision.

The 2004 administration of the Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2004c), a national survey developed by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), revealed that first-year WCU students were more satisfied with the amount of faculty contact they experienced, opportunities for community service, relevance of coursework to everyday life, and overall college experience than students at many of the 132 other colleges and universities that participated in the survey.
However, of the WCU freshman class, 45% of females and 47% of males reported that orientation did not prepare them for life at WCU. Approximately 33% of entering first-year students reported declaring a major during summer orientation, while 29% had not declared a major at the end of their first year; the remaining 15% and 14% reported declaring a major by the end of the fall semester and during the spring semester, respectively. Forty-four percent reported receiving guidance and advice about their educational program from a professor, and a significant number of males (67%) indicated that they were concerned about life after college. In sum, the survey indicated that, while students felt good about the academic experience early on, more program and career direction is needed in the first year.

Second-year students rate Career Services at WCU highly—this is clearly a program the QEP can build upon by introducing it to students earlier in their university experience. The 2004 Sophomore Institutional Evaluation (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2004a) was completed by 47% of Western sophomores, 94% of whom responded that opportunities for career assistance were good or excellent and 81% of whom rated overall career-related services as good or excellent. Both indicators reflected an increase from 77% on each rating in 2000. Ninety-eight percent indicated that faculty efforts to set high expectations for student learning were good or excellent and 91% reported that faculty members were good or excellent at encouraging them to be actively involved in learning, an increase of six points from 2000.

WCU participated in the administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) for first and fourth year students in 2001, 2004, and 2006 (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2006c). The NSSE data illustrate that while most students (87% of first-year students and 85% of seniors) evaluated their experience at WCU as good or excellent, students reported mixed results related to items that track closely to those behaviors we hope to impact with our QEP. Almost half (46%) of first-year students and nearly one-third (30%) of seniors reported, for example, that they only sometimes or never put together ideas from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions. Almost 60% of first-year and nearly half (47%) of seniors reported that they only sometimes or never talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor. One-third of first-year students and one-quarter of seniors reported that coursework emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences only very little or some of the time. Twenty percent of both first-year students and seniors reported that they had not yet decided or did not plan to participate in an experiential learning activity such as a practicum, co-op experience, field experience or clinical assignment during their college career. Additionally, almost two-thirds of first-year students and nearly half of seniors reported that they had not yet decided or did not plan to participate in a culminating educational experience such as a capstone course or senior project.

Internal Graduating Senior surveys also proved useful. Completed by 56% of graduates during the 2005-2006 academic year (Graduating Senior Survey for December 2005 - August 2006 at http://planning.wcu.edu/Assessment/Surveys/seniorsvy0506.htm), the data showed that WCU has an excellent faculty and staff to build upon but that graduates still under-perform in terms of beginning careers in comparison to national averages (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2006d). The data revealed that 91% of the seniors rated WCU faculty as good or excellent in encouraging them to be actively involved in their
learning, and the same percentage of seniors reported that WCU faculty, in general, were good or excellent at encouraging student-faculty interaction inside and outside of the classroom. Of the graduating students who reported using Career Services, 77% rated their experiences as good or excellent, and again approximately the same percentage perceived that the resources available to them (career and internship information) were good or excellent. Seventy percent reported that access to employment opportunities and assistance with résumé preparation was good or excellent. Of these same graduating seniors, 25% were unemployed at graduation, up from 23% the preceding year (Graduating Senior Survey for December 2003 - August 2004 at http://planning.wcu.edu/Assessment/Surveys/seniorsvy0304.htm), while 27% had already accepted a job. Of the latter group, 74% indicated that the job was in their major field of study; 96% felt that the overall quality of instruction in their major courses was excellent or good, as compared to 89% who rated the overall quality of instruction as good or excellent.

In a recent National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) study (2005 Career Services Benchmark Survey), an average of 49.8% of graduates for the 2003-2004 academic year had jobs at the time of commencement, approximately 22% higher than reported by Western’s graduating seniors (Graduating Senior Survey for December 2003 - August 2004). Only 18% of those surveyed at WCU planned to pursue graduate studies.

**Faculty Perspective**

Supplemental to the NSSE study, the first administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) was conducted at WCU in spring 2006. Results of the FSSE can be found at http://www.wcu.edu/assessment/FSSE2006.htm and comparisons of the 2006 NSSE and FSSE results are located at http://www.wcu.edu/assessment/NSSE-FSSE2006Comparisons.htm (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2006b). The FSSE results reveal strong underlying support for the primary initiatives we plan to address with the QEP. Eighty-five percent of faculty, for example, reported that it was important or very important for undergraduates to participate in experiential learning activities such as practica, co-op experiences, study abroad, etc. Eighty-one percent of faculty felt it was important or very important for undergraduates to complete a culminating senior experience. FSSE data also reveal where we can achieve substantive improvements with the QEP initiatives. For example, most faculty (more than 75%) reported spending very little time (four hours or less) in a typical seven-day week working with students on activities other than coursework or in other interactions with students outside of the classroom. Faculty teaching lower division courses reported that less than 25% of students talked with them at least once about career plans. Over half (53%) of faculty teaching lower division courses and 43% of faculty teaching upper division courses considered putting together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions to be either not important or only somewhat important. Similarly, 60% of faculty teaching lower division courses and 51% of faculty teaching upper division courses structured those courses only very little or some so that students learned and developed their understanding of themselves.

A faculty survey dealing with technology use conducted at WCU in 2002 (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning) indicated an academic culture that would support the innovation of the QEP’s Education Briefcase. Approximately 60% of faculty indicated that interactions between the faculty member and his or her students increased as a result of incorporating technology into teaching. Fifty percent of the faculty who
responded to the survey reported that active or engaged learning opportunities increased as a result of incorporating technology into their classes, and 42% felt their expectations of students’ performance increased as well. Finally, 46% of faculty reported that their teaching effectiveness increased because of computer technology.

**Retention and Graduation Rates**

The data cited above suggest that academic and co-curricular programs in place are working favorably for undergraduates at WCU. However, the survey results also reveal some weakness in student academic and career planning. In light of this weakness, it is not surprising that the university needs to improve in terms of retention and graduation rates. In a recent comparison of institutions designated as peers of Western Carolina University used by the WCU Office for Institutional Research and Planning, the graduation rate for Western students was 48.9%, compared with the peer group average of 53.9% ([http://planning.wcu.edu/peers/summary%202006.xls](http://planning.wcu.edu/peers/summary%202006.xls)). Additional comparisons of peer institutions selected by NSSE based on our Carnegie Classification and of institutions that were self-selected through our decision to be part of the American Democracy Project (ADP) consortium are included in Table 1.
### Table 1: College Retention Rates by Carnegie and American Democracy Project Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Retention Rate F05-F06</th>
<th>Graduation Rate (6 year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WCU</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Peers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Missouri State U.</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Washington U.</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State U.</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair State U.</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Connecticut State U.</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois U. - Edwardsville</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Wisconsin – Oshkosh</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP Peers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-South Bend</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Kokomo</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Richard Stockton College of NJ</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Iowa</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina Aiken</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky University</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although WCU does not stand out negatively in peer group comparisons, the university is near the bottom of the 16-campus University of North Carolina system in terms of retention and graduation, as seen in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
<th>4-Yr Graduation Rate</th>
<th>6-Yr Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNC-CH</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSU</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCW</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCC</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCG</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCA</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCU</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSU</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSU</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSU</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSA</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA&amp;T</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCP</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WCU</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention and graduation rate data suggest that undergraduates at WCU, despite good academic and co-curricular programs, still do not persist or graduate at a rate the student responses to individual programs would suggest. The QEP will encourage students to link these various programs and experiences into a coherent learning plan - a pathway toward intentional learning and matriculation. The learning goals presented in the QEP are designed to foster the development and completion of such a learning plan.

**Learning Outcomes**

Western’s QEP will encourage students to align their disjointed experiences into a coherent whole that has focus and direction. Students will be expected to apply synthesis throughout the university experience, from understanding as a first-year student to evaluation as a graduating student. Specific, measurable learning outcomes will occur through on-going compilation of the Education Briefcase and the collection of data related to student outcomes in the QEP pilot USI course and major-level courses. The overarching goal of synthesis learning is for students to integrate knowledge and skills from academic and co-curricular experiences and become intentional participants in their learning and career plans. Specifically, students will:

1. identify their aptitudes, abilities, and interests and articulate their future goals and aspirations;
1. modify behaviors and values in response to knowledge and skills gained from their academic and co-curricular experiences; and
2. recognize the synthesis of their university experiences and evaluate those experiences relative to their future education and career plans.

Table 3: Synthesis - A Pathway to Intentional Learning offers an outline of the key learning goals, outcomes, and behaviors or activities for the QEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are we trying to effect in our students? (Learning Goals)</th>
<th>What do intentional learners do/know/value? (Learning Outcomes)</th>
<th>How will they demonstrate what they know/do/value? (Key Behaviors/Activities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Understanding of Self                                        | Students will identify their aptitudes, abilities, and interests and articulate their future goals and aspirations. | • Complete a realistic self-appraisal.  
• Evaluate and explore career opportunities.  
• Develop career, education, and personal goals.  
• Develop preliminary career and degree plans. |
| Flexibility/Versatility                                      | Students will modify behaviors and values in response to knowledge and skills gained from their academic and co-curricular experiences. | • Select and participate in co-curricular experiences consistent with their goals and interests.  
• Select a major (and concentration, minor, and, if necessary, a second major) and develop a degree plan.  
• Reflect on what has been most useful, interesting, and challenging in their academic and co-curricular experiences.  
• Refine their career and degree plans relative to new knowledge and skills. |
| Integrated Learning                                          | Students will recognize the synthesis of their university experiences and evaluate those experiences relative to their future education and career plans. | • Re-examine their self-appraisal.  
• Articulate the value of setting goals.  
• Reflect on their university experiences  
• Articulate how those experiences furthered their goals.  
• Make connections between their academic experiences, co-curricular experiences, and their future plans.  
• Prepare a career package (cover letters, personal statements, résumés) for employment or graduate school. |
Development

Conceptualization of the Plan

Two significant events occurred during the 2004-2005 academic year that galvanized the development of the Quality Enhancement Plan at Western Carolina University. The first, a five-hour leadership retreat held on September 23, 2004, was attended by more than 100 faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Hosted by Chancellor John Bardo and Troy Barksdale, then Director of University Planning at WCU, this retreat introduced the concept of the Quality Enhancement Plan as an important new element of the SACS reaffirmation process and it opened discussions on potential topics. The retreat agenda included four presentations by three administrators external to WCU who were knowledgeable about the new SACS reaffirmation process and the QEP in particular: Ephraim Schecter, formerly director of University Planning and Analysis at North Carolina State University (Schecter, 2004a; Schecter, 2004b), Houston Davis at Austin Peay State University (Davis, 2004), and Teresa Summers from Louisiana State University (Summers, 2004). Presentations by the director of WCU’s 1996 SACS Self-Study, Frank Prochaska (Prochaska, 2004), and Troy Barksdale (Barksdale, 2004) framed the context for discussions by providing information about WCU’s mission, the institution’s past and current characteristics, and future challenges and opportunities. More than 150 potential topics were generated during the brainstorming session facilitated by Newton Smith, then Chair of the Faculty. These topics were subsequently clustered into 23 general themes and used later in the QEP development process (WCU-SACS Leadership Retreat, 2004).

The University Mission

The second major initiative impacting the QEP’s development was Chancellor Bardo’s charge to the University’s Strategic Planning Committee to review the institutional mission and to make recommendations for a revised mission statement. As a focused growth institution within the UNC system, WCU encounters many challenges as well as opportunities that significantly impact the institution’s ability to serve our constituents and effectively fulfill our mission. A thorough review of the current mission, last approved in 2002, and the proposal of a new mission, accompanying vision, core values, strategic directions and goals resulted from the work of the Strategic Planning Committee during the 2005-2006 Academic Year (Western Carolina University, 2006a; Western Carolina University, 2006b).

Western Carolina University’s revised mission statement provides direction for the institution to prepare students to be successful academically and personally through opportunities for engaged learning, experiential education, and service. The most recent review of the mission, which took place during the 2005-2006 academic year, emphasizes the importance of integrating the whole college experience:

---

1 Focused Growth Institutions – seven public institutions in North Carolina identified in 1998 as having excess physical capacity and smaller enrollments agreed to pursue aggressive enrollment growth of 20% or more by 2003. The institutions received special funding and support provided by the General Assembly and the UNC Office of the President to develop comprehensive enrollment growth plans, improve instruction, develop new academic programs, promote greater operating efficiencies, enhance development offices, strengthen facilities management capabilities, and reduce additional stresses on campus services associated with enrollment growth.
Western Carolina University creates engaged learning opportunities that incorporate teaching, research and service through residential, distance education and international experiences. The University focuses its academic programs, educational outreach, research and creative activities, and cultural opportunities to improve individual lives and enhance economic and community development in the region, state, and nation. (Western Carolina University, 2006a)

The mission of the university is based on its espoused core values:

The University prepares students to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens in a global community. By working independently, collaboratively, and in teams, graduates of the University should demonstrate:

- Integrity, critical thinking, problem-solving, and both written and oral communication skills;
- Proficient and responsible use of information and technology;
- Appreciation for the arts, sciences, humanities, and technologies;
- Intellectual competence and professional and technical skills; and
- Continued personal development and lifelong learning.

To encourage and protect the free and open interchange of ideas, the University strives to provide experiences that foster the development of respect among all its members toward the larger communities of which it is a part. Accordingly, the University encourages its students, faculty, and staff to display the following traits of citizenship:

- behavior characterized by honesty, integrity, and responsibility;
- service to others;
- awareness of and sensitivity to the concerns of diverse people and cultures; and
- commitment to stewardship of the natural and cultural environment (Western Carolina University, 2006b).

The revision of the mission statement and the development of the Quality Enhancement Plan are connected in several ways. First, several faculty, staff, and administrators who served on the QEP and Strategic Planning Committees injected relevant information to each process. Second, early in the process and several times thereafter, the Director of the SACS Review met with the Strategic Planning Committee to discuss the relationships between institutional mission, strategic planning, budgeting, assessment, and the QEP. Third, several documents were used jointly to guide and inform both processes: the internal and external scanning documents produced for the revision of the mission in 2002 and 2005 (Western Carolina University Strategic Planning Committee, 2001a; 2001b; 2005a; 2005b); the list of potential QEP Topics produced at the Leadership Retreat held on September 23, 2004 (WCU-SACS Leadership Retreat, 2004); University Fact Books (Western Carolina University, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2006a); and various assessment results presented previously.
Quality Enhancement Plan Committee

The Quality Enhancement Plan Committee, composed of faculty, staff, administrators, and one student, was established in December 2004 with input from the Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellors, SACS Director, Deans, and several Department Heads and Directors (Burton, 2006). Letters of invitation to serve on the QEP Committee were distributed in early January 2005. The SACS Director then trained committee members in the SACS reaffirmation and QEP processes in February 2005 (Burton, 2005). Co-chairs Brian Railsback, Professor of English and Dean of the Honors College, and Scott Philyaw, Associate Professor of History and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, were selected in early March by the Provost and the Director of the SACS Review. The committee met for the first time on March 22, 2005 to formulate strategies for developing the QEP. The QEP Committee met throughout the summer and fall of 2005 to develop, review and refine the QEP topic, solicit input, and update the university community on potential topics (Western Carolina University QEP Committee, 2006).

Selection of the QEP Topic

During the final weeks of the spring semester of 2005 the QEP Committee issued campus-wide emails about the QEP process. All members of the Quality Enhancement Plan Committee conducted visits to more than 30 academic, extracurricular, and student groups, as well as WCU’s Board of Trustees, Staff Forum, University Advisory Council (UAC), Council of Deans, Faculty Senate, and student Honors College Board to discuss the concept of the QEP and to solicit ideas on potential areas of focus for enhancing student learning (WCU QEP Committee, 2005a). The unit discussions were based on guiding principles established by SACS (WCU QEP Committee, 2005b) and those discussions resulted in the development of a master document that reflects the collective wisdom and professional judgment of faculty, students, staff, administrators, alumni, and Board of Trustees members (WCU QEP Committee, 2005c). The QEP Committee synthesized the master document into 20 potential QEP topics after eliciting feedback from the university community (WCU QEP Committee, 2005d). Throughout the process of refining the topic, the recurring themes of student and faculty engagement, community service and experiential learning, study abroad experiences, and application of knowledge emerged.

The theme that guided the work of the committee in the summer of 2005 was: From students to educated citizens: learning through engagement (enhancing student learning by application of knowledge, experiential education, and professional endeavor in a regional and global community). In October 2005, after input from the university community, the QEP Committee proposed the following revision for Western’s QEP: Academic Engagement Inside and Outside the University (AEIOU). Sub-committees were formed to investigate four areas identified as keys to implementing AEIOU: academic and co-curricular programs, service learning, faculty development, and careers/internships/co-ops. The sub-committees’ charge to connect the classroom or on-campus experience with the wider community was achieved by raising and addressing the following questions for each of the four areas:

1. How does this engagement activity positively impact student learning?
2. How can this impact be assessed in terms of student learning outcomes?
3. How does this activity relate to the university mission and strategic plan?
4. What resources are needed to increase positive student learning in relation to this engagement activity?

In November 2005, Dr. Ann Chard, the SACS Liaison from the Commission on Colleges for Western Carolina University, visited the campus to provide feedback on our SACS Review progress and respond to questions from members of the SACS Committees, faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Dr. Chard’s feedback was clear regarding the QEP: the current version was too broad and unnecessarily complicated. The QEP Committee revised its earlier draft after a series of discussions on the purpose of desired QEP outcomes. Building upon these revisions the Provost, SACS Director, and QEP Co-chairs identified synthesis as a potential focusing element. The QEP Committee continued its review and revision through several meetings as the early stages of the synthesis model evolved into the present topic. The implementation plan for the QEP, presented in the next section, was developed in the summer and fall of 2006 by a sub-committee of the QEP Committee.
Implementation

Western Carolina University’s Quality Enhancement Plan is an enhancement of several on-going campus operations coordinating previously disjointed aspects of students’ academic and co-curricular activities. Relating learning outcomes to synthesis and developing campus-wide attention to synthesis learning comprise the enhancement. Under the coordinating authority of the Office of the Provost and the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP links several campus support offices traditionally treated as separate in mission, services offered, and administrative structure. As the implementation of the QEP integrates the work of these various campus offices it will serve as an example of the kind of synthesis thinking and learning we aim to foster among students.

Planning and reflection will reinforce intentionality. The longitudinal and complementary nature of these activities will anchor students’ increased understanding and appreciation for synthesis. University faculty and staff will systematically alert students to various synthesis experiences; promote the value of synthesis; encourage student participation; and, through student reflection, deepen understanding of synthesis.

The areas that will initially experience the greatest impact of the QEP are student orientation, advising, academic departments that volunteer to be in the pilot study, the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and Career Services. As students progress through the university, the key areas of student recruitment/orientation (introduce synthesis), advising and special courses (reinforce the synthesis concept), and Career Services (apply synthesis learning to student plans at graduation and beyond) will be critical. The Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will serve a central role in training faculty and staff on the integration of synthesis activities within coursework, advising, and other departmental activities; the Center will also continually introduce the plan to new faculty members as the pilot study expands to several departments or other units.

There are four key components for the implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan:

I. Oversight of the Plan
II. Training of Faculty and Staff
III. Learning Outcomes
IV. QEP Pilot Study

I. Oversight of the Plan

Administrative oversight of the QEP will be under the direction of the Office of the Provost. A Project Manager for the QEP (half-time faculty or administrative staff position, reporting to the Provost) will chair a Quality Enhancement Plan Implementation Committee and will appoint chairs for sub-committees that emerge from the larger group. The entire QEP Implementation Committee will meet at least once a semester, or more frequently as needed. The following figure represents campus constituencies that tie into the synthesis plan and that will have representation on the Implementation Committee.
Working with the Provost, academic deans, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Project Manager will form a committee consisting of:

- Director of Assessment
- Director of Institutional Research and Planning
- Chair of the Faculty Senate or designee
- One-two faculty representatives from each of the academic colleges. Faculty representatives will be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the college dean.
- A Student Affairs Division representative (Vice Chancellor’s appointment)
- Director of the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
- New Faculty Fellow of the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (Curriculum Design Specialist)
• Associate Chief Information Officer, IT Division
• Director of Orientation
• Director of Advising and Student Success
• Director of Career Services
• Director of International Programs
• Coordinator of USI 130
• Two students (appointed by the QEP Committee)
• Director or Associate Director of Service Learning
• A representative from Residential Living appointed by the Director of Residence Life
• A representative from the Graduate School appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School.

The Project Manager and the members of the committee may opt to alter the size of the committee as they deem necessary. The committee will advise and assist the Chancellor and Provost on the QEP implementation and oversight. Specific areas of emphasis by the committee include:
• faculty and staff training in preparation for the QEP;
• phasing in the QEP and meeting deadlines set forth in the plan;
• monitoring the use of resources and the budget set forth in the plan;
• assessing the implementation and success of the plan;
• recommending adjustments to the plan as a result of ongoing internal and external assessment;
• preparing for the next SACS review of the plan, including writing the five-year Impact Report, based on assessment of the plan’s implementation; and
• creation of a training/resource manual and coordination of training activities with the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

The committee will establish sub-committees in the following areas:
• QEP IT Services Sub-Committee: charged with working with the Implementation Committee and specifically creating and monitoring the Education Briefcase, co-curricular transcript, assessment tools, QEP Web site, and other aspects of the QEP requiring technological solutions/infrastructure;
• QEP Assessment Sub-Committee: charged with assessing the implementation and success of the plan, and making recommendations for improving the plan.

The Project Manager will establish additional sub-committees as necessary.

II. Training of Faculty and Staff

The role of the Faculty Center will be critical in the implementation of synthesis learning for the QEP. The Center’s role will be to assist with faculty and advisor training and the integration of synthesis content and learning activities into syllabi and curricula for specially designed USI and major courses. The Center will also assist adopter departments create appropriate cognitive learning outcomes relevant to the department major and the QEP learning outcomes; the QEP Committee and the Center will enhance this effort with outside consultants or a review panel. A curriculum design specialist will conduct research, provide resources, and lead
training on synthesis. In addition, summer retreats devoted to the QEP (led by selected faculty from an early adopter department) will facilitate the incorporation of synthesis learning into the curriculum. These retreats will be modeled on the Center’s summer retreats already in place. Faculty workshops and a Faculty Learning Community will be sponsored during the academic year and synthesis-related activities will also be integrated into other Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning events.

In consultation with the QEP Implementation Committee, the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will support the:

- development of a training/resource manual based on the QEP for faculty and staff;
- selection of campus personnel who will assist in QEP training;
- emphasis of on-going training of key personnel (such as advisors and new faculty participants as the pilot expands) on the QEP; and
- identification of relevant consultants and advisors external to WCU to enhance training efforts.

### III. Learning Outcomes

Table 4: WCU’s Pathway to Synthesis Learning, illustrates students’ progress through the QEP and the connection of learning outcomes to general timeframes in undergraduate life. The map includes a listing of assessable artifacts related to learning outcomes that would be created under the guidance of course instructors from the first year to the senior year. While not all traditional undergraduates might follow this path so neatly, the process map suggests the typical trend. Following the process map are discussions of key support areas for the QEP, including the Education Briefcase, instructors, advisors, and a variety of support offices across WCU.

#### Table 4: WCU’s Pathway to Synthesis Learning

**Overarching learning goal of the QEP:** In synthesis learning, students will integrate knowledge and skills from their academic and co-curricular experiences to become intentional participants in their learning and career plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th>Fourth Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Students will identify their aptitudes, abilities, and interests and articulate their future goals and aspirations.</td>
<td>Students will modify behaviors and values in response to knowledge and skills gained from their academic and co-curricular experiences.</td>
<td>Students will recognize the synthesis of their university experiences and evaluate those experiences relative to their future education and career plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will:</td>
<td>Students will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• formulate a learning plan;</td>
<td>• connect the academic and student life components of their experience;</td>
<td>• communicate the connections;</td>
<td>• review and revise their learning plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrate synthesis.</td>
<td>• refine their learning plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (data collection points)</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th>Fourth Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In USI 130, students will be led through prompts to:</td>
<td>In 200-level major course, students will be led through prompts to:</td>
<td>In 300-level major course, students will be led through prompts to:</td>
<td>In 400-level major capstone course, students will be led through prompts to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• do a realistic self appraisal;</td>
<td>• re-examine their self appraisal;</td>
<td>• re-examine their self appraisal;</td>
<td>• prepare an extended career package for employment or graduate school;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• write out their life goals (include personal and educational goals);</td>
<td>• re-examine their life goals;</td>
<td>• re-examine their life goals;</td>
<td>• re-examine their self appraisal/life goals;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• develop an educational plan to achieve their career/graduate plans;</td>
<td>• revise their educational goals;</td>
<td>• revise their educational goals;</td>
<td>• revise their career plan with an essay about changes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identify career choices based on assessment of interests, values, skills, and abilities;</td>
<td>• revise their career plan with an accompanying essay about changes;</td>
<td>• revise their career plan with an essay about changes;</td>
<td>• revise their career plan with an essay about changes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• articulate the relationship between academic and co-curricular experiences;</td>
<td>• revise their educational plan with a personal assessment about what has been most useful, most challenging, and most interesting;</td>
<td>• revise their educational plan with a personal assessment about what has been most useful, most challenging, and most interesting;</td>
<td>• revise their educational plans with a personal assessment about what has been most useful, most challenging, and most interesting;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• articulate a rationale for the selection of academic major, co-curricular experiences, and career choices;</td>
<td>• write a proposal or application for a co-op/internship or international experience that incorporates knowledge obtained in a variety of course work and knowledge and experience gained outside class;</td>
<td>• write a proposal or application for a co-op/internship or relevant co-curricular activity that incorporates knowledge obtained in academic work and knowledge gained outside class;</td>
<td>• write an essay about how their beliefs have changed and why;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• make use of campus resources.</td>
<td>• participate in co-op/internship, study abroad, or service learning activities.</td>
<td>• participate in co-op/internships or other relevant activities.</td>
<td>• write an essay reflecting and evaluating how their university experience prepares them for post-graduation plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SYNTHESIS: A PATHWAY TO INTENTIONAL LEARNING AT WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th>Fourth Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable artifacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessable artifacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessable artifacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessable artifacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-appraisals</td>
<td>• Goal statements</td>
<td>• Goal statements</td>
<td>• Career package materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goal statements</td>
<td>• Essays on career and educational plans/reflective narratives</td>
<td>• Essays on career and educational plans/reflective narratives</td>
<td>• Career and educational plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflection statement on internship/co-op experience, study abroad experience, or other co-curricular activities</td>
<td>• Internship/co-op experience or reflection statement on relevant co-curricular activities</td>
<td>• Essays/reflective narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Role of the Education Briefcase

The Education Briefcase (EB) will support the pathway charted previously as a collaborative space where students and university personnel share information to facilitate the holistic, personal development of each student’s educational career. The EB will be an electronic portal that supports student planning and reflection mentored by instructors and advisors. Students will use the EB to chart their educational progress, social activities, experiential learning, and future educational/career plans. Advisors and instructors will use the additional information available in the EB to understand more fully the student’s total education to better advise and guide a student through decision-making processes.

