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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HOW AND WHY WE SELECTED THE QEP TOPIC. The topic of “Real-World Ready” (RWR) emerged and developed from a multi-year conversation (2011-2014) with students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, and community partners on how to improve student learning. A recurring topic was the need to provide authentic, real world, experiences to supplement classroom instruction. Existing campus data and a review of current practices confirmed the need for improvement. A review of the literature suggested that providing additional experiential opportunities for students would be a valuable learning strategy for re-enforcing classroom instruction. As a result, Southeastern chose “Real-World Ready” as the QEP topic.

QEP GOAL. While we did not coin the phrase “Real-World Ready,” it clearly articulates our primary goal: To prepare students for a professional life after academics by providing authentic learning opportunities that connect academic courses with real-world experiences. This goal aligns with Southeastern’s mission to “lead the educational, economic and cultural development of southeast Louisiana.” Further, it promotes the core values of excellence and caring, and addresses our strategic priorities as outlined in Southeastern Louisiana University’s Strategic Plan, Vision 2017 (Appendix A). Finally, it provides a tool for addressing workforce needs in the state of Louisiana.

WHAT WE WILL DO. While there are pockets of authentic learning (i.e., experiential or performance-centered) opportunities at Southeastern, the University does not require all undergraduate degree programs to include a Real-World Ready component for their students. Further, there is no uniform campus-wide assessment for experiential-learning activities. As students clearly indicated in the BE HEARD campaign, they want experiences in the real world to play a role in their educational pursuits. Through this QEP initiative, the University is responding to students and departments with a commitment to organize, reassert, and institutionalize experiential learning as a meaningful method for guiding students to a fuller understanding and application of classroom instruction.

Depending on the discipline, current applied learning activities fall into the categories of service-learning, civic engagement, internships, study abroad, research or creative activity. We will expand these offerings such that every undergraduate degree program will have an experiential component integrated in an existing course by the completion of year four. These activities will help students to connect their academic experience more fully with their future profession, and to gain meaningful skills and knowledge for the careers they have chosen. Common characteristics of these experiences that align with QEP Student Learning Outcomes will be identified and assessed using standardized measures and common rubrics to ensure that all students are meeting a common set of expectations. We will operate under the auspices of the Division of Academic Affairs to ensure academic rigor as students gain practical understanding and cultivate professionalism. We will increase the quality and quantity of RWR experiences.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES. RWR will provide students the opportunity to apply the discipline in a professional context by integrating an experiential-learning component into the undergraduate curricula for those degree programs without an existing opportunity AND by enhancing current experiential-learning components. Four outcomes will be the measure of student learning: 1) Students will apply professional (discipline-specific) knowledge in an authentic setting; 2) Students will demonstrate effective communication in a professionally authentic form; 3) Students will reflect on their work—identifying strengths and weaknesses of product and process, and deriving directions for future efforts; and 4) Students’ professional behaviors will reflect a commitment to quality work.
II. PROCESS USED TO DEVELOP THE QEP

NEEDS ASSESSMENT
In Spring 2012, Southeastern began the formal process of conducting a needs assessment to identify a topic for its QEP. We generated interest and participation with an advertising campaign that included mass emails, QEP posters placed strategically around campus, and idea boxes located in key areas like the Center for Faculty Excellence and the Center for Student Excellence. We carried out a series of focus groups with the campus community. To reach individual students as well as student leadership, we held four focus groups with students. Two were open to all students (one with the Presidents of Greek organizations, and one with a Division of Student Affairs leadership group). In addition, we scheduled a focus group with presidents of student organizations during a regular meeting of the group; however, no students showed up for that particular meeting. Five focus groups met with faculty and staff. Two met with faculty members, one with staff, one with administrators, and one was open to all three groups.

The protocol for all three groups was the same. We gave a brief overview of SACSCOC and QEP, emphasizing the need to focus on student learning. Participants discussed the University’s strengths with regard to student learning, then offered suggestions for improving student learning. We recorded both lists. Finally, keeping in mind that the first two questions inspired the lists, we asked participants to identify an appropriate QEP topic for Southeastern.

Fifty students participated in the groups, with representation from all the colleges. A total of thirty-nine faculty and staff participated. In addition, participants and those who could not attend had an opportunity to submit QEP ideas outside of the focus groups through email or the QEP drop box located in the Center for Faculty Excellence. We collected another eleven ideas via these methods.

Michelle Hall, the Director of the Office of Institutional Research, organized the focus-group ideas by a common thread. The following thirteen threads arose as potential focus areas of the QEP. Multiple ideas appeared under each thread.

- Student engagement/applied learning
- Faculty training/support
- Advising
- Student services/support
- Curricula: Changes to current and ideas for new
- Communication
- Writing
- Healthy campus
- E-learning
- Scheduling and course offerings
ROAD TO THE FINAL FOUR
In 2012, the newly established QEP Organizational Team examined the results of the focus-group discussions. The team developed a plan for engaging the campus community in further selection and refinement of a QEP topic that improved student learning and aligned with institutional assessment. The charge for the committee included the submission of a narrowed list of evidence-based QEP topics that could be measured and assessed.

The Organizational Team reviewed the focus-group report and examined data from eleven different surveys to identify topic areas aligned with institutional needs. The surveys examined included:

- Alumni Survey: Undergraduate
- Alumni Survey: Graduate
- Current Student Survey
- Extender Students Survey
- Non-Returning Students Survey
- Employer Survey
- ACT Student Opinion Survey
- National Survey of Student Engagement
- CAAP — Critical Thinking and Writing Essay
- Entering Freshmen Survey
- Exit Survey

### Table 1: QEP Organizational Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Alessi</td>
<td>Professor, Counseling &amp; Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Blanchard</td>
<td>Department Head, Chemistry &amp; Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fischetti</td>
<td>Dean, College of Education &amp; Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tena Golding, chair</td>
<td>Director, Center for Faculty Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh Huynh</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Marketing &amp; Supply Chain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Humphries</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Kinesiology &amp; Health Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Johnson</td>
<td>Director, Sims Memorial Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Summers</td>
<td>Assistant to Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Temple</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the review of assessment results, the team identified fifteen potential QEP topics. Then, the team created a short online survey to share these data-supported topics and to gather feedback from a broader audience. We asked students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community partners to identify their top three ideas for enhancing student learning from the following fifteen topics. We presented the topics randomly to each participant in order to minimize order effects.

- Real-World experiences such as internships, practica, and/or field experiences
- Service-learning, community service, or volunteer work that relates to students’ field of study
- Provide opportunities to work with faculty on scholarly projects
- Analytical or critical thinking opportunities
- Provide opportunities for more applied experiences in the classroom
- Support and enhance effective teaching
- Provide opportunities for engaged advising, mentoring, and career planning
- Campus-wide climate of respect, support, and dialogue
- Provide opportunities for improving communication skills including listening, oral, and interpersonal
- Provide opportunities for increasing writing skills in general and specific areas
- Health and fitness opportunities outside of classes
- Enhance quality of online classes
- Provide more opportunities for online classes
- Provide more opportunities for online interaction in face-to-face courses
- Provide technology opportunities that meet industry/field standards

Input was solicited through Campus Notices of the Day; mass emails to students, faculty and staff; and a **BE HEARD** button posted on Southeastern’s homepage for access by all institutional constituencies. Alumni Director, Kathy Pittman, also promoted the survey and included a link in the online Alumni newsletter. A QEP booth was set up at the Fall 2012 Welcome Back picnic so attendees could complete the survey on available laptops.

**Figure 2:** Snapshot of homepage with **Be Heard** survey button

Michelle Hall of the Office of Institutional Research compiled survey results of the 680 responses and presented her findings to the QEP Organizational Team. Of those individuals...
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responding, 54.4% (number=370) were students, 23.5% (n=160) were faculty, 13.8% (n=94) were staff, 7.9% (n=54) were alumni, and 0.3% (n=2) were individuals who identified as “Other.”

The main survey question asked was “For the potential QEP topics listed below, please indicate the three that you believe are the most important to enhance student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning at Southeastern. For all others, mark ‘Not in Top 3.’” The remaining questions were demographic. We assigned three points for each first choice, two points for each second choice, and one point for each third choice. After adding the points, we knew which topics generated more interest.

The top five topics appear below, ordered by the total number of points each received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Choice</th>
<th>Second Choice</th>
<th>Third Choice</th>
<th>Not in Top 3</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-World experiences such as internships, practica, and/or field experiences</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and enhance effective teaching</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for more applied experiences in the classroom</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for engaged advising, mentoring, and career planning</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical or critical thinking opportunities</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Top Five Topics from Survey Results

While “Opportunities for engaged advising, mentoring and career planning” was fourth, other available data did not support its inclusion in the top four. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2010 Mean Comparisons showed Southeastern students ranked academic advising higher than all comparison groups: Freshmen—significantly HIGHER (percentage<.001) in all groups; Seniors—significantly HIGHER than Carnegie Class (p<.001) and Selected Peers (p<.05). Thus, the final four topics were as follows:

- Real-World experiences
- Effective teaching
- Applied learning in the classroom
- Analytical or critical thinking

With help from the Student Government president, Branden Summers, and a student anchor-reporter and winner of a 2013 student Emmy, Chrissy Carter, a QEP informational video was created by the Southeastern Channel to announce the final four topics. The video was available on the Quality Enhancement Plan Selection website.

The QEP website provided links to relevant data on each of the topics and solicited additional input on possible implementation plans for each topic, including suggested student learning outcomes. Mass emails and a WE LISTENED button on the Southeastern homepage directed
the University community to the site. When the site closed in September 2012, data indicated over 1,000 visits to the Quality Enhancement Plan Selection webpage.

The QEP Organizational Team reviewed submissions and discussed pros and cons of each idea. Team members researched existing QEPs on each of the final four topics to collect sample outcomes and measures and to expand the list of ideas. A resulting report summarized the work of the team and outlined the final four topics with ideas for implementation and pros and cons for each (see Road to the Final Four Report in Appendix B). The Organizational Team presented their findings to the University Planning Council (UPC) on October 30, 2012. The UPC is a broadly representative group that serves as the major advisory body to the President on matters related to strategic planning. The council includes administrators and professional staff, faculty, and representatives from the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association. After affirmation by the UPC, the QEP Organizational Team concluded its charge in November 2012. The team submitted its Road to the Final Four report to the President and SACSCOC Leadership Team.

The SACSCOC Leadership Team reviewed the “Road to the Final Four” report and made a determination that progress on the QEP was aligned with the University’s mission and the workforce development requirement of LA GRAD (Granting Resources and Autonomy for Diplomas) Act, instituted in 2010 to give colleges and universities increased autonomy in exchange for a commitment to meet clearly defined statewide performance.

Table 3: Leadership Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Crain</td>
<td>University President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Bourg</td>
<td>Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Domiano</td>
<td>Vice President for Administration and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Yates</td>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Johns Lauderdale</td>
<td>Vice President for University Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Temple</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Walker</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kirylo</td>
<td>President, Faculty Senate and Professor, Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Alessi</td>
<td>SACSCOC Liaison and Professor, Health and Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tena Golding</td>
<td>Director, Center for Faculty Excellence and Professor, Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Snapshot of homepage with We Listened QEP survey results button.
President Crain then appointed the QEP Design Team in January 2013 to build on the work of the QEP Organizational Team. Dr. Crain charged the team with finalizing the QEP topic based on the Final Four recommendations, developing and writing the QEP, and communicating the final QEP to the campus community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Alessi</td>
<td>Professor, Counseling &amp; Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Burley</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Sociology &amp; Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fischetti*</td>
<td>Dean, College of Education &amp; Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tena Golding</td>
<td>Director, Center for Faculty Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh Huynh</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Marketing &amp; Supply Chain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Humphries</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Kinesiology &amp; Health Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Klein-Ezell</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Norwood</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Chemistry &amp; Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayetta Slawson</td>
<td>Associate Professor, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branden Summers**</td>
<td>Undergraduate student &amp; SGA President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Summers</td>
<td>Assistant to Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian van Delden</td>
<td>Department Head, Computer Science &amp; Industrial Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sharon Hoffman, Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership & Technology replaced Dr. Fischetti in July, 2013.
**Greg Crovetto, SGA President replaced Branden Summers in March of 2014.

Table 4: QEP Design Team

**FINAL TOPIC SELECTION**

At its first meeting on February 8, 2013, the QEP Design Team reviewed the Road to the Final Four report and agreed that the focus of the QEP should be Real-World experiences. The report along with a review of new data (released after the report of the QEP Organizational Team) confirmed the selection. The 2012 NSSE Means Comparison Report suggested that Southeastern’s students might have fewer opportunities for Real-World connections than comparison groups.

- Responses by both first-year students and seniors who “participated in a community-based project (e.g., service-learning) as part of a regular course” (Item 1k), were significantly lower ($p<.001$) than ALL comparison groups.
- Responses by both first-year students and seniors to the item regarding participation in community service or volunteer work (Item 7b) were significantly lower ($p<.001$) than ALL comparison groups.
- Responses by both first-year students and seniors to the item regarding participation in “Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment” (Item 7a), were significantly lower than most comparison groups (FY: $p<.01$ for two groups and $p<.05$ for the other group and SR: $p<.001$ for one group).
- Responses by seniors to Item 7h, “Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.),” was significantly lower ($p<.001$) than ALL comparison groups.

In addition, an examination of Southeastern’s 2011 Employer Survey released in December 2012 revealed significant negative gaps (e.g., skill level had a lower rating than the importance
level) between the reported importance of certain job-related skills and characteristics and the skill level of Southeastern graduates. The team grouped the thirty-one skills or characteristics rated by employers into four general areas: (a) Communication Skills, (b) Technical Skills, (c) Workplace Knowledge and Skills, and (d) Professional Traits and Attitudes (see Table 5). The survey revealed significant negative gaps in 17 of the 31 skills with the biggest differences occurring in the areas of Communication Skills and Professional Traits and Attitudes where six skills/characteristics were significantly lower at p<.001.