The briefcase will be a repository for sharing learning plans, résumés, academic and co-curricular transcripts, templates, questions and suggestions from advisors, student reflections/essays on university activities, and other synthesis-related documentation. Access to the student’s EB will be restricted to assigned instructors, advisors and career counselors, and university personnel assisting in assessing sample briefcases.

The Education Briefcase will be the literal manifestation of the student’s learning plan and will include information that reflects the evolution of the student’s plan as degree and associated experiential objectives are completed. The EB provides the advisor, student, faculty member, or staff person with information to assist in the formation of a student’s educational experience. Items automatically included in the EB will include:

- information on high school activities and interests from each student’s application to WCU;
- information from Orientation’s CatWalk on possible majors and other interests;
- data from the Personality Mosaic for students who complete it as part of orientation;
- student papers or other work indicative of a student’s interests in majors and careers submitted from USI instructors;
- reports, job descriptions, reflections, and other relevant materials for student internships and co-ops included from Career Services;
- résumé (updated regularly);
- links to the student’s co-curricular transcripts, the Leadership Program, and other activities submitted from Students Affairs;
- a student’s reflection essays, job descriptions, and other documents generated for service learning activities submitted by the Service Learning Department;
- reflection papers and other documents generated by study abroad experiences;
The Role of Instructors

The mentored reflection and instruction necessary for students to begin working in the synthesis concept will occur in the first semester at WCU through modified sections of USI. Upon declaring their major, students will take courses in the major that have been modified to accommodate the QEP learning objectives. Instructors involved in the QEP, beginning with early adopters in the pilot study, will receive training in the summer before working with students and shorter follow-up training sessions afterward. Early adopter faculty will in turn work with the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to train other instructors added as the QEP expands from the pilot study.

While faculty members in 200- and 300-level courses will reinforce the synthesis concept introduced in USI 130, the 400-level capstone experience will also be critical. Many WCU programs require some type of culminating academic experience. These include activities as varied as capstone courses, internships, public performances and presentations, research projects, and other activities depending upon discipline. The Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will support academic programs with resources and training as needed to enhance such capstone experiences in relation to the learning objectives of the QEP. Students will be provided with opportunities to offer a public presentation of their synthesis experiences.

The Role of Advisors

Using the materials collected in the Education Briefcase, advisors will confer individually with students (initially, those students in the pilot) about learning plans and the synthesis concept to reinforce instructors’ work in USI courses. Upon declaration of a major, students will confer with advisors in the major to integrate academic and co-curricular experiences along with other activities that prepare undergraduates for graduation and beyond.

The Role of Co-Curricular and Support Offices

Admissions

As the initial point of contact, Admissions recruiters and counselors will introduce the concept of synthesis to prospective students and their caregivers, as well as high school and community college faculty and staff. Initially, recruiters will be trained to introduce the synthesis concept to prospective students who indicate an interest in a major offered by early adopter academic departments. Letters and brochures that define the synthesis concept will support this effort.
Orientation

The Orientation Program introduces new students to the college classroom and will set the tone for synthesis’ enhancement of learning. Orientation staff, including student counselors, faculty, and administrators, will introduce the synthesis concept to new students and their caregivers. QEP implementation will capitalize on existing elements of orientation and will foster the development of new initiatives, such as teaching students to make connections between curricular and co-curricular experiences, providing them with real-life examples of integrated learning and its benefits, and fostering self-awareness by administering career and personality inventories. Special orientation sessions will be arranged for first-year students who indicate an interest in a major offered by an academic department in the QEP pilot project.

Information Technology (IT) Services

Instructors and advisors will use the Education Briefcase to monitor academic and co-curricular progress of students; the QEP IT Services Sub-Committee will monitor progress of the electronic aspects of the plan and coordinate IT support for the EB. WCU, as part of its technology infrastructure upgrade, is actively creating systems to support student, faculty, advisor, and career counselor interaction. We anticipate the adoption of Microsoft’s Share Point portal system in conjunction with existing enterprise systems. A new staff position will be created to maintain and manage access to the shared Education Briefcase. Upon full implementation all students will have an Education Briefcase that is accessible by students, their advisors, and select faculty members, staff members, and career counselors.

Service Learning

The mission of the Service Learning Department is to promote service learning as a special form of experiential education where students engage in organized activities designed to enhance their intellectual, social, and personal development while meeting community needs. Service Learning administrators and faculty fellows will be trained in the principles of synthesis to enhance existing efforts to focus students’ attention on integrating academic and community service experiences with career plans. The Service Learning Department currently promotes integrated learning by encouraging and assisting faculty to combine academic goals with civic, social, and career-related goals through the service learning component of courses. Service Learning faculty fellows assist their faculty colleagues in using service learning reflection effectively. Through structured reflection, students think about, discuss, and document knowledge, skills, attitude changes, and accomplishments resulting from service experiences in relation to coursework. This reflection process, already in place, will support the QEP as Service Learning personnel mentor students who create reflection artifacts for the Education Briefcase.

The Service Learning Department will produce a Reflection Manual primarily for faculty use. Detailed reflection procedures, activities, and assessment criteria related to the QEP will be included in the manual.

Undergraduate Research

Mentored research or creative work at the undergraduate level, encouraged at WCU for many years, requires students to synthesize several skills including research methodology, written communication, and public presentation. Students currently present their research in a variety of local, regional, and national venues including the National Conference on
Undergraduate Research. In 2006, WCU was second in the nation in the number of student presentations at this conference.

Faculty and staff will expect students to participate in mentored research and public presentations in venues such as department symposia, public presentations, and local, regional, and national research conferences. WCU’s Honors College will continue to encourage and support mentored research by allocating funds to underwrite a campus Undergraduate Research Expo, WCU’s participation in the National Conference on Undergraduate Research, the Undergraduate Projects Grant Program, and printing the publication *Imagine* to highlight such endeavors.

Undergraduate research or creative work has a natural connection to the objectives of the QEP as students will be expected to participate in mentored research and connect such activity to the evolving learning plan contained in the Education Briefcase. As more departments phase into full implementation, there may be an opportunity to modify the existing Undergraduate Expo so that students enrolled in specially designed capstone courses will have a public venue to present culminating synthesis projects.

**Office of International Programs**

The Office of International Programs, which has hosted nearly 1,000 students in Study Abroad advising sessions since 2001, is well prepared to incorporate the synthesis concept in advising meetings with students. Advisors in International Programs already work closely with study abroad students to ensure that their experiences tie back to WCU coursework and student degree plans. Also, in reviewing applicants for study abroad, staff members consider the student’s total university experience (courses, major plans, and co-curricular activities).

**Career Services**

Using the Education Briefcase, counselors in Career Services will guide students in the formation of their career plans and translate those plans into specific outcomes (job or graduate school applications). Students will be able to see how their social and academic activities have prepared them for related employment and/or graduate school opportunities. With guidance, students will be able to create the documents needed (résumés, cover letters, etc.). If this process begins in the sophomore or junior year, students will have an opportunity prior to graduation to reflect on and enhance areas that might need additional development.

The co-op/internship opportunity for students is an excellent synthesis activity coordinated by Career Services and select academic departments. As students participate in a job or activity directly related to their major, they have a focused opportunity to draw on their university experiences and apply these to the field. After their experiences, students return to the university with an understanding of what they need to know and how that knowledge contributes to their educational and career goals.

Advisors, Career Services staff, and department faculty (initially in pilot departments) will encourage students to participate in on- and off-campus internships and co-ops that support students’ academic and career goals. Career counselors will review student reflection essays and employer evaluations and ensure that these artifacts are added to the Education Briefcase.
IV. QEP Pilot Study and Expansion

While the QEP will provide a context for synthesis learning at WCU through faculty, staff, and advisor training, as well as the Education Briefcase, a pilot study will allow phased implementation of the QEP initiatives informed by assessment processes and student learning. Initially, the pilot will serve as a model to assess QEP learning outcomes and related cognitive learning outcomes developed by adopter departments, evaluate the effectiveness of mentored reflection, and create recommendations for faculty members participating in the pilot. Outside consultants or external review panels will help the assessment of adopter department progress and, in the third year, the progress of the entire QEP. Depending on assessment of the pilot, the QEP Implementation Committee will make recommendations for expanding or adjusting the model as it moves from the pilot phase to the mainstream. The expansion of participating departments will, in early phases, be voluntary; it is recognized that other approaches to synthesis may emerge over time as the Implementation Committee continues to manage the QEP.

The QEP Pilot Study

The pilot study serves several needs identified by the QEP Committee in addition to needs ascertained through feedback from the Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate members, and other university constituents. Table 5 and the following Timeline outline the pilot study.
### Table 5: QEP Pilot Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th>Fourth Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QEP Learning Objective(s)</strong></td>
<td>1: Students identify aptitudes, abilities, and interests and articulate future goals and aspirations.</td>
<td>2: Students modify behaviors and values in response to knowledge and skills gained from academic and co-curricular experiences.</td>
<td>2-3: QEP Objective 2, and students recognize and evaluate the synthesis of university experiences relative to future education and career plans.</td>
<td>3: Students recognize and evaluate the synthesis of university experiences relative to future education and career plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course</strong></td>
<td>USI 130; fall term for pilot study</td>
<td>200-level major gateway; fall term for pilot study</td>
<td>300-level mid-major course selected by department; fall term for pilot study</td>
<td>400-level major capstone course; fall term for pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structured activities related to QEP Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Students will: • create Education Briefcase (EB); • do mentored reflection of EB (student/instructor or conferences); • write self appraisal for EB; • write life goals statement (personal, educational, career); articulating academic and co-curricular connections for EB; • write rationale for selection of major/minor (EB); • identify career choice based on assessment of interests, values, and abilities (EB).</td>
<td>Students will: • revise Education Briefcase (EB) materials; • evaluate EB materials (student/instructor conferences); • revise student self-appraisal for EB; • revise life goals statement for EB; • write proposal or application for service learning project, internship, study abroad plan, or undergraduate research/creative project (EB); • write statement reflecting on total university experience and how it helped in writing proposal/application; statement may include reflection on internship, study abroad, service, or research/creative activities already completed (EB).</td>
<td>Students will: • revise EB materials (self-appraisal, life goals statement); • evaluate EB materials (student/instructor conferences); • write or revise proposals or applications as in 200-level course; • write statement reflecting on how university experience to date has enhanced progress toward graduate or career objectives (EB); • write statement projecting what university experiences are yet needed to further graduate school or career objectives (EB).</td>
<td>Students will: • revise EB materials (final self-appraisal, life goals statement); • prepare cover letters, résumés, and application materials for graduate school or career (EB); • present culminating undergraduate research/creative work for public presentation at university or external conferences (EB); • present “What I Learned, Where I’m Going” (synthesis statement) for capstone seminar, which synthesizes academic and co-curricular experiences and ties these to graduate/career plans (EB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable artifacts</strong></td>
<td>• sampling of EBs • written appraisal and essays</td>
<td>• sampling of EBs • revised materials, applications, statements</td>
<td>• sampling of EBs • revised materials, applications, statements</td>
<td>• sampling of EBs • cover letters, résumés, and other materials for graduate/career plans • culminating research/creative presentation • synthesis statement/presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessable artifacts:**
- sampling of EBs
- revised EB materials
- written statements
- evaluations by academic and external evaluators of student internship experiences (if internship is completed)
Time line

**2007-09:**
- Initial department volunteers for pilot study identified (no later than May 2007)
- QEP Project Manager named (summer 2007)
- QEP Implementation Committee formed (fall 2007)
- Initial faculty members for pilot study are trained in a summer 2008 workshop
- Professional advisors trained in a spring workshop
- Education Briefcase technology in place for three pilot USI courses (no later than July 2008)
- Three special sections of USI 130 taught in fall 2008; these will be populated with first-year students who have indicated/declared a major in a volunteer pilot department
- First department in the pilot identifies 200, 300, and 400-level courses for study and modifies curricula and cognitive learning outcomes in those courses to accommodate QEP learning outcomes
- Two additional departments volunteer for pilot
- *Estimated number of student participants for first year: 60-70 first-year students*

**2009-10:**
- Assessment report for USI 130s; six sections taught in fall 2009
- Special 200-level courses taught in fall 2009
- Training of faculty from two new departments proceeds throughout year
- New departments identify/modify curricula/related cognitive learning outcomes for participating 200, 300, and 400-level courses
- On-going assessment of USI 130 as more courses added
- Two more departments volunteer for pilot by spring 2008
- First 200 level courses assessed; report in spring 2009
- Three departments offer 200 and 300-level courses in fall 2009
- Request for Proposal for new approaches to the QEP in early fall 2009; awards made in spring 2010 for implementation in 2010-11
- *Estimated number of student participants for second year: 120 first-year students; 30 sophomores*

**2010-11**
- Ten sections of USI taught in fall 2010
- Process described above continues with a total of five departments participating
- Based on assessment, QEP Implementation Committee creates a standard program from pilot models; more departments invited to participate
- First alternate model(s) based on grant awards implemented
- The QEP is assessed internally (QEP Assessment Sub-committee) and by an outside review panel (including external consultants)
- Based on internal and external assessment, QEP Committee makes recommendations for continuation of model(s), expansion, adoption by other departments, and projected number of participating departments from 2011 to 2014
• Estimated number of student participants for third year: 200 first-year students; 75 sophomores; 45 juniors

Training

Faculty members and department support staff in the volunteer department(s) will all be trained in the QEP in special summer training sessions and sessions throughout the academic year. These will be organized by the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

Faculty Compensation and Evaluation

• Faculty members will receive a stipend for participation in the summer seminar.
• Faculty members who teach a course in the QEP will receive a research allotment for each course taught (money can be spent on travel, books, or equipment related to professional development).
• Faculty continuation in the program will be guided by performance feedback evaluations administered at the end of each course; the evaluations will be used for assessment in the QEP only and not for annual faculty evaluation or tenure, promotion, and reappointment purposes although faculty have the option of including QEP feedback in their regular evaluation documents. Decisions based on the evaluations will be determined by the QEP Implementation Committee (or a designated sub-committee) in consultation with the faculty member.

Conclusion: A Case Study

A view of QEP implementation is offered by following a hypothetical student, Karen, through the proposed plan.

Karen is introduced to the concepts of synthesis and the WCU Quality Enhancement Plan by an Admissions recruiter. She is approached with this information by the recruiter because she has indicated an interest in one of the majors in a department that has volunteered to be an early adopter in the QEP, for example, the English Department. At summer orientation, she is reminded of the QEP concept at a special session; Karen confirms she is still interested in English as a major.

In fall 2008, Karen is enrolled in one of three specially designed USI 130 courses for prospective English majors. In this one-hour course, the synthesis concept is reinforced and Karen works with her instructor to create several artifacts for the Education Briefcase related to her learning plan. Karen begins to think of her university experiences, from social activity to coursework, as interconnected. She is assigned a professional advisor who will support what she is learning in USI 130. She also enrolls in a special section of “Jumpstart.” Though Jumpstart, a non-credit course preceding the term that introduces freshmen to relevant technology, is already in place, Karen’s class has been modified to introduce the Education Briefcase. In the spring term she declares English as her major (consulting with her professional advisor) and then is advised by a QEP-trained advisor in the English Department. She continues to add artifacts to her EB in consultation with her new advisor.

In fall 2009, Karen enrolls in a special gateway course to the major: English 303 (Introduction to Professional Writing). Along with regular course content, Karen is encouraged
to maintain her EB, which her instructor periodically reviews, by adding special writing assignments. As she explores activities at the university that reinforce her major and career goals, she becomes interested in a minor in Spanish, study abroad and service learning. Her instructor directs her to meet with QEP-trained counselors in International Programs and Service Learning. Because she plans to be a journalist, she decides to write press releases for a non-profit organization in the community. Meeting with a Study Abroad counselor, she realizes that although she cannot manage a full year away, she can opt for a summer program in Mexico to reinforce her Spanish minor.

In fall 2010, she takes a special section of English 306 (Creative Nonfiction) where the instructor, after reviewing her EB, encourages her to continue her successful service work with the non-profit organization. In addition, she works on an assignment in class designed for presentation at the Undergraduate Expo on campus in the spring of 2011. She also submits an abstract to the National Conference on Undergraduate Research but it is not accepted. Her instructor and advisor, reviewing the evolving goals Karen has added to her EB, encourage Karen to go to the Career Center. There, another QEP-trained staff member reviews her EB and they decide she should apply for a summer co-op (English 389). Karen also uses her EB materials to apply for a position with the campus newspaper. Given Karen’s hope to work for a newspaper in North Carolina, she applies to co-ops near her hometown in the Charlotte area. She finds a co-op with a magazine and works there throughout the summer of 2011.

Because Karen did a capstone experience with her English 389 course, she does not take a QEP course in the fall of 2011. Prompted by the career counselor with whom she has been working and her department advisor, she continues to develop her EB. Karen has already learned that the artifacts generated in the EB form a useful foundation for her job application materials (cover letters, résumé, and writing portfolio). Karen focuses her job search on positions with a news desk for a daily paper. She also considers magazines and e-media; because of her integrated learning experiences she can easily articulate her qualifications in these related fields. Another important factor for Karen is her fiancé who will soon begin graduate school at the University of South Carolina. Karen would like to be in graduate school as well, but her GPA of 2.89 makes that a dim possibility. Working with her advisor and career counselor, she decides not to graduate in May but instead to take another English course in the summer (delaying graduation until August).

Because of her earlier experiences at the magazine and her work for the non-profit organization and the student newspaper, Karen is offered a co-op at a newspaper in Columbia, SC. After graduating in August, Karen, now with letters of recommendation from two editors and an excellent portfolio of work developed from her experiences and EB, finds a job as a beginning news reporter.

Although the scenario described above is possible today at Western Carolina University, at present the burden of making all the connections described would be on the student. The enhancement of the QEP is the formation of learning objectives that encourage synthesis with a network of courses, instructors, advisors, and staff members across campus that can, with the foundation of the EB, collectively mentor a student to keep a holistic approach to university life with a constant focus on learning and career goals.
Budget

Western Carolina University’s capability to implement and sustain the Quality Enhancement Plan will be reflected in the financial and physical resources allocated to the Plan. The budget for the Plan will be available to the reviewers during the on-site review.
Assessment

**Assessment Strategies, Protocols, and Procedures**

The long-term viability of the Quality Enhancement Plan depends on a manageable and sustainable process of assessment. The ambitious nature of the QEP will require not only a greater institutional commitment to providing deliberate experiences through which students will demonstrate their understanding and application of the synthesis concept, but will demand a creative and flexible approach to assessing the quality of student achievement related to synthesis.

The definitive measure of the Quality Enhancement Plan’s effectiveness will be determined by student learning: how it has improved and how university processes enhance it. As Gary Hanson (2004, p. vii) has noted, the success of any higher education initiative is “not only about the educational outcomes we produce, but also the educational process we use to achieve those outcomes.” Synthesis, like other complex learning, is not achieved in a single course, experiential activity, or co-curricular experience; assessment of synthesis cannot be reduced to a single summative measure either. Consequently, assessment of the QEP will take many forms but will focus on two primary dimensions:

1. Process evaluation/assessment of institutional support and effort, and
2. The extent of student learning.

To that end, the initial approach to assessment of the QEP will include:

1. An investigation of students’ ability to synthesize information across content and context as impacted by:
   - QEP program initiatives and
   - student affective characteristics, such as academic motivation, self-efficacy, general coping ability, anxiety, cognition, and modes of critical thinking and problem solving
   - subject-based cognitive learning outcomes related to the QEP as developed by adopter departments
2. An analysis of the QEP programs and procedures that promote synthesis to determine which are most effective.
3. A development of formative and continuous feedback and analytic mechanisms to shape further QEP program enhancements and institutional efforts.

It is expected that, much like the process of complex learning, the reliability and validity of QEP assessments will improve over time.
Process Evaluation and Assessment of Institutional Support and Effort

Process evaluation for WCU’s QEP will be modeled on the general evaluation work of Patton (1997), Fitz-Gibbon and Morris (1978), and Posavac and Carey (1980). Specifically, process evaluation will focus on three primary areas including:

1. staff, student, and program context;
2. types and amount of services; and
3. fidelity to program design (program theory and model description, model deviation, implementation strategy, satisfaction, budget allocations, and cost effectiveness).

Process evaluation will function primarily as context for the interpretation of assessment results, capitalizing on those results which improve programs and/or demonstrate how programs and the related assessment frameworks can be applied in other contexts (Fitz-Gibbon & Morris, 1978; Patton, 1997; Posavac & Carey, 1980). Structured interviews and/or focus groups will be conducted each term with students, faculty, and staff (initially those participating in the pilot) to understand this context. The QEP Assessment Sub-committee will coordinate these focus groups (see Appendix A for focus group questions).

In addition to the qualitative approach discussed previously, we will collect key output data related to institutional support and effort which will provide additional context for interpreting outcomes. These data measure the level and extent of the university’s commitment to the stated goals and outcomes of the QEP. Table 7 summarizes the means by which institutional support and effort will be assessed.

Table 7: Key Objectives Related to Institutional Support and Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objectives by Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Criteria for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offices of the Chancellor/Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provide adequate funding to ensure successful implementation of the QEP. | • Compare initial budget proposals outlined in the QEP and initial allocations based on those recommendations.  
• Compare subsequent annual budget requests from the QEP Implementation Committee with final allocations approved by the Chancellor’s Executive Council. | Allocation of funds will be adequate to support approved QEP initiatives. |
| Establish and support campus leadership for the QEP. | • The Provost will identify and name an existing faculty or staff member to be Project Manager for the QEP.  
• Based on recommendations outlined in the QEP and feedback from key stakeholders, the Provost will appoint and charge a QEP Implementation Committee. | • Project Manager will be named and in place no later than August 2007.  
• The QEP Implementation Committee will be appointed and charged by early fall 2007. Membership on the committee will be representative of the critical support units outlined in the plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objectives by Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Criteria for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning</strong></td>
<td>Provide training and support for faculty to incorporate QEP learning outcomes, assist instructors with the development of course/subject cognitive learning outcomes related to the QEP, activities, and assessments in their courses.</td>
<td>• At least one summer training workshop will be developed and conducted in the first year of the QEP and will increase in number annually consistent with the number of departments participating in QEP initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of training workshops and seminars offered.</td>
<td>• The annual rate of participation in the QEP Faculty Learning Community will be comparable to that of other faculty learning communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rates of participation in training workshops and seminars.</td>
<td>• Faculty will report high levels of satisfaction with the amount and quality of training opportunities offered by the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in support of the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rate of participation in QEP Faculty Learning Community.</td>
<td>• Results of the FSSE will reflect an increase in classroom activities that promote the concepts of synthesis learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback on surveys and evaluations by faculty on their satisfaction with the amount and quality of training opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of course syllabi that explicitly address QEP learning goals and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis of results from the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner with the Advising Center and Information Technology to provide training and support for faculty advisors to incorporate the goals and outcomes of the QEP in student advising sessions.</strong></td>
<td>• Number of training opportunities offered.</td>
<td>• At least two summer training workshops will be developed and conducted in the first year of the QEP and will increase in number annually consistent with the number of departments participating in QEP initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rate of participation in training workshops.</td>
<td>• Faculty advisors will report high levels of satisfaction with the amount and quality of training opportunities offered by the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in support of the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback on evaluations by faculty regarding their satisfaction with the amount and quality of training provided.</td>
<td>• Results of the FSSE will reflect an increase in advising activities that promote the concepts of synthesis learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis of results from the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote the goals and outcomes of the QEP among all faculty.</strong></td>
<td>Number of Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning events with themes and/or tracks consistent with QEP goals and outcomes.</td>
<td>In addition to the QEP training workshops, at least two events sponsored by the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will have a QEP-related theme or track.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information Technology

**Key Objectives by Area of Responsibility**

Develop and implement a secure, user-friendly Education Briefcase that seamlessly integrates with existing enterprise systems and allows posting and organization of new documents and materials.

**Methods of Assessment**

- Accessibility of EB interface.
- Integration of EB with existing enterprise systems.
- Focus groups of students and faculty on the design of the EB interface.

**Criteria for Success**

- The EB interface will be accessible to students in the initial cohort and their advisors by summer 2008. Accessibility to all students and advisors will occur on a phased implementation schedule in accordance with the QEP timeline.
- All information currently available to students and their advisors on existing enterprise systems (i.e., academic transcripts, co-curricular transcripts, course schedules, etc.) will be accessible through the EB.
- Feedback from focus groups will indicate students and faculty find the EB interface to be easily accessible, navigable, and user-friendly.

### Career Services

**Key Objectives by Area of Responsibility**

Strengthen programming offered by Career Services in support of the QEP goals and objectives.

**Methods of Assessment**

- Availability of and participation in co-ops and internships.
- Number and quality of contacts with students.
- Participation in Career Services events.
- Visits to Career Services website.
- Focus groups of students and faculty on the amount and quality of Career Services programming.

**Criteria for Success**

- The number of co-ops and internships available to students will increase as will the number of students requesting and participating in them.
- Career Services counselors will contact each student in the initial pilot study at least once per semester.
- Students in the initial pilot study will participate in at least one Career Services event each semester.
- In feedback from focus groups, students will report that Career Services counselors helped them make connections between career plans and their academic and co-curricular experiences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key Objectives by Area of Responsibility</strong></th>
<th><strong>Methods of Assessment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Criteria for Success</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Advising Center**                         | • Analysis of advisor evaluations.  
• Number of advisor contacts.  
• Focus group and structured interview questions related to student-advisor interactions. | • At least 75% of students in the initial pilot study will indicate satisfaction with their advisor and will report that their advisor made consistent use of materials from their EB during their advising sessions.  
• Advisors will contact students in the pilot study at least twice per semester during the first year and at least once per semester in subsequent years.  
• A majority of students participating in focus groups or structured interviews will be able to provide examples of how their advisor used materials from their EB during their advising sessions. |
Outcomes Assessment

Assessment of synthesis and the related QEP learning outcomes will be based on the expected developmental trajectory of students as outlined in the Implementation section. For those students initially recruited as part of the pilot project, assessment of the QEP outcomes will be structured as a longitudinal study that will begin in fall 2008. Subsequent cohorts will be assessed using the following same key measures. Assessment will begin prior to matriculation and will continue in the specially designated USI 130 sections and in designated major courses as the student progresses toward graduation as outlined in Table 8 (see the Implementation section for a complete discussion of the QEP framework).

Table 8: QEP Framework Linked to Key Assessment Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Learning Outcome(s)</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th>Fourth Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: Students identify aptitudes, abilities, and interests and articulate future goals and aspirations.</td>
<td>2: Students modify behaviors and values in response to knowledge and skills gained from academic and co-curricular experiences.</td>
<td>2-3: QEP Objective 2, and Students recognize and evaluate the synthesis of university experiences relative to future education and career plans.</td>
<td>3: Students recognize and evaluate the synthesis of university experiences relative to future education and career plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>USI 130; fall term for pilot study</td>
<td>200-level major gateway; fall term for pilot study</td>
<td>300-level mid-major course selected by department; fall term for pilot study</td>
<td>400-level major capstone course; fall term for pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Assessment Measures</td>
<td>• BCSSE (summer prior to matriculation) • Evaluation of selected work products (fall semester) • Focus groups/structured interviews (fall/spring semesters) • NSSE (spring semester) • ASSIST (fall semester) • Test of critical thinking/problem-solving (fall semester)</td>
<td>• Advisor evaluation (fall semester) • Evaluation of selected work products (fall semester) • Focus groups/structured interviews (spring semester) • UNC Sophomore Survey (spring semester)</td>
<td>• Advisor evaluation (fall semester) • Evaluation of selected work products (fall semester) • Focus groups/structured interviews (spring semester) • UNC Graduating Senior Survey</td>
<td>• Advisor evaluation (fall semester) • Evaluation of selected work products (fall semester) • Focus groups/structured interviews (spring semester) • NSSE (spring semester) • UNC Graduating Senior Survey • Test of critical thinking/problem-solving (fall semester)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment measures identified in Table 8 will provide a large and comprehensive set of data to use in assessing student performance relative to key QEP-related outcomes. The evaluation of selected student work from the EBs and student feedback from the focus groups and structured interviews will provide a rich pool of information on actual student learning. Results obtained from these key assessment measures, administered at consistent points, will
allow the QEP Implementation Committee to better target where breakdowns may occur and work with faculty, program directors, advisors, and counselors to ensure the QEP is successfully implemented. A full description of each assessment measure and a summary of responsibility for data collection and analysis are provided in Table 9.

### Table 9: Outcomes Assessment Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Collection/Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE)</td>
<td>The BCSSE measures students’ pre-college involvement in academic and co-curricular activities as well as their expectations for involvement in and the importance of educationally purposeful activities in college. BCSSE provides student-level data which will be utilized as a control on the outcomes analysis and to undertake comparisons between students in the initial pilot cohort and those who do not participate (see Appendix C for sample BCSSE Survey).</td>
<td>The Offices of Assessment and Institutional Research and Planning will provide oversight for BCSSE administration and analysis. Results will be disseminated to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of selected student work products</td>
<td>Faculty teaching the designated USI sections will be asked to use specific reflection, writing, and review activities related to the student’s Education Briefcase that promote the synthesis approach to learning. Student work from the Education Briefcase will be evaluated using specially designed rubrics (see Appendix B for a general example). Review of student work over time will form the basis for judging progress toward the outcomes of the QEP.</td>
<td>Trained faculty reviewers will evaluate student works relative to predetermined rubrics. The QEP Assessment Sub-committee will ensure reviewers are appropriately trained following the protocols and procedures outlined in Wolcott and Legg (1998) and White (1989) to ensure meaningful results. Readers will be trained at the beginning and at regular intervals throughout the project. Summary of analyses will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups/Structured Interviews</td>
<td>Students will participate in focus groups or structured interviews (see Appendix A). These sessions will focus on student experiences with, and perceptions of, the various QEP initiatives in which they have participated.</td>
<td>Faculty and staff with appropriate expertise will conduct the focus groups and structured interviews relative to predetermined scripts. Summary of results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)</td>
<td>The NSSE measures a range of student academic and co-curricular experiences and levels of engagement in college. The NSSE provides a body of extremely well-tested and reliable data that research has consistently shown to be empirically linked to student learning and development. Although an analysis of the complete NSSE results will be conducted, items of highest interest that track closely with our QEP outcomes include Items (1d), (1i), (1k), (1o), (1s), (2c-e), (7h), (11e), and (11m). NSSE provides student-level data and this information will be utilized as a control on the outcomes analysis and to undertake comparisons between students in the initial pilot cohort and those who do not participate (see Appendix D for sample survey instrument).</td>
<td>The Offices of Assessment and Institutional Research and Planning will provide oversight for administration and analysis of the NSSE. Results will be disseminated to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Collection/Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Evaluation</td>
<td>Students will be required to rate their advisors on a variety of sub-scales related to satisfaction, approachability, empathy, and effectiveness. An online evaluation form is currently in development.</td>
<td>The Office of Assessment and the Advising Center will provide oversight for the administration and analysis of the Advisor Survey. Results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of selected student work products</td>
<td>Faculty teaching the designated 200-level major course section(s) will be asked to use specific reflection, writing, and review activities that reflect a student’s ability to use the synthesis concept. Student work from the Education Briefcase will be evaluated using a specially designed rubric (see Appendix B for a general example). Review of student work over time will form the basis for judging progress toward the outcomes of the QEP.</td>
<td>Trained faculty reviewers will evaluate student works relative to predetermined rubrics. The QEP Assessment Sub-committee will ensure reviewers are appropriately trained following the training protocols and procedures outlined in Wolcott and Legg (1998) and White (1989) to ensure meaningful results. Readers will be trained at the beginning and at regular intervals throughout the project. Summary of analyses will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups/Structured Interviews</td>
<td>Students will participate in focus groups or structured interviews (see Appendix A). These sessions will focus on student experiences with and perceptions of the various QEP initiatives in which they have participated.</td>
<td>Faculty and staff with appropriate expertise will conduct the focus groups and structured interviews relative to predetermined scripts. Summary of results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Sophomore Survey</td>
<td>The UNC Sophomore Survey is currently mandated by the UNC General Administration. Additional items related to student perceptions of their abilities relative to the QEP learning outcomes and their perceptions of and satisfaction with critical support functions such as the Advising Center, International Programs, and Career Services will be developed and included on the standard instrument. Responses of students in the initial cohort will be compared with those of other students not in the pilot study.</td>
<td>The Office of Assessment and Institutional Research and Planning will provide oversight for the administration and analysis of the UNC Sophomore Survey. Results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Collection/Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Evaluation</td>
<td>Students will be required to rate their advisors on a variety of subscales related to satisfaction, approachability, empathy, and effectiveness. An online evaluation form is currently in development.</td>
<td>The Office of Assessment and the Advising Center will provide oversight for the administration and analysis of the Advisor Survey. Results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of selected student work products</td>
<td>Faculty teaching the designated 300-level major course section(s) will be asked to use specific reflection, writing, and review activities that reflect a student’s ability to use the synthesis concept. Student work from the Education Briefcase will be evaluated using a specially designed rubric (see Appendix B for a general example). Review of student work over time will form the basis for judging progress toward the outcomes of the QEP.</td>
<td>Trained faculty reviewers will evaluate student works relative to predetermined rubrics. The QEP Assessment Sub-committee will ensure reviewers are appropriately trained following the training protocols and procedures outlined in Wolcott and Legg (1998) and White (1989) to ensure meaningful results. Readers will be trained at the beginning and at regular intervals throughout the project. Summary of analyses will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups/Structured Interviews</td>
<td>Students will participate in focus groups or structured interviews (see Appendix A). These sessions will focus on student experiences with and perceptions of the various QEP initiatives in which they have participated.</td>
<td>Faculty and staff with appropriate expertise will conduct the focus groups and structured interviews relative to predetermined scripts. Summary of results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Data Collection/Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups/Structured Interviews</td>
<td>Students participate in focus groups or structured interviews (see Appendix A). These sessions will focus on student experiences with and perceptions of the various QEP initiatives in which they have participated.</td>
<td>Faculty and staff with appropriate expertise will conduct the focus groups and structured interviews relative to predetermined scripts. Summary of results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)</td>
<td>The NSSE measures a range of student academic and co-curricular experiences and level of engagement in college. The NSSE provides a body of extremely well-tested and reliable data that research has consistently shown to be empirically linked to student learning and development. Although an analysis of the complete NSSE results will be conducted, items of most interest that track closely with our QEP outcomes include Items (1d), (1i), (1k), (1o), (1s), (2c-e), (7h), (11e), and (11m). NSSE provides student-level data and this information will be utilized as a control on the outcomes analysis and to undertake comparisons between students in the initial pilot cohort and those who do not participate (see Appendix D for sample survey instrument).</td>
<td>The Offices of Assessment and Institutional Research and Planning will provide oversight for administration and analysis of the NSSE. Results will be disseminated to the QEP Assessment Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Graduating Senior Survey</td>
<td>The UNC Graduating Senior Survey is currently mandated by the UNC General Administration. Additional items related to student perceptions of their abilities relative to the QEP learning outcomes and their perceptions of and satisfaction with critical support functions such as the Advising Center, International Programs, and Career Services will be developed and included on the standard instrument. Responses of students in the initial cohort will be compared with those of other students not in the pilot study.</td>
<td>The Office of Assessment and Institutional Research and Planning will provide oversight for the administration and analysis of the UNC Graduating Senior Survey. Results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of general critical thinking and problem-solving skills</td>
<td>Students will be required to participate in a test of critical thinking and problem solving in Years 1 and 4. The specific instrument has not been selected, but will be either the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) or the Assessment of Critical Thinking (Project CAT).</td>
<td>The Offices of Assessment and Institutional Research and Planning will provide oversight for administration and analysis of the selected test of critical thinking skills. Results will be provided to the QEP Assessment Subcommittee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the key measures outlined in Table 8, university programs with defined roles in the implementation of the QEP (see Implementation section for a discussion of the role of supporting units) will be required to identify and assess unit-specific objectives and outcomes relative to QEP learning goals. These assessments will occur annually and will be reported to the QEP Assessment Subcommittee.

**Dissemination and Use of Assessment Results**

Specific oversight of assessment of the QEP will be the responsibility of the QEP Assessment Sub-committee (QEP Project Manager, the Director of Assessment, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, select faculty members, and others as necessary). The Assessment Sub-committee will be responsible for research design, data collection, data analysis, and reporting of results to the QEP Implementation Committee. The Assessment Sub-committee will prepare and submit an annual report of its activities and findings to the QEP Implementation Committee.
Committee and other university groups as needed. The QEP Project Manager will share the assessment results with key university constituencies and facilitate the use of those results to make program improvements as appropriate.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Focus Group Questions (Process Evaluation)

1. What constitutes an active student and/or faculty participant in the QEP and what does this individual actually do in the program? What are their primary activities (in detail)? What do they experience?
2. What are the program’s key characteristics as perceived by various stakeholders—e.g., students, administrators, advisors, the QEP assessment and implementation team, faculty (term, full-time, part-time) actively participating and directly connected to the QEP initiative? How similar or different are those perceptions? What’s the basis?
3. What is the consensus about next steps for the QEP Structure? Services?
4. How do the parts of the QEP structurally/programmatically fit together? Are there perceived gaps or disconnects?
5. After the initial pilot, what has changed from the original design and intentions of the QEP and related program elements and why? On what basis are adaptations from the original design being made? Who needs to “approve” such changes?
6. What is the participation rate of faculty in QEP related initiatives?
7. What parts of the curriculum evidence direct influence from the QEP initiative and why?
8. How is evaluation built into the delivery of our services? What are the primary capture points? Additionally, what are possible capture points moving forward?
9. What’s working as expected? What’s not working as expected? What challenges and barriers have emerged? How have we responded to these barriers?
10. How well are students, administrators, advisors, faculty (term, full-time, part-time) teaching in the program functioning together? What are their perceptions about what’s working and not working? Do they know what outcomes they’re aiming for? Do they “buy into” the program’s goals and intended outcomes?
Appendix B: Sample Rubric for Evaluation of Student Work

This is a multi-definition rubric developed by Bowling Green State University to assess the ability of students to make connections, a type of complex integrative learning similar to what we have defined as synthesis. Faculty in the early adopting department(s) will utilize this descriptive model to develop analytic rubrics that measure the extent and quality of synthesis in a disciplinary context.

### Beginning
- Describe similarities and differences in a collection or set of items
- Categorize items or observations into groups
- Recognize simple links among topics or concepts in a course
- Offer accurate definitions of terms and concepts
- Describe the setting (e.g., context, environment, culture, and domain) in which connections are being made.

### Intermediate
- Organize groups of items into ordered collections and specify the organizing principles(s)
- Recognize links among topics and concepts presented in different courses
- Relate and use information from other courses or experiences in the current setting
- Formulate generalizations about collections or set of items
- Distinguish concrete and abstract representations
- Identify disciplinary concepts (theories, frameworks) and instances of their application

### Proficient
- Use disciplinary frameworks and concepts to illuminate relationships among apparently diverse items
- Examine phenomena from multiple viewpoints, both concretely and abstractly
- Specify the limits or boundaries within which generalizations apply
- Apply abstract academic knowledge to solve concrete practical problems

### Advanced
- Identify ways to reconcile diverse or conflicting priorities, viewpoints, or options.
- Call attention to something that has not been adequately noticed by others (e.g., a subtle or deep relationship, novel findings or interpretations, the context or frame of reference)
- Apply frameworks from multiple domains of knowledge and practice to create a culminating work (e.g., exhibition, business plan, musical composition, thesis, capstone paper, research project, etc.)
- Integrate diverse elements into a product, performance or artifact that fits its context coherently.
Appendix C: BCSSE

Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement 2005-2006

We are interested in how you plan to spend your time this year, how important certain college activities will be to you, as well as some aspects of your high school experience. The information that you provide will help your institution improve the conditions that contribute to your learning and development during college. Thank you for your responses. Write or mark your answers in the boxes. Examples: ☑ or ☐

Please print your student ID number in the boxes below, and fill in completely the corresponding circles beneath the boxes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please print the first three letters of your last name:

Please write in today’s date:

mm / dd

You are taking this survey: (Mark one box only)
☑ Before attending college orientation
☐ While attending college orientation
☐ After attending college orientation
☐ Not applicable, not attending college orientation

High School Experiences

1. Please write in the year you graduated from high school: (For example, 2005)

2. Please indicate all years of high school in which you took a class in the following areas: (Mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate whether you took at least one Advanced Placement (AP) class or college course in the following subject areas while in high school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>College course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. English/Language Arts</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Math</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Science</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. History/Social Studies</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Foreign Language</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Fine or Performing Arts</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. During your last year of high school, how often did you do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Discuss grades or assignments with a teacher</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Come to class without completing readings or assignments</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Work with other students on projects during class</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Discuss ideas from your readings or classes with teachers outside of class</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Discuss ideas from your readings with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What were most of your high school grades? (Mark one box only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ A</td>
<td>☐ B</td>
<td>☑ C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ A-</td>
<td>☐ B-</td>
<td>☑ C- or lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ B+</td>
<td>☐ C+</td>
<td>☑ Grades not used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendices

#### 6. During your last year of high school, about how many hours did you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of hours per week</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>More than 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for class (studying, doing homework, rehearsing, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for pay (before or after school, weekends)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in extra-curricular activities (arts, clubs, athletics, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing or socializing (watching TV, talking on the phone, playing video games, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. While in high school, how involved were you in the following school-sponsored activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Highly involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing or visual arts programs (band, chorus, theater, art, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic teams (varsity, junior varsity, club sport, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership positions (student government, class officer, club officer, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (student newspaper, yearbook, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic honor societies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic clubs (debate, mathematics, science, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational clubs (business, health, technology, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service clubs or organizations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8. From which type of high school did you graduate?

- ☐ Public
- ☐ Private, religiously affiliated
- ☐ Private, independent
- ☐ Home school
- ☐ Other, specify: 

#### 9. How many students were in your high school graduating class?

- ☐ Fewer than 25
- ☐ 25 to 99
- ☐ 100 to 199
- ☐ 200 to 299
- ☐ 300 to 399
- ☐ 400 to 499
- ☐ 500 to 599
- ☐ 600 or more

#### College Expectations

10. What do you expect most of your grades will be at this college during the coming year? (Mark one box only)

- ☐ A
- ☐ B
- ☐ C
- ☐ A-
- ☐ B-
- ☐ C- or lower
- ☐ B+
- ☐ C+
- ☐ Grades not used

11. What is the highest academic degree that you intend to obtain at this or any college? (Mark one box only)

- ☐ Vocational certificate
- ☐ Associate's degree (A.A., A.S., etc.)
- ☐ Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
- ☐ Master's degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
- ☐ Doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)
- ☐ Health/Medical doctorate (M.D., D.O., D.D.S., D.V.M., etc.)
- ☐ Law degree (J.D.)
- ☐ Uncertain

12. How difficult do you expect the following to be in the coming year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Keeping up with school work</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Managing your time</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Paying for college expenses</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Getting help with school work</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Making new friends</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How important is it to you that your college emphasize each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Providing the support you need to thrive socially</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Using computers in academic work</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How important is it to you that you do the following at this college during the coming school year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions
- b. Make a class presentation
- c. Prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in
- d. Work on a paper or project that requires integrating ideas or information from various sources
- e. Include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments
- f. Come to class with readings or assignments completed
- g. Work with other students on projects during class
- h. Work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- i. Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions
- j. Tutor or teach other students (paid or voluntary)
- k. Participate in a community-based project as part of a regular course (e.g., service learning)
- l. Use an electronic medium (listens, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment
- m. Use e-mail to communicate with an instructor
- n. Discuss grades or assignments with an instructor
- o. Talk about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
- p. Discuss ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
- q. Receive prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)
- r. Work harder than you think you can to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations
- s. Work with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)
- t. Discuss ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)
- u. Have serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own
- v. Have serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values
- w. Examine the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue
- x. Try to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective
- y. Learn something that changes the way you understand an issue or concept

### During the coming school year, about how many hours do you think you will spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of hours per week</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>More than 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- a. Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)
- b. Working on campus
- c. Working off campus
- d. Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternities or sororities, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)
- e. Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)
16. Compared to other students entering this college, how do you rate your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

- Having a broad general education
- Having job or work-related knowledge and skills
- Writing clearly and effectively
- Speaking clearly and effectively
- Thinking critically and analytically
- Analyzing quantitative problems
- Using computing and information technology
- Working effectively with others
- Understanding local, state, and national politics
- Learning effectively on your own
- Understanding yourself
- Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds
- Solving complex real-world problems
- Having a developed personal code of values and ethics
- Contributing to the welfare of your community
- Having a deepened sense of spirituality

17. Do you intend to graduate from this college?
- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

18. Your sex:
- Female
- Male

19. Write in the 5-digit ZIP Code of your home during your last year of high school:

20. How many of your close friends will attend this college during the coming year?

- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

21. Did at least one of your parents or legal guardians complete a 4-year college degree or more?
- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

22. Which of the following best describes you?
- In-state student
- Out-of-state student
- International student (Not a U.S. citizen)

23. Please indicate all of the following members of your family who have attended, or are currently attending, this college: (Mark all that apply)
- None
- Mother (or maternal guardian)
- Father (or paternal guardian)
- One or more brothers or sisters
- One or more grandparents

24. At the time that you applied for admission, this college was your:
- First choice
- Second choice
- Third choice
- Fourth choice or lower

25. Do you know what your college major will be?
- No
- Yes, specify: [allow for input]

26. To what extent have the following influenced your expectations about your experience at this college?

- Not at all
- A lot

- Family members
- Friends/students in high school
- Friends/students already attending this college
- High school guidance counselors
- High school teachers/administrators
- College recruiters/admissions counselors
- College website/materials (brochures, catalogues, etc.)
- Campus visits (excluding orientation)
- College orientation
- External publications (guidebooks, rankings, etc.)
- Other, specify:

THANKS FOR SHARING YOUR VIEWS!

Copyright © 2005 Indiana University
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National Survey of Student Engagement 2006
The College Student Report

1. In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? Mark your answers in the boxes. Examples: [ ] or [ ]

   a. Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
   b. Made a class presentation
   c. Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in
   d. Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
   e. Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments
   f. Came to class without completing readings or assignments
   g. Worked with other students on projects during class
   h. Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
   i. Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions
   j. Toured or taught other students (paid or voluntary)
   k. Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course
   l. Used an electronic medium (listen, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment
   m. Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor
   n. Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
   o. Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
   p. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
   q. Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance

   r. Worked harder than you thought you could to meet a professor’s standards or expectations
   s. Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)
   t. Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)
   u. Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own
   v. Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values

2. During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?

   a. Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form
   b. Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components
   c. Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships
   d. Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions
   e. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations
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**Appendices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. During the current school year about how much reading and writing have you done?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. In a typical week, how many homework problem sets do you complete?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>More than 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of problem sets that take you more than an hour to complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of problem sets that take you less than an hour to complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year have challenged you to do your best work.</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Attended an art gallery, play, dance, or other theater performances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?</td>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Community service or volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Work on a research project with a faculty member on a topic outside of your major or program requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Foreign language course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Study abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Independent study or self-designed major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Cumulating senior experience (capstone course, senior project, senior thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Mark the box that best represents the quality of your relationships with people at your institution.</td>
<td>Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of alienation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly, Supportive, Sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationships with other students</td>
<td>Unavailable, Unhelpful, Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available, Helpful, Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationships with administrative personnel and offices</td>
<td>Unhelpful, Inconsiderate, Rigid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful, Considerate, Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?**

   a. Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing and other academic activities)
      - 0 1-5 5-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30
      - Hours per week

   b. Working for pay on campus
      - 0 1-5 5-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30
      - Hours per week

   c. Working for pay off campus
      - 0 1-5 5-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30
      - Hours per week

   d. Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)
      - 0 1-5 5-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30
      - Hours per week

   e. Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)
      - 0 1-5 5-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30
      - Hours per week

   f. Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)
      - 0 1-5 5-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30
      - Hours per week

   g. Commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)
      - 0 1-5 5-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 More than 30
      - Hours per week

2. **To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following?**

   a. Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work
   b. Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically
   c. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds
   d. Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
   e. Providing the support you need to thrive socially
   f. Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.)
   g. Using computers in academic work

3. **To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?**

   a. Acquiring a broad general education
   b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills
   c. Writing clearly and effectively
   d. Speaking clearly and effectively
   e. Thinking critically and analytically
   f. Analyzing quantitative problems
   g. Using computing and information technology
   h. Working effectively with others
   i. Voting in local, state, or national elections
   j. Learning effectively on your own
   k. Understanding yourself
   l. Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds
   m. Solving complex real-world problems
   n. Developing a personal code of values and ethics
   o. Contributing to the welfare of your community
   p. Developing a deepened sense of spirituality

4. **Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?**

   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Fair
   - Poor

5. **How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?**

   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Fair
   - Poor

6. **If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?**

   - Definitely yes
   - Probably yes
   - Probably no
   - Definitely no
**SYNTHESIS: A PATHWAY TO INTENTIONAL LEARNING AT WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY**

**APPENDICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write in your year of birth:</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your sex</td>
<td>Male, Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you an international student or foreign national?</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Mark only one.)</td>
<td>American Indian or other Native American, Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander, Black or African American, White (non-Hispanic), Mexican or Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Other Hispanic or Latino, Multiracial, Other, I prefer not to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your current classification in college?</td>
<td>Freshman/first-year, Senior, Sophomore, Unclassified, Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you begin college at your current institution or elsewhere?</td>
<td>Started here, Started elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since graduating from high school, which of the following types of schools have you attended other than the one you are attending now? (Mark all that apply.)</td>
<td>Vocational or technical school, Community or junior college, 4-year college other than this one, None, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about this current academic term, how would you characterize your enrollment?</td>
<td>Full-time, Less than full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a member of a social fraternity or sorority?</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THANKS FOR SHARING YOUR VIEWS!**

After completing the survey, please put it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope and deposit it in any U.S. Postal Service mailbox. Questions or comments? Contact the National Survey of Student Engagement, Indiana University, 1900 East Ten Mile Street, Eugene H. Hall Suite 119, Bloomington IN 47405-7512 or nsse@indiana.edu or www.nsse.iub.edu. Copyright © 2005 Indiana University.
Appendix E: FSSE

Faculty Survey of Student Engagement 2004

Mark your answers in the boxes. Examples: X or ■

1. How important is it to you that undergraduates at your institution do the following?
   - Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience
   - Community service or volunteer work
   - Participation in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together
   - Work on a research project with you outside of course program requirements
   - Study a foreign language
   - Study abroad
   - Independent study
   - Self-designed major
   - Culminating senior experience

2. Select the box that you believe best represents the quality of student relationships with other students:

   | Friendly, Supportive, Sense of Belonging |
   | Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of Alienation |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. Select the box that you believe best represents the quality of student relationships with faculty members:

   | Available, Helpful, Sympathetic |
   | Unavailable, Unhelpful, Unsympathetic |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4. Select the box that you believe best represents the quality of student relationships with administrative personnel:

   | Helpful, Considerate, Flexible |
   | Unhelpful, Inconsiderate, Rigid |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5. To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following?

   | Very much | Quite a bit | Some | Very little |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

   - b. Providing students the support they need to help them succeed academically
   - c. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social and racial or ethnic backgrounds
   - d. Helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
   - e. Providing students the support they need to thrive socially
   - f. Encouraging students to participate in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternities or sororities, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)
   - g. Encouraging students to attend campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural events, symposiums, etc.)
   - h. Encouraging students to use computers in their academic work

6. About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?

   | # of hours per week |
   | More than 30 |
   | 21-30 |
   | 13-16 |
   | 9-12 |
   | 5-8 |
   | 1-4 |

   - a. Teaching undergraduate students in class
   - b. Grading papers and exams
   - c. Giving other forms of written and oral feedback to students
   - d. Preparing for class
   - e. Reflecting on ways to improve my teaching
   - f. Research and scholarly activities
   - g. Working with undergraduates on research
   - h. Advising undergraduate students
   - i. Supervising internships or other field experiences
   - j. Working with students on activities other than course work (committees, organizations, student life activities, orientation, intramurals, etc.)
Please respond to the following questions based on one particular undergraduate course section you are teaching or have taught during this academic year.