### Employer Survey Results: Significant Negative Gap Scores at p<.001

![Graph showing significant negative gap scores for various skills](image)

#### Table 5: Survey Results

After agreeing on the QEP topic, the Design Team investigated the current state of Real-World experiences on campus. As a first step, the designers broke into teams to interview department heads in all colleges to determine:

- Enrollment numbers
- Current expectations of field experiences
- How existing experiences were financed and assessed
- What was working well
- What they would like to do differently
- Aspirations for experiential learning and the resources necessary for those aspirations
- Additional ideas or comments

The team determined that experiential learning existed, including undergraduate research, internships, service-learning, and study abroad. Discussions with faculty engaged in these initiatives revealed a deep commitment to student learning and shared interests for expanding and enhancing these student opportunities, but also voiced some major concerns for continuation.

After reviewing the current experiential-learning practices at Southeastern, the team identified six areas of concern:
- Student expectations of Real-World experiences, including when they first arrive at Southeastern
- Little or no assessment of existing experiences and/or link to student learning outcomes
- Insufficient communication of opportunities to both faculty and students
- Lack of and inconsistencies in faculty rewards/incentives for participation
- Little or no funding/finances available
- No University-wide structure/clearinghouse to facilitate/coordinate efforts

Next, the designers reviewed best practices of other QEPs focused on Real-World experiences.

The reports of best practices at the March 19 meeting revealed similar components to those already in existence at Southeastern, with study abroad often being labeled “study away” to include both international and domestic travel. There was also community-based research (a specific form of undergraduate research) and outdoor learning via an outdoor laboratory. The programs often used capstone courses to coordinate Real-World experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern Identified in Current State Review</th>
<th>Possible Solution Identified in Review of Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student expectations of Real-World experiences</td>
<td>Admission and recruiting materials should adequately reflect the opportunities for RWR—all print and web resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no assessment of existing experience and/or link to student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment activities for Real-World experiences included written reflections, presentations, e-portfolios, and internal and national surveys. In many cases, rubrics were the vehicle for targeting QEP competencies across disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient communication of opportunities to both faculty and students</td>
<td>With or without a central unit, communication of opportunities could be enhanced through departmental coordinators and/or the use of technology and special software (e.g., career service, service-learning) or homegrown systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of and inconsistencies in faculty rewards/incentives for participation</td>
<td>Examples of faculty rewards/incentives offered included stipends, internal grants, reassigned time, and fellowships. A faculty development component was included in many QEPs to prepare faculty for implementation of the QEP topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no funding/finances available</td>
<td>Budgets included grant monies/stipends for faculty, some one-time dollars to establish central office. Student fees were also used (e.g., undergraduate research fee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No University-wide structure/clearinghouse to facilitate/coordinate efforts</td>
<td>Many universities had a central unit (e.g., the Center for Community Engagement, Center for Undergraduate Research) to coordinate and communicate initiatives. These centers often assisted with the assessment and the monitoring of student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Current Practices and Possible Solutions

Convinced that a focus on Real-World experiences was not only data based but would engage the long-term commitment of faculty through implementation and continuation of the QEP, the team adopted “Real-World Ready” as the QEP.
The choice of Real-World Ready was communicated to the campus community through the “Getting Ready” campaign which included a QEP booth at the annual convocation picnic, the launching of a QEP informational website, distribution of “Getting Ready!” ink pens, and the distribution of Nestlé CRUNCH bars that read:

“Thanks for helping us through the CRUNCH! After two years of campus discussions, Southeastern has chosen Real-World experiences as the focus of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) required for our SACSCOC reaffirmation. Watch for more information as details unfold: southeastern.edu/qep.”

The “Getting Ready” campaign was also promoted on Southeastern’s homepage for access by all institutional constituencies.

Over a four-year period (2011–2014), the University worked diligently to ensure a QEP that would enhance and support student learning, while drawing on a review of best practices as a model for our efforts and to ensure campus-wide buy-in. The process used to develop the QEP involved listening to a broad range of individuals, then demonstrating that we heard their ideas. After the initial campus conversations, a QEP Design Team met regularly, researched the field of experiential learning, and talked with faculty and staff campus-wide to ensure a QEP with vibrant possibilities for enhancing student learning.

The team communicated and met with a wide-range of constituencies as the process unfolded, including alumni, individual faculty members, program directors (such as current internship coordinators), department heads, campus support offices, students, and deans. Design representatives met with the Faculty Senate, and input was requested through regular announcements at Faculty Senate meetings. Through literally hundreds of discussions, the Design Team mapped a plan for moving forward.
III. IDENTIFICATION OF THE TOPIC

OVERVIEW
This section describes the rationale for the QEP topic, including a description of how the topic relates to Southeastern’s mission, current planning efforts, and strategic plans; argues how this topic addresses workforce development needs in the state of Louisiana; and characterizes an organic and logical integration of a Real-World Ready QEP into our institution. It focuses on building an environment to support student learning more fully.

RATIONALE FOR REAL-WORLD READY
As educators settle into the 21st century, there is a move to expand the classroom beyond its four walls and to link ways of learning and knowing to new student delivery systems and more experiential-learning opportunities. Although higher education has an established practice of professor-run classrooms, experiences that supplement and reinforce face-to-face classroom encounters have become more important than ever to help students understand and acquire the global skill sets necessary to compete in the careers they will enter after graduation regardless of their discipline. By providing RWR opportunities for students before graduation, Southeastern is preparing students to acquire and develop the hard and soft skills sets needed to acclimate successfully into their chosen professions.

Additionally, the Real-World Ready initiative has an intimate connection with the mission, core values, and strategic priorities of Southeastern, and with the action plans for the Division of Academic Affairs as laid out in Vision 2017 (Appendix A). The mission of Southeastern Louisiana University is to lead the educational, economic and cultural development of southeast Louisiana. As Vision 2017 states, “Guided by our core values [excellence and caring], Southeastern creates engaging learning opportunities [. . .] that extend knowledge and its application in the classroom and beyond.” Since this institution has a stated desire to create a binding relationship between the applications of knowledge beyond the classroom, a Real-World Ready approach is necessary to achieve our plans for better success as an institution of higher learning.

Three of the University’s strategic priorities outlined in the document fall directly in line with a Real-World Ready initiative:

1. To engage a diverse population of learners with powerful experiences (Strategic Priority 1).
2. To spearhead collaborative efforts (Strategic Priority 2).
3. To prepare the University community to thrive in a global society (Strategic Priority 4).

More specifically, the Real-World Ready initiative supports the achievement of the action plans for the Division of Academic Affairs in meeting the objectives of Vision 2017. There are three sections of particular relevance to our QEP:

1. Section 1.1.a (AA). Colleges and academic departments will regularly examine and refine curricula in accordance with discipline-specific trends, accreditation requirements, and current and future workforce/economic development needs, including student preparation for (a) job placement upon graduation using information from regional and state workforce and economic development agencies, including the Louisiana Workforce Development Office’s Star Rating System [. . .].
2. Section 1.1.c.ii (AA). Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines will encourage innovative and engaging faculty pedagogical and professional
activities associated with demonstrated success of student learning in the classroom and/or in the pursuit of a career and/or graduate/professional school placement upon graduation (e.g., individualized instruction of students outside the classroom; supervision of service-learning, student research, creative activities; faculty-student research/scholarly/creative collaborations; active participation in programs/activities designed to better prepare students for university-level work).

3. Section 1.8.a. (AA). Based on information from entities such as regional economic development agencies (GNO, Inc.; Northshore Business Alliance), the Louisiana Economic Development Office, and professional discipline-specific boards/agencies, faculty, department heads, deans, and the Provost will work to identify, propose, and implement new concentrations, certificate programs, and/or degree programs that address regional needs; faculty and department heads will work to modify as necessary and appropriate existing degree programs to better align with regional needs.

When the QEP Design Team held a meeting on December 13, 2013, with Deans and Department Heads for a discussion and opinion survey of the Real-World Ready initiative, we learned about existing internships, clinical and community practica, observation of and practice teaching, service-learning, study abroad, oral proficiency interviews, civic engagement, and undergraduate research. There is clear consensus across academic units that purposeful and practical experiences do indeed transcend and complement the traditional classroom structure and provide a rich strategy for expanding and enhancing a student’s job readiness upon graduation. However, the opportunity for students to engage in a Real-World Ready component is not available in ALL degree programs. Further, there is no uniform campus-wide assessment for experiential-learning activities. As students clearly indicated in the BE HEARD campaign, they want Real-World experiences to play a role in their educational pursuits. Through this QEP initiative, the University is responding to students and departments with a commitment to organize, reassert, and institutionalize experiential learning as a meaningful method for guiding students to a fuller understanding and application of classroom instruction. The QEP will provide all Southeastern students an opportunity to learn by ‘doing the discipline’ in a setting that is appropriate to the discipline and in which graduates often find themselves employed.

LOUISIANA NEEDS
When examining our needs in Louisiana, we find additional support for the selection of our QEP topic. The LA GRAD (Granting Resources and Autonomy for Diplomas) Act, instituted in 2010 to give colleges and universities increased autonomy in exchange for a commitment to meet clearly defined statewide performance goals, confirms our need to raise our retention and graduation rates. One of the performance goals in the GRAD Act focuses on Workforce and Economic Development. Universities need to identify/modify/initiate programs to align them with current or strategic workforce needs so that graduates are work-force ready. Our RWR QEP addresses this goal.

As the Executive Director of the Louisiana Workforce Commission states in that organization’s Strategic Plan of July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2017, there are “unprecedented challenges to growing and strengthening our workforce” (i). After careful review, we know that our QEP will meet the challenges of growing and strengthening the economic engine of southeast Louisiana.

WORKFORCE READY
Real-World Ready will provide organized, meaningful experiences for students that complement their coursework while providing mentors to guide their journeys. In this way, Southeastern will aid students for professional entry into the careers they have chosen by providing them the
opportunity to engage actively, ethically, and authentically in their chosen career paths before graduation. To meet these goals, we will help them increase their chances for success in their professions and broaden their understanding of our world. This move will result in a significant impact on their learning.

This initiative will bring learning by doing into better academic partnership with the bedrock of academic rigor (reading, critical analysis, thinking, writing, and reflection) in an organized, campus-wide effort to move our institution and to serve our students more effectively. To do so is to develop diverse curricula and learning strategies that provide students opportunities to apply professional knowledge in authentic settings. To do so is to employ the ideas of Eight Principles of Good Practice for All Experiential Learning Activities published by the National Society for Experiential Education (Appendix C). These principles presented at the Society’s 1998 annual meeting in Norfolk, VA include intention, preparedness and planning, authenticity, reflection, orientation and training, monitoring and continuous improvement, assessment and evaluation, and acknowledgment. By following these principles in the actions we implement, Southeastern’s experiential-learning opportunities will be consistent and of the highest quality to help students become Real-World Ready.

SUMMARY

Through the research process to select a topic, we have carefully considered Southeastern Louisiana University’s needs as an institution, as a member of the higher education and state of Louisiana communities, and as a team of educators charged with developing and providing the best possible learning practices for our students. With our Real-World Ready QEP, we have found a worthwhile topic that aligns with our mission, our goals, and our plans for advancement. This alignment of institutional needs and expectations with the long-term improvement of student learning, poises the students and University for greater success. Our QEP fits organically and logically into the identity of our campus, and advances the environment for providing workforce-ready student learning. In the next section, we detail specific goals and learning outcomes in our effort to make our students Real-World Ready.

IV. DESIRED GOALS AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

OVERVIEW

Although a number of Southeastern students have the opportunity to complete an experiential-learning component in their areas of study, a number do not. For existing experiences there are no common student learning outcomes across disciplines and no uniform campus-wide assessment of the experiential-learning activities. Southeastern’s Real-World Ready QEP aims to integrate RWR experiences into the curricula for those degree programs without an existing opportunity AND to enhance the quality of current experiential-learning components in degree programs with existing opportunities to ensure that all students engaged in experiential learning are meeting a common set of expectations. Common characteristics of these experiences that align with QEP Student Learning Outcomes will be identified and assessed using standardized measures and common rubrics. We have identified a QEP goal and learning outcomes for our RWR activities that will provide every student with an opportunity to complete at least one meaningful RWR experience as a component embedded in an academic course. This experience will relate explicitly to individual areas of study and intended professions and will lead to observable results for better preparing students for entry into their professions. While the QEP will require all degree programs to offer at least one experiential-learning opportunity to
students, whether or not the experiential-learning opportunity is required or optional for students is determined at the degree program level, not by the QEP. The chart below helps detail the differences between the current experiential-learning activities—the Now—and the activities during/after QEP implementation—the New.

**REAL-WORLD READY (RWR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOW</th>
<th>NEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University expectations are not well defined</td>
<td>The QEP Goal will spearhead the campus Real-World Ready (RWR) initiative: <em>To prepare students for life in the real world by providing authentic learning opportunities that connect academic courses with real-world experiences.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated pockets of experiences</td>
<td>QEP Coordinator, RWR Advisory Council and RWR faculty provide infrastructure for coordinated RWR initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available in all degree programs</td>
<td>By year four, all degree programs will offer RWR experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No uniform student-learning outcomes</td>
<td>All RWR students will meet the QEP Student-Learning Outcomes (SLOs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No uniform assessment</td>
<td>Common characteristics of RWR experiences that align with QEP SLOs will be assessed using standardized measures and common rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited communication of opportunities to students/faculty</td>
<td>QEP Coordinator will maintain a website to assist communication of RWR opportunities to faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of faculty rewards/incentives</td>
<td>Office of Experiential Learning will provide faculty grants to develop/enhance RWR experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no funding/finances</td>
<td>Administration has committed over $1.1 million for the RWR QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No centralized unit for coordination</td>
<td>Office of Experiential Learning is established to help coordinate/assess RWR activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Real-World Ready Now vs New
DEFINITIONS
The following definitions inform our QEP goal and student-learning outcomes:

- **Authentic** is a term that speaks to real and genuine places and methods of learning the discipline in a professional context that supplements classroom instruction.