7 Level of students in your selected course section:
- [ ] Lower division (mostly 1st year students and sophomores)
- [ ] Upper division (mostly juniors and seniors)
- [ ] Other (Please describe)

8 Is your selected course a distance education course (correspondence course, Internet course, telecourse, etc.)?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

9 How many students are enrolled in your selected course section?
- [ ] Fewer than 10
- [ ] 10 to 19
- [ ] 20 to 29
- [ ] 30 to 49
- [ ] 50 to 74
- [ ] 75 to 99
- [ ] 100 to 149
- [ ] 150 to 199
- [ ] 200 or more

10 Prior to this semester, how many times have you taught your selected course?
- [ ] None
- [ ] 1 to 3
- [ ] 4 to 6
- [ ] 7 to 9
- [ ] More than 20

11 What is the general area of your selected course? (Please specify an academic discipline, e.g., Chemistry, Psychology, Theater)

12 About what percent of students in your selected course section do the following?

| Percent | None | 1-24% | 25-49% | 50-74% | More than 75%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Frequently ask questions in class or contribute to class discussion</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Frequently come to class without completing readings or assignments</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Frequently work harder than they usually do to meet your standards</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Occasionally use e-mail to communicate with you</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Occasionally discuss grades or assignments with you</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 How often do students in your selected course section engage in the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have class discussions or writing assignments that include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Work with other students on projects during class</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Participate in a community-based project as part of your course</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Use an electronic medium (listerv, chat group, Internet, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Receive prompt feedback (written or oral) from you on their academic performance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Have serious conversations in your course with students of a different race or ethnicity than their own</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Have serious conversations in your course with students who are very different from them in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 In your selected course section, about how much reading and writing do your students do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than 6</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of assigned textbooks, books, and/or book length packs of course readings</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of written papers or reports of more than 10 pages</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 10 pages</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**15** In a typical week, how many homework problem sets do you require students in your selected course section to complete?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>More than 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Number of problem sets that take your students more than one hour to complete

b. Number of problem sets that take your students less than one hour to complete

**16** Time students spend preparing for your selected course section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**18** In your selected course, on average, what percent of class time is spent on the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of class time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>0-9</th>
<th>10-19</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teacher-student shared responsibility (seminar, discussion, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Student computer use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Small group activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Student presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. In-class writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Testing and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Performances in applied and fine arts (e.g., dance, drama, music)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Experiential (labs, field work, art exhibits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**19** Select the box that represents the extent to which you believe the student's evaluations of student performance (e.g., examinations, portfolio) challenge students in your selected course section to do their best work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20** In your selected course section, how much emphasis do you place on engaging students in each of these cognitive activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your course and readings so students can repeat them pretty much in the same form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth, and considering its components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>To what extent do you structure your selected course section so that students learn and develop in the following areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much □</td>
<td>Quite a bit □</td>
<td>Some □</td>
<td>Very Little □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Analyzing quantitative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Using computing and information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Learning effectively on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Understanding themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Solving complex real-world problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Developing a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Developing a deeper sense of spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Acquiring a broad general education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22</th>
<th>During this term, does your institution consider you to be employed part-time or full-time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 23 | Write in the total number of courses (undergraduate, graduate) you have taught or are scheduled to teach during the current academic year: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24</th>
<th>Which of the following best describes your academic rank, title, or current position? (Mark only one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 25 | What is the general discipline of your academic appointment? (Please specify an academic discipline) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>What is your current tenure status? (Mark only one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 27 | Write in the year that you began teaching at any college/university: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28</th>
<th>What is the highest degree you have earned?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First professional degree (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., J. D., D.V.M.) □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 29 | Write in the year of your birth: 19□□ |

| 30 | Your sex □ Female □ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31</th>
<th>What is your citizenship status?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States citizen, native □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32</th>
<th>Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33</th>
<th>What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Mark all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Native American □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 34 | How important is it to you that undergraduates at your institution do the following? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Express an opinion about a political or community issue in a public forum (e.g., send a letter or e-mail to the media, contact a government official, make a speech, sign a petition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Use media sources (e.g., newspaper, radio, television, Internet) to stay informed about local political or community issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Participate in a fundraising event (e.g., phone-a-thon, run, walk, dance marathon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Attend a rally, vigil, or protest about an issue that is important to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Lead meetings or activities for a local community organization or religious group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Important □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR SHARING YOUR VIEWS!
Copyright 2003 Indiana University
Appendix F – ASSIST Sample by N. Entwistle (2000)

ASSIST
Approaches and Study Skills Inventory for Students
(Short version)
This questionnaire has been designed to allow you to describe, in a systematic way, how you go about learning and studying. The technique involves asking you a substantial number of questions which overlap to some extent to provide good overall coverage of different ways of studying. Most of the items are based on comments made by other students. Please respond truthfully, so that your answers will accurately describe your actual ways of studying, and work your way through the questionnaire quite quickly.

Background information
Name or Identifier ........................................... Age ...... years Sex M / F
University or College ....................................... Faculty or School …….
Course .............................................................. Year of study ……..

A. What is learning?
When you think about the term ‘LEARNING’, what does it mean to you?
Consider each of these statements carefully, and rate them in terms of how close they are to your own way of thinking about it. Very Quite Not so Rather Very
a. Making sure you remember things well. 5 4 3 2 1
b. Developing as a person. 5 4 3 2 1
c. Building up knowledge by acquiring facts and information. 5 4 3 2 1
d. Being able to use the information you’ve acquired. 5 4 3 2 1
e. Understanding new material for yourself. 5 4 3 2 1
f. Seeing things in a different and more meaningful way. 5 4 3 2 1

© 1997 a Centre for Research on Learning and Instruction, University of Edinburgh

Please turn over
B. Approaches to studying
The next part of this questionnaire asks you to indicate your relative agreement or disagreement with comments about studying again made by other students. Please work through the comments, giving your immediate response. In deciding your answers, think in terms of this particular lecture course. It is also very important that you answer all the questions: check you have.

5 means agree ( . ) 4 = agree somewhat ( ? ) 2 = disagree somewhat ( x? ) 1 = disagree ( x ).
Try not to use 3 = unsure ( ?? ), unless you really have to, or if it cannot apply to you or your course.

1. I manage to find conditions for studying which allow me to get on with my work easily. 5 4 3 2 1
2. When working on an assignment, I’m keeping in mind how best to impress the marker. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Often I find myself wondering whether the work I am doing here is really worthwhile. 5 4 3 2 1
4. I usually set out to understand for myself the meaning of what we have to learn. 5 4 3 2 1

© 1997 a Centre for Research on Learning and Instruction, University of Edinburgh
5. I organise my study time carefully to make the best use of it. 5 4 3 2 1
6. I find I have to concentrate on just memorising a good deal of what I have to learn. 5 4 3 2 1
7. I go over the work I’ve done carefully to check the reasoning and that it makes sense. 5 4 3 2 1
8. Often I feel I’m drowning in the sheer amount of material we’re having to cope with. 5 4 3 2 1
9. I look at the evidence carefully and try to reach my own conclusion about what I’m studying. 5 4 3 2 1
10. It’s important for me to feel that I’m doing as well as I really can on the courses here. 5 4 3 2 1
11. I try to relate ideas I come across to those in other topics or other courses whenever possible. 5 4 3 2 1
12. I tend to read very little beyond what is actually required to pass. 5 4 3 2 1
13. Regularly I find myself thinking about ideas from lectures when I’m doing other things. 5 4 3 2 1
14. I think I’m quite systematic and organised when it comes to revising for exams. 5 4 3 2 1
15. I look carefully at tutors’ comments on course work to see how to get higher marks next time. 5 4 3 2 1
16. There’s not much of the work here that I find interesting or relevant. 5 4 3 2 1
17. When I read an article or book, I try to find out for myself exactly what the author means. 5 4 3 2 1
18. I’m pretty good at getting down to work whenever I need to. 5 4 3 2 1
19. Much of what I’m studying makes little sense: it’s like unrelated bits and pieces. 5 4 3 2 1
20. I think about what I want to get out of this course to keep my studying well focused. 5 4 3 2 1
21. When I’m working on a new topic, I try to see in my own mind how all the ideas fit together. 5 4 3 2 1
22. I often worry about whether I’ll ever be able to cope with the work properly. 5 4 3 2 1
23. Often I find myself questioning things I hear in lectures or read in books. 5 4 3 2 1
24. I feel that I’m getting on well, and this helps me put more effort into the work. 5 4 3 2 1
25. I concentrate on learning just those bits of information I have to know to pass. 5 4 3 2 1
26. I find that studying academic topics can be quite exciting at times. 5 4 3 2 1
27. I’m good at following up some of the reading suggested by lecturers or tutors. 5 4 3 2 1
28. I keep in mind who is going to mark an assignment and what they’re likely to be looking for. 5 4 3 2 1
29. When I look back, I sometimes wonder why I ever decided to come here. 5 4 3 2 1
30. When I am reading, I stop from time to time to reflect on what I am trying to learn from it. 5 4 3 2 1
31. I work steadily through the term or semester, rather than leave it all until the last minute. 5 4 3 2 1
32. I’m not really sure what’s important in lectures so I try to get down all I can. 5 4 3 2 1
33. Ideas in course books or articles often set me off on long chains of thought of my own. 5 4 3 2 1
34. Before starting work on an assignment or exam question, I think first how best to tackle it. 5 4 3 2 1
35. I often seem to panic if I get behind with my work. 5 4 3 2 1
36. When I read, I examine the details carefully to see how they fit in with what’s being said. 5 4 3 2 1
37. I put a lot of effort into studying because I’m determined to do well. 5 4 3 2 1
38. I gear my studying closely to just what seems to be required for assignments and exams. 5 4 3 2 1
39. Some of the ideas I come across on the course I find really gripping. 5 4 3 2 1
40. I usually plan out my week’s work in advance, either on paper or in my head. 5 4 3 2 1
41. I keep an eye open for what lecturers seem to think is important and concentrate on that. 5 4 3 2 1
42. I’m not really interested in this course, but I have to take it for other reasons. 5 4 3 2 1
43. Before tackling a problem or assignment, I first try to work out what lies behind it. 5 4 3 2 1
44. I generally make good use of my time during the day. 5 4 3 2 1
45. I often have trouble in making sense of the things I have to remember. 5 4 3 2 1
46. I like to play around with ideas of my own even if they don’t get me very far. 5 4 3 2 1
47. When I finish a piece of work, I check it through to see if it really meets the requirements. 5 4 3 2 1
48. Often I lie awake worrying about work I think I won’t be able to do. 5 4 3 2 1
49. It’s important for me to be able to follow the argument, or to see the reason behind things. 5 4 3 2 1
50. I don’t find it at all difficult to motivate myself. 5 4 3 2 1
51. I like to be told precisely what to do in essays or other assignments. 5 4 3 2 1
52. I sometimes get ‘hooked’ on academic topics and feel I would like to keep on studying them. 5 4 3 2 1

C. Preferences for different types of course and teaching

5 means definitely like ( . ) 4 = like to some extent ( . ) 3 = dislike to some extent ( x? )
1 = definitely dislike ( x ).

Try not to use 3 = unsure ( ?? ), unless you really have to, or if it cannot apply to you or your course.

a. lecturers who tell us exactly what to put down in our notes. 5 4 3 2 1
b. lecturers who encourage us to think for ourselves and show us how they themselves think 5 4 3 2 1
c. exams which allow me to show that I’ve thought about the course material for myself. 5 4 3 2 1
d. exams or tests which need only the material provided in our lecture notes. 5 4 3 2 1
e. courses in which it’s made very clear just which books we have to read. 5 4 3 2 1
f. courses where we’re encouraged to read around the subject a lot for ourselves. 5 4 3 2 1
g. books which challenge you and provide explanations which go beyond the lectures. 5 4 3 2 1
h. books which give you definite facts and information which can easily be learned. 5 4 3 2 1

Finally, how well do you think you have been doing in your assessed work overall, so far?
Please rate yourself objectively, based on the grades you have been obtaining
Very well Quite Well About average Not so well Rather badly
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Thank you very much for spending time completing this questionnaire: it is much appreciated.
EXHIBIT F

Department of Communication Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
Draft--June 29, 2010

Section I. General Information

Program/Departmental Contacts: Dr. Betty Farmer, Professor of Communication & Public Relations (Primary) & Mr. Don Connelly, Head & Associate Professor of Communication

Units to be covered: Broadcasting, Broadcast Sales & Public Relations

Timeframe to be covered by the plan: August 2010 to June 2011 for Broadcasting; August 2011 to June 2012 for Public Relations; August 2012 to June 2013 for Journalism and Organizational Communication

The Department of Communication will focus its initial QEP implementation and assessment on the Broadcasting, Broadcast Sales, and Public Relations concentrations because they: 1) are the largest concentrations in the department; 2) have veteran, tenured faculty members leading the programs; and 3) have successful track records placing students in the communication industry. The two other concentrations in the department—journalism and organizational communication—are new. The new journalism faculty member joins the department this coming fall. The search for an organizational communication faculty member has failed twice. We will review these programs in the 2012-2013 academic year.

Section II. Alignment Information

1. Mission Alignment

Western Carolina University Mission Statement
Western Carolina University creates engaged learning opportunities that incorporate teaching, research and service through residential, distance education and international experiences. The university focuses its academic programs, educational outreach, research and creative activities, and cultural opportunities to improve individual lives and enhance economic and community development in the region, state and nation.

Overview of the Communication Department
The Department of Communication offers the Bachelor of Science Degree in Communication with concentrations in broadcasting, broadcast sales, human communication, journalism, public relations, or organizational communication. And, for those who qualify, the Department of Communication has Honors College programs in broadcasting and speech communication.
The mission of the Department of Communication is to help students develop the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to be successful employees in the communication workforce. Communication concepts and theories are combined with hands-on experience both inside and outside the classroom through faculty-student collaborations and professional internships. Our facilities are equipped with the latest technology in order to provide students with marketable, up-to-the-minute skills. In addition to a solid academic background, each student participates in a professional internship in his/her respective concentration. Many of our students leave WCU and immediately enter the most sought-after jobs, often in major markets, thanks to their internship experiences. The professional internship is required of every student and the formal evaluation feedback from employers will be used as one of the primary methods of assessing whether the department is adequately preparing its graduates for employment.

In addition to their academic credentials, many of the department’s faculty members bring years of extensive professional experience to the classroom. Moreover, faculty members in broadcasting and public relations continue to be active as working professionals in their respective areas. This unique blend of professional and academic credentials among the faculty provides an excellent springboard for synthesis for the core expectations. For example, what better way to help students achieve the core outcome of integrating information from a variety of contexts than to have faculty members who can utilize “real world scenarios” in the classroom from their own recent professional experiences in addition to the textbook and other scholarly and professional publications?

Regarding the core expectation to “communicate effectively and responsibly,” students pursuing the B.S. Degree in Communication have multiple opportunities to “convey information in a variety of formats and contexts; identify intended audience and communicate appropriately and respectfully.” For example, students in the public relations concentration are required to develop a comprehensive communication campaign for a real-world client. One of the most important lessons the students learn from this experience is the importance of tailoring the communication strategies and tactics to the specifics of the client’s problem, goals, budget and time constraints. Students are divided into teams and present their campaigns to the clients at the end of the year. One of the notable outcomes is the wide variety in approaches and execution, depending on the needs and goals of the client. In the broadcast sales concentration, students develop radio sales plan tailored specifically to the needs and opportunities of the respective client.

Long before QEP, the Department of Communication has been a leader in the area of service learning and community engagement. As highlighted in the Program Outcomes/Assessment Methods section below, we have numerous examples to illustrate the department’s commitment to achieving the core outcome of “practice civic engagement.”
2. Integration of QEP and Program Objectives

The timeline for integrating the QEP objectives/assessment is as follows:
- Academic year 2010-2011: Broadcasting and Broadcast Sales
- Academic year 2011-2012: Public Relations
- Academic year 2012-2013: Journalism and Organizational Communication

3. Program Outcomes/Assessment Methods:

**Educational Goal #1:** Integrate information from a variety of contexts

Department of Communication student learning outcome:

- To articulate the role of and value of their college experience in the satisfactory completion of their internship and to their future career. Specifically, students will evaluate the degree to which required core communication courses, concentration specific courses, liberal studies courses, minor or elective courses, and extracurricular involvement (such as work at the campus radio station) adequately prepared them for their internship experience and for what they expect in the workplace.

Where in the curriculum being delivered and where/when data will be collected:
As part of the requirements for COMM 483 Internship in Communication, students complete a five-page paper summarizing their internship and reflecting on which courses and extracurricular activities prepared them for the experience. Students will be asked to identify the top three core courses, the top two concentration courses, and three other courses from liberal studies and/or elective courses. Students also will be asked to demonstrate how their participation in extracurricular activities helped them in a specific situation during the internship experience. Students will be expected to 1) synthesize information from various courses and analyze how the combination of this information and experiences served them in this “real world” internship scenario and 2) how they expect this synthesis will prepare them for the next “real world” scenario, full-time employment in the communication industry. Mid-term and final evaluation feedback from employers also will be reviewed to determine employers’ satisfaction with the students. The focus will be on identifying trends or commonalities across students or courses and not on individual student deficiencies. Finally, students will be asked to identify three areas in the curriculum they believe could be improved to help future students excel in their internships and in the profession.
**Educational Goal #2:** Solve complex problems

Department of Communication learning outcome:
• To help solve (or identify solutions for) a real-world communication problem or opportunity

Where in the curriculum being delivered and where/when data will be collected:
In each of the concentrations, communication students are required to take a senior-level course that requires them to help a real world client address a problem. In the public relations concentration, that course is COMM 460 Public Relations Campaigns. Students are divided into teams and assigned to a local client (either on-campus or in the community). For example, for several years public relations students have helped REACH of Jackson County increase awareness about domestic violence and the services REACH provides, as well as helping the agency with its major annual fundraiser.

As part of the assignment, students conduct research, set measurable objectives, develop a comprehensive strategy, determine specific tactics, develop a timeline for implementation, set a budget, and evaluate the degree to which they were successful in achieving their objectives. Students are required to present the results of their campaign to the client in a presentation open to the public. If the objectives were not met, they reflect on whether 1) the objectives were not realistic/appropriate or 2) the strategy and/or tactics were not appropriate or 3) the funding or timeframe were not sufficient or 4) if there were other factors such as group dynamics or client relationships that impacted (positively or negatively) the group’s ability to solve the problem.

Students enter the campaigns course after having successfully completed COMM 365 Public Relations Cases, which requires students to analyze 28 recent Silver-Anvil Award Winning cases from around the world. The Silver Anvil is the highest designation from the Public Relations Society of America for effective public relations campaigns. So, when the students enter COMM 460 Public Relations Campaigns, they have a solid foundation and understanding of how the best companies in the business have solved complex problems. Both the case studies course and the campaigns course require the students to understand and apply the ROPE process, which stands for Research, Objectives, Programming, and Evaluation, to the client’s problem and/or opportunity. Additionally, public relations students continue to apply the ROPE process and solve problems for real world clients outside the classroom as members of the student-run public relations firm, Catamount Communications.

In the broadcast sales concentration, the capstone course that allows students to solve complex problems is COMM 458 Broadcast Sales and Promotion. Students enrolled in this class are seeking the first level of professional sales certification from the Radio Advertising Bureau; Radio Marketing Professional. The Radio Advertising Bureau is recognized throughout the radio and television industry as the “benchmark” professional certification in broadcast sales. Students are divided into two-person teams and prospect for a local retail business to work with. Students prospect for this retail business using
the same criteria they would use if seeking out a new client as a broadcast sales person. This assignment requires the students to meet with their client in the client’s place of business and to conduct an in-depth client needs analysis to determine the marketing concerns and the marketing goals of the business. Once the concerns and goals are determined, the students conduct marketing research for that particular business category citing national, regional, and local trends. Students establish a set of measureable advertising objectives, do a competitive analysis of the local and regional market, conduct industry and consumer research, do a media analysis, develop a creative strategy, and create a proposed schedule of advertising and the investment necessary for success. This research is presented in written form to the client at a “sales” presentation. The written materials and client presentation must conform to nationally accepted professional standards. The client is instructed by the faculty member to treat the students as they would any other sales or marketing consultant. The client may accept the proposal or may ask for changes and modifications to the proposal to meet their needs. Once accepted, the client is free to use the student’s research and materials to benefit their business. The instructor observes the presentation in the client’s place of business and grades the project. The final examination for COMM 458 is the national Radio Marketing Professional certification examination. To date, all students taking the course have earned professional certification and many have gone on to a career in broadcast sales.

**Educational Goal #3: Communicate effectively and responsibly.**

**Department of Communication learning outcomes:**

- To develop messages (both written and oral) appropriate for the audience, occasion and goal

- To demonstrate skills in applying new technology/information, such as social media, to real-world problems.

- To demonstrate competency in the technical/professional writing standards of the profession (e.g. AP style for public relations and journalism students)

**Where in the curriculum being delivered:**

COMM 240 Writing for Communication: The Department requires student pass this mandatory writing class with at least a C in order to become a communication major.

COMM 345: Public & Mediated Communication: Students develop live and mediated presentations
COMM 352: Writing for Broadcast: Students pursuing careers in radio and television learn the technical aspects specific to writing for broadcasting.

COMM 303: Public Relations Writing: Students pursuing careers in public relations learn the basics of writing press releases, public service announcements, etc.

COMM 483: Internship in Communication: Students will demonstrate for an employer that they have the communication skills expected of an entry-level professional in the field.

Where/when data will be collected: Data will be collected on two fronts: internships and portfolios in the educational briefcase. Internship employers are required to provide formal, written midterm and final evaluations of communication interns. Faculty members supervising internships will compile employers’ feedback on the communication dimensions of the evaluation and submit them to the QEP coordinator, who will then combine the individual findings into a departmental report. This will occur every summer. Any evaluation less than satisfactory will be reviewed to determine the reason behind the unsatisfactory evaluation. The overarching concern will be to go beyond the individual student performance to determine if there are shortcomings in any of the core writing and oral communication areas.

Students are required to complete a professional portfolio that showcases their communication competencies. Students begin the portfolio in COMM 296 Introduction to Professional Development during the sophomore year and complete it in COMM 496 Seminar in Professional Development during the senior year. The faculty member teaching COMM 496 will be responsible for reviewing the portfolios. To provide a measure of external review, each student is required to identify a professional in the field to review the portfolio and to provide feedback to the student and the department in a short evaluation form. To further insure the department is preparing quality students ready to enter the workforce, the department will ask a three-member committee of working professionals to serve as a QEP advisory council and to conduct a comprehensive review of at least 25 percent of the portfolios each semester. (Approximately 35-40 students complete the portfolio in COMM 496 each semester.) The QEP coordinator will compile the feedback from this committee every semester and share the results with the department.

Educational Goal #4: Practice Civic Engagement

Department of Communication learning outcomes:
• To participate in engagement activities that positively impact their communities

Where in the curriculum being delivered:
The vast majority of the courses in the communication department include a service learning component and the department has been a leader in this area since the early
1990’s. Several communication department projects have been cited for their positive contributions to the community. For example, Michael Caudill, who teaches COMM 400 Crisis Communication, and his students have for several years developed crisis communication plans for real-world clients. This work was recently featured in the Exemplary Service-Learning Projects brochure. Jim Manning, who teaches COMM 150 Interpersonal Communication, and his students recently worked with senior citizens in the community to join the social media community. Manning’s work was featured in regional newspapers and in WCU’s news links. This Spring, communication faculty members Betty Farmer, Debie Connelly and Pam Harris, and students in three classes and Catamount Communications were actively engaged in the Dillsboro revitalization project and were responsible for “Dillsboro on Display” (funded by a $600 QEP grant), social media training for Dillsboro businesses, and various collateral materials, such as press kits, radio announcements, newsletters and special event coordination. Communication faculty and students contributed more than half of the approximately 1500 hours logged by WCU faculty, staff and students for the Dillsboro project during the Spring semester.

Where/when data will be collected:
Students will be required to contribute at least two examples of work that documents their successful participation in engagement activities in their portfolio/electronic briefcase. The faculty member teaching COMM 496 Seminar in Professional Development will be responsible for ensuring that every student graduating with a B.S. Degree in Communication has at least two quality examples of engagement in their senior portfolio. A three-person committee will review randomly selected samples of at least 25 percent of the senior portfolios once a year to determine the quality of the department’s engagement work overall. This committee will be charged with making recommendations to the department for possible curricula revisions or improvements.

Educational Goal #5: Clarify and act on personal values

Student Learning Outcomes:

• To identify aptitudes, abilities, interests and articulate their future goals and aspirations

• To modify their behaviors and values in response to knowledge and skills gained from their academic and co-curricular experiences

Where in the curriculum being delivered and when data will be collected: Students will write a paper in COMM 296 Introduction to Professional Development in their sophomore year. Given their aptitudes, abilities, and interests, students will discuss why they believe their selected concentration is a good fit for them. Students will be encouraged to consult the Office of Career Services and to take advantage of the various career counseling and advising services, such as the DISCOVER program. Students also are required to shadow a professional in his/her chosen concentration of study. One of the positive outcomes of this shadowing experience is that sometimes students realize that the job they thought they wanted to do is not actually a good fit for them after all. We believe that learning this in the sophomore year as opposed to the internship experience,
or, worse, on the job, is very much a positive outcome. Students will summarize their academic and professional development experiences to date and develop a plan for future activities. Students will document how knowledge gained from these experiences will help them make informed judgments about their future plans. This paper will become part of the student’s portfolio/educational briefcase. In their senior year, the students will revise this paper in COMM 496 Seminar in Professional Development to reflect, ideally, their more sophisticated understanding of their values and purpose. Students will be asked to reflect on their own personal growth from the time of the original essay to the final essay. They will evaluate the consequences of the choices they’ve made in three areas: 1) their own professional development; 2) the profession in general; and 3) society in general. Data will also be collected on the graduating student exit survey, which every student in the department is required to complete and is already part of our assessment plan.
On March 1-2, 2007, the consultant visited with Western Carolina University (WCU) students, faculty, staff and administrators about the impact upon Communication of the creation of a College of Fine and Performing Arts – one that would split Theatre and Dance from the existing unit.

WCU has an impressive and dedicated faculty (with a solid blend of academic and professional experience), energetic and ambitious students, caring and concerned administrators and helpful staff. The WCU scenic campus and ideal location near major media markets are important assets, which can be leveraged to advance the institution’s strategic goals and objectives.

Among the pressing issues are: (1) the decision about whether or not to move Communication to the new college; (2) the decision of whether or not to remove Electronic Media (Broadcasting) from the remaining Communication unit; (3) the need to decide the best structure for the remaining Communication programs; (4) the discussion between Communication and the Department of English about Journalism; and (5) the interest in identifying focused programs of excellence or future programs of excellence in a new Department or School of Communication.

The decision about whether or not to move Communication to the new college.

At the time of the visit, a decision had already been made to remove Theatre and Dance from Communication and create a separate department in the new college. This decision is consistent with decisions across the country over the past 50 years. Likewise, just before the visit, it became known that Cinema and Film would also be moving, which broadened a lively debate about whether Electronic Media (Broadcasting) should stay or go. WCU Administration expressed concern about the remaining, yet vitally important Communication programs.

---

1 School of Communication Director, Robert Reilly Diamond Professor, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Arts and Sciences Hall 108-A, Omaha, NE, 68182. Dr. Lipschultz may be reached at: jlipschultz@mail.unomaha.edu.
In the best of all worlds, the consultant believes that a more complete dialogue about the future of all units should have been engaged following the October, 2005 recommendations from Communication faculty in the affected areas.\(^2\) The current plan attempts to address concerns that the department is “too large and too diverse to manage effectively,” that “resources are spread too thin,” that “department-wide meetings” are “difficult to hold,” that the “department has only one secretary,” and that “the wide range of programs” has produced recruitment problems.\(^3\) The faculty report, however, neither effectively addressed peer institutions nor offered creative solutions. There are many examples across the country of large and complex programs that work more effectively as a team. Nevertheless, the structural proposals that included either creation of a College of Communications and Theatre Arts or School of Communications and Theatre Arts, while too narrow, offered a basis for review of peer institutions.

East Carolina University’s College of Fine Arts and Communication has been studied by others and considered a model structure.\(^4\) This college includes Schools of Art and Design, Communication, Music, and Theatre and Dance.\(^5\) Likewise, the University of Memphis has created a College of Communication and Fine Arts that houses Art, Communication, Journalism, and Theatre and Dance departments and the Rudi E. Scheidt School of Music. The unit is also home to an art museum and an Institute of Egyptian Art and Archeology.\(^6\) More recently, the consultant’s institution, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, created a College of Communication, Fine Arts and Media. It includes a new School of Communication, a departments of Art and Art History, a Department of Theatre, a Writer’s Workshop, KVNO-FM and UNO Television.\(^7\) Each university broke from the status quo in bold moves to produce exciting, creative and collaborative initiatives. The winners are the students who are being prepared to enter what economist Richard Florida has dubbed the “Creative Class.”\(^8\)

The WCU faculty document proposed creating four departments within a new college:

- Communication Studies
- Broadcasting and Motion Picture Studies
- Journalism, Public Relations and Advertising
- Theatre and Dance

\(^2\) Reorganization Recommendations: Department of Communication, Theatre and Dance, October 10, 2005.
\(^4\) http://www.ecu.edu/artscomm/
\(^5\) http://www.ecu.edu/cs-cfac/about.cfm
\(^6\) http://ccfa.memphis.edu/departments.htm
\(^7\) http://www.unomaha.edu/cfam/
\(^8\) http://www.creativeclass.org/
While resources may not have existed to departmentalize each of these four areas, the organization reflected a valuable \textit{emerging vision} for WCU. The consultant favors a more integrated approach to Communication, but local concerns may have steered the document in this direction. Faculty viewed the current structure as a “burden of being buried within a large cumbersome department.”\textsuperscript{9} In point of fact, size is not as important as effective communication, leadership and cultivation of a team spirit.

Clearly, one can find many examples of the four areas organized as separate departments. While the historic trend across the country has been to separate Theatre and Dance from Communication, there also are many examples in which Broadcasting and Journalism have been combined into Mass Communication units.

Thus, faculty and administrators might have negotiated an ideal structure for a new college. However, an outside committee instead did the heavy lifting, and Communication faculty members expressed feelings of frustration over being left out. Still, there also was more that the department could have done during this period to proactively engage the campus in a discussion. That being said, WCU must move forward.

Communication faculty – during an important stretch of months that continues at this writing – have lacked appropriate leadership, and frequently failed to meet to help strategize their potential options. WCU, thus, did not seize the opportunity to create a forward-looking college (i.e. College of Communication & Fine and Performing Arts). It is unclear to the consultant whether or not this door has closed. However, given that Communication faculty in their document articulated long-standing connections with Theatre, there is good reason to give this option further consideration in an open and deliberative fashion.

The decision of whether or not to remove Electronic Media (Broadcasting) from the remaining Communication unit.

Regardless of whether or not Communication moves or stays, there was strong consensus by Communication faculty that Electronic Media (Broadcasting), which has thrived and grown into a major program, should remain with colleagues in Communication.

The decision to move Cinema and Film did not create a constructive environment for faculty input. Further, Communication faculty members do not hold in high regard the current direction of Cinema and Film. Beyond these reasons, there are exciting opportunities offered in the area of Convergence Journalism, Interactive and New Media – these \textit{must} include Broadcasting.

\footnote{Supra. Fn. 1, p. 2.}
The need to decide the best structure for the remaining Communication programs. Given the size and complexity of the remaining unit, as well as the need to strengthen Convergence Journalism and Interactive/New Media, the consultant recommends that WCU strongly consider the establishment of a School of Communication. Such a structure would place WCU among peers with professionally oriented programs across the county. A School of Communication should have a director and assistant director, a full-time academic advisor and two staff assistants. There are additional needs for support staff – especially in the area of broadcast engineering. A School would retain the remaining areas left by the departure of Theatre and Dance.

The discussion between Communication and the Department of English about Journalism. The Department of English appears to be misguided in its contention that professional journalists come from English majors: “High school writers look for Journalism when they go to college, and they look for it in the English department… Most truly professional writers were English majors.”10 This view reflects an old model that existed prior to the development of Journalism departments, schools and colleges during the past 50 years. The establishment of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) with 3,500 members around the world,11 the development of doctoral degree programs in Journalism and the insistence of the industry that Journalism programs meet the rapidly changing industry forces led to a decline in the previously popular English programs.

Further, the existing WCU courses do not address Convergence Journalism, which will eventually push news to exclusively online sites – the PBS Frontline investigation “News War” should be reviewed by faculty members in this area.12 It is also suggested that WCU send a delegation of faculty members from all areas to “A Showcase of Convergent Media Projects and Practices,” hosted by the University of South Carolina (USC), October 11-13, 2007. USC also holds valuable Newsplex Summer Seminars and produces a monthly Convergence Newsletter.13

WCU is not fully meeting the needs of Journalism students because there is no daily newspaper and online site that would force students to adhere to daily deadlines. Instead, the Western Carolinian news magazine, while offering a limited writing experience for students, does not adhere to professional standards of journalism.14

---

10 Elizabeth Addison, English Department Head, March 2, 2007.
11 http://aejmc.org/
12 http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/newswar/
13 http://www.jour.sc.edu/news/convergence/
A Convergence Journalism program must reside in Journalism because the multimedia products produced will involve not only text editing, but also audio and visual communication. English should limit its involvement to writing and editing courses that focus on grammar, punctuation, spelling and style. WCU needs an entrance course that certifies the writing and editing skills of its Journalism and all Communication majors. Communication should have the exclusive responsibility to address the advanced instructional needs of students wishing to become professional journalists.

The interest in identifying focused programs of excellence or future programs of excellence in a new Department or School of Communication.

1. Electronic Media. There is no question that the Electronic Media (Broadcasting) degree program is the existing primary program of excellence in Communication. Radio students routinely go directly from WCU to large media markets, which is extremely rare in programs across the country. The reason is simple: WCU has rapidly established a radio station that adheres to the strictest professional norms, and students are prepared to work at a high level. Likewise, the industry is clamoring for WCU Broadcast Sales graduates. The consultant was impressed that faculty members travel with students to the annual meeting of the Broadcast Education Association (BEA) and National Association of Broadcasters. Students gain valuable experience and insights by networking with professionals. Unfortunately, there are inadequate resources currently available, and students must pay more than $1,000 each for these vital activities.

WCU has a state-of-the-art television studio that is under-utilized because of the lack of faculty and academic support staff in this area. It makes no sense to have only one radio and one television professor for the largest major in Communication. More resources must be strategically targeted in this area to realize the promise offered by taxpayer support of the newest technology. WCU can develop news, sports, arts and entertainment programming, if the program is funded at an appropriate level. Additionally, WCU faces the challenge of addressing the transition to High Definition Television (HDTV), which is scheduled to be complete in early 2009. A final advantage to a complete development of TV is the service that can be provided in elevating the image of the campus by using facilities to uplink national network interviews of campus experts.

2. Public Relations and Advertising. An emerging program of academic excellence is the work done by WCU’s new public relations student firm. Across the nation, Public Relations and Advertising have grown on many campuses to be the largest and most important programs. Public Relations will assist WCU to develop its image. Public Relations and Advertising will establish important corporate connections with industry, and it will offer opportunities to do needed development work with successful alumni. Finally, this area is related to emerging programs in Broadcast Sales and Interactive/New Media, which have a need for Web courses that address image.
3. Convergence Journalism and Interactive/New Media
In a little over one decade the Internet went from curious experiment to new business model. All Communication efforts must address this fundamental change. Major newspapers, such as The New York Times, are now predicting the end of the printed newspaper in as little as five years.\(^{15}\) Convergence Journalism will require that print journalists, radio journalists and television journalists prepare for a multimedia world. Critical skills for all students include: writing, speaking, audio and video production, image manipulation, Web design and presence, network file management and yet unimagined software and hardware applications. The current radio and television operations in Communication have Web streaming capabilities and have made a good start. However, it is now time for WCU to begin hiring faculty who are immersed in the Web to collaborate with existing traditional media faculty members on exciting student projects.

4. Health Communication
The demographics of aging baby boomers and increased numbers of immigrants from Latin America demand that health issues will dominate the public policy agenda during the next few decades. Health Communication would be one of two Human Communication Studies areas (the other is Training and Development), which could define the future of WCU’s Interpersonal Communication focus.

Faculty members see potential in this area, but they believe that existing programs need adequate support first.

While not yet developed, WCU could move quickly to establish an interdisciplinary Health Communication program that partners with nursing and other allied fields. Additionally, there are large opportunities for external funding for health campaigns and homeland security programs. The hiring of an additional faculty member in this area could bolster current interest among faculty members.

5. Training and Development
Training and Development appears unable to grow into a strong program, despite the fact that there are great industry needs in this area. The program needs to be restructured around an interdisciplinary undergraduate major that includes Organizational Communication, Psychology, Management and Human Resources. In the same way, this area will offer an important basis to create a needed graduate program in Communication. Such a program will help the unit grow its own qualified adjunct and “80 percent” faculty members to relieve some of the pressures now faced by tenure-track people.

---

The consultant anticipates that WCU will continue to raise the bar with respect to its reappointment, promotion and tenure standards. In order to allow faculty members the time to publish at least one high quality peer-reviewed journal article or juried creative activity, Communication needs to find creative ways to establish three-course per semester workloads. Only with such a structure will experienced faculty members be able to cultivate international recognition for their work.

Listening to Students: A Vision for the Future

WCU needs to do a better job of listening to its students. WCU Communication has determined students wanting to succeed for themselves and their university. A student who had struggled in high school and community college, but bloomed at WCU, offered this powerful statement: “I am here to say I love it and I love this place and what it has done for me.”\textsuperscript{16} Students envision WCU as becoming the premier institution in the East for Electronic Media, Public Relations and other instruction. Their energy should be harnessed in order to continue the development of teaching and learning activities.

At present, however, logistical limitations present practical problems. The consultant learned that there are scheduling difficulties in getting courses in Communication. The unit has not considered creation of cross-listed courses with allied departments. Such cross listing could relieve pressures on Communication faculty, but also leave the door open to having Communication faculty teach when they are available the needed sections. The institutional data need to be incorporated into a strategic use of available resources:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & Electronic Media & Public Relations & Jr/Sr & Total Communication \\
\hline
1994 & 7 & 5 & 72 & 98 \\
1998 & 63 & 65 & 94 & 174 \\
2001 & 81 & 99 & 130 & 229 \\
2003 & 59 & 72 & 137 & 175 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Communication Majors at Key Points\textsuperscript{17}}
\end{table}

According to the Chair, the current department now has 382 majors, which includes about 70 Theatre majors. Almost half of the remaining Communication majors are studying Electronic Media. However, these data have not continued to be well documented under the current leadership.

\textsuperscript{16} Joe Mullins, e-mail to chair, Feb. 14, 2007, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{17} CTA Majors, 1990-2003,
Beyond additional funding that needs to be based upon an accurate credit hour production count, Communication needs to examine and *streamline* its core courses.¹⁸ Faculty members are over-burdened with lower level required courses – sometimes teaching four, five or even six courses per semester. This is unacceptable. Students see overlap and repetition in core courses, and they would prefer to have experienced professors teach upper-level industry-specific course work. By focusing on priorities, Communication can make life better for students and faculty – a development that would enhance its campus image with administrators and the larger community.

Community engagement through service-learning courses, which has already begun, should be encouraged in all areas. In the areas of Public Relations and Interpersonal Communication, service-learning courses have enjoyed much success.

The Public Speaking program, which generates a large number of credit hours, requires Communication to have a challenging dual mission: meeting WCU’s liberal arts general education needs *and* continuing to develop key program concentrations. Communication has much potential, but the unit needs resources and support. The woefully low wages of 80 percent faculty present a constant problem of high employee turnover and lack of qualified replacements. This can produce low morale.

The development of a convergence newsroom, online newspaper and multimedia site are essential needs to provide students with a competitive edge. Broadcasting needs to remain in communication because of news and industry. Cinema is the entertainment production side, while broadcasting delivers the content. These areas may function in separate colleges, if this is the final resolution.

Collaboration with Music, Theatre, Cinema and Film, as well as Photography will continue to be important, regardless of structure. New Media curricula will incorporate broad skill sets, and faculty members must remain open to ever-changing and new opportunities.

WCU must work diligently to move beyond the current Communication faculty opinion that, “We never had a voice.” Additionally, WCU should employ Delaware Data techniques in order to determine through objective, verifiable and comparative data the state of funding in Communication.¹⁹ In exchange, the faculty must identify new leadership, as the current chair will be leaving in the restructuring. *It is unacceptable to say that Communication faculty cannot find a time to meet monthly or more often during this critical time.* The consultant’s School of Communication, which is larger, solved scheduling by meeting over the lunch hour and not scheduling classes during this window.

¹⁸ The 26 required hours in the core includes work that students found repetitive and draining on valuable faculty resources. See http://catalog.wcu.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=4&poid=74.

¹⁹ http://www.colorado.edu/pba/course/delaware/ovv.htm
The long-term health of Communication is at stake. Whatever the outcome, students and faculty must live with the decision for years to come. There must be a renewed sense of urgency and purpose to elevate Communication to be one of the top programs at WCU. Only competent and energetic leadership will place WCU Communication on the road toward national prominence. With more than 300 majors, the crucial step is strategic planning to focus on successful initiatives and free the faculty from burdensome and expansive core requirements – dated structures that do not serve the current student body. Communication needs to receive authorization to begin hiring tenure-track faculty members once again. The current freeze and treading water model is not productive.

WCU students expressed the view that they are not opposed to moving Communication to the new College of Fine and Performing Arts, but such a move must come with recognition of the importance of Communication. By increasing interdisciplinary collaboration, WCU can create flexible major and minor concentrations that place students first.

Conclusion
The broad findings of the consultant are that: Broadcasting must remain within Communication; Convergence journalism demands that Electronic Media be focused in Communication; and English should concentrate on, if at all, a basic editing course in AP style.

A new School of Communication could be housed in the existing or the new College of Fine and Performing Arts. The School will need support in the form of an innovative and entrepreneurial director, assistant, two staffers and a full-time first-year advisor. This could be created with three departments or divisions – such as,

- Department (or division) of Electronic and Interactive Media
  (Emphases in Broadcast Sales, Broadcast News or New Media)
- Department (or division) of Journalism, Public Relations and Advertising
- Department (or division) of Communication Studies

There are 312 majors in what will be the new Communication unit, not counting about 70 theatre majors. There is demonstrated and significant growth over the past two decades. By serving about 4,500 students per year – including the dual general liberal arts education and major missions – WCU can and must be a priority. WCU has experienced rapid and tremendous development of its radio station, and it has excellent potential from the television studio and web. Focus needs, then, must be:
• Electronic media with almost half of remaining Communication majors
• Emerging focus on Public Relations and Advertising
• Need for Convergence Journalism, Interactive and New Media
• Need for funded Health Communication research and curriculum development
• Need for a graduate program that would give purpose to Training and Development

Beyond Health Communication, WCU Communication must begin to focus on external funding and development. State funding will never meet the expansive needs of a successful School of Communication. Student groups need to travel to national conferences and compete for awards; faculty members need funding for the latest equipment, travel and other ongoing faculty development in order to keep pace with rapid social and technological change.

The Department of English misunderstands the nature of Journalism, drawing upon a model that has faded away over the past 40 years. High school Journalism programs look for applied college curricula in schools of Journalism or Communication, not English departments.

The motion picture focus is a misguided drain of important resources, as the campus location is not conducive to development of a Hollywood-style program.

The consultant acknowledges the limitation of a brief site visit, as well as conclusions based upon a limited review of data. The complex issues raised by students, faculty and administrators demand a more extended self-study, which should be followed by a thorough academic program review within the next five years.

WCU needs to establish for itself benchmarks for intended growth and development: student credit hour production, number of majors, assessment of student learning and success of students in internships.

The consultant suggests that Communication meet as soon as possible to draft a strategic plan to address the next five to ten years. Once short-term and long-term goals, objectives and benchmarks are established, the much needed focus and leadership should emerge. Communication deserves the respect and support of the campus community, but it must continue to work not only harder, but also smarter to earn this. By shifting the emphasis from “my program” to “our program,” faculty members will be able to prioritize to the benefit of all.
WCU Broad Areas of Concern

1. Evaluate the current areas of concentration to determine whether the department includes the essential areas that position the university to attract students to the discipline. Should existing areas be modified or new ones added to strengthen the departmental offerings?
The key here is focus – particularly on Electronic Media and Public Relations. The faculty also should move quickly to develop Convergence Journalism opportunities.

2. What benchmarks should the University establish to review the program over a period of five years?
WCU should use its internal benchmarks, which may include SCH, number of majors and number of degrees granted.

3. What other Universities of similar size and scope would you recommend to review as we reorganize this department?
As stated above, Eastern Carolina, Memphis and Nebraska at Omaha all offer bold organizational structures.

WCU Questions and Issues

1. What areas of communication concentration are typical and should be included in a Department of Communication (e.g., advertising, human communication, public relations, training and development, journalism, radio, television, motion pictures, etc.)?
The consultant suggests the following: Electronic Media; Public Relations and Advertising; Convergence Journalism/Interactive and New Media; Interpersonal Communication/Organizational Communication (Training and Development); and Health Communication.

2. Examination of all communication faculty Full Time Equivalency (FTE) hours (i.e. tenured, tenure track, full time term, 80% term, and adjunct) is needed.
WCU has an over-reliance on term faculty. The most significant problem is that the two largest programs – Electronic Media and Public Relations – have a paucity of faculty and support staff. The two existing frozen lines should be targeted at these vital areas. WCU must determine for itself, based upon institutional culture, what constitutes adequate and fair levels of funding.
3. Considering the recommendations for the issues above (issues #1 & 2#), what faculty are needed in a Department of Communication, and what would be appropriate teaching, research, and service workloads (for levels tenured thru 80% term)? What salary ranges are appropriate at each level? All tenure-track and tenured faculty members with research assignments should teach three courses per semester. New faculty members should be offered a two course semester in their first year. All other faculty members should teach no more than four courses per semester.

4. What specialty areas should we consider for the future (e.g., health communication, convergence journalism, Internet public relations, etc.)? Convergence Journalism is a dynamic area, which could provide course work useful for other areas, such as Public Relations.

5. What type of budget is required to mount a successful program? Each key area, such as Electronic Media and Public Relations/Advertising, should have a cadre of at least three to four faculty members focused in the work of the program. Radio and Television each need at least two faculty members and one support staff member.

6. What benchmarks should the University establish to review the program over a period of five years? Beyond enrollment growth, program success could be gauged by state, regional and national recognition in the two key areas – Electronic Media and Public Relations/Advertising. Student success in the Public Relations Student Society of America (PRSSA), the Broadcast Education Association (BEA) and the Radio-Television News Directors Association (RTNDA) can be found in the form of awards and scholarships.

7. What other Universities of similar size and scope would you recommend to review as we reorganize this department? This has been noted above. The consultant would suggest that WCU pay special attention to the developments at East Carolina, as these may reflect regional and state expectations.
Hi Don,
The most current list I have shows the following institutions as WCU’s peer institutions:

Appalachian State Univ.
Bloomsburg Univ. of Penn.
Clarion Univ. of Penn.
Eastern Washington Univ.
Murray State Univ.
Northern Michigan Univ.
Radford Univ.
SUNY College at Brockport
Univ. of Tenn. – Chattanooga
Univ. of Central Arkansas
Univ. of Mass. – Dartmouth
Univ. of Wisconsin – Oshkosh
Univ. of Wisconsin – Stout
Western Carolina University
Winona State Univ.

Hope this helps!

AJ

AJ Grube, Ph.D.
Asst. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
560 H.F. Robinson Building
Cullowhee, NC  28723
Phone:  (828) 227-7495
Fax:  (828) 227-7498
Email:  agrube@wcu.edu
Additional Peer Review Institutions as Request by Chancellor Bardo of All Departments May 2009

- Appalachian State University
- James Madison University
- Marquette
- University of North Carolina, Wilmington
- University of Denver
Communication, B.S.

Total number of hours for the program: 120.

Liberal Studies Hours: 42

Liberal Studies Program Requirements

Major Requirements

The major requires 38 hours, including 6 hours of course prerequisites for major, 14 hours in communication core courses and an 18-hour concentration.

Course Prerequisites for the Communication Major (6 hours)

- COMM 150 - Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Credits: (3)
- COMM 240 - Writing for Communication Credits: (3)

Communication Core Courses, 14 hours:

- COMM 296 - Introduction to Professional Development Credits: (1)
- COMM 345 - Public and Mediated Speaking Credits: (3)
- COMM 350 - Communication Theory and Criticism Credits: (3)
- COMM 415 - Intercultural Communication Credits: (3)
- COMM 483 - Internship in Communications Credits: (3, R9)
- COMM 496 - Seminar in Professional Development Credits: (1)

Concentrations, 18 hours selected from:

Broadcasting:

- COMM 254 - Radio Production Credits: (3)
- COMM 255 - Television Production Credits: (3)
- COMM 352 - Writing for Broadcast Credits: (3, R6)
- LAW 406 - Media Law Credits: (3)
- 6 hours of communication department electives.
Broadcast Sales:

- COMM 458 - Broadcast Sales and Promotion Credits: (3)
- ENT 201 - Introduction to Entrepreneurship Credits: (3)
- MKT 201 - Marketing Planning and Strategy Credits: (3)
- MKT 206 - Introduction to Professional Selling Credits: (3)
- MKT 310 - Consultative Selling Credits: (3)
- 3 hours of marketing electives.

Journalism:

- To be admitted to the Journalism concentration a student must receive a B or higher in ENGL 101, 102 and COMM 240.
- COMM 330 - News Reporting I Credits: (3)
- COMM 430 - News Reporting II Credits: (3)
- ENGL 303 - Introduction to Professional Writing and Editing Credits: (3)
- ENGL 313 - Authoring Multimedia Credits: (3, R6)
- GEOG 103 - Cultural Geography Credits: (3)
- LAW 406 - Media Law Credits: (3)

Public Relations

- COMM 260 - Introduction to Public Relations Credits: (3)
- COMM 303 - Public Relations Writing Credits: (3)
- COMM 404 - Desktop Publishing Credits: (3, R6)
- COMM 365 - Public Relations Case Studies Credits: (3)
- COMM 460 - Public Relations Campaigns Credits: (3)
- 3 hours of communication department electives.

Organizational Communication

- COMM 215 - Organizational Communication Credits: (3)
- COMM 312 - Small Group Communication Credits: (3)
- COMM 313 - Conflict Resolution Credits: (3)
- COMM 414 - Gender Communication Credits: (3)
- 6 hours of communication department electives.

General Requirements

To become a communication major the student first declares the communication pre-major and must make a C or better in COMM 150 and COMM 240. Upon successful completion of the pre-major, the student will be admitted as a communication major. To continue in the program, a student must earn a grade of C or better in each course required for the major and maintain a 2.5 overall GPA. To complete the program, a total of 40 hours is required, including a
minor, second concentration, second major, or other approved program and student selected general electives. At least 30 hours taken at WCU must be at the junior-senior level to meet one of the general university degree requirements.