- **Communication** is the art of transmitting or exchanging information and ideas through oral, aural, and visual means.

- **Experiential Learning** is learning by doing. In this document, we sometimes use the terms *applied learning, authentic learning, or performance-centered learning* interchangeably with *experiential learning*.

- **Commitment to quality work** includes training students to demonstrate professional behavior in areas such as work attitude, punctuality, listening skills, the ability to work under pressure, and the ability to work in an ethical manner.

QEP GOAL AND DESIRED STUDENT-LEARNING OUTCOMES
A central goal spearheads the Real-World Ready initiative:

Southeastern will promote an environment of excellence and caring while meeting strategic priorities of engaging a diverse population of learners with powerful experiences. We are committed to spearheading collaborative efforts, to fostering a climate that nurtures relationships and engages people in the life of the University, and to preparing the University community to thrive in a global society. We will increase, diversify, and manage effectively, while taking care to communicate the University’s identity and value (see Vision 2017 in Appendix A).

Four outcomes will measure student learning in our RWR QEP:

- Students will apply professional (discipline-specific) knowledge in an authentic setting.
- Students will demonstrate effective communication in a professionally authentic form.
- Students will reflect on their work—identifying strengths and weaknesses of product and process, and deriving directions for future efforts.
- Students’ professional behaviors will reflect a commitment to quality work.

We have completed a review of the literature to determine the soundness of these learning outcomes and formulated assessment strategies to ensure a plan for verifying our success.
BENEFITS OF QEP IMPLEMENTATION
Southeastern’s Real-World Ready (RWR) initiative demonstrates our commitment to preparing students for life after college while promoting consistency and quality across all Real-World experiences. Through this undertaking, we will increase the quantity and quality of experiences while addressing aspects of Southeastern’s role, scope and mission (see Vision 2017 in Appendix A), including serving regional employers and meeting the needs of regional economic development.

By year four of our QEP, each undergraduate degree program will be required to offer students an opportunity to participate in a Real-World Ready experience (either a senior capstone or an equally-meaningful experience at a different level) in which they connect their academic experience with their future professional practice. Whether the RWR experience is required or optional for students is determined at the degree program level, not by the QEP. As indicated in Section II, data from Southeastern’s 2011 Employer Survey revealed significant gaps between skills of Southeastern graduates and skills/characteristics rated important by employers. The categories with the biggest gaps were in the areas of Communication Skills and Professional Traits and Attitudes. The expected SLOs will help address those gaps.

Throughout the implementation of the QEP, we will identify common characteristics of RWR experiences across disciplines that align with the learning outcomes and will institutionalize an annual series of training workshops and events for students and faculty to promote professional performance (separate from the experience itself). We will do this to address the concern stated by one of our academic leaders: “Recently it has come to our attention the interns in some cases are not ready for a real job and lack some skills in terms of business etiquette and professional presence.” The uniform assessment of RWR experiences will include standardized measures and common rubrics to ensure that all students are meeting a common set of expectations (see Section X).

It has been documented in the experiential-learning literature that engaging students in experiential-learning activities does indeed improve student learning. Southeastern’s Real-World Ready (RWR) initiative focuses on improving the quality of student learning by enhancing the academic climate so that more and better experiential-learning opportunities are available to students. Our RWR will provide students the opportunity to apply the discipline in a professional context by integrating an experiential-learning component into the curricula for those degree programs without an existing opportunity AND by enhancing current experiential-learning components. Our measures of success will include environmental indicators that reveal an increase in the quality and quantity of RWR experiences.

SUMMARY
By year four of our QEP, all undergraduate degree programs will provide at least one RWR opportunity that reinforces course instruction and prepares students for entry into a chosen profession. The experience may take different forms—depending on the discipline—such as an internship, a civic engagement or service-learning project, a research or creative application, or a study-away experience. All experiential-learning opportunities will center on our specific goal and four specific learning outcomes that we will assess directly and indirectly at the degree program level and as a campus community. With funding provided over the five-year period of the QEP, it is anticipated that a minimum of 195 experiential-learning experiences will be developed or enhanced (65 new and 130 existing). With 43 baccalaureate degree programs, this initiative could potentially provide/impact at least four experiences per degree program. We undertake this work to ensure that Southeastern is preparing students for life in the real world by...
providing authentic learning opportunities and connecting academic courses with valuable, professional experiences.

V. LITERATURE REVIEW AND BEST PRACTICES

To think is easy. To act is hard. But the hardest thing in the world is to act in accordance with your thinking.

Goethe

OVERVIEW

Experiential learning takes the form of internships, practica, and other community/industry-based partnerships that complement and enhance classroom instruction, allowing students to gain applied experience in a specific industry/community setting (Beck and Halim; Alex-Assensoh and Ryan; Fortune, Lee, and Cavazos; and Bay). In undergraduate programs where students typically want to obtain employment upon graduation, such experiences can be particularly beneficial because the student graduates with knowledge of a profession’s model/philosophy, and can be productive from day one. A review of the literature provides guideposts for best practices in developing an experiential-learning program.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The concept of experiential learning has often reached to the 20th Century theories of John Dewey and his seminal work Experience and Education (first published in 1938) and to his method of “do, do, do” as “the most successful for learning” (Tucker 88). However, the 2011 Sourcebook of Experiential Education: Key Thinkers and Their Contributions documents a history of experiential philosophers and educational theorists reaching back to Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates.

In the late 1960s, thinkers such as Paulo Freire were continuing to advocate for learning that happens in a variety of settings and ways. Then in the 1980s, the learning and knowledge theories of David Kolb and his experiential-learning cycle informed the educational community that best practices require understanding that students have different learning styles that require sharing and applying experiences. More recent thinkers have linked the “contemporary approach to experiential education (EE) in America … [to] … beginnings of the adventure education movement in the 1970s …” (Smith, Knapp, et al 1).

An important aspect of the conversation in more recent decades has centered on not only the learning by doing philosophy, but on the assessment of experiential education activities. In his study “Evaluating and Assessing Experiential Learning,” Robert Shumer draws on Urban Whitaker’s ideas of assessment “both rigorous and flexible” as he details a history of higher education in the 1980s and 1990s. This era ushered in focused “attention to evaluation and assessment” (244-47). Thinkers such as Guba, Lincoln, VanManen and others have entered the conversation of “doing participatory work” (245) and evaluating principles and procedures of assessment. By the 21st Century, Shumer recounts “a sense of parity and established position for qualitative (our emphasis) methods of evaluation, including a stress on mixed methods (our emphasis) that offered a balanced approach to most assessment questions and issues” (245).
Scholarly research informs the importance of experiential education and of qualitative and mixed methods of evaluation. Yet, it is necessary to examine experiential learning more thoroughly in a contemporary context to identify learning outcomes that promote students’ growth and to meet their needs for life in the real world after college.

THE VALUE OF EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION

A recent article in a publication of the National Association of College and University Officers calls experiential education, “one of the most significant trends affecting the college experience in the last 20 years” (Hignite). Marilyn Mackes, Executive Director of the National Association of College and Employers, points to NACE’s “Job Outlook 2014” report, in which “74 percent of employers surveyed prefer to hire candidates with relevant work experience,” while “[a]nother 20 percent would accept any type of work experience.” Mackes says, this “suggests virtually every employer would like to see students testing and applying themselves in some capacity outside the classroom” (Mackes qtd. in Hignite).

While the value of experiential education has been established, a question arises: What are the best methods an institution can employ for implementing a learning-by-doing campaign?

Joseph A. Raelin contends:

> Work-based learning [. . .] deliberately merges theory with practice and acknowledges the intersection of explicit and tacit forms of knowing at both individual and collective levels. It recognizes that learning is acquired in the midst of practice and can occur while working on the tasks and relationships at hand. (39)

This merging of theory and practice recognizes the different ways in which humans learn. Learning, says Harvard professor Chris Dede, includes multiple dimensions of classrooms, richly contextualized real-world learning such as internships and apprenticeships, and community—both face to face and virtual. In contemplating learning for a 21st Century student population, Dede notes the core challenges academicians face related to technology and the Internet that require teaching and student-learning methods that operate within these platforms. He points to immersive learning that helps students to understand the real world without actually being there in three areas: multi-user virtual environments, virtual reality, and ubiquitous computing (i.e., “wearable wireless devices coupled to smart objects for ‘augmented reality’”). Dede identifies “next generation learning” that is social, richly contextualized, and personalized.

At the 2014 SACSCOC Summer Institute in New Orleans, Louisiana, Dede spoke of a different model of pedagogy in which:

- Experiences are central, rather than information as pre-digested experience (for assimilation or synthesis)
- Knowledge is situated in a context and distributed across a community (rather than located within an individual: with vs. from)
- Reputation, experiences, and accomplishments are measures of quality (rather than tests, papers)

Further, Dede suggests that professional development for 21st Century educators include:

- Complementing presentational instruction with situated, collaborative learning
• Unlearning almost unconscious assumptions and beliefs and values about the nature of teaching, learning, and schooling

Methods of improved student learning situated squarely in the realms of merging theory with practice, recognizing and embracing multiple dimensions that include real-world experiences, meeting the demands to incorporate technology and the Internet, and moving beyond assumptions and beliefs must be considered in concert with two documents of the National Society for Experiential Education: Guiding Principles of Ethical Practice and Eight Principles of Good Practice for All Experiential Learning Activities (see Appendix C).

In a workshop titled “NSEE Principles of Ethical and Best Practice of Experiential Educators” held on September 29, 2014, in Baltimore, MD, Ronald Kovach and the attending participants concluded that principles of experiential educators are necessary because there should be proven and shared ideas common to the community. Further, principles can provide continuity across experiences and can guide intentionality. Best practices should lead institutions to develop or adopt a formal document (such as the “Guiding Principles of Ethical Practice”). These guidelines should be communicated to faculty and shared with students. Institutions should devise a plan for vetting the organizations with which they partner. Institutions involved in cultivating experiential education should maintain strong faculty communication, provide faculty training, and perform site visits. Of particular interest is Principle Four of the Guiding Principles of Ethical Practice:

Experiential educators are informed and guided by a body of knowledge, research and pedagogical practices recognized by and specific to the field of experiential education, including reflection, self-authorship, assessment and evaluation, civic engagement, and the development of personal and social responsibility. (NSEE)

Kovach stressed the importance of teaching students how to think, which can be done through self-reflection. According to Kovach, students need to be able to say how an experience transformed them for it to truly be a learning experience.

Principle Five of the Guiding Principles of Ethical Practice would demonstrate:

Experiential educators are committed to excellence through active scholarship, assessment and instruction, and the creation of shared knowledge and understanding through affiliation with networks and organizations that advance experiential learning. (NSEE)

As methods and principles are developed by an institution, student learning outcomes should be developed that are grounded in such principles. Further, educators should continue to their own professional development that aligns with best practices.

ALIGNING THE QEP WITH BEST PRACTICES

Our institution has reviewed best practices in experiential learning at conferences of the National Society for Experiential Education (2013 in St. Pete’s, Florida, and 2014 in Baltimore, Maryland), and has participated in workshops provided by the Experiential Education Academy (EEA), including “Fundamentals of Experiential Education,” “Assessment 101: Identifying, Understanding and Applying Outcomes Assessment in Experiential Learning” (2013), “Legal Issues in Internships and Experiential Education” and “NSEE Principles of Ethical and Best Practice for Experiential Educators” (2014). The QEP Coordinator also attended the 2014 SACSCOC Summer Institute held in New Orleans, Louisiana. Additionally, we reviewed QEPs
on similar topics, and conducted an online review of institutions that emphasize community engagement and real world experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>Title of QEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo State University</td>
<td>Campus and Community: ASU’s Plan to Enhance Learning through Community Engagement (CONNECT!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Carolina University</td>
<td>Experienced@Coastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown College</td>
<td>Spirit, Mind, Action: Civic Engagement at Georgetown College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville University</td>
<td>ECHO: Everything You Do Comes Back to You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>The Madison Collaborative: Ethical Reasoning in Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis College of Art</td>
<td>Professional Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern State University</td>
<td>Enhancing Undergraduate Research Endeavors and Creative Activities (EURECA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfeiffer University</td>
<td>Engaging Students to Think Critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Learning without Borders: Internationalizing the Gator Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>Write Here. Write Now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>Community-Based Transformational Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pikeville</td>
<td>Moving UP with Experiential Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>The Global Citizens Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina Wilmington</td>
<td>ETEAL: Experiencing Transformational Education through Applied Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University</td>
<td>Keeping it REAL: Real-world Experiences Applied to Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s University</td>
<td>Pioneering Pathways: Learn by Doing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Best Practices Reviewed

Efforts to understand best practices in QEP development have continued with the attendance of Southeastern representatives at the SACSCOC annual conference held in Nashville, Tennessee, December 2014. We have undertaken these activities while developing four student learning outcomes to guide our work.