Communication, Minor

Total number of hours for the program: 18.

Minor Requirements

The minor requires 18 hours:

- COMM 140 - Introduction to Mass Communication Credits: (3)
- COMM 150 - Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Credits: (3)
- COMM 240 - Writing for Communication Credits: (3)
- COMM 345 - Public and Mediated Speaking Credits: (3)
- COMM 346 - Communications Ethics and Responsibilities Credits: (3)
- COMM 350 - Communication Theory and Criticism Credits: (3)

Broadcast Sales, Minor

Total number of hours for the program: 18.

Minor Requirements

This minor is designed to prepare students for a career in media sales. The minor requires 18 hours including:

- COMM 303 - Public Relations Writing Credits: (3)
- COMM 458 - Broadcast Sales and Promotion Credits: (3)
- MKT 206 - Introduction to Professional Selling Credits: (3)
- MKT 310 - Consultative Selling Credits: (3)
- MKT 409 - Negotiations/Relationship Marketing Credits: (3)
- MKT 410 - Sales Management and Negotiation Credits: (3)

Note:

For students outside the Communication major minoring in Broadcast Sales:

A student majoring or minoring in Broadcast Sales cannot pass the above-listed courses with a grade below C- (minus) and still have that course count toward satisfying the minor in Broadcast Sales.
Journalism, Minor

The Journalism Minor is currently being relocated from the Department of English to the Department of Communication. Please contact the Department of Communication for the current approved curriculum for the Journalism minor.

Not open to those pursuing the B.S. in Communications.
EXHIBIT J

PRODUCTIVITY

Trend data on **numbers of enrollments** in communication for the past 4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Majors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>198*</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Sales</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Comm.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Development***</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Media****</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared – No Concentration</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Sales</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS ED S.A.C*****</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2.5 overall GPA requirement initiated
**replaced by journalism
***replaced by organizational communication
**** replaced by broadcasting
*****Communication has been consulted by C.E.A.P. regarding dropping all secondary academic concentrations

Trend data on number of **degrees awarded** during the last 3.5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Number of Degree Awarded</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trend data on the **average GPA** of communication majors for the last four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Number of Majors</th>
<th>Overall GPA*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Cumulative Stats by Major from Banner; students on probation were not included in the overall GPA calculation.
Trend Data on total SCH generated during the last 3.5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SCH Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>8,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 2009-10 year there were 13 faculty members that generated 7,024 SCH. Each faculty member generated an average of 540.31 SCH.

Each faculty member in the department served an average of 87 students per semester during the 2010-11 academic year (includes department head and one faculty member on a course release to the Chancellor’s office).

The 2009-10 salary generated in Communication as determined by the SCH-based formula was $773,936. The budgeted line salaries for Communication in 2010-11 are $698,842 and the actual salary expenditures are $670,811, or $103,125 below what was earned by the department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SCH Generated Salary</th>
<th>Allocated Line Salaries</th>
<th>Actual Salaries</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>$773,936</td>
<td>$698,842</td>
<td>$670,811</td>
<td>$103,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average faculty salary in the College of Arts and Sciences at Western Carolina University is $56,425. The average faculty salary in Communication is $46,927, or $9,498 less than the college’s average.
EXHIBIT K

Pre- and post-test questions for COMM 201, based on National Communication Association recommendations that student attitudes be assessed before and after taking a basic communication skills class.

The pre- and post-test are administered electronically and students rate themselves on a Likert scale for each question.

1. I have a particular communication style that is part of my personality.
2. I know how my communication style affects others.
3. I use language that promotes clarity and understanding.
4. I avoid using words that communicate sexism, racism, or other prejudice or bias.
5. I recognize that an individual’s experience influences communication.
6. I consciously use appropriate body language to enhance my effectiveness as a communicator.
7. I understand that there are cultural differences among people that may affect communication and understanding.
8. I adapt my communication to others’ cultural differences.
9. I am good listener.
10. I respond to appropriately others to show that I have understood what they have said.
11. I can usually identify a speaker’s purpose and his or her important points.
12. I can identify bias and/or prejudice in a spoken message.
13. I listen actively in groups, letting others know that I am listening.
14. I use positive language when responding to others in groups.
15. I ask others to clarify their ideas when I’m not sure I understand.
16. I understand how diversity can affect group dynamics.
17. I assert my own ideas without dominating or withdrawing.
18. I cooperate with others in groups, whether I agree with them or not.
19. I am aware of the roles individuals play in groups, both constructive and destructive.
20. I know how to use structured problem-solving methods in groups.
21. I recognize when conflicts are becoming destructive in a group.
22. I know how to confront a conflict in a constructive way.
23. I know how to plan and organize a speech.
24. I know how to control my anxiety when speaking.
25. I feel able to present a well designed, interesting presentation that fulfills the requirements of the speaking situation.
EXHIBIT L

Department of Communication
Department Collegial Review Document
Effective Fall Semester, 2008

Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation:
Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

I. Overview—As the field of communication is diverse in its nature, the Department of Communication requires a faculty with diverse expertise and experience. The department needs to balance teaching, scholarship and service. Quality teaching is the number one priority for all faculty; however, individual faculty members will differ in terms of the types of scholarship pursued, investment in service, and balance between research and practice.

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty performance evaluation specific to the Department of Communication. With the exception of stipulated departmental criteria listed below, the Department of Communication will follow Section 4 of the Faculty Handbook and any approved supplements or addenda to the Handbook, which prevail on any matter not covered herein.

II. Domains of Evaluation
A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)
   1. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated according to the following 7 dimensions:
      a. Content expertise – Effective teachers display knowledge of their subject matters. Content expertise includes the skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced experience, training, or education.
      b. Instructional delivery skills – Effective teachers communicate information clearly, create environments conducive to learning, and use an appropriate variety of teaching methods.
      c. Instructional design skills – Effective teachers design course objectives, syllabi, materials, activities, and experiences that are conducive to learning.
      d. Course management skills – Effective teachers give timely feedback to students, make efficient use of class time, and handle classroom dynamics, interactions, and problematic situations (e.g., academic dishonesty, tardiness, etc.) appropriately.
      e. Evaluation of students – Effective teachers design assessment procedures appropriate to course objectives, ensure fairness in student evaluation and grading, and provide constructive feedback on student work.
      f. Faculty/student relationships – Effective teachers display a positive attitude toward students, show concern for students by being
approachable and available, present an appropriate level of intellectual challenge, sufficient support for student learning, and respect diversity.

g. Facilitation of student learning – Effective teachers maintain high academic standards, prepare students for professional work and development, facilitate student achievement, and provide audiences for student work.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence

a. Self-evaluation of teaching, addressing the 7 dimensions of effective teaching (4.05A). The instructor's self-report and assessment should address each of the seven dimensions of teaching identified above. A packet that includes items including a statement of a teaching philosophy should accompany the report; a description of goals, methods, and strategies used; and selected teaching materials for the courses taught during the period of review.

b. Peer review of teaching materials --including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B2b) The Departmental Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment committee (TPR) will review the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE) for teaching quality and effectiveness when giving consideration for tenure, promotion, and reappointment and will assess the following:
   • Annual student evaluations for each course
   • Annual Report of Faculty Activities
   • Review of course materials, such as syllabi, tests, handouts, reading lists, and audio-visuals.

c. Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol. (4.3.1.1). All departmental faculty will have direct observations in their classes at least once a year. The procedure for conducting these observations is as follows:
   • Each faculty member will choose a colleague to serve as an observer of their teaching
   • The faculty member and the faculty observer will agree on the criteria/scope of the observation.
   • After the observation, the faculty member and the observer will discuss the experience.
   • The observer will fill out a departmental-approved evaluation form, which will be forwarded to the Department Head to be included in the faculty member's file.
   • Note: Other options are available for direct classroom observations: (1) observers not employed at WCU approved by the Department Head, (2) Faculty Center observers, and (3) non-departmental teaching awards committee. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside
consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department; mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

- Outside observers or the Faculty Center observers will fill out the departmental-approved form. If a teaching awards committee observes the faculty member, the faculty member should request from that committee any evaluation of the observation be sent to the Department Head.

d) Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument. (4.05A) All sections of courses will be evaluated using a form of the Senate-approved 20 item university-wide SAI instrument.

3. General Comments—The evaluation of teaching involves multiple sources of data, peer review of substantive teaching material and quantitative SAIs. Recognition of quality work performed on-campus and off-campus, including guest lectureships, the judging of activities, and work with students in experiential activities will also be considered appropriate to teaching. Professional development activities in the area of teaching are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event. Faculty members will be rated on a 5-point scale with the following ratings: 5=exemplary; 4=superior; 3=satisfactory; 2=needs improvement; 1=unsatisfactory.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the 4 types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below. The Department of Communication recognizes that different faculty members might emphasize one of these forms of scholarship more than other, and all Boyer categories are valued equally. Scholarship must include external peer review by experts in the discipline.

a. Scholarship of discovery – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical, or literary works. The Department of Communication will consider as research and creative works all work accomplished for the production of television programs, radio programs, motion picture production, and professionally related consulting, as well as traditional journalistic, historical (where new discoveries or knowledge claims are made) and empirical research leading to publication. Publication is defined as all presentations to the public, including books, brochures, journals, conference papers, exhibitions, performances (live, recorded or mediated communication
such as podcasts, streamed audio/visual, or new media defined by leading authorities in the discipline), expert interviewee for television or radio, magazine and newspaper stories, op-ed pieces, editorial work, design or directing for public performance (television, radio), published software (commercial or publicly distributable), etc.

b. Scholarship of integration – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time. Examples include textbooks, literature reviews, or documentary pieces presented to the public in such forms as described for discovery.

c. Scholarship of application – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers. Publications in this area may be written or oral reports where the presentation of such is made “in the field” to professional, civic, or academic organizations. Professional consulting including, television, radio, or other broadcasts (either as expert interviewee or production consultant), public relations, marketing, training and development or other communication-related endeavors for academic, governmental, and professional organizations will be considered as scholarship of application.

d. Scholarship of teaching and learning – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes. The department recognizes that faculty research and scholarship in teaching, learning, and educational technology is of great importance to this department, the College of Arts and Science, WCU, and the State of North Carolina; therefore, the department will consider faculty activities in these areas in its tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions.

2. Methods of evaluation – Scholarship and creative works in the Department of Communication, regardless of the Boyer category involved, will be based on the concept of a “unit” of work, which generally reflects the expectation for most faculty members for a normal year. Scholarship must include external peer review by experts in the discipline. The department’s TPR Advisory Committee will judge whether a unit has been achieved on a case-by-case basis, but the following provides general guidelines:

a. Published pieces (as defined in Section II B1a above) are valued more highly than unpublished pieces.

b. The quality of the journal in which an article appears will play a role in determining the value of the contribution.

c. The department values multi-disciplinary research but candidates should show competence in the field of Communication.

d. The department values collaboration and co-authorship as well as single-authorship.

e. Presentation at national or international conferences is valued as well as presentations at prestigious regional or local conferences.
f. At conferences where symposiums are selected by a competitive or juried method, organizing a symposium and participating in it is valued more highly than just participating in a symposium.

g. Professional speaking engagements other than at Western Carolina University (e.g., at other academic institutions, government agencies, etc.) where the speaker’s research, creative, or professional works are highlighted.

h. Professional consulting, including public relations, marketing, training & development, or other communication-related endeavors for academic, governmental, and professional organizations are highly valued. Note: it is important that non-traditional refereed scholarship be documented in a manner that will clearly indicate the impact of the scholarship.

i. Publishing the first edition of a book is valued more highly than publishing subsequent editions of that book except when subsequent editions require significant revision.

j. With published books, scholarly treatises that involve some degree of original research are valued more highly than the production of textbooks (i.e. the scholarship of discovery over the scholarship of integration).

k. Technical reports or “white papers” will be evaluated according to the impact of the scholarship (e.g., international, national, regional, state, or local) and according to the type of scholarship (discovery, application, integration, etc.)

l. When acquiring grants, external grants are more highly valued than internal grants.

m. Applying for a grant, and being unsuccessful, is valued more highly than not applying for any grants.

n. Scholarship must identify Western Carolina University as the author’s institution.

o. The department expects faculty to have a well formulated program of scholarship and refereed creative works indicating future projects and activities.

Using these general guidelines, the department’s TPR Advisory Committee will determine “unit” totals for each faculty member being reviewed. Although what constitutes a unit cannot be defined absolutely, the following should be useful to the candidate and to the TPR committee. Some items are of such high value that they will be awarded two or more units, most items will earn one unit, and some items will earn a half unit. It is important to recognize what follows are examples and do not exhaust the possible ways in which units can be earned.

**Category A - four units:**

- Authorship of a first edition book with a university press or equivalent (i.e. no “self-publications”)


Category B – three units:
○ Authorship of the first edition of a textbook
○ Original research or creative works that reach an international or national audience involving WCU students and that brings national recognition to the department

Category C - two units:
○ Authorship of an article in a refereed journal that is widely recognized as having high status within the discipline (Journal of Communication, Journal of Broadcast and Electronic Media, Human Communication, Theory, etc.)
○ Editorship of an edited book with a university press or equivalent
○ Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a national network audience.
○ Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a national network audience.
○ Receiving a national award for the production of a radio or television product, original research, or book from organizations that are widely recognized as having high status within a discipline (International Communication Association, National Communication Association, Broadcast Education Association, Intercollegiate Broadcast Service, etc.)

Category D - one unit:
○ Authorship in a refereed journal other than those named in category C
○ A chapter in a scholarly edited book
○ Authorship of a refereed academic conference paper
○ A successful external grant proposal (excluding travel grants) of $1,000 or more.
○ Presentation at a prestigious refereed professional conference at the state, regional, national, or international level.
○ An article in a prestigious magazine or other publication
○ Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a regional multi-state audience.
○ Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a regional multi-state audience.
○ Receiving a national award for the production of a radio or television product, original research, or book from an organization other than those in category C
○ Professional consulting or creative works that includes WCU students, reaches a national audience, and brings recognition to the Department

Category E - one-half unit:
○ Authorship in a refereed state-level journal or equivalent (e.g., Florida Journal of Communication)
○ A scholarly book review
o Presentation at a professional conference at the state, regional, national, or international level (other than Cat. D above).

o Professional speaking engagements as defined in 2.g above

o Professional consulting as defined in 2.h. above

o A successful internal grant proposal (excludes travel grants)

o An opinion-editorial piece for a newspaper

o An article in a magazine or other general readership publication

o An encyclopedia entry in a scholarly publication

o A technical report for a program evaluation project or government agency (e.g., Citizen Satisfaction Survey)

o Creation of a long-form radio or television program or significant program segment that airs to a local audience.

o Creation of a short-form radio or television announcement or series of announcements (commercial or non-commercial) or short-form program segment that airs to a local audience.

3. General comments – These guidelines and examples are not intended to serve as an exhaustive inventory, nor do they focus on “borderline” cases. The activities listed are intended to be typical examples of scholarship in the Department of Communication. We recognize that infrequently a candidate may present “interesting things” that do not fit well with these categories yet are still legitimate scholarship. It will be up to the candidate to defend the activities as scholarship, based on their extraordinary nature, presenting their work in sufficient detail and with evidence of external peer review. The candidate may request a prior review of the proposed project in order to get feedback from the TPR Advisory Committee. The TPR Advisory Committee may solicit outside reviewers if necessary. In these cases of prior review, the TPR Advisory Committee will provide written feedback to the faculty member for inclusion in their dossier or other evaluation materials, and a copy will also be provided to the Department Head for placement in the faculty member’s departmental file. Professional development activities in the area of scholarship are also positively valued and should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of Service

a. Institutional service—committee service, recruiting, faculty governance, search committees, mentoring, at all levels, including department, college/school, and university.

b. Community engagement—providing disciplinary expertise to an academic, professional, civic, economic, or educational entity at the local, regional, or national level. The department will recognize extension instruction workshops given in the community, any fieldwork, guest speaking, judging for contests or similar activities in the specific areas of communication.
d. Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership/membership, activities and leadership roles in professional organizations from the state, regional, or national level such as service as an officer, participation in conference planning, service as journal editor or reviewer, academic conference paper reviewer, service on accreditation teams, serving as an officer in area-specific academic or professional organizations (e.g., the National Communication Association’s Organizational Communication Interest Group), etc. Recognition of quality work performed in on-campus and off-campus service such as department head or a major role in faculty governance will also be considered as appropriate.

e. Advising—advise students, advise work of or work with co-curricular and extracurricular student groups, and the supervision of individual projects in the various communication areas.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—The faculty members listing of service/engagement activities will be examined and evaluated with regards to time and energy requirements, level of expertise involved, available quantitative/qualitative data (e.g., number of advisees) and other indicators of quality of service

3. General comments—Faculty members are expected to participate in a threshold level of service activity at each institutional level (department, college, university) and to be active and competent advisors to students. In addition, the faculty member is expected to exhibit exceptional contributions in at least one area of service/engagement, which may be institutional or service to external constituencies. For a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, service/engagement is typically considered to represent 15% of the workload. Professional development activities in the domain of service/engagement are valued by the department; they should be described and documented as appropriate for the specific review event

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. Overview—All instructional faculty, regardless of status or participation in other review processes, are evaluated annually. This evaluation serves as an active, ongoing monitoring of faculty effectiveness. The Deans and Provost determine deadlines for completion of the review process.

2. Composition of review committee—The Departmental AFE Committee will consist of the department head and three faculty members (at least two tenured or tenure-track faculty) nominated by the department head from the full-time permanent faculty at the beginning of the academic year and approved by vote of all faculty. The positions are to be rotated (among all areas in the department) among the faculty each year as practical. The Department Head will serve as a non-voting chair. This committee will also be responsible for reviewing the department Collegial
Review Document and recommending changes as needed. These changes will be submitted to the departmental faculty at one of the first meetings of the academic year. The faculty will discuss and vote on the proposed changes. If adopted, the changes will be written into the following year's evaluation procedures.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation
a. The evaluation weighting percentages applied to teaching, scholarship, and service are typical guidelines recognizing that some faculty may be assigned differential loads.

All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes 1) the Annual Report of Faculty Activities and (2) a set of appendices with supporting documentation and artifacts. The Annual Report addresses the following aspects:

1) Teaching (60% of Evaluation)
   - Teaching loads
   - Teaching versatility—range of preparation and level of courses
   - Teaching effectiveness—brief summary of student assessment of instruction, and other indices used to measure effectiveness.
   - Other information: include objective information to illustrate teaching commitment and effectiveness (e.g., graduate students supervised, service learning projects, engagement activities, directing student research)
   - The seven dimensions of teaching: based on information in a. through d., briefly address each dimension, as outlined in the departmental Collegial Review Document.

2) Scholarship and Refereed Creative Work (25% of Evaluation)—Faculty will list the total cumulative record in chronological sequence for the year from most recent to the most dated with regard to scholarship and creative works, as defined by above. Items with projected publish dates may also be included if publication is projected to occur within the year. Items should be clearly designated as referred, non-referred, or non-traditional referred.

NOTE: Public recognition is also considered. Public recognition is defined as any activity, which brings positive recognition to the department and the university. Consideration will be given to the balance
between quantity and quality. Also, differing needs, career opportunities, and professional obligations may change the formula for limited periods of time during a faculty member's career. Such changes will take the form of a letter of agreement between the individual faculty and the Department Head in the individual's AFE file stating the time period covered as well as the purpose and terms of the adjustment.

3). Service (15% of Evaluation)—Consideration will be given to the balance between quantity and quality as well as to willingness to contribute. Faculty will list the cumulative record of their service/engagement activities in chronological sequence from most recent to most dated with each category:

- Service to the University—departmental, college and institution;
- Service to external constituencies—engagement activities, delivering workshops, professional consulting, teaching professional continuing education courses, service to professional disciplines, etc.; and
- Service to students—advisee load, work with student organizations, etc.
- Note: Expectations for service is based on years of experience (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College or University level committees)

b. Specific Guidelines for Preparation of the AFE Document—See Section III.A.3.a above.

c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05F) Part time (including adjunct) and Lecturer positions shall be evaluated in a similar procedure as tenure-track faculty. Part time (including adjunct) and Lecturer positions shall be evaluated based 100 percent on their teaching. Fixed term Instructors will be evaluated in the same procedure as the tenure/tenure-track faculty. Eighty percent of an Instructor evaluation will be based on teaching and the remaining 20 percent on either scholarship or service. All faculty will complete the elements of the Annual Report of Faculty that is applicable to them (scholarly activity and service may not be required). For those teaching the Liberal Studies course CMHC 201, the Director of that program does classroom observation and
confirmation of the observation will be placed in the faculty member's file.

d. General Comments: Procedures for the AFE Committee

The AFE committee will elect a secretary among its membership. The committee will meet and evaluate each faculty member in accordance with university procedures and the provisions of this document. The committee will confer and discuss all of the submitted materials and enter a rating and rationale to be placed on the Faculty Evaluation Scale. (See appendix). The committee will act in an advisory capacity to the Department Head. During committee deliberations, the Department Head will be a non-voting member. When the Department Head is the person being considered, he/she will excuse him/herself. The AFE Committee Secretary will submit the committee’s recommendations directly to the appropriate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Based on the committee deliberation and ratings, the Department Head will prepare a written AFE Statement for each faculty, addressing the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, in the context of departmental expectations. The faculty members meet with the Department Head to read and sign the AFE Statement and may prepare a rebuttal statement if they wish. The AFE Statement is then submitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

B. Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)

1. Overview – The Office of the Provost will generate an annual list of faculty eligible for tenure and reappointment. The Dean’s office will review and consult with the Provost’s office on any changes.

2. Composition of review committee (4.07D1) - The Departmental TPR Advisory Committee will be chaired by the Department Head (non-voting) and will be comprised of three tenured faculty members elected annually by the department’s tenured and tenure-track faculty. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with Department tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Dean of Arts & Sciences, selects tenured faculty from other closely-related departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

3. Procedures and preparation of documentation – The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean’s office. Detailed instructions for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.
C. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. **Overview** – Post-Tenure Review (PTR) is required of all tenured faculty with 50% or more responsibilities involving teaching, scholarship and/or service. This review is required of all tenured faculty no later than the fifth academic year following the most recent review event.

2. **Composition of review committee** – The departmental post-tenure review committee shall be comprise of the Department Head (non-voting) and all tenured members of the department, excluding any member scheduled for Post-tenure Review. In the event that there are less than three tenured faculty, the Department Head, in consultation with Department tenured and tenure-track faculty and the Dean of Arts & Sciences, selects tenured faculty from other closely-related departments to constitute a committee of at least three.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**
   a. The Office of the Provost includes the timetable for PTR along with the annual TPR schedule, distributed at the beginning of the academic year.
   b. The faculty member under review should provide the following information for the committee to review:
      1) A current curriculum vitae
      2) The four most recent AFE statements written by the Department Head, plus any rebuttals.
   c. The committee will discuss and determine a rating of exemplary, superior, satisfactory, needing improvement or unsatisfactory based on the previous four AFE Statements. The Department Head will provide a copy of this evaluation to the faculty member and will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review. The department head will add his/her own review, and any written response from the faculty member, and forward this material to the Dean.
   d. See the Faculty Handbook (Section 4.08) for further details concerning procedures, outcomes, appeals, and due process.
Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in Department of Communication

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation

1. Teaching – Each full and part-time faculty member must be evaluated annually for teaching effectiveness. The departmental faculty evaluation committee (AFE committee) must reach consensus on each faculty member’s teaching effectiveness based on the following criteria:
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
   b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
   c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching evaluations at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship – Minimum one unit per year, as described in Section II B 2.

3. Service: Tenure and tenure-track faculty are expected to participate in each of the following levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair). Total commitment to all service areas should be approximately 15% of tenured and tenure track faculty workload. (Note: Expectations for service is based on years of experience (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College of University level committees) Part-time and fixed term faculty commitments to service are contingent on individual contract terms.

4. General Comments: In general, time and work efforts for tenured & tenure track faculty should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service. Unless the faculty contract stipulates differently, part-time and fixed term faculty are considered as 100% teaching. Exceptions to this full-time teaching commitment are dependent on individual contract. In these cases, the part-time or fixed term faculty member is expected to submit a copy of their contractual agreement with their AFE file.
B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. Teaching – Each full and part-time faculty member must be evaluated annually for teaching effectiveness. The departmental faculty evaluation committee (AFE committee) must reach consensus on each faculty member’s teaching effectiveness based on the following criteria:
a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship – Minimum of one unit per year, as described in Section II B 2. As the candidate progresses through the probationary period, expectations increase with regard to scholarly activity. On a case-by-case basis, the candidate may need to exceed the yearly minimum to maintain sustainable progress towards tenure. Special note: Typically, for the initial reappointment decision, there will be no expectations for the completion of scholarly activity during the first year, only the clear indication that plans have been initiated to establish a pattern of scholarly activity that will lead to tenure.

3. Service: The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service (departmental; college; university; external/regional service), though this pattern may emerge gradually over the span of the probationary period (e.g., faculty in their first year are not expected to have departmental advisees and are not expected to serve on College of University level committees). There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. Total commitment to all service areas should be approximately 15% of faculty workload. Exposure to all levels of institutional service is desirable; however, exceptions approved by the Dept. Head and AFE committee are acceptable. Examples of approved service that might exempt a faculty member from traditional levels of varied institutional service includes: large outreach projects, funded research projects, faculty fellowships, etc. Tenure track faculty members should gradually accrue a share of advisees.
4. General Comments: In general, time and work efforts for tenured & tenure track faculty should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. Teaching – To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to tenure application, have an overall “excellent” rating based on AFE committee reports. The overall “excellent” rating is based on an AFE committee consensus decision on the faculty member’s following teaching materials:
   a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be “excellent.”
   b) Receive an “excellent” score (averaging a minimum of 4.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 75% of the courses taught.
   c) One “excellent” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc., hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship— Six units, as described in Section II B 2. Faculty are expected to initiate scholarly work upon appointment, but these units may be completed during the latter four years of the probationary period. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. The faculty member should have experience in each level of service before receiving tenure. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of advisees by the year prior to submission for tenure.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)
1. Teaching – To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to promotion for Associate Professor, have an overall “excellent” rating based on AFE committee reports. An overall “excellent” rating is based on AFE committee consensus of the following candidate teaching materials:

a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be “satisfactory.”
b) Receive a ‘satisfactory’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.0 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAJ on at least 75% of the courses taught.
c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc., hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship – Six units, as described in Section II B 2. Faculty are expected to initiate scholarly work upon appointment, but these units may be completed during the four years preceding the requested promotion. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees by the year prior to submission for promotion.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. Teaching – To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should for three consecutive years prior to promotion to Full Professor, have an overall superior rating based on AFE committee reports. The overall superior rating is based on an AFE committee consensus decision of
faculty member submissions of the following teaching materials
a) AFE committee finds the faculty member’s “self assessment” document based on the 7 dimensions of teaching to be ‘satisfactory.’
b) Receive a ‘superior’ score (averaging a minimum of 3.5 on a 5.0 scale) on the 5 “factor scores” of the SAI on at least 90 percent of the courses taught.
c) One “satisfactory” rating annually from direct “peer” observations or other credible sources of teaching at WCU. Credible observations include: departmental colleagues (tenure or tenure-track); non-departmental teaching award committee members; observers not employed at WCU approved by AFE committee members and Department Head; Faculty Center observers. Non-credible observations of teaching include: spouses and other family members; quid pro quo observers (university or outside consultants, experts, etc, hired in the past, present or knowingly will be hired in the future by the observed faculty member or department); mentors; observers unapproved by AFE committee and Dept. Head.

2. Scholarship—Eight units subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor. A minimum of three units must come from categories A, B, C, or D.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service” section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees and have demonstrated competence as a student advisor and serve as a model/mentor for junior faculty.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. Teaching –To meet minimum expectations for teaching effectiveness, the faculty member should, for three consecutive years prior to post-tenure review, have an overall “satisfactory” rating based on the previous AFE committee reports.

2. Scholarship—One or two unit minimum for each year since tenure or the last post-tenure review noting that some faculty may be assigned a differential load.

3. Service – The faculty member is expected to participate in each of the following traditional levels of institutional service: departmental; college; university; external/regional service. There should be exceptional effort in one of these levels (e.g., committee chair) per year. As noted above in the “Service”
section for “Reappointment” requirements, there can be exceptions to “traditional” levels of institutional service. The faculty member is also expected to carry a full share of departmental advisees and have demonstrated competence as a student advisor and serve as a model/mentor to junior faculty.

4. General Comments: In general, faculty workload should be as follows: 60% in teaching; 25% devoted to scholarship; 15% to all service.

Approved by: [Signature]
Department Head | 9-29-08
Date

Dean [Signature] | 9-29-08
Date

Provost [Signature] | 9-30-08
Date
EXHIBIT M

FACULTY PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND CERTIFICATIONS

Memberships:

- Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
- Association of Journalists of Macedonia
- Broadcast Education Association
- Global Investigative Journalism Network
- Inter-collegiate Online News Network
- National Association of Broadcasters
- National Communication Association
- North Carolina Association of Broadcasters
- Public Relations Society of America
- Society of Professional Journalists
- Southern States Communication Association
- Public Relations Association of Western North Carolina
- American Society for Training and Development
- Sloan Consortium

Faculty Professional Certifications:

- Accreditation in Public Relations, APR, Public Relations Society of America
- Certified Radio Marketing Expert – Radio Advertising Bureau
- Certified Digital Marketing Consultant – Radio Advertising Bureau
- Federal Communication Commission – Third Class Radio Telephone Operators Permit
- Lifetime Secondary Teacher Certification in Speech and Theatre, State of Missouri
- Lifetime Secondary Teacher Certification in English, State of Missouri
- Registered Nurse, Nursing Science
- Society of Broadcast Engineers – Radio Broadcast Technologist
- Society of Broadcast Engineers – Television Broadcast Technologist
Curriculum Proposal Guide

I. NEW COURSES

A. Course Prefixes. The prefixes used to designate courses, except in the case of very short names such as art, are abbreviations of the names of departments or of fields of study within the departments.

B. Numbering System. Each course is identified by means of a course prefix and a three-digit number. The first digit of the number designates the level of the course and indicates the minimum class rank a student should have achieved to enroll in the course.

Students should not enroll in courses numbered above their class rank without the permission of the department offering the course. Undergraduate students may not enroll in graduate level courses for either undergraduate or graduate credit except under the conditions specified in the graduate catalog. In such cases, the student must meet graduate-level requirements to receive credit.

Courses numbered 293, 294, 393, 394, 493, 494, 593, 594, 693 or 694 are for special topics that reflect a student’s or faculty member’s special interest not covered by regular departmental curriculum offerings. Credit in these courses varies from one to four credit hours, to be determined by the department for each offering. Students may take up to 12 hours of special topic credit in a single department/program. A particular topic course can be taught at most two times in a five-year period. If a department/program wishes to teach a particular topic course more than twice in a five-year period, it must propose the course as a regular course, subject to the curriculum review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix Range</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-100</td>
<td>Noncredit courses which are not applicable to degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-199</td>
<td>Courses for freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190-199</td>
<td>First-Year Seminar courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td>Courses for sophomores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399</td>
<td>Courses for juniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499</td>
<td>Courses for seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-799</td>
<td>Masters-level courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-999</td>
<td>Doctoral-level courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number 389 is reserved for cooperative education undergraduate courses, and the number 589 is reserved for cooperative education graduate courses.

Within the sequences 480-499, 580-599, 680-699, and 780-799, the second and third digits of the numbers are assigned to special types of courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix Range</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-82</td>
<td>Independent study and directed-readings courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-89</td>
<td>Internships, practicum, and special applied field projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-92</td>
<td>Student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>Special topics courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-98</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Credits and Class Meetings. Unless otherwise indicated at the end of the course description, the number of hours a class meets each week is the same as the credit-hour value of the course. The credit-hour value of each course is indicated in parentheses immediately following its title. For example, if 3 hours of credit may be earned, the credit is indicated as (3). In variable credit courses, the minimum and maximum hours are shown as (1-3). Unless repeat credit is specified in the course description, a course may be applied only once toward the hours required for graduation. The availability of a course for repeat credit and the maximum hours that may be earned are indicated within the parentheses and immediately following the credit-hour value of the course as follows: (3, R6). In this example, the course carries 3 hours of credit and may be repeated once for a total maximum of 6 hours applicable toward a degree.

Credit is awarded in experiential courses on the basis of a minimum of three contact hours per credit hour.

D. Course Descriptions. Course descriptions can only be 25 words or less. This length does not include prerequisites, corequisites, or S/U grading, or other wording not pertaining to the description. If the description in any way overlaps another department, a signed consultation form from the affected department is needed.

E. Prerequisites and Corequisites. A prerequisite (PREQ) is any special requirement, usually one or more background courses or requirements other than class rank, that must be met before enrolling in a course specifying the prerequisite. A corequisite (COREQ) is any course which must be taken during the same term as the course that specifies the corequisite. Experiential Courses. The maximum credit in experiential courses that may be applied toward a degree within the minimum of 120 or 128 hours required in all bachelor’s programs is 26 semester hours (20 percent). The maximum credit that may be earned in cooperative education or applied field project courses/internships or in any combination of the two is 15 hours.

- A course prerequisite can not be a higher level course number than the course itself. That not only means from 100 to 200, but also from 123-124 numbers.
- Anytime you use a prerequisite that has a prefix other than your department, you must consult with that department as you make changes to your course and the consultation form should be attached. For example, if BIOL 233 uses CHEM 130 as a prerequisite and you want to delete BIOL 233, the Chemistry department needs to be consulted. This lets the Chemistry department know you no longer offer this course and also that they will not need to offer additional sections of CHEM 130.

F. Cooperative Education Courses. Students participating in a cooperative education work term are registered for a 389 course in the major department, or the department most closely related to the work experience. To be eligible, a student must be at least a sophomore and have a GPA of 2.0 or above. Exceptions must be approved by the departmental co-op placement adviser. A full statement of the requirements for academic credit is available from the Cooperative Education Office in the Career Services Office. Academic assignments and work performance are used to evaluate the student on an S/U basis.

G. Special Topics Course Policy. Courses numbered 293, 294, 393, 394, 493, 494, 593, 594, 693 or 694 are for special topics that reflect a student’s or faculty member’s special interest not covered by regular
departmental curriculum offerings. Credit in these courses varies from one to four credit hours, to be determined by the department for each offering. Students may take up to 12 hours of special topic credit in a single department/program. A particular topic course can be taught at most two times in a five-year period. If a department/program wishes to teach a particular topic course more than twice in a five year period, it must propose the course as a regular course, subject to the curriculum review process. Do not delete the special topics number when developing a new course.

H. New Liberal Studies Courses. The category of Liberal Studies to which each course applies may be found in the liberal studies requirements section. The applicable category also is indicated by the parenthetical code at the end of each course description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Writing</td>
<td>P1 Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Mathematics</td>
<td>P2 (changed to C5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Oral Communication</td>
<td>P3 History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Wellness</td>
<td>P4 Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Physical and Biological Sciences</td>
<td>P5 Fine and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6 World Cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any Liberal Studies course being proposed (new or changing an existing course) needs to complete the appropriate LS course proposal form found at http://www.wcu.edu/liberalstudies/. The syllabus must also reflect the Liberal Studies objectives for that particular Liberal Studies Program category.

II. NEW PROGRAMS

A. Intent to Plan (Appendix A form) and coversheet are developed by the department.
B. Once approved by the Dean, the Dean submits the program proposal to the Assoc. VC for Academic Affairs to place on the Council of Deans agenda. If endorsed by the COD then the program continues through the curriculum approval process.
C. Once the program Intent to Plan is approved by Senate, it is electronically submitted to General Administration.
D. If approved, General Administration (GA) posts the Intent to Plan on their website and the institution has eleven months to develop and submit the Authorization to Establish (Appendix C) to the Provost Office.
E. After review and approval by the Provost the Appendix C is submitted to General Administration for final approval.
F. Nancy Carden notifies departments when the Appendix C has been approved by the Provost and the departments submit the program AA5s through the campus curriculum approval process.
G. Basic Program Requirements (undergraduate)
   1. no less than 120 hours and no more than 128 hours required
   2. all concentrations require equal number of hours
   3. majors with 27-45 hours must require minor, second major, or other approved program
   4. 46-64 hours are required in majors that do not require a minor or second major
   5. 50% of courses required in the major have to be at the 300-400 level (must petition for exemption to this rule when proposing the program)
   6. 25% of the total degree program required hours must be at the 300-400 level
7. 8 semester plan for completing the program must be attached. (will eventually be posted on the website for the degree program---no longer posted in the catalog)

H. Basic Program Requirements (graduate)
1. 50% of the credit hours for a master’s degree must be 600 level or above
2. 50% of the credit hours for the education specialist’s degree must be 700 level or above
3. At least 24 hours must be earned as resident credit hours (teacher education requires 1 semester of full time graduate work—summer may be counted as one of the semesters—see Graduate Catalog for exceptions)
4. Graduate degrees must be completed within 6 years

III. CONSULTATION FORMS

Many academic programs consist of courses offered by departments other than their own. As you plan changes to your curriculum, keep in mind the fact that your changes might have an impact on other departments. You must submit consultations forms from the library (for new courses or programs) as well as any other department that is effected by the course proposal or change. Some of the reasons may be:

- Course proposal has similar content to content in another department
- Course proposal has prerequisite/corequisite from another department
- Course proposal impacts another major from a different department
- Course proposal might be of particular interest to another department to list as an elective choice

IV. ITEMS THAT REQUIRE APPROVAL FROM GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

- New degree program Intent to Plan (Appendix A) for approval THEN the Authorization to Establish (Appendix C)
- New degree program in the same 6-digit CIP code as currently authorized program at the same level (Appendix D)
- Certificate of Advanced Study (CAS) Intent to Plan (Appendix A)
- Discontinuation of a degree program, CAS program, or other certificates
- New doctoral program or first professional degree program Authorization to Plan (Appendix B)
- Intent to Offer a sequence of distance education courses for certification, licensure, or other purpose not leading to award or a degree (Appendix E)—Authorization to Establish is not required
- Degree program title change
- *New distance education program Intent to Plan (Appendix F—at least 3 months prior to implementation) for approval—if 50% or more of the degree program is provided through distance education THEN the Authorization to Establish (Appendix G)—no less than one month following the Appendix F.

*In order to be approved as a distance program through General Administration, the institution must have already established the program in its degree inventory through the Appendix A & C processes.
Annual Concentration Evaluations

2007-08  Print Media transitioning to Journalism
2008-09  Public Relations
2009-10  C 3 Oral Communication Liberal Studies Requirement COMM 201 Human Communication Course Redesign

Sample Concentration Evaluation

Western Carolina University
Oral Communication Component – COMM 201
Communication Department
Annual Assessment Report for 2009-2010

Primary Contact Name/Info:
Donald Connelly, Department Head & Associate Professor
227-3851

The Department of Communication assessed the oral communication component of the department’s liberal studies class COMM 201 this year. There were approximately 1,100 COMM 201 students during the 2009-10 academic year. The oral communication courses typically are filled beyond capacity.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessed in 2009-10

During the past two years the assessment of this program has repeatedly failed to accomplish its goal due to a serious personnel issue which was remedied in December 2009. The department immediately instituted a rapid plan to elevate the program to match standards established by the
National Communication Association for oral communication and to meet recommendations and strategic actions established in the program development plan of July, 2007. Michael Caudill and Ruth Bennett were assigned to lead the faculty in the COMM 201 re-design. Please note that any course references within the earlier recommendations are outdated.

**Responses to the 2007 C 3 Oral Communication Development Plan 2007 - Recommendations and Strategic Action**

**Recommendation 1**
Establish a standardized number of sections that allocated resources will support.; Coordinate with administration 30 sections per semester has on University student needs.

**Strategic Action 1**
Due to state budget constraints, this recommendation has not been met. With present staffing the department is able to staff 21 sections; two of those sections being overloads for current faculty. Presently the department is searching for a COMM 201 lecturer that will add four more sections if the position is filled fall 2010.

The problem that has arisen is that 1,400 plus freshmen entered in 2009; there were seats for only 1,100 students in COMM 201. The same number of freshmen is anticipated fall 2010. A bottleneck to get into the class in the freshman/sophomore year is fast developing.

**Recommendation 2**
Recommended changes to C3 Learning Objectives. Students will be able to:
   a) Demonstrate competency in small group communication.
   b) Demonstrate understanding of critical and literal listening.
   c) Recognize discrepancies between the speaker’s verbal and non verbal messages.
   d) Demonstrate competency in public speaking.
   e) Demonstrate competency in interpersonal communication

**Strategic Action 2**
The recommended changes are being incorporated with wording that is parallel with the National Communication Association guidelines. The “new” program is being piloted summer 2010 and fall 2010 in a limited number of classes. Full adoption will occur spring 2011. A new text has been adopted. The textbook is either a hard copy or an online version; student preference. The new program follows and is based upon a “typical semester.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEKS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS &amp; LEARNING OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>Effective oral communication involves generating messages and delivering them with attention to vocal variety, articulation, and nonverbal signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing communication skills is essential in order to be effective in school, the workplace, and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1: Introduction &amp; Assessment</td>
<td><strong>1A. Determine The Purpose of Effective Human Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A1. Identify the various purposes for human communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1A2. Understand that different contexts require different methods and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1B. Assess Communication Skills, Abilities, and Styles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B1. Identify individual communication style(s) &amp; ways they affect interpersonal communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B2. Set personal goals for developing a clear, concise, assertive interpersonal communication style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Verbal Communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The competent speaker must be able to compose a message, as well as provide ideas and information suitable to the topic, purpose, and receiver(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 Verbal Communication &amp; Perception</td>
<td><strong>2A. Demonstrate Need for the Careful Choice of Words</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A1. Demonstrate an understanding of the power and consequences of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A2. Employ language that promotes clarity and the receiver's understanding and acceptance of the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A3. Select words that are 1) appropriate to the topic, audience, purpose, context, and speaker; and 2) avoid sexism, racism, and other forms of prejudice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A4. Explain how jargon, slang, idiomatic language, and regionalisms may facilitate or hinder understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2B. Demonstrate Need for Accurate Perception</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B1. Understand how personal perspectives on the world and previous experiences influence communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B2. Explain how stereotypes, perceptual sets and attributions influence communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B3. Understand how cultural differences may influence perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Communication</td>
<td>Effective communication involves generating messages and delivering them with attention to vocal variety, articulation and nonverbal signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td><strong>3A. Demonstrate Nonverbal Behavior That Supports The Verbal Message</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonverbal Communication &amp; Cultural Competence</strong></td>
<td>Monday holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A1. Use appropriate nonverbal elements (paralanguage, kinesics, chronemics, proxemics, personal appearance) to enhance credibility and effectiveness in communication. 3A2. Explain how nonverbal communication may be arbitrary, intentional, unintentional and influenced by culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3B. Cultural Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B1. Identify the demographic changes underway in American society 3B2. Understand and adapt communication to people from other cultures, co-cultures or groups. 3B3. Understand how communication is affected by high and low context culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Listening &amp; Processing</strong></th>
<th><strong>The competent listener must be able to engage in both literal and critical comprehension of ideas and information transmitted in oral language.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4A. Demonstrate the Ability to Actively Listen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening &amp; Processing Information</strong></td>
<td>4A1. Demonstrate awareness that each person has a unique perspective, and that one's knowledge, experience, and emotions affect listening. 4A2. Demonstrate comprehension by formulating questions that clarify or qualify the speaker's content and paraphrasing the speaker's message. 4A3. Identify the speaker's purpose and important points. 4A4. Distinguish between fact and opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4B. Demonstrate the Ability to Process Messages</strong></td>
<td>4B1. Identify instances of bias and prejudice in a spoken message and specify how this may affect the impact of a spoken message. 4B2. Demonstrate an understanding that arguments have both emotional and logical dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5A. Demonstrate the Ability to Provide Effective Constructive Feedback that is descriptive, specific, relevant, current, and factual.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing Effective Feedback - Transition to</strong></td>
<td>5B. Demonstrate the ability to check with the receiver for understanding of both content and intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Communication</td>
<td>The success of collaborative efforts in groups depends on effective use of interpersonal skills, an understanding of group dynamics, effective use of problem-solving skills, and the ability to resolve conflict constructively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Week 6**          | **6A. Identify and assess own group communication styles and skills**  
| Group communication skills | **6B. Demonstrate the ability to use positive, effective interpersonal communication skills in groups and teams**  
| | **6B1. Apply effective interpersonal interaction skills to working collaboratively in groups**  
| | • actively listening  
| | • using positive, descriptive language  
| | • using open-ended questions and paraphrasing to clarify issues  
| | • asserting own ideas, without dominating or withdrawing  
| | • Understand and value differences in communication styles.  
| | **6C. Recognize positive group interaction skills and behaviors in classroom activities.**  
| | **6C1. Demonstrate the ability to adapt to people from other cultures, organizations, or groups.**  
| | **6C2. Demonstrate the following skills:**  
| | • indicating empathy  
| | • staying on track  
| | • verbally recognizing others’ ideas and accepting others’ points of view as valid  
| | • encouraging participation  
| | • identifying shared interests  
| | • asserting own ideas  
| | • without dominating or withdrawing  
| | • using reasons, fact, & common interests to influence  
| | • summarizing to keep the group on track  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th><strong>7A. Understand the types of groups and how groups develop</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Dynamics</td>
<td>7A1. Identify types and purposes of groups, from informal to formal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7A2. Identify and demonstrate the ability to recognize group development stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7B. Define the roles individuals play in a group, both constructive and destructive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7B1. Demonstrate the ability to use appropriate team roles in team activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7B2. Demonstrate the ability to fulfill leadership functions in group activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7C. Discuss structured and creative problem-solving methods that can be used in groups.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7C 1. Demonstrate the ability to use appropriate methods in group activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th><strong>8A. Understand how conflict can be managed productively in teams/groups</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing and Resolving Conflict in Groups/Teams</td>
<td>8A1. Describe the types and sources of conflict in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8A2. Recognize the characteristics of constructive and destructive conflict in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8A3. List the forces that shape a group’s decisions, including cultural forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH, F holiday</td>
<td><strong>8B. Demonstrate the use of conflict resolution methods and strategies to resolve conflicts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8B1. Identify important issues or problems before they become barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8B2. Demonstrate the ability to choose the conflict style that is most appropriate to the situation and participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8B3. Demonstrate the ability to negotiate an agreement effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th><strong>9A. Create a team project agreement and plan for a team presentation.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing and planning a team project - Transition to Public</td>
<td>9A1. Create a team agreement/contract to cover group norms, conflict resolution agreements, and project plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9A2. Demonstrate the ability to apply group decision making processes to plan the team presentation project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>M, T holiday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Communication</strong></td>
<td>The competent speaker must be able to transmit the message by using delivery skills suitable to the topic, purpose, and audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 9 (continued)</strong></td>
<td><strong>The basics of delivering a presentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A. Demonstrate effective methods for controlling anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B. Understand effective delivery guidelines for both individuals and teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C. Develop awareness of how vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity affect reception of message.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C1. Demonstrate the ability to use vocal variety, rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest, clarify, and emphasize.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Informative Speaking** | The competent speaker must be able to construct and deliver an informative message, individually or in teams, that is adapted to the audience, purpose, and context of the speaking situation. In this class informative speeches will be presented in team. |
| **Week 11 Team presentations preparation** | **W Advising Day** |
| 11A. Demonstrate the ability as a team to develop and organize an informative message for effectiveness with an introduction, main points, support material, useful transitions, and a conclusion. |
| 11A1. Select organizational patterns that are appropriate to the topic, audience, context, and purpose. |
| 11B. Prepare a preparation outline for the Team presentation. |
| 11C. Evaluate another team’s preparation outline for clarity and organization. |

| **Persuasion** | The competent speaker must be able to construct and deliver a persuasive message that is adapted to the audience, purpose, and context of the speaking situation. |
| **Week 12 Team Informative Presentations** | **W Advising Day** |
| 12A. Demonstrate the ability to present as a member of a team |
| 12B. Write an analysis of the team’s process and dynamics |
Methods of Assessment - Students

Recommendation 3
Recommendation for student assessment: develop a reliable pretest/posttest data collection instrument that provides valid data. NCA recommends assessing individual attitudes toward communication by exploring the variables:
   a) Value placed on oral communication
   b) Communication apprehension
   c) Communication reticence
   d) Willingness to communicate

Strategic Action 3
Ruth Bennett and Michael Caudill are working with John Hawes of the Learning Management System (LMS) Team in the Coulter Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. A Qualtrics testing account has been established for COMM 201 specifically for students to pre and post test their perceptions of their communication skills. The pre and post test data will provide the information necessary for individual student and program assessment. To be completed fall 2010.
Recommendation 4
For program-wide assessment: enumerate all students enrolled in CMHC 201 at the beginning of each semester and implement assessment protocols as outlined in the C3 Assessment Report.

Strategic Action 4
See Strategic Action 3 above.

Methods of Assessment - Faculty

Recommendation 5
Standardize instructor evaluation methods program-wide.
- Benchmark against Caudill’s use of outstanding comprehensive instructor and student evaluation rubrics.
- Adapt this method for use by all CMHC 201 faculty.

Strategic Action 5
Standardized rubrics have been adopted for faculty to use in judging oral communication/public speaking. A COMM 201 course development website has been created in WebCat to allow for sharing of course information. With the adoption of the university approved communication department Collegial Review Document, all faculty evaluations are standardized.

Implementation Plan

Recommendation 6
Funding should be allocated to procure at least four additional cameras and DVDr disks. (For recording students presentations and assessment)

Strategic Action 6
Rather than equipping numerous faculty members with camera’s, tripods, power cords, and all of the accessories necessary to record each student on an individual DVD the assessment team developed a simpler, more effective cost-efficient plan. Three classrooms have been designated as “capture” classrooms. Three class rooms will efficiently accommodate all of the sections of COMM 201and make the best uses of space and university resources. Equipment has been purchased to equip each room with a ceiling mounted camera and microphone and interface the equipment with a central server. Faculty will log in to the server from the computer cart already in the classroom and record each presentation. Once recorded, the presentation is posted to WebCat for the student or faculty to review.
Recommendation 7
Funding should also be provided to purchase DVDr discs. New director is responsible for: scheduling, in-class instructor evaluations, program management, instructor/student arbitration, annual faculty evaluation (AFE) reports, cover classes for absent faculty, faculty search committees, program assessment, higher administration-mandated duties, complete lack of summer semester director funding.