**SLO 1: APPLYING KNOWLEDGE IN AUTHENTIC SETTINGS**

In their 2006 article on the general principles of teaching professionalism, Cruess and Cruess suggest that the traditional method of transmitting professionalism (or “Real-World Ready” as we term it) via role modeling is not sufficient alone (205). In “our wonderfully diverse world [. . .] professionalism must also be taught explicitly” (205). Cruess and Cruess draw on Maudsley and Strivens and the educational theory of “situated learning” as most effective for “the design of programs which have as their objective the transformation of students from members of the lay public (or non-experts) to expert members of a profession, with both appropriate skills and a commitment to a common set of values” (205). This theory “suggests that learning should be embedded in authentic activities which help to transform knowledge from the abstract and theoretical to the usable and useful” (205). Further, its “proponents believe in balance between the explicit teaching of a subject and the activities in which the knowledge learned is used in an authentic context” (205).
The first of our four student learning outcomes draws on the situated-learning theory:

Students in QEP-designated course sections will engage in an experiential-learning activity in which the student can connect and apply academic work in a setting authentic to the discipline. This application of knowledge will be assessed through observed behavior during the experience and student reflections after completing the experience. We expect student reflections to demonstrate a synthesis of the connections among academics and the experience, and an awareness of the impact of the experience on the chosen profession.

**SLO 2: COMMUNICATING EFFECTIVELY**

In her 2012 publication in *Business Communication Quarterly*, Marcel Robles reports that 91.2 percent of business executives responding to a survey “overwhelmingly [placed] integrity and communication [as] the top two soft skills needed by employees in today’s workplace” (455-56). Soft skills are those traits such as people skills that complement hard skills or “expertise and knowledge” needed in the workplace. Robles draws on Nealy’s 2005 article, “Integrating Soft Skills through Active Learning in the Management Classroom,” when suggesting that “soft skills are critical for productive performance in today’s workplace” (453).

This research follows Tucker’s investigation in the late 1990s on ways communication is practiced through service-learning projects and can be included as a component in a class to ensure “well-qualified communicators” upon graduation (88). While common sense tells us that writing and speaking skills improve through practice, Tucker found that sending students out to complete active learning projects enriched class discussions and increased their communications in four ways: building team cohesion, developing interview and meeting management skills, writing a technical report, and presenting findings of research (96-97).

In a review of communication literature published from 1998 through 2006, Morreale and Pearson addressed the question, “Is communication education important in contemporary life and society; and if so, how so?” (227). Four of the six themes identified by the authors were identical to those identified by Morreale, Osborn, and Pearson in their review of communication literature ranging from 1955 to 1999. The common themes include the importance of teaching communication for (1) the development of the whole person; (2) the improvement of the educational enterprise; (3) being a responsible participant in the world, socially, and culturally; and (4) succeeding as an individual in one’s career and business (225, 228). Specific to the fourth theme, Morreale and Pearson point to a myriad of studies that “indicate that good communication abilities are critical to success in … positions and careers” (232). The newer study reinforces the notions that communicating “effectively and appropriately is learned and, therefore, can and should be taught” across disciplines, and that “competent communication
plays a critical role in how our students will react to and manage life’s challenges” (224, 225, and 236).

Our second student learning outcome addresses appropriate and effective communication:

After performing an experiential-learning activity, we will expect students in QEP-designated course sections to demonstrate effective skills in communicating about the experience through an appropriate ‘work.’ The ‘work’ refers to the presentation and/or performance and/or written assignment and/or creation by which the students will be evaluated on their communication skills. Acceptable works are designed at the degree program level. Communication requires students to perform their Real-World Readiness and, in the process, to reflect on the experience more fully.

**SLO 3: REFLECTING CRITICALLY**

*Thought without practice is empty, practice without thought is blind.*

*Kwame Nkrumah Former President, Ghana*  
*Qtd. in Waterman*

In the *Sourcebook of Experiential Education*, Smith, Knapp, Seaman and Pace suggest that as students reflect carefully, “an event in life is often transformed into a meaningful and memorable experience that can be applied more easily to similar situations in the future” (2). In other words, students learn and may improve their future endeavors by present-day reflection.

While advocating for a more reflective curricula, Qualters references Gibbs’ reflective cycle commencing with a story/description (“What happened?”). This step addresses an affective component (“What students were thinking and feeling during the experience [. . .]”). The second and third steps in Gibbs’ cycle are evaluating and analysis (Qualters, “Making the Most of Learning” 95-99).

Our third student learning outcome is to develop students’ ability to reflect critically on their work.
After completion of the Real-World Ready experience and the ‘work,’ we expect students’ reflections to demonstrate critical/academic thinking. The QEP Coordinator will ensure professional development activities provide training to faculty on models of reflection so that each of the student experiences will include a reflective component suitable to the discipline, be it a project log, presentation, final report, or journal.

**SLO 4: DEMONSTRATING PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR**

Beard and Wilson have reported (while drawing on the DEEP initiative) on experiential learning as a means of engaging the learner and as a vehicle for performance enhancement—that is, "training in skills and competencies that result in improvement of personal ... effectiveness" (48-49). Additionally, problems such as ethical dilemmas that students encounter can disappear when students prepare for pressures they "commonly encounter in their field" (Cohen 48). Experiential learning providers have a role that "involves a qualitative change to the way individuals are, bringing out latent potential" (Beard and Wilson 48). Thus, experiential learning takes students on a structured and personal journey of change and growth during which they can make sense of and practice who they might be expected to become as future professionals. As our QEP unfolds, Southeastern will assist our students on this learning journey by working with both the University faculty and outside partners to establish "performance standards" (49). The Office of Experiential Learning will provide various workshops and training sessions open to students across campus to prepare them to confront issues specifically related to producing quality work through professional behavior. For example, an Ethical Awareness Workshop might “empower students to take on the role of reflective ethical practitioner while [carrying out their authentic learning experiences and later] [. . .] under the pressures of being full-time employees” (Cohen 48).

By emphasizing professional protocol and quality performance in the workplace, Southeastern students will have an opportunity to accomplish the fourth student learning outcome:

*Throughout the QEP-designated course and the Real-World Ready experience, we expect the actions, conduct and performance of students to consistently reflect a commitment to quality work.*

**DESIGNING EXPERIENTIAL-LEARNING PROJECTS**

As we fold an experiential-learning opportunity into all degree programs, we will continue to use academic research as a guide for designing experiences to meet our four learning outcomes. Miller et al. provides a detailed, six-part handbook on best practices in establishing cooperative education and internship experiences. The handbook is a compilation of recent research and
information on active-learning design issues. Its stated aim is “to help co-op and internship educators design, carry out and disseminate quality research and evaluation studies” (xi). We will use this handbook as we begin to implement our QEP. There are also discipline-specific guides (e.g. Nursing, see Flynn and Stack) and other helpful publications such as The Internship, Practicum, and Field Placement Handbook (see Baird). These publications teach us the value of and provide guideposts for developing our experiential-learning program.

Work-based activities, such as service-learning, give students “the ability to participate in shaping the direction of [their] own learning even as [they] contribute to the well-being of [their] community” (Duncan and Kopperud ix). By observing and participating in Real-World Ready projects designed and integrated in these initiatives, students will gain a deeper appreciation and understanding of civic service and responsibility even as they transform into professionals. Their critical thinking and writing skills will improve as they derive meaning from their experiences.

Practical experience in some disciplines takes the form of research. The benefits of undergraduate research have been well-established in the literature (Lopatto; Brakke et al.; Landrum and Nelsen). Undergraduates gain improved reading, writing, collaborative problem-solving, and presentation skills, as well as an enhanced résumé for applying to graduate school. Ideally, faculty mentors of undergraduate research assistants benefit as well because they gain competent understudies who contribute to their scholarly productivity.

Although there are some challenges to achieving the ideal undergraduate research collaboration, Wenderholm, Whiteside et al, and Coker and Davies provide effective and concise guides for selecting and supervising undergraduate research assistants. Van Delden furthermore describes how an annual internal undergraduate research symposium can bring seasoned undergraduate researchers together with newcomers to provide a sustainable undergraduate research stream.

The Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR) has recently published entire journal volumes and books that elaborate on best practices in undergraduate research. Such resources will be useful references at Southeastern, in particular the work by Karukstis and Hensel which focuses on primarily undergraduate institutions. CUR has also produced volumes on undergraduate research in specific academic disciplines which will act as reference guides for colleges and departments at Southeastern, including Business (Kinkead), Science (Lopatto), Literature (Behling), Studying Abroad (Bolen and Martin), and Mathematics (Adams et al). In the latter, the LURE model focuses on “developing strong mentoring relationships as well as camaraderie among the students” (216).

Marilyn Mackes, executive director of the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), says employer advisory councils are more and more a vehicle adopted by institutions “to provide input about the kind of skills students need in the workplace, or to have employers offer case-study research for the classroom that provides real-world problem-solving opportunities for students” (Mackes qtd. in Hignite). Patricia Rose, director of career services at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, says they alert students to opportunities available to them such as attending events in which “alumni speak about their careers” and shadowing those alumni at their work (Rose qtd. in Hignite).
LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

In his 2014 workshop in Baltimore, Maryland, on “Legal Issues in Internships and Experiential Education,” Eric Fink led an examination of legal ramifications when an institution sends students away from the university to learn by doing. Fink notes that control and supervision is a shared responsibility that involves potential risks and federal and state statutes. Legal duties and liabilities relate to everything from tort and contract law to issues of negligence and risk management. Therefore, it is necessary for universities to develop appropriate program guidelines that include orientations and communications for expectations to both faculty and students. Guidelines should be developed related to site selection and screening (including potential background checks).

Fink’s workshop, presented as an event of the 2014 National Society for Experiential Education conference, teaches that faculty, students, and workforce partners all have responsibilities in study away programs. Faculty should receive appropriate training and should add language to their syllabi about the expectations of the Real-World Ready opportunities. Students must communicate limitations and have the skill set appropriate to the outside partner needs. Likewise, outside partners should provide an accurate description of the study away opportunity and demonstrate students will have a safe environment (Fink).

ASSESSING EXPERIENTIAL-LEARNING PROJECTS

In her book, Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education, Mary J. Allen identifies six steps to assess student learning:

1. Develop learning objectives.
2. Check for alignment between the curriculum and the objectives.
3. Develop an assessment plan.
4. Collect assessment data.
5. Use results to improve the program.
6. Routinely examine the assessment process and correct, as needed.

Allen, director of the California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning, presents regular workshops on assessment. From her experience, she concludes:

One of the most important aspects of program assessment is that faculty discuss student learning, and these discussions naturally include consideration of curriculum, pedagogy, and student support services. Assessment focuses attention on helping students master learning objectives, and this learner-centered approach involves curriculum and course alignment and collaboration with staff who support student development. Focusing on the learning objectives provides common goals for all campus professionals. (56)

An assessment plan should explain “who is going to do what, when they will do it, and how they will use the information that is generated” (Palomba and Banta qtd. in Allen 57). A plan should include direct assessment techniques so that students can display their learning (e.g., embedded assignments and course activities, competence interviews, portfolios, etc.) (Allen 75-102). Likewise, a plan should include indirect assessment techniques (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, reflective essays, etc.) (103-129). After making sense of the collected data, “[r]eports should include sufficient detail so that readers can interpret numerical results accurately” (134). Direct quotes from students in reports make them “more powerful” (136). Assessment reports should contain other information such as “how data were collected and how student privacy and confidentiality were addressed” (137).
Assessing service-learning can be a complex undertaking at best. Serow contends the challenge exists because the evaluator is required “not only to capture the essence of the experience itself, but also to show that students are converting that experience into other outcomes, among which are competence, participation, understanding, and relationships ...” (22). Thus, he argues for holistic assessment. Holistic rubrics allow for holistic judgments “based on reviewing the entire product in sufficient detail so that the classification can be made with confidence” (Allen 138).

In a presentation at the 2014 SACSCOC Summer Institute in New Orleans, Louisiana, Catherine Wehlburg noted that educators assess for accountability, learning, teaching, but should move to develop “transformative assessment,” which Wehlburg calls the “true purpose of assessing—enhancing student learning.” This way of assessing is cyclical, contributes to ongoing dialogue, and aligns with institutional mission and goals. It is collaborative, consistent, systematic, appropriate and realistic, meaningful, and sustainable.

Drawing on contemporary experiential-learning assessment, an assessment plan should be developed using both direct and indirect methods. The undertaking must, to borrow from Shumer, demonstrate that all of the students are “learning something” (251) in ways both quantitative and qualitative. However, institutions should strive for developing a systemic approach. Holistic assessment can display the outcomes of an experience.

**SUMMARY**

Pedagogy that integrates experience to supplement and reinforce classroom instruction provides students “supervised practical training at a work site,” in which students learn to adapt to “complex situations” even as they develop “critical thinking and problem-solving skills” (Duncan and Kopperud 5-7). Ultimately, to be “Real World Ready” means that students have studied their discourses through rigorous academic coursework and have acquired a skill set that enables students to put the text into performance on the real-world stage, which is what Southeastern students have indicated they want to do.

Donna Qualters, author of *Experiential Education: Making the Most of Learning Outside the Classroom*, suggested in a recent keynote address on “The Perfect Educational Storm: Opportunities for Experiential Education” that students do not learn to master a topic “in two meetings of one hour and fifteen minute blocks of time” (“Keynote PowerPoint”). Qualters cautions that while there is “power” in this way of learning, institutions of higher learning are still left with a number of questions with which to grapple (“Editor’s Notes”):

1. How do we remain relevant in a world that may still view us as the “ivory tower”?
2. If we bring in the outside world, how do we convince our own faculty of the value of learning outside the classroom?
3. How do we help students reflect deeply to acquire the knowledge and skills they will need in the future?

The faculty across all of Southeastern’s degree programs will grapple with these questions while identifying, organizing, and assessing Real-World Ready opportunities. We will continue to use academic research to guide our learning outcomes and for our implementation and completion of a successful QEP. This initiative seeks to improve student learning by providing students with a professional identity (Hilton and Slotnick, and Schon), while developing faculty (Hafferty; Steinert et al.) and evaluating the student learning more effectively.
VI. ACTIONS TO BE IMPLEMENTED

OVERVIEW
As stated previously, the goal of Southeastern’s QEP is as follows:

This goal will be accomplished by enhancing current real-world experiences in degree programs with existing opportunities AND creating real-world experiences in degree programs without existing opportunities. Through a faculty grant initiative, courses will be designated as QEP courses and aligned with the QEP goal and student learning outcomes. By year four of Southeastern’s QEP, each undergraduate degree program will be required to offer at least one real-world ready experience (either a senior capstone or an equally meaningful experience at a different level) in which students connect their academic experience with their future professional practice.

After reviewing the literature and best practices in experiential education, the QEP Design team decided on a three-phased approach for implementing the actions necessary to achieve the goal of the QEP. While there is overlap in the three phases (in terms of the timeframe), we plan to (1) build an infrastructure to ensure the implementation, success, and continuation of our QEP; (2) launch and assess experiential experiences in QEP designated courses; and (3) enhance our initiative by using data-based findings to drive expansion.

Phase 1 (Years 0 to 1—2014-2016): Building the Infrastructure
The first phase includes launching and assessing two pilots—one online and one in a traditional classroom setting—to refine assessment strategies and implementation plans; launching a marketing plan to educate and to promote experiential learning to students, community, region, outside employers, and faculty/staff; establishing a strong campus support system; and providing training opportunities and incentives for RWR faculty and staff.

Phase 2 (Years 1 to 4—2015-2019): Launching and Assessing Experiential Projects
The second phase includes launching and assessing experiential projects in QEP-designated course sections and building a climate for developing/enhancing new and existing projects across undergraduate degree programs. By the end of phase two, every undergraduate degree program at Southeastern will offer at least one experiential-learning activity to its majors. Training opportunities will continue.

Phase 3 (Years 3 to 5—2017-2020): Enhancing and Expanding the QEP
In the third phase, we will continue to enhance and expand experiential learning across undergraduate degree programs, and continue assessment activities while working closely with the Office of Institutional Research and the Assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness. We will use data-based findings to drive evolution and improvement for those
experiential-learning projects that were already up and running at the beginning of the QEP (e.g., those who served as mentors may now be in a position to be mentored).

PHASE 1: BUILDING THE INFRASTRUCTURE

THE PILOTS
The success of the Real-World Ready initiative requires a solid infrastructure to support both faculty and student needs. To help ascertain those needs, Real-World Ready pilot activities began in summer 2014 after discussions between the QEP Coordinator and faculty in various academic departments. As the QEP proposal was still being refined, the ‘pilots’ in Summer 2014 and Fall 2014 provided a valuable needs assessment for refining the implementation process of the QEP and also helped test the waters for the implementation of a RWR experience in a 100% online course. The pilot courses included a 100% online course in General Studies (Career Planning 304) that was implementing a new experiential-learning activity and a traditionally-delivered classroom course in the College of Business (Management 464) enhancing an existing experiential-learning component.

NOTE: Results of the Fall 2014 pilot of Career Planning 304 and Management 464 were not available at the completion of this report but will be available for the on-site review team.

Lessons Learned from the Pilot Process
Additional pilots of these same two courses are scheduled for Spring 2015 and will be truer pilots, in the sense that all aspects of the proposed QEP assessment plan will be implemented, and all four of the QEP Student Learning Outcomes will be assessed. The primary purposes of the Spring 2015 pilots are threefold:

1. To launch RWR pilot projects that test the QEP assessment plan and identify areas of improvement for assessment strategies and the development of assessment tools.
2. To make any needed adjustments to QEP implementation plans in general and to the Career Planning and Management courses, specifically, before Year 1.
3. To collect data and material that may prove useful to other programs that are integrating RWR opportunities for their students as a part of the QEP and the Year 1 rollout in 2015-2016.

While these initial pilots were limited in scope (and results of Fall 2014 pilots were not completed at the writing of this report), valuable lessons have already been learned and planned improvements for implementing the QEP are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No common understanding/definition for experiential learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southeastern Louisiana University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course sections with experiential-learning activities that align with the QEP should be designated as QEP course sections</th>
<th>With the number of existing course sections that claim a Real-World Ready offering, there needs to be some designation between those course sections and the course sections that have been verified as clearly aligning with the goals and student learning outcomes of the QEP. Only course sections designated as QEP course sections will be assessed and reported in QEP results.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and accommodations needed for assessment</td>
<td>Training on the assessment of experiential learning generally and the use of student reflections and rubrics specifically is needed to ensure authentic assessment results. In addition, while the use of outside professionals in assessment helps ensure the experience is real world, involvement (and incentives for involvement) may be problematic. Campus discussions with faculty and the Real-World Ready Advisory Council scheduled for Phase One will address these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty need incentives for involvement</td>
<td>Implementing real-world ready activities is time consuming. Funds will be allocated for competitive faculty grants to help faculty develop new and enhance existing Real-World Ready experiences. While faculty currently get Tenure and Promotion and Annual Evaluation credit for providing students with RWR experiences, the grants will provide additional faculty incentives and rewards for participation in experiential learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need warriors – both faculty and student mentors</td>
<td>Establishing a campus-wide initiative takes time and manpower. While the QEP Coordinator is highly trained in areas of experiential learning, a team of faculty should be identified and trained to help. Student warriors could also be identified to promote the benefits of experiential learning. Funding will be designated to establish an annual Experiential Learning (EL) Team (faculty) and Student Ambassador Scholarships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication is key</td>
<td>Ongoing faculty conversations within and across disciplines are essential. Guidelines and models of experiential learning should be shared, be under constant review and improvements made based on assessment results. Faculty will be asked to share RWR projects in the annual Faculty Conference on Teaching, Research &amp; Creativity sponsored by the Center for Faculty Excellence. Students will be asked to share RWR experiences in Southeastern’s Students’ Research, Creative &amp; Scholarly Activities Showcase organized by the Office of Sponsored Research and Programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Lessons Learned
MARKETING PLAN
The phase one marketing plan to promote our Real-World Ready campaign was developed by a QEP marketing committee comprised of Rene Abadie, Director of Public Information; Erin Cowser, Executive Director of Public and Governmental Affairs; Amber Dejean, Web CMS Coordinator; Todd Delaney, KSLU General Manager; Mike Rivault, Director, Communications and Marketing; Rick Settoon, General Manager, Southeastern Channel; and Jayetta Slawson, QEP Coordinator. This marketing plan outlines provides a timeline for implementation. We plan for a soft launch in Year 0 (2014-2015) for better campus-wide and community awareness of our experiential-learning plans. We plan for full implementation Year 1 (2015-2016), upon approval of the QEP by SACSCOC. The marketing plan can be found in Appendix D.

CAMPUS SUPPORT SYSTEM
Creating a strong campus support system for the QEP includes the creation of the new Office of Experiential Learning, establishing strong ties with existing campus units and establishing a network of ‘people resources’ to support faculty and students.

Office of Experiential Learning. The Office of Experiential Learning (OEL) will be located in the newly-renovated Student Union complex. The space is centrally-located on campus and in close proximity to the Center for Student Excellence and the Career Services offices. The OEL will house the QEP Coordinator and student staff, and will be used by students, faculty, and community partners for marketing, developing, and advancing experiential education projects. The space is large enough to contain a reception area that is technologically-savvy-- a vibrant, inviting area for students where they can receive information on experiential education and meet with RWR student ambassadors. The Office of Experiential Learning will help centralize Real-World Ready activities across the curriculum.

Sims Memorial Library. Sims Memorial Library will support the Real-World Ready initiative in a number of ways. The library collections contain both print and electronic books in the area of experiential learning, and databases provide access to full-text articles in pertinent education, business, and communications journals. The Research Consultation Service matches a student or faculty member with a subject-specialist librarian to provide in-depth and personalized reference service. A LibGuide has been created with access to library materials and services and campus resources.

Two rooms in the library lend themselves to use for experiential learning by faculty and students. The Presentation Practice Studio in the Media Department is a very popular service point, providing a dedicated space for University students to develop and rehearse multimedia presentations individually or in small groups. The practice space will be used to prepare students for success beyond the classroom by providing them with intensive time to practice the presentation skills necessary in the modern workplace. As the largest group study room in the library, the PPS will accommodate up to 15 persons.

An instructional classroom (Room 252) is available by reservation to faculty members. The room accommodates 30-35 students and has an instructor PC with Sympodium presentation technology, overhead projector, document camera, and DVD/VHS viewing equipment. Previously used only by faculty teaching classes, the room will now be available to students needing a larger venue for their presentations via their instructor.

Career Services. The Offices of Experiential Learning and Career Services will partner to support Southeastern's commitment to prepare students fully for entry into the workforce. While
each office has its own areas of responsibilities, the offices will collaborate with each other and with faculty to offer assistance for cultivating new relationships with community partners and for seeking out new job shadowing and internship opportunities. The two offices will share resources whenever possible, including the job-search database eRecruiting. Additionally, the Office of Experiential Learning will host a table at the annual career fair presented by Career Services, one of the most prominent and visible university-wide events of Southeastern and usually the second-largest career fair held in the state.

Director of Career Services, Ken Ridgedell, sees this new Real-World Ready initiative as a prime opportunity to work collaboratively with the Office of Experiential Learning and the various academic units and faculty around campus, particularly as academic departments finalize their Real-World Ready plans and seek to implement and execute those plans. Ridgedell comments, “there are natural synergies that already exist between the services Career Services provides and the new initiatives underway around campus. There are opportunities to create new programs and services (and expand upon existing services and programs) to create further support for Real-World-Ready initiatives.”

To begin that process, a meeting was held in the Summer 2014 semester with representatives of Career Services and the QEP Design Team and campus Internship Coordinators. Collaboration is ongoing.

**College of Education.** The College of Education is effective in offering its students experiential-learning opportunities. Last year alone (2013-2014), their students completed 92,582 hours of field experience. This number includes observation, small group instruction, whole class instruction, and student teaching. The college has contracts with 311 public and private field sites. Given this experience, the Office of Experiential Learning will establish faculty learning communities in collaboration with the College of Education to serve as a forum for campus-wide communication/sharing/mentoring. Interim Dean Shirley Jacob and Interim Department Head of Teaching and Learning Cindy Elliott will share instruments ranging from employer surveys to student insurance liability forms to assist other developing programs at Southeastern. While the College of Education’s field experiences are mandated and may be different from other field experiences on campus, their support through sharing ideas across disciplines is important to Southeastern’s experiential-learning activities.

**Southeastern 101 (SE 101).** Southeastern 101 (SE 101), a course administered through the Center for Student Excellence, was developed as a part of a previous QEP. The course addresses twelve basic student development issues found in most student-success courses. For the first five years the course was taught, the topics were addressed as separate, unique factors, which resulted in a somewhat disjointed flow of information. However, in Fall 2012, focus shifted from teaching the twelve topics as autonomous items to a focus on the students’ career goals.

Students begin the semester with a discussion of “why” they elected to attend college and their expectations. That discussion leads to identifying personal career-related traits and viable, realistic career goals – which include identified occupational opportunities associated with a selected college major. Using tools such as Holland’s assessment of career self-concept development, the online Occupational Outlook Handbook, and O’Net Online, students clarify and formulate career goals. With their career goal in mind, and with occupational skills and personal requirements identified, students begin to look closely at the internal workings of the university and the structure of the college curriculum.
The framework, when scrutinizing the curriculum for course types (i.e., gen ed, major, elective), involves reading the course descriptions and identifying/discussing occupational skills which are inherent in the course. Many of the identified skills are cognitive in nature, while others are more tangible. The list of skills obtained through occupational exploration is used as a checklist for identifying which skills are directly or indirectly addressed in courses they will need to take to earn their degree. Conversations shift from “Why do I need to take math?” to “I can see that I will have to have [a certain level of] math skills to work in this field or get the job I want.” When discussing the value of labs or studio classes, or hands-on projects, students are encouraged to focus on and isolate the more tangible skills they are using for beginning a functional résumé.

All of this course content provides a clear message to Southeastern students: College courses do provide career-related skills, and astute students recognize and learn as many of those skills as possible, in each and every course. Eventually, students can include those functional, transferable skills on relevant résumés and in behavior-based interviewing situations (i.e., when asked to provide proof of statements of past experience).

Additionally, SE 101 has increasingly included reflection opportunities for students, as they transition through their first semester of course work. In-class discussion, journal-writing, and a culminating reflection project serve to sharpen the focus of the ultimate goal of higher education, which is to prepare students for a richer (richer in health, culture, and world-view, perspective), more meaningful and successful life after college.

What is not yet included in the structure of this campus-wide required course (and how this QEP is—in part—an outgrowth of and will build on the last QEP) is information on how particular courses at Southeastern can provide students with experiential-learning opportunities and how these applied learning experiences can enhance the degrees they earn. By adding the Real-World Ready infomercial as course content (see marketing plan in Appendix D) and by providing other information about the new expansion of experiential learning as components in various classes, a new layer of guidance related to career preparation and real-world readiness will be created for our SE 101 students. In addition to a preliminary meeting with Center for Student Excellence director, Dorothy Nelson, to discuss these ideas, a meeting was held on July 14, 2014, with eleven first-year advisers and instructors of SE 101 to discuss the QEP and to solicit feedback on ways SE101 can and should promote the campaign. The instructors of SE 101 have committed to providing information to their students on our proposed QEP and on experiential learning.

**Real-World Ready Advisory Council.** In consultation with the Provost, the QEP Coordinator will convene the Real-World Ready Advisory Council subsequent to SACSCOC approval of the proposed QEP or a modified version of it. Members of the council will include representatives from the University and local communities. The council will advise and support the QEP Coordinator and offer guidance as the initiative develops and evolves.