Strategic Action 7
The funding for DVDr discs is no longer needed; see Strategic Action 6 above. After analysis, the department has concluded that the “director of oral communication” position should not be a position in the department. Rather, the duties for the oral communication director should be a faculty service function within the department similar to the department head and should rotate among the COMM 201 faculty. Oversight will be provided by the department head. Evaluation of faculty has already been addressed in the university approved communication department Collegial Review Document; all faculty evaluations are standardized. It will also not be necessary to fund a program director’s position over the summer.
COMM 240 Course Pre-Test
Grammar Diagnostic Exam

1. Robert ______ from his bike.
   a. had fell
   b. had fallen
   c. fallen
   d. falling

2. The plane with its crew ____________ trying to take off now.
   a. is
   b. be
   c. are
   d. been

3. Is the atmosphere on the moon _____ the atmosphere here on earth?
   a. different from
   b. like to
   c. different than
   d. as different as

4. Why is the referee so _____ the players?
   a. angry at
   b. angry with
   c. angry in
   d. angry over

5. Why ________________ allowed to join?
   a. was Ann and her
   b. was Ann and him
   c. were Ann and he
   d. were Ann and him

6. Someone ____________ turned on the automatic sprinkler.
   a. must of
   b. might of
   c. must to
   d. must have

7. I noticed the dog as he ______ on the porch.
   a. laid
   b. lay
   c. lain
   d. lied
8. Share the work _______all the workers.
   a. between
   b. amongst
   c. betweens
   d. among

9. The trunk was _____heavy _____carry.
   a. to, to
   b. too, too
   c. too, to
   d. to, too

10. Will you _____come?
    a. try and
    b. try to
    c. be trying and
    d. trying to

11. It was Ann who __________the book on the table.
    a. layed
    b. laid
    c. lain
    d. lay

12. The committee _____holding an open meeting on Thursday.
    a. are
    b. is
    c. been
    d. be

13. The new suit is ________.
    a. alright
    b. al right
    c. allright
    d. all right

14. I am happy to __________ Your offer to go to the games.
    a. accept
    b. except
    c. have excepted
    d. having accepted

15. He spoke very __________.
    a. strange
    b. stranger
    c. strangest
    d. strangely
16. He speaks _________________.
   a. good
   b. goodly
   c. well
   d. more better

17. She __________finished the job in half the time.
   a. could of
   b. can’t of
   c. could have
   d. could had

18. Please _________ here.
   a. set
   b. sit
   c. to be set
   d. to be sitted

19. He __________a pint of milk.
   a. has drank
   b. have drank
   c. has drunk
   d. have drunk

20. Either you or your friends ____to blame for the accident.
   a. is
   b. are
   c. been
   d. was

21. Neither Barbara nor Sara _____homework on Saturdays.
   a. do
   b. does
   c. are doing
   d. were doing

22. None of the programs _____free from station breaks.
   a. is
   b. are
   c. be
   d. being

23. Why are you still angry ________me?
   a. at
   b. with
   c. be
   d. against
24. If everyone does _______ share, we shall certainly finish on time.
   a. their
   b. his or her
   c. there
   d. they're

25. ____________, the majority of the board members promises to support him.
   a. Regardless of who is chosen
   b. Regardless of whom is chosen
   c. Irregardless of who is chosen
   d. Irregardless of whom is chosen

26. Choose the correct style:
   a. In a Baptist church
   b. In a baptist Church
   c. In a baptist church
   d. In a Baptist Church

27. Choose the correct style:
   a. a Mother’s Day gift
   b. a Mother’s day gift
   c. a mother’s day gift
   d. a Mother’s Day Gift

28. Choose the correct style:
   a. The new Fall colors
   b. The new fall colors
   c. The New Fall Colors
   d. The New fall colors

29. Choose the correct style:
   a. The Brother of mayor Bates
   b. The brother of Mayor Bates
   c. The Brother of Mayor Bates
   d. The brother of mayor Bates

30. Choose the correct style:
   a. A brazilian pianist
   b. A Brazilian Pianist
   c. A Brazilian pianist
   d. A brazilian Pianist

31. Choose the correct style:
   a. At Easton High School
   b. At Easton high school
   c. At Easton high School
   d. At easton high school
32. Choose the correct style:
   a. On the North Side of Pine Lake
   b. On the north Side of Pine Lake
   c. On the North side of Pine Lake
   d. On the north side of Pine Lake

33. Choose the correct style:
   a. Dodd tool company
   b. Dodd Tool company
   c. Dodd tool Company
   d. Dodd Tool Company

34. Choose the correct style:
   a. any Sunday in July
   b. any Sunday in july
   c. any sunday in July
   d. any Sunday in july

35. Choose the correct style:
   a. A College Football star
   b. A college football star
   c. A College Football star
   d. A College Football Star

36. Mabel asked, “To which colleges has Joan _____________
   a. applied.”
   b. applied”?  
   c. applied”.
   d. applied?”

37. ____________________________ should be free of loose dirt and paint.
   a. Before you paint the surface, of course,
   b. Before you paint the surface of course,
   c. Before you paint, the surface, of course,
   d. Before you paint, the surface of course

38. All the __________________________
   a. students, whose reports were not handed in, failed.
   b. students who’s reports were not handed in, failed.
   c. students who’s reported were not handed in failed.
   d. students whose reports were not handed in failed.

39. “Before starting to write your _____________Miss Wright advised.
   a. composition plan what you are going to say,”
   b. composition plan what you are going to say”
   c. composition, plan what you are going to say,”
   d. composition, plan what you are going to say”,

   __
40. Choose the correct possessive case:
   a. Everyones’ friend
   b. Childrens’ toys
   c. The school’s reputation
   d. Is this your’s?

41. Built in 1832, _____ is now a museum of early American life.
   a. Dunham Tavern at 6709 Euclid Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio,
   b. Dunham Tavern, at 6709 Euclid Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio,
   c. Dunham Tavern, at 6709 Euclid Avenue in Cleveland Ohio
   d. Dunham Tavern at 6709 Euclid Avenue in Cleveland Ohio

42. “When you come to the stop ______ “make a full stop.”
   a. sign”, Dad repeated,
   b. sign: Dad repeated,
   c. sign,” Dad repeated
   d. sign,” Dad repeated,

43. Every _______________________________ lose his license.
   a. motorist, who is caught speeding, should
   b. motorist who is caught speeding should
   c. motorist who is caught speeding; should
   d. motorist, who is caught speeding should

44. ___________________________ stimulates the heart and raises blood pressure.
   a. Caffeine which is present, in both tea and coffee,
   b. Caffeine, which is present in both tea and coffee,
   c. Caffeine, which is present in both tea, and coffee
   d. Caffeine, which is present in both tea and coffee

45. Choose the correct possessive case:
   a. Barton’s and McLean’s store
   b. Jack and Tom’s responsibility
   c. Moon rays
   d. Editor-in-chiefs’ opinion

Choose the correct spelling in 46-65

46. a. fullfil     b. fulfil     c. fullfill    d. fulfill
47. a. separate   b. separate   c. separate   d. saperate
48. a. defenitley b. defientely  c. definitely  d. definitley
49. a. calander   b. calandare  c. calendar   d. calender
50. a. acomodat   b. accomadate  c. accommodate d. accommodate
51. a. amatur     b. ameteur    c. amateur    d. amater
52. a. defusute   b. deficit    c. deficite   d. defecite
53. a. auxelary  b. auxilary  c. auxiliary  d. axiliary

54. a. conceintous  b. consientius  c. conscientious  d. consentious

55. a. presendent  b. presedant  c. precedent  d. precedant

56. a. superentendent  b. superintident  c. superintendent  d. superintendent

57. a. recieve  b. receive  c. ricieve  d. receive

58. a. adaptability  b. adaptability  c. adaptability  d. adaptibility

59. a. alegance  b. allegiance  c. alegiance  d. allegiance

60. a. privilege  b. priviledge  c. previledge  d. preveledge

61. a. concede  b. conceed  c. consede  d. conseed

62. a. elegible  b. eligible  c. elegeble  d. eligible

63. a. camoflauge  b. camouglauge  c. camouflag  d. camalage

64. a. athleet  b. athlete  c. athelete  d. athilete

65. a. generousity  b. generosity  c. genatousity  d. generousity

---

**COMM 240 Post-Test**

**Grammar Diagnostic Exam**

**Indicate the correct answer.**

1. There ____ many possible candidates.
   a. is
   b. are
   c. was
   d. none of the above

2. Both of your excuses _________ plausible.
   a. sound
   b. sounds
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

3. Several of the members ______ absent.
   a. was
   b. were
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above
4. Many ______surprised at the final score.
   a. was
   b. were
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

5. Some of the money ____missing.
   a. is
   b. are
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

6. All of the cherries ______ripe.
   a. look
   b. looks
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

7. Baker took the handoff, _____his way within one foot of the goal line.
   a. bulldozes
   b. bulldozing
   c. bulldozed
   d. none of the above

8. I will ______you to swim.
   a. learn
   b. teach
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

9. Fans cheered as the touchdown __________.
   a. had been made
   b. was made
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

10. A large _____of disgruntled men barred the entrance.
    a. amount
    b. number
    c. either of the above
    d. none of the above

11. What honor is there _________forty thieves?
    a. among
    b. between
    c. either of the above
    d. none of the above
12. You have _______ friends than she.
   a. Fewer
   b. Less
   c. Either of the above
   d. None of the above

13. Is an author to blame for what the public _____ from his work?
   a. infers
   b. implies
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

14. Between you and ______, the food could have been much better than it was.
   a. I
   b. Me
   c. She
   d. None of the above

15. _______ and _______ dad have the same hobbies.
   a. she, her
   b. him, his
   c. them, their
   d. none of the above

16. The construction of fallout shelters _____ being considered.
   a. was
   b. were
   c. are
   d. were not

17. A combination of these methods _____ sure to succeed.
   a. were
   b. are
   c. is
   d. none of the above

18. Each of their children ______ a different instrument
   a. have
   b. play
   c. plays
   d. either a or b

19. Val _____ me the very record I would have ____________.
   a. give, choosed
   b. gave, choosed
   c. give, chosen
   d. gave, chosen
20. By the time the sun ________, we had ___________ nearly a hundred miles.
   a. rised, drove
   b. raised, driven
   c. rose, driven
   d. had raised, driven

21. As I _______ there, my hat was _____________ into the river.
   a. sit, blowed
   b. sit, blown
   c. sat, blown

22. Mr. Greenfield’s lost eyeglasses _____ the object of everyone’s search at the church picnic.
   a. were
   b. was
   c. is
   d. be

23. Don’t pay the bill _____ you received the goods.
   a. unless
   b. without
   c. but
   d. whether

24. Both the doctor and his nurse ________ to work on foot.
   a. come
   b. comes
   c. has come
   d. has came

25. If you ____________, you would have passed easily.
   a. would have took my advice
   b. had taken my advice
   c. had taken my advise
   d. would have took my advise

26. Why don’t you _____ someone else have a turn?
   a. let
   b. leave
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

27. I _______ down and waited for the dentist to call me in.
   a. set
   b. sat
   c. sit
   d. sitted
28. Glen ________ me the pictures he had taken at the game.
   a. brung
   b. bringed
   c. bring
   d. brought

29. I __________ past a house on which a tree had fallen.
   a. drived
   b. drive
   c. driven
   d. drove

30. Henry is the ________ of the two.
    a. more strong
    b. strongest
    c. stronger
    d. most strong

    a. taking
    b. taken
    c. has taken
    d. has took

32. Cross the streets ______________.
    a. careful
    b. carefully
    c. most careful
    d. carefuller

33. The girl waved goodbye, ________ her mother did not see her.
    a. because
    b. whether
    c. but
    d. since

34. The two students assigned to this project are you and me.
    a. correct as is
    b. you and I
    c. I and you
    d. me and you

35. He walked right ____ the trap we set for him.
    a. up on
    b. in
    c. into
    d. in upon
36. Too much food and rest _____ circus animals lazy.
   a. make
   b. makes
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

37. Tracy Avenue is the only one of our streets that _______ from one end of the city to the other.
   a. run
   b. runs
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

38. The man acts as though he ______ the owner.
   a. is
   b. was
   c. were
   d. none of the above

39. If he _______ registered later, he would have had the right classes.
   a. Would have
   b. Had
   c. Either of the above
   d. None of the above

40. Each one of the ladies _______ splashed by the passing car.
   a. was
   b. were
   c. are
   d. a and c are correct

41. On the wall ______ several posters.
   a. was
   b. were
   c. is
   d. either a or b

42. He misspelled ____ words on this exam.
   a. less
   b. fewer
   c. lesser
   d. more fewer

43. The gift from ______ and Bert came on Christmas Eve.
   a. she
   b. her
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above
44. Norm and _______share the same locker.
   a. he
   b. him
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

45. The children amused _______ by asking riddles.
   a. theirselves
   b. themselves
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

46. Four of the committee members ______married.
   a. were
   b. is
   c. are
   d. either a or c

47. ______and ______are good friends.
   a. Her, me
   b. He, she
   c. She, I
   d. either b or c

48. She _________________her new clothes as if they made her superior to the rest of us.
   a. flouted
   b. flaunted
   c. had flouted
   d. flautened

49. Athletics ______required of every student
   a. are
   b. is
   c. either of the above
   d. none of the above

50. Please tell me ___________you ___________during the winter.
   a. at where, live
   b. where live at
   c. where, live
   d. where at, live
EXHIBIT P1
Communication Spring 2011

Department Head: Don Connelly (X3851)
http://communication.wcu.edu

Program Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Fall 2010 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S. Communication</td>
<td>Broadcasting, Broadcast Sales, Journalism, Organizational Communication, Public Relations (216 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors</td>
<td>Broadcast Sales, Communication (29 minors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Academic Concentration</td>
<td>Support the B.S. Ed. program with a Secondary Academic Concentration in Organizational Communication (14 SAC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Full-time Faculty AY 10/11 (1 Prof; 2 Assoc; 4 Asst; 1 Visiting Asst; 2 Instructors; 3 Lecturers, 2 one year appt. Lecturers)

Distinctive Characteristics

- Selective Admission
  Communication majors are required to have and maintain a 2.75 minimum overall GPA. Average GPA fall 2010, 3.194.

- Professional Internships
  Communication majors are required to do an off-campus professional internship as a graduation requirement.

- Professional Certifications
  Three professional certifications are offered: Society of Broadcast Engineers (2); Radio Advertising Bureau (1)

- Award-Winning Faculty & Scholars
  Communication faculty members include nationally recognized award winners in their fields: a college textbook author and national Emmy winner. In addition to their degrees, many faculty members have years of outstanding professional experience and hold nationally recognized professional certifications.

- Liberal Studies – Speech Communication
  1,489 students enrolled in COMM 201 AY 10/11. The class was at 106 percent capacity for the AY10/11. Completed course redesign summer 2010; piloted fall 2010; fully implemented spring 2011. Modeled after the National Communication Association standards and recommendations. Proposal to create an online version of the class pending.

QEP Status

The department has long had a program of aggressive engaged learning for students. Students in communication operate the region’s only FM radio station, run a student public relations firm, and routinely work on community and regional projects as a part of the classroom experience. Students are actively involved in the Broadcast Education Association and the Public Relations Student Society of America. Students and faculty are forming a chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists spring 2011. Students cross disciplines such as broadcasting students preparing radio and television products for public relations clients. Writing and desk-top publishing students prepare printed materials for all of the concentrations. An excellent example of the Department of Communication’s QEP program is the Chancellor’s Dillsboro Project, headed by a communication faculty member, in which students and faculty are working with the Dillsboro business community to help reinvent Dillsboro.

Key Challenges

- Faculty
  The department has never been appropriately staffed with regard to tenure and tenure-track faculty. Spring 2011 over 50 percent of the faculty remain as fixed-term lecturer, instructor, or visiting positions.

- Journalism
  This new program links the university radio station and television studios to form a complete “convergence” journalism program. Although a new program, with 32 in the concentration its first semester (fall 2010), this high-growth program is making do with available resources during the startup phase. A new minor in journalism is pending.
The Department of Communication is actively engaged in offering liberal arts service courses to the university.

The department’s primary liberal arts service course is the C 3 Communication component of the liberal arts program, COMM 201 Introduction to Speech Communication. During the 2009-10 academic year 1,137 students were enrolled in the class. The class operated at 104 percent of capacity. Over 1,400 freshmen entered the university in 2009-10. In addition to the preexisting 2009-10 backlog of students waiting to take the class, the 2009-10 year added a minimum of 263 students to the student backlog waiting to take the class.

The department was given two one-year fixed term faculty members for COMM 201 for the 2010-11 year. Additionally, three faculty members each accepted two overloads during the year (total of six overloads). During the 2010-11 academic year 1,489 students were enrolled in the class operating at 106 percent of capacity. Over 1,400 freshmen entered the university in 2010-11. During the 2010-11 year COMM 201 was able to keep pace with the incoming freshman, but still has a backlog of approximately 3-400 students waiting to take the class.

The department offers two sections (30 students each) of the liberal studies freshman seminar, COMM 190 A User’s Guide to the Mass Media. Both sections were at 100 percent capacity.

In 2009 when the communication department streamlined its degree program, unnecessary course perquisites were eliminated to allow students from other disciplines to take communication classes as electives. COMM 415 Intercultural Communication is required of all communication majors and is an approved elective for the new International Studies major. During the 2010-11 academic year 38 percent of the students in COMM 415 were non-communication majors. Similarly, 39 percent of the students in COMM 255 Television Production I were non-communication majors. The non-major television students taking the class ranged from criminal justice to biology majors who wanted to enrich their course of study with professional video production skills. Fall 2010 50 percent of the students in COMM 313 Conflict Resolution were non-communication majors including political science, sociology and philosophy majors.

As of fall 2010 there were 29 students enrolled in the broadcast sales and communication minors. Nineteen students are being served in the organizational communication secondary academic concentration for the B.S. in Education.

Fall 2010, the Department of Communication generated 2,241 SCH of service classes out of a total of 3,692 SCH generated by the department, or 60 percent of the SCH generated was in service courses.

The department continues to work closely with the English department. The two departments collaboratively designed the new journalism program in communication that launched fall 2010 and also did likewise with the new journalism minor that will be in place fall 2011.

Communication faculty members make significant contributions to non-instructional campus initiatives. A communication faculty member leads the Chancellor’s Dillsboro project. A communication faculty member serves as the advisor for the WWCU FM which serves a potential audience of over 60,000 in Jackson and Haywood counties.
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION – PRODUCTIVITY

Trend data on numbers of enrollments in communication for the past 4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Majors</strong></td>
<td>238</td>
<td>198*</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Sales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Comm.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Development***</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Media****</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared – No Concentration</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Sales</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS ED S.A.C*****</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2.5 overall minimum GPA initiated  **replaced by journalism
***replaced by organizational communication **** replaced by broadcasting
*****Communication has been consulted by C.E.A.P. regarding dropping all secondary academic concentrations

Trend data on number of degrees awarded during the last 3.5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Number of Degree Awarded</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trend Data on total SCH generated during the last 3.5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SCH Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>8,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>7,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 2009-10 year there were 13 faculty members that generated 7,024 SCH. Each faculty member generated an average of 540.31 SCH.

Each faculty member in the department served an average of 87 students per semester during the 2010-11 academic year (includes department head and one faculty member on a course release to the Chancellor’s office).

The department has one concentration that does not meet state-established productivity standards with regard to the number of majors. While a concentration is not a major, the department should be
prepared for the fact that under-performing concentrations may become targets for state budget-cutting.

Fall 2010 organizational communication had eight students in the concentration and there were two students in the older training and development concentration. Spring 2011 there are four students in organizational communication – all seniors – and the two training and development students, each having over 105 hours, who will soon graduate. It is not surprising that the concentration has not grown; there has not been a dedicated faculty member to promote the concentration and to move the concentration forward. Organizational communication is typically one of the larger concentrations in most universities and across all industries.

It must be noted that the enrollment in classes that might be taught by an organizational communication faculty member include a number of classes presently being covered by other faculty members in the department. The classes include COMM 215 Organizational Communication, enrollment 28 fall 10; COMM 313 Conflict Resolution, enrollment 16 fall 10; COMM 350, Communication Theory with an enrollment of 28 fall 10 and 34 spring 11; COMM 414 Gender Communication with an enrollment of 25 spring 11 (three of the four classes were at or beyond capacity.) When faculty members teach these courses, it prevents them from teaching courses in their respective concentrations—or they do it as an overload.

Should the state-mandated budget cuts advance beyond the present level, as of January 27, 2011, the department would have no choice but to identify the organizational communication area as a potential target for cuts—even though enrollment in those courses is robust. The organizational faculty line is currently in a search status. The search has failed for the last two years. Ironically, we have just interviewed and have identified an excellent candidate to lead this concentration. The department would very much like to extend an offer to this candidate because the search committee and faculty are confident the candidate could build the concentration.

Therefore, when looking at the low number of students who have declared a concentration in organizational communication, the department would hope that decision-makers would take into account the fact that the department has lacked a faculty member to champion this concentration. Without a dedicated faculty member to build this area, the status quo will continue. Moreover, looking at the SCH salary lines generated by the department, communication is well below the number of full time faculty it should have. While the elimination of the organizational communication faculty line is the only viable option in this difficult scenario, it is one that, when compared to other options across the college and university, the department hopes does not materialize. The potential for this area is profound.

It is critical to note that the only cost savings in taking this step would be the funds budgeted for position 696. As of fall 2010, there are still 14 students in the B.S.Ed. secondary academic concentration in organizational communication offered by the department as a service to the College of Education and Allied Professions.
The department was formed in July, 2007 after extensive faculty input and outside professional consultation. As a result, a new 38-hour streamlined degree program was developed based on extensive peer review. The 38-hour degree program and 42 hours of liberal studies courses total 80 hours. With the remaining 40 hours a student may select a minor outside the department, a dual concentration within the department, a second major with another degree program, or an approved program defined by the student and academic advisor, including international study. Communication students are required to have a 2.75 overall GPA. Western’s only peer institution to have a similar overall GPA requirement is James Madison University at 2.7. The communication degree program emphasizes academic freedom and flexibility to be responsive to changing market trends.

Students have the academic freedom to combine concentrations and majors that best fit their needs and market trends and are still able to complete the degree program in 120 hours. Examples of concentration combinations include broadcasting with broadcast sales and public relations with journalism. Examples of dual majors include broadcasting with marketing and public relations with international studies. The department is beginning to see majors from other departments selecting communication as a second major.

As previously stated, the department has a long history of participating in engaged learning in what is now called the QEP. Students participate in three national professional organizations, have the opportunity to take three nationally recognized and accredited professional certifications, and attend regional and national conferences in their fields.

Students have the opportunity to expand their learning experience in the student-run university radio station, participate in the operation of the student-run public relations firm, and produce exceptionally high quality television productions in the television studio. Students have the opportunity to participate in remote live-event television production in the football stadium and the Fine and Performing Arts Center through a broadcast fiber-optic network. Journalism students are in the beta test mode of The Western Carolina Journalist, a new online news product. Journalism, radio and television students use the Associated Press News service with all of its news and research materials.

A department benchmark is that graduates should be prepared to enter a top 100 market in their field of study upon graduation. All communication students participate in professional development seminars and are required to do an off-campus professional internship. Internships must be faculty approved and include both mid-term and final employer evaluations. Communication internships occur at some of the finest facilities in the country (see attached exhibit 1).

Students are getting their first positions in top 100 markets (see exhibit 2). The fact is many are landing first jobs in top 50 markets.

Communication faculty members include nationally recognized award winners in their fields: a college textbook author and national Emmy winner. In addition to their degrees, many faculty members have years of outstanding professional experience and hold nationally recognized professional certifications.

Because the department has accomplished nearly all of its original objectives it is undergoing program review spring 2011—two years early.
The 2009-10 salary generated in Communication as determined by the SCH-based formula was $773,936. The budgeted line salaries for Communication in 2010-11 are $698,842 and the actual salary expenditures are $670,811, or $103,125 below what was earned by the department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SCH Generated Salary</th>
<th>Allocated Line Salaries</th>
<th>Actual Salaries</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>$773,936</td>
<td>$698,842</td>
<td>$670,811</td>
<td>$103,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average faculty salary in the College of Arts and Sciences at Western Carolina University is $56,425. The average faculty salary in Communication is $46,927, or $9,498 less than the college’s average.

Fall 2010 93.7 percent of the available seats in communication classes were filled; spring 2011 92 percent of all communication seats are filled.

The communication degree program is comparable to Western’s peer institutions and in some cases exceeds Western’s peer institutions.

In 2007 the new Department of Communication was given a charge by the Provost to discard the old 59-hour degree program and develop a streamlined degree program comparable to peers and aspirational peers that would be responsive to student needs and establish the university as having a quality communication program. A review of Western’s peer institutions – plus five additional institutions selected by Chancellor Bardo at a later date for all departments in the university – resulted in a new streamlined degree program of 38 hours. The new degree program took effect fall 2009. The new journalism concentration was heavily based on industry consultation to meet the six most identified benchmarks that new journalists should have.

The department distinguished itself by instituting a minimum 2.5 overall GPA requirement to become a communication major; effective spring 2011 the minimum overall GPA requirement is 2.75. Western’s only peer institution to have a similar overall GPA requirement is James Madison University at 2.7. Additionally, to be admitted to the journalism concentration students must make a B or higher in ENGL 101, 102, and COMM 240 Writing for Communication.

The 38-hour degree program leaves the student 40 hours of classes with which to make personal career choices allowing the student the flexibility to tailor his or her education to their selected career field. The communication industry is a dynamic industry that is in constant forward motion. An effective degree program such as Western’s has the flexibility to meet those dynamic changes. For example, to be competitive a journalist needs a second degree field such as law, science, medicine, business, etc. as an area of specialization. Imagine the career possibilities for a public relations major with a second major in international studies. One of our students already has.
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION – REVIEW AND CLOSING

Departmental Program Priority Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Critical</th>
<th>Internal Demand</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
<th>Priority Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty percent of the Department of Communication’s work load is providing the liberal studies courses for the university. However, the department has not received the positions necessary for COMM 201 to serve all students. At the present time this report reflects the serious bottleneck or backlog of students who have not been able to take the class. When the department was established it was determined that the department would need 30 sections of this class each semester to handle the student load. Spring 2011 was the first semester the department had those 30 sections, but it was done with three faculty taking course overloads.

The department maintains a large number of majors and is seeing good growth. Over the past four years the average number of new communication majors was approximately 30 to 35. Fall 2010 the department had 56 new majors and generated over 4,000 SCH.

With the revision of the communication degree and the institution of the 2.5 minimum overall GPA the department saw a small drop in the number of majors from 2007; however the number of majors is trending upward toward the 2007 level with higher quality students. Spring 2011 the minimum overall GPA is 2.75. The department may again see a small drop in the number of majors. The minimum overall GPA requirement has raised the quality of our students and has controlled growth at a time when the prevailing economic conditions will not support larger numbers of students and helps to ensure program quality.

The quality of our program is high based on the streamlined degree program and peer review. The department has the highest overall GPA requirement to be a major of all of our peers and aspirational peers. The program quality is also reflected in where communication students are doing their internships and in the positions they are getting upon graduation. The organizational communication concentration is a weak point in the degree program due to not having a faculty member to direct the concentration and build the program. A lack of tenure-track and tenured faculty has plagued the department from its origination. Over 53 percent of the faculty members are fixed term lecturers, instructors, or visiting positions.

With regard to the department’s cost effectiveness, the department generates far more SCH salary than its allocated salary lines. The average faculty salary is well below 50K ($46,927). Fall 2010 93.7 percent of the available seats in communication classes were filled; spring 2011 92 percent of all communication seats are filled.

Because the department has accomplished so much in such a short amount of time, communication is undergoing a full program review at least two years early in spring 2011.