**The Experiential-Learning Team or ‘EL Team.’** Recognizing the need for faculty champions, funding has been earmarked to create an Experiential-Learning Team to travel to the annual conference of the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) held each fall. The team will serve as campus mentors upon their return by assisting the QEP Coordinator, working with individual faculty and serving as advocates for experiential learning across campus and within their own colleges. The first team of mentors will be selected in Fall 2015 (see draft of Experiential-Learning Team announcement in Appendix E). Establishing teams in each of the five years of the QEP will assist in faculty capacity-building to sustain the experiential-learning initiative beyond the QEP.
**Student Ambassadors.** To further promote experiential learning to students and the campus community, Student Ambassador Scholarships will be established in each college beginning in year one. Students who have completed experiential-learning activities may apply for a scholarship to serve as the Ambassador for his/her college. Ambassadors will assist the QEP Coordinator and EL Team in promoting experiential learning and providing student development activities.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

The success of our Real-World Ready QEP requires that faculty develop the knowledge base and skills needed to create and implement experiential-learning activities that improve student learning. To that end, a number of faculty development initiatives are planned.

The QEP Coordinator began discussions on experiential learning with individual faculty and departments in Spring 2014. These discipline-specific initial discussions revealed the need to develop a common understanding of experiential learning as pedagogy. After attending the annual conference of the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) in October 2014, the QEP Coordinator partnered with the Center for Faculty Excellence to organize a series of workshops for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 focused on topics such as:

- Fundamentals of Experiential Education
- Identifying, Understanding & Applying Outcomes Assessment in Experiential Learning
- Choosing an Authentic Experience for your Discipline
- Defining Academic Rigor in Experiential Education
- NSEE Principles of Ethical and Best Practice for Experiential Education
- Using Reflection to Make the Experience Educative

The Spring 2015 series will be presented as a *Certificate of University Teaching and Learning (CUTL).* This certificate program allows faculty a structured, concentrated way to expand their knowledge of experiential learning while providing tangible documentation for inclusion in faculty professional portfolios for tenure and promotion purposes (see draft of CUTL flyer in Appendix F).

The faculty development activities will include a seed grant program for faculty who wish to develop or redesign a course to include an experiential-learning activity and to serve as a QEP-designated course (see draft of Real-World Ready Faculty Grants in Appendix G). The idea for a faculty grant program emerged during the QEP Design Team’s discussions on best practices. These funds are for competitive faculty grants to help faculty develop new or enhance existing Real-World Ready experiences. The grants are also meant to provide faculty incentives and rewards for participation in experiential learning. The Call for Proposals will run through the existing grant structure in the Center for Faculty Excellence. Applications will be sent to the QEP Coordinator. Members of the Real-World Ready Advisory Team will serve as reviewers of the grant proposals. Applications will include line items to apply for such things as overload pay, reassigned time from teaching, stipends, additional sections, equipment, exploratory or conference travel, specific projects or needs (such as career fairs, development of assessment tools, community offerings, etc.). Over the five-year period of the proposed QEP, these grant funds will allow a minimum of 195 experiential-learning experiences to be developed or enhanced (65 new and 130 existing), potentially affecting 195 different faculty.
As indicated previously, funding has also been earmarked for a grant initiative to create an annual Experiential-Learning (EL) Team. These grants will establish a team of faculty mentors to promote and facilitate campus discussions on experiential learning. Faculty will apply to be part of the EL Team. Team members will attend the National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE) conference and upon return, will share knowledge gained at the conference by presenting a minimum of four workshops/discussions/activities (e.g. Lunch N Learns) on experiential learning for faculty over the academic year. Team members will assist the Office of Experiential Learning in promoting experiential learning by working one-on-one with individual faculty and by working with the QEP Coordinator to provide organized professional development activities based on the individual needs of faculty (see draft of Experiential-Learning Team announcement in Appendix E). Over the five-year period of the proposed QEP, the EL Team initiative could potentially establish 40 faculty mentors to serve as champions for promoting experiential learning on campus.

Additional resources for faculty support will be available on the website of the Office of Experiential Learning. The website will serve as an online location for resources that faculty may find useful in developing and implementing experiential-learning activities such as community partner guides, rubrics, websites, assessment tools, and articles. The website will also provide a link to the Lib Guide on Experiential Learning created by Southeastern’s Sims Library.

Faculty development activities will be ongoing throughout the implementation of the QEP and will be driven by the needs identified through assessment results and faculty requests, with the focus always being on the student learning outcomes.

**PHASE 2: LAUNCHING AND ASSESSING PROJECTS**

Southeastern’s Real-World Ready (RWR) initiative focuses on improving the quality of student learning by enhancing the academic climate so that more and better experiential-learning opportunities are available to students. Our RWR initiative will target both ‘now’ and ‘new’ opportunities for authentic experiential learning. The ‘now’ component refers to existing RWR-type experiences that will be enhanced and aligned with the QEP goal and student learning outcomes. Assessment of the ‘now’ opportunities will also conform to the assessment plan of the QEP. The ‘new’ component refers to creating Real-World Ready experiences in degree programs that do not offer experiential-learning opportunities. These new opportunities will be developed to align with the goals and student learning outcomes of the QEP. Phase Two will increase the quantity of experiential-learning opportunities through the development of ‘new’ opportunities while increasing the quality of experiential learning by enhancing ‘now’ opportunities.

After the topic of Real-World Ready was chosen for Southeastern’s QEP, the QEP Design Team worked with faculty members, department heads, and deans in all disciplines to identify places in the curriculum where the University should focus our initial QEP efforts. While degree programs and concentrations are rather dynamic, Southeastern offered 43 baccalaureate degrees when QEP discussions began. After identifying courses at Southeastern that contain a capstone or other equally-significant experiential-learning component (as determined by individual programs), the campus-wide investigation revealed 39 areas in which the focus would be enhancing ‘now’ opportunities and at least six degree programs (some with multiple concentrations) in which the focus would be the development of new opportunities. The six areas identified initially as focusing on new experiential-learning opportunities are as follows.
• B.A. in Art: Theatre Design Concentration
• B.G.S. General Studies (includes seven major concentrations)
• B.A. History (History Concentration and the Cultural Resources Management/Public History Concentration).
• B.A. Political Science
• B.A. Organizational Leadership (Disaster Relief Management Concentration)
• B.A. Criminal Justice

While the 2013 campus inventory revealed 39 areas with a current experiential-learning opportunity, it is important to note that there was no campus-wide definition of or guidelines for experiential learning at the time of the inventory so program leaders and faculty members had the authority to determine what they considered to be authentic, experiential-learning, opportunities for their students. For example, a program may have determined that their study abroad activities rose to the level of a capstone experiential-learning opportunity, whereas another program did not. As faculty development activities are implemented and campus conversations about experiential learning are continued, determinations of what constitutes authentic learning within a specific discipline may evolve—as will the quality and consistency of the experiential-learning opportunities.

As a follow-up to the 2013 campus inventory, an independent audit of the Fall 2014 student learning outcomes posted in WeaveONLINE® revealed that only one of the 39 degree programs indicating current applied-learning opportunities actually had student learning outcomes that aligned with all four of the QEP student learning outcomes. So while programs may indeed have an ‘experiential-learning’ activity, most of the current activities are not assessed as those in QEP-designated course sections would be. Our QEP will focus on creating new experiential-learning opportunities AND enhancing existing experiential-learning opportunities so that students in all experiential-learning activities are meeting a common set of expectations. Results of the 2013 campus inventory and the 2014 WeaveONLINE® audit are summarized in Appendix H.

Ultimately, Southeastern’s Real-World Ready initiative focuses on improving the quality of student learning by enhancing the academic climate so that more and better experiential-learning opportunities are available to students. While the proposed faculty grant initiative will determine the actual QEP-designated course sections, these grant funds will allow a minimum of 195 experiential-learning experiences to be developed or enhanced (65 new and 130 existing) over the five year period of the QEP. With 43 baccalaureate degree programs, these funds could potentially provide/impact at least four experiences per degree program.

PHASE 3: ENHANCING AND EXPANDING THE QEP

After Southeastern has established the infrastructure for our QEP (Phase 1) and has launched projects to ensure a RWR opportunity in all degree programs (Phase 2), we will work in Phase 3 to add more RWR projects into the Southeastern curriculum. The work for Phase 3 will begin concurrently to Phase 1 and 2 rollouts, and will continue beyond the QEP’s fifth year. The primary purpose of Phase 3 is to ensure—by 2019-2020—the long-term sustainability of RWR as well as an established campus identity tied to experiential education. By Phase 3, we will be locating additional avenues for enhancing the campus curriculum based on data collected from assessment in the previous RWR projects.
SUMMARY
Through a three-phased approach, each undergraduate degree program at Southeastern will be required to offer at least one Real-World Ready experience in which students connect their academic experience with their future professional practice by year four of the QEP. Over the five-year period of the proposed QEP, grant funds will be available to allow a minimum of 195 experiential-learning experiences to be developed or enhanced (65 new and 130 existing). With 43 baccalaureate degree programs, these funds could potentially provide/impact at least four experiences per degree program.

VII: TIMELINE

The table below contains a general timetable for the Office of Experiential Learning headed by the QEP Coordinator for “big-picture” timeline targets of the QEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Market the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue the QEP General Studies pilot started in Summer 2014 (on 100% online courses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Begin the College of Business pilot (for in-person course delivery).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete and submit the QEP proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• QEP Coordinator attends annual National Society for Experiential Learning Conference and annual SACSCOC Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to monitor the pilots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue faculty training and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish the Experiential Learning (EL) Team for Year 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish Student Ambassador Scholarships for Year 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare and distribute QEP annual report to the Provost, the AVP for Institutional Effectiveness, RWR Advisory Council, pilot faculty, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue faculty training and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare the Year 1 calendar for Office of Experiential Learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to market QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify and showcase RWR pilot projects at the Faculty Conference for Teaching, Research &amp; Creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Host a Real-World Ready Advisory Council meeting to share pilot results and develop action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue faculty training and development—assisted by EL Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organize student training and development activities with Student Ambassadors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• QEP Coordinator and EL Team attend annual National Society for Experiential Learning Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• QEP Coordinator attends annual SACSCOC Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish RWR faculty grants to identify QEP-designated course sections and solicit proposals for Spring 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to market QEP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Southeastern Louisiana University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Year 2** | **Fall 2016** | Continue to market QEP.  
Identify and showcase RWR projects at the Faculty Conference for Teaching, Research & Creativity.  
Host a Real-World Ready Advisory Council meeting to share QEP results and develop action plans.  
Continue faculty training and development—assisted by EL Team.  
Organize student training and development activities with Student Ambassadors.  
Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.  
QEP Coordinator and EL Team attend annual National Society for Experiential Learning Conference  
QEP Coordinator attends annual SACSCOC Conference. |
| | **Spring 2017** | Continue to market QEP.  
Solicit and award RWR grants to identify QEP-designated course sections for 2016-2017 implementation.  
Faculty training and development continues—assisted by the EL Team.  
Continue student training and development activities with Student Ambassadors.  
Identify and showcase students’ RWR experiences in Southeastern’s Students’ Research, Creative & Scholarly Activities Showcase organized by the Office of Sponsored Research and Programs.  
Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.  
Establish the Experiential Learning (EL) Team for Year 2.  
Establish Student Ambassador Scholarships for Year 2.  
Collect QEP assessment data and develop action plans with Real-World Ready Advisory Council. |
| | **Summer 2016** | Prepare and distribute QEP annual report to the Provost, the AVP for Institutional Effectiveness, RWR Advisory Council, RWR faculty, etc.  
Continue faculty training and development.  
Prepare the Year 2 calendar for Office of Experiential Learning. |
| **Year 3** | **Fall 2017** | Continue to market QEP.  
Identify and showcase RWR projects at the Faculty Conference for Teaching, Research & Creativity.  
Host a Real-World Ready Advisory Council meeting to share QEP results and develop action plans.  
Continue faculty training and development—assisted by EL Team. |
### Spring 2018
- Continue to market QEP.
- Solicit and award RWR grants to identify QEP-designated course sections for 2018-2019 implementation.
- Faculty training and development continues—assisted by the EL Team.
- Continue student training and development activities with Student Ambassadors.
- Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.
- Identify and showcase students’ RWR experiences in Southeastern’s Students’ Research, Creative & Scholarly Activities Showcase organized by the Office of Sponsored Research and Programs.
- Establish the Experiential-Learning (EL) Team for Year 4.
- Establish Student Ambassador Scholarships for Year 4.
- Collect QEP assessment data and develop action plans with Real-World Ready Advisory Council.

### Summer 2018
- Prepare and distribute QEP annual report.
- Continue faculty training and development.
- Prepare the Year 4 calendar for Office of Experiential Learning.

### Year 4
#### Fall 2018
- Identify and showcase RWR projects at the Faculty Conference for Teaching, Research & Creativity.
- Host a Real-World Ready Advisory Council meeting to share QEP results and develop action plans.
- Continue faculty training and development—assisted by EL Team.
- Organize student training and development activities with Student Ambassadors.
- Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.
- QEP Coordinator and EL Team attend annual National Society for Experiential Learning Conference.
- QEP Coordinator attends annual SACSCOC Conference.

### Spring 2019
- Solicit and award RWR grants to identify QEP-designated course sections for 2019-2020 implementation.
- Faculty training and development continues—assisted by the EL Team.
- Continue student training and development activities with Student Ambassadors.
- Identify and showcase students’ RWR experiences in Southeastern’s Students’ Research, Creative & Scholarly Activities Showcase organized by the Office of Sponsored Research and Programs.
- Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.
- Establish the Experiential-Learning (EL) Team for Year 5.
- Establish Student Ambassador Scholarships for Year 5.
- Collect QEP assessment data and develop action plans with Real-World Ready Advisory Council.

### Summer 2019
- Prepare and distribute QEP annual report.
- Continue faculty training and development.
- Prepare the Year 5 calendar for Office of Experiential Learning.

### Year 5
#### Fall 2019
- Identify and showcase RWR projects at the Faculty Conference for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching, Research &amp; Creativity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Host a Real-World Ready Advisory Council meeting to share QEP results and develop action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continue faculty training and development—assisted by EL Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organize student training and development activities with Student Ambassadors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- QEP Coordinator and EL Team attend annual National Society for Experiential Learning Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- QEP Coordinator attends annual SACSCOC Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Publicize QEP results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RWR experiences are present in all programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Solicit and award RWR grants for continued enhancement of capstone experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Faculty training and development continues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify and showcase students’ RWR experiences in Southeastern’s Students’ Research, Creative &amp; Scholarly Activities Showcase organized by the Office of Sponsored Research and Programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continue campus-wide discussions of experiential learning and RWR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collect QEP assessment data and develop action plans with Real-World Ready Advisory Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop the QEP Impact Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Prepare and distribute QEP Impact Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Timeline
VIII. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

With the intent to implement new and enhance existing Real-World Ready experiences in each of Southeastern’s undergraduate degree programs, the activities of the QEP fall within the purview of the Division of Academic Affairs. The QEP coordinator, a faculty member responsible for the implementation of the plan, will report directly to the Provost, who will ensure the University’s commitment to institutionalizing experiential learning and to academic rigor. There will be ongoing conversations and coordination with offices in the Division of Student Affairs, as needed, to ensure effective operation. An Advisory Team will be appointed to ensure all affected constituencies have input.

We will coordinate experiential-learning outcomes campus-wide to test our success and to identify improvement strategies. A new Office of Experiential Learning will be established in the Student Union. This office will be led by a QEP Coordinator (faculty member Dr. Jayetta Slawson) and student workers (see Appendix I for staff job descriptions and Appendix J for Dr. Slawson’s Vita). The QEP staff will cultivate relationships campus-wide to support the development of this initiative. The QEP Coordinator will direct all aspects of the QEP initiative with guidance from the Provost and the Real-World Ready Advisory Team (to be established in Year 0). Responsibilities will include cultivating community-based partnerships and working with all constituencies to ensure the development and ongoing success of applied and integrated learning experiences.

Figure 5: QEP Reporting Lines
IX. RESOURCES

OVERVIEW
Although higher education funding has often been volatile and subject to cuts from the State of Louisiana in the recent past, Southeastern is committed to providing the necessary resources—administrative support, dedicated space, human resources, and funding to initiate and sustain a successful Real-World Ready initiative. The University’s funding commitment totals $1,134,216 during the six year QEP period (including Year 0).

The University currently charges every student an Academic Enhancement Fee. This fee was created by the Board of Supervisors to assist Universities in providing students with enhanced educational opportunities above and beyond those found in the traditional classroom. This fee currently generates approximately $700,000 per year. The University has established the QEP as a priority and will commit the revenues from the Academic Enhancement Fee to support the program needs as outlined below, prior to allocating funds to support other needs. Given the projected revenues from the Academic Enhancement Fee and the proposed QEP budgets, the revenues are more than sufficient to fund the Real-World Ready program. While enrollment declines are not projected, the funding level is also sufficient to accommodate any potential enrollment shifts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED QEP BUDGET</th>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 0 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Coordinator release time (six hours—fall, spring, summer), Ret./F.I.C.A.)</td>
<td>$40,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAs/student staff</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and maintain Office of Experiential Learning – (phone, fax, printer, computer, office equipment, etc.)</td>
<td>$13,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Coordinator Training/travel (conference, field, etc.)</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development workshops/seminars-food, supplies, materials, etc.</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grants to develop NEW RWR experiences (grant max is $3,000). Year 0 includes stipend for pilot</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Grants to enhance EXISTING RWR experiences (grant max is $1,500) Year 0 includes stipend for pilot faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Grants to enhance EXISTING RWR experiences (grant max is $1,500) Year 0 includes stipend for pilot faculty.</th>
<th>$2,650</th>
<th>$30,000</th>
<th>$30,000</th>
<th>$45,000</th>
<th>$45,000</th>
<th>$45,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL Team grants to establish mentor groups-- 8 faculty per year @ $5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Operations (includes institutional memberships, subscriptions and books for resource room – to include discipline specific materials).</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing materials – color brochures, giveaways, table banners, etc.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, printing and copying (Document Source and student mail-outs)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support expenses – awards, travel presentations (to support current SGA funds), speakers for student training, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Ambassador scholarships to assist EL Team and Office of Experiential Learning ($1,000 per year per college @ $500 scholarship per fall and spring semester).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>$203,796</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,483</strong></td>
<td><strong>$225,737</strong></td>
<td><strong>$212,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>$213,968</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Budget
QEP Coordinator. The QEP Coordinator will receive six hours of reassign time each semester to lead the QEP initiative and coordinate the Office of Experiential Learning. Yearly increases reflect anticipated increases in benefits. Duties are outlined in the job description for the QEP Coordinator found in Appendix I.

GAs/student staff. Support staff for the QEP Coordinator will consist of a graduate assistant and student workers. Budget reflects a state student worker for 10 hrs/week for fall, spring and summer semesters. Students on federal work-study may supplement staff needs.

Office of Experiential Learning. These funds include the establishment of the Office of Experiential Learning in Year 0 and then the yearly cost to maintain the office. Expenses for Year 0 include costs for computers, printers, fax machine, maintenance fees, telephone, data lines, software, office furniture, office supplies, etc. Expenses for Year 1 and beyond include $1,205.28 annual fee for phone/data lines and office/operating supplies.

QEP Coordinator Training/Travel. QEP Coordinator will attend the annual conference of the National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE). Funding includes expenses for other relevant travel such as field travel to community partner sites and attendance at state meetings.

Faculty Development. Faculty development activities will be ongoing throughout the implementation of the QEP and will be driven by the needs identified through assessment results and faculty requests. Funds will support training activities related to the QEP such as those described below:

Monthly Lunch N Learns to provide faculty with professional development opportunities to discuss their teaching and learning strategies in regard to experiential-learning courses and activities. Presenters are Southeastern faculty working with the Office of Experiential Learning as members of the Experiential-Learning (EL) Team. Participants share techniques, strategies, and tools for enhancing their teaching of experiential-learning courses. The series is co-sponsored by the Office of Experiential Learning and the Center for Faculty Excellence. Funding to provide lunch is estimated at $900 annually (6 luncheons per year for 25 people @$6 per person).

The Certificate of University Teaching and Learning (CUTL) is a series of workshops that allow faculty a structured, concentrated way to expand their knowledge of experiential learning while providing tangible documentation for inclusion in faculty professional portfolios. Plans are to offer the series of four workshops every semester (spring and fall) beginning in Spring 2015. Each of the workshops will be offered at two different times to accommodate faculty schedules. Funding for refreshments is estimated at $480 annually (8 sessions each in fall and spring semesters—so 16 sessions per year for 15 people @ $2 each) for Years 1-3 and $240 for Years 0, 4 and 5 (CUTL will be offered once, not twice).

Funds for Year 3 are slightly higher as plans include bringing in a nationally-recognized speaker on experiential learning. This event will provide faculty an additional professional development opportunity to enhance their teaching and learning strategies around experiential-learning
activities and courses and serve to energize continued efforts as we reach the midpoint of the QEP. The event will be co-sponsored by the Office of Experiential Learning and the Center for Faculty Excellence. Funding for travel and honorarium is estimated at $2,000.

An additional $349 is budgeted for each year to allow for the purchase of applicable webinars that may become available based on emerging practices of experiential learning. Estimated funds allow one seminar per year @$349 (estimate is based on the online seminar package from Magna).

Faculty Grants to Develop RWR Experiences. These funds are for competitive grants to help faculty develop new or enhance existing Real-World Ready experiences. The Call for Proposals will run through the existing grant structure in the Center for Faculty Excellence. Applications will be sent to the QEP Coordinator. Members of the Real-World Ready Advisory Team will serve as reviewers of the grant proposals. Applications will include line items to apply for such things as reassigned time from teaching, overload pay, stipends, additional sections, equipment, exploratory travel, specific projects or needs (such as career fairs, community offerings, etc.). It is anticipated that the number of grant proposals to develop new experiences will decline after year three, while the number of grant proposals to enhance existing experiences will increase after year two. Funding amounts allow for 15 grants for new proposals in years one, two and three, followed by 10 grants in years four and five. Funding amounts to enhance existing experiences allow for 20 proposals in years one and two, followed by 30 proposals in years three, four and five. The increased number is predicted since faculty establishing projects in years one and two may see a need to enhance those projects based on assessment results. Over the five-year period of the QEP, these grant funds will allow a minimum of 195 experiential-learning experiences to be developed or enhanced (65 new and 130 existing). With 43 baccalaureate degree programs, these funds could potentially provide/impact at least four experiences per degree program.

EL Team Grants. These grants will establish a team of faculty mentors to promote and facilitate campus discussions on experiential learning. Faculty will apply to be part of the EL Team. Team members will attend the National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE) conference and upon return, will share knowledge gained at the conference by presenting a minimum of four workshops/discussions/activities on experiential learning for faculty over the academic year. Team members will assist the Office of Experiential Learning in promoting experiential learning by serving as a faculty mentor for faculty.

Professional Operations. These funds are for institutional memberships to organizations such as the National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE) and for applicable subscriptions and support resources.

Marketing Materials. These funds will be used to create and purchase brochures, banners, posters, and promotional items and give-aways to market the QEP.

Postage, Printing and Copying. These funds will support mail-outs of QEP materials and printing/copying costs associated with the activities of the Office of Experiential Learning.
Student Support Expenses. These funds support activities related to student development. Examples may include support for student travel expenses associated with the completion and/or presentation of the RWR activity; guest speakers for student events; and student attendance at applied-learning-related conferences. These funds will be coordinated with existing funds from the Student Government Association currently available for these types of activities.

Student Ambassador Scholarships. To further promote experiential learning to students and the campus community, Student Ambassador Scholarships will be established in each college beginning in year one. Students who have completed experiential-learning activities may apply for a scholarship to serve as the Ambassador for his/her college. Ambassadors will assist the QEP Coordinator and EL Team in promoting experiential learning and providing student development activities. These annual scholarships will provide $1,000 per year ($500 per semester for fall and spring semesters). This initiative to provide financial support for our engaged students clearly aligns with the University's emphasis on student retention and progression.
X. ASSESSMENT

OVERVIEW

In our RWR initiative, Southeastern plans for assessment activities that will have, to borrow a phrase from Catherine Wehlburg, "a long-term, positive impact on the institution" ("Just Right"). In her recent article on outcomes assessment, Wehlburg argues for a balance between *not too much* and *not too little* as she advocates for an assessment paradigm that focuses on the teaching/learning process. Such a strategy, says Wehlburg, is "how we improve and enhance teaching and learning" (our emphasis).

Southeastern adopted WeaveONLINE® software for program assessment and planning in 2011. Since then, much time and effort has gone into developing and using this information system for purposes of cultivating institutional effectiveness. Concurrent to this adoption, the QEP Design Team began developing assessment ideas for multi-dimensional learning in 2013. At its November 5, 2013 meeting, the team established a subcommittee to discuss methods and performance criteria for measuring the QEP student outcomes. The members of this faculty subcommittee included Colleen Klein-Ezell, Chair; Sheri Hoffman; David Norwood; and Charlotte Humphries. The subcommittee determined that rubrics for evaluating RWR activities should be structured to identify specific characteristics or behaviors while, in another sense, being deliberately broad enough to allow authentic assessment by each program.

Next, QEP Coordinator Jayetta Slawson attended an assessment workshop as part of the National Society for Experiential Education Academy held in St. Petersburg, Florida, in Fall 2013. Additionally, she attended sessions on assessment at the 2014 SACSCOC tenth annual Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation held in New Orleans, Louisiana. On campus, Dr. Slawson had meetings for assessment advisement and input with Mary White, Professor of Biological Sciences and Chair of the University Academic Assessment Committee; and Josie Walker, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness.

As a result of these activities and efforts, we have developed an initial experiential-learning assessment plan. Any adjustments will be an outgrowth of patterns that emerge as we implement our RWR campaign. Assessment data will be collected by the faculty member who is responsible for the RWR experience and supplied to the Office of Experiential Learning each semester via WeaveONLINE®. The QEP Coordinator will create an annual report for distribution to the campus community for reflection and continued growth in our efforts to incorporate experiential learning as an effective strategy for improved student learning.

ASSESSMENT STRATEGY

The assessment strategy developed for the QEP is comprehensive, multi-faceted and flexible. The assessment plan for student learning outcomes includes direct and indirect measures including structured reflections, observed behavior, pre/post surveys and locally-developed rubrics. The assessment of the effectiveness of the QEP at the institutional level will include the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the University-administered Alumni Survey, and the analysis of data collected for each student learning outcome.

A holistic Master Rubric (see Appendix K) was developed by the QEP Assessment subcommittee to identify and assess common characteristics of all Real-World Ready activities while accommodating the variety of discipline-specific activities. Elements of the Master Rubric ensure that all students are meeting a common set of expectations for each student learning outcome but are deliberately broad to allow for interpretation by the programs that will use them.
Faculty at the degree program level will use the holistic Master Rubric to develop clearly stated scoring guidelines or analytic rubrics within the discipline to render reliable ratings. It is within these analytic rubrics that programs have individual latitude for meeting the needs and requirements of their specific disciplines.

Although participating academic programs will devise experiential-learning opportunities that are authentic to the discipline, assessment practices will include the use of the analytic rubrics developed from the holistic Master Rubric to measure the four QEP student learning outcomes (SLOs) in three areas: the experience, the work and the behavior. The table below summarizes the direct and indirect measures for assessing each student-learning outcome (SLO) within these three areas and is followed by a more detailed description of the assessment activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Assessment</th>
<th>QEP Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Direct Measures</th>
<th>Indirect Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Experience</strong></td>
<td>SLO 1: Student will apply professional (discipline-specific) knowledge in an authentic setting.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Work</strong></td>
<td>SLO 2: Student will demonstrate effective communication in a professionally-authentic form.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLO 3: Student will reflect on the work, identifying strengths and weaknesses of product and process, and deriving directions for future efforts.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Behavior</strong></td>
<td>SLO 4: Students’ professional behaviors reflect a commitment to quality work.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Summary of Assessment Activities
ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: Student learning outcomes

Direct measures of the student learning outcomes include both course embedded and community-based assessments. Course Embedded assessments refer to those activities directed by the faculty member(s) teaching the course aligned with the real-world experience. Community-based assessments are performed by the site supervisor (when applicable) of the real-world experience. As indicated above, analytic rubrics within the discipline will be used to evaluate student writing (course embedded) and observed behavior (course embedded and community based). These discipline-specific rubrics will align with the Master Rubric (Appendix K) and reflect these assessment categories: Connections to Experience, Professional Performance, Integrated Communication, Self-Assessment, and Student Behavior.

Assessment within these three areas is described in the following outline.

I. **The Experience** refers to the activity in which the student can connect and apply academic work in a setting authentic to the discipline.

   SLO 1: Students will apply professional (discipline-specific) knowledge in an authentic setting.

   **Suggested Assessment Activity:**
   A. Students will describe how they applied knowledge from their curricula in the authentic setting through a written response to a reflection prompt. All students will respond to the same prompt with submissions due at the end of the RWR experience and after the presentation of the communication activity (i.e. the ‘Work’). Reflections will be submitted to the faculty supervisor and evaluated using the discipline-specific rubric created for the Connections to Experience dimension of the Master Rubric (Appendix K). Evaluation will be done on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 representing ‘misses expectations’ and 3 representing ‘exceeds expectations’. The achievement target for this measure is that 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations for SLO 1.

      *Sample Prompt for SLO 1: Describe your Real-World Ready Experience. Explain how you applied the knowledge acquired in your academic course(s) to this experience. Provide specific examples of connections made and insights gained. Analyze the impact of your RWR experience on your academic understanding and your preparation for your chosen profession.*

   B. Through observed behavior, site supervisors will complete an evaluation of each student using the discipline-specific rubric created for the Professional Performance dimension of the Master Rubric (Appendix K). Site supervisors will complete the evaluations and submit to the faculty member within one week of the end of the experience. The achievement target for this measure is that 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations for SLO 1.

II. **The Work** refers to the performance/act/product by which the student communicates information on the experience in a method in line with the discipline (such as an oral presentation, an essay, a video, a graphic design, etc.).

   SLO 2: Student will demonstrate effective communication in a professionally authentic form.
   SLO 3: Student will reflect on the work, identifying strengths and weaknesses of product and process, and deriving directions for future efforts.
Suggested Assessment Activity:
A. The faculty supervisor evaluates ‘the work’ (the discipline appropriate method by which the student communicates information on the experience) using the discipline-specific rubric created for the Integrated Communication dimension of the Master Rubric (Appendix K). Evaluation will be done on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 representing ‘misses expectations’ and 3 representing ‘exceeds expectations’. The achievement target for this measure is that 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations for SLO 2.

B. Students will reflect on ‘the work’ via a written response to a reflection prompt. All students will respond to the same prompt with submissions due after the presentation of the communication activity (i.e. the ‘Work’). Reflections will be submitted to the faculty supervisor and evaluated using the discipline-specific rubric created for the Self-Assessment dimension of the Master Rubric (Appendix K). Evaluation will be done on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 representing ‘misses expectations’ and 3 representing ‘exceeds expectations’. The achievement target for this measure is that 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations for SLO 3.

Sample Prompt for SLO 3: Explain how your ‘work’ embodies the culmination of your coursework and RWR experience and serves as an appropriate communication. Examine both the development and presentation of your work and expand on strengths and weaknesses. Articulate the value added for both you and your audience/reader.

III. The Behavior refers to the actions, conduct and performance of the student throughout the course and the RWR experience.

SLO 4: Students’ professional behaviors reflect a commitment to quality work.

Suggested Assessment Activity:
A. The faculty supervisor evaluates the professional behavior of the student throughout the course and RWR experience using the discipline-specific rubric created for the Student Behavior dimension of the Master Rubric (Appendix K). Evaluation will be done on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 representing ‘misses expectations’ and 3 representing ‘exceeds expectations’. The achievement target for this measure is 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations for SLO 4.

B. Site supervisors (when applicable) evaluate the student’s professional behavior in the real-world setting using the discipline-specific rubric created for the Student Behavior dimension of the Master Rubric (Appendix K). Site supervisors will complete the evaluations and submit to the faculty member within one week of the end of the experience. The achievement target for this measure is 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations for SLO 4.

In addition to the activities described in the outline above, student responses to a Pre/Post Experience Survey will enable us to assess student learning by using a ‘value added’ approach. The Pre/Post Experience Survey instrument has not yet been identified but will be selected (or created) with the guidance of the Office of Institutional Research and the Assistant Vice-President of Institutional Effectiveness. Students enrolled in QEP-designated course sections will complete the survey at the beginning and end of the course. A positive change in mean
scores (e.g., a 5% increase) for each student learning outcome area will be the established criterion for success for this assessment.

The diagram below illustrates the flow of suggested assessment activities.

![Flow of Assessment Activities]

**ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: Effectiveness of QEP**

As described previously, faculty at the degree program level will develop analytic rubrics based on the holistic Master Rubric to assess student learning within a specific discipline. Data will be collected by the faculty member, compiled in aggregate and submitted to the Office of Experiential Learning. The QEP Coordinator will use the Master Rubric (Appendix K) to view program data (holistically) across disciplines, compile results and record in the QEP entity of WeaveONLINE®. Evaluation will be done on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 representing ‘misses expectations’ and 3 representing ‘exceeds expectations’. The achievement target for this measure is that 80% of all students in QEP-designated real-world experiences will meet or exceed expectations in all four of the student learning outcomes.

Our QEP will enhance the academic climate for student learning by providing authentic learning opportunities that connect academic courses with real-world experiences, thereby better preparing students for life in the real-world. So in addition to attainment of the student learning outcomes (SLOs) reported by faculty in QEP-designated course sections, effectiveness of the QEP will be monitored through a periodic audit of the SLOs posted by each degree program in WeaveONLINE®. As the campus culture for enhancing student learning through experiential-learning opportunities evolves, the number of degree SLOs that align with QEP SLOs should increase. The Fall 2014 audit will serve as the baseline (see Appendix H).

As indicated previously in the Final Topic Selection section of this report, data from the 2012 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Southeastern’s 2011 Employer Survey helped confirm the selection of Real-World Ready as our QEP. Data from the most recent administration of these surveys will be used as a baseline for helping measure the effectiveness of the QEP.
The NSSE survey is administered to freshmen and seniors every two years. The data collected by the survey include students’ self-reports of quantity and frequency of engagement in educational practices associated with high levels of learning and development. The NSSE questions related to experiential learning are included in Appendix L. During the QEP implementation, a positive trend in mean scores for the related NSSE questions will be the established criterion for success for this assessment.

Southeastern’s Employer Survey is administered every other year as a follow-up to the Alumni Survey. As part of the Alumni Survey, alumni are asked to provide information about their employers. The employers identified in the Alumni Survey are sent an Employer Survey. The Employer Survey addresses three specific areas: what skills or knowledge are important to a graduate’s job; what the graduate’s skill level is in the identified areas; and what attributes employers believe are important when they hire a new employee. The survey also asks some general questions concerning the graduate’s overall preparedness and the type of organization for which the graduate works. The questions related to Communication Skills and Professional Traits and Attitudes were identified as significant to the QEP and are included in Appendix M. A positive trend in mean scores for the related Employer Survey questions will be the established criterion for success for this assessment.

The NSSE and Employer Survey data will be collected and analyzed by Institutional Research and disseminated to the QEP Coordinator and Real-World Ready Advisory Team for comparison with baseline data. The QEP Coordinator will record the data in the QEP entity of WeaveONLINE®. Results will be shared with faculty and all QEP stakeholders and used as affirmation of QEP effectiveness or impetus for improvement.

DEFINING SUCCESS OF THE QEP

It has been documented in the experiential-learning literature and in the review of literature in Section V of this report that engaging students in experiential-learning activities does indeed improve student learning. Our Real-World Ready initiative will also improve the quality of student learning by enhancing the academic climate so that more and better experiential-learning opportunities are available to students. Our RWR initiative will provide students the opportunity to apply the discipline in a professional context by integrating an experiential-learning component into the curricula for those degree programs without an existing opportunity AND by enhancing current experiential-learning components. In addition to assessment of our four student-learning outcomes, our measures of success will include environmental indicators that reveal an increase in the quality and quantity of RWR experiences.

IMPROVING THE QUANTITY OF EXPERIENTIAL-LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Environmental indicators of success for increasing the quantity of experiential-learning opportunities are as follows.

- Increase the number of students engaged in experiential learning
- Increase the number of course sections that include experiential-learning opportunities
- Increase the number of degree programs that offer experiential learning

For purposes of tracking increases in the number of students who engage in experiential learning, the number of course sections that include experiential learning, and the number of degree programs that offer experiential learning, each program will complete an academic year-
end survey and return to the Office of Experiential Learning. The QEP Coordinator will compile this data and, in conversation with the Division of Academic Affairs, set new and increased targets for the following academic year. The new campus targets will be communicated to all programs each summer.

**IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EXPERIENTIAL-LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES**

Indicators of success for increasing the quality of experiential-learning opportunities are as follows.

- Develop faculty expertise in experiential learning
- Align designated QEP course sections with the campus definition, guidelines and SLOs
- Increase in the number of degree programs that align program outcomes with the RWR student-learning outcomes
- Increase student satisfaction with experiential-learning opportunities

As described previously, the QEP Coordinator will work with the Center for Faculty Excellence to offer a number of faculty development workshops in the area of experiential learning. An assessment questionnaire will be distributed after all workshops and will include questions regarding satisfaction with the training, as well as content questions to evaluate the effectiveness of the training.

Establishing a common understanding of what constitutes experiential learning and agreed upon definitions/guidelines for the depth of student involvement in the experiential-learning activity is essential to ensure the quality and consistency of RWR experiences across disciplines. The application process for the Faculty Grant initiative (Appendix G) will ensure that QEP designated course sections align with the campus definition, guidelines and student-learning outcomes in the QEP proposal.

WeaveONLINE® audits will be conducted at the end of Years 3 and 5 to measure the increase in the number of degree programs that align program outcomes with the RWR student-learning outcomes. Data will be compared with baseline data established in Year 0.

To measure student satisfaction with experiential learning, a pre/post survey will be designed to align with questions on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), such as, “How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in…Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills.” This survey will be given to all students engaged in QEP designated course sections. Results will be compared to general results obtained from the campus-wide administration of NSSE in Spring 2016, 2018 and 2020.
### ASSESSMENT TIMELINE

While a general timetable for “big-picture” timeline targets of the QEP was provided in [Section VII](#), the timeline below provides a summary of and schedule for assessment activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Campus discussions of assessment strategy continue. Conversations include pilot faculty, the QEP Coordinator, the Assistant Vice-President for Institutional Effectiveness and members of the QEP Design Team.  
|  
| Draft rubrics are created for each student learning outcome for use in the Spring 2015 pilot (e.g. adaptations of AAC&U VALUE Rubrics). Rubrics align with the holistic Master Rubric created by the QEP Assessment subcommittee.  
|  
| Draft pre/post student survey is created for Spring 2015 pilot.  
|  
| WeaveONLINE® audit of student learning outcomes (SLOs) for degree programs to establish baseline for number of degree SLOs that align with QEP SLOs.  
|  
| **Spring 2015** |  
|  
| Pilot course sections assess **The Experience, The Work** and **The Behavior** using the draft rubrics.  
|  
| Pilot course sections implement a draft of the pre/post survey.  
|  
| Campus discussions of assessment strategy continue as draft instruments (e.g. pre-post survey) are shared and reviewed. Additional modifications are pending pilot results.  
|  
| Pilot faculty report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.  
|  
| **Summer 2015** |  
|  
| The QEP Coordinator compiles the data and writes a report. Data collected through the application of the rubrics will include individual student ratings for each rubric category. Statistics to be generated include number and percentage of ratings levels within each rating category (e.g. 37 students or 88% Exceeded Expectations in the Connections to Discipline category).  
|  
| The QEP Coordinator distributes report and discussions are held with Provost, RWR Advisory Council, pilot faculty, AVP for Institutional Effectiveness, etc. Existing implementation plans are modified as needed and targets are established to ensure we are moving towards a successful result.  
|  
| **Year 1** |  
| **Fall 2015** |  
|  
| Assessment strategy and pre-post survey is finalized based on improvements and modifications suggested by pilot results and campus conversations.  
|  
| Assessment plans are ready for use in the first round of QEP-designated course sections scheduled for Spring 2016.  
|  
| **Spring 2016** |  
|  
| Begin first round of QEP-designated course sections.  
|  
| The Office of Institutional Research administers the National Survey for Student Engagement and Southeastern’s Employer Survey. Results are used to determine baseline data.  
|  
| Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.  
|  
| **Summer 2016** |  
|  
| The QEP Coordinator compiles the data, writes and distributes report. Assessment instruments and implementation plans are modified as needed based on results/improvements suggested by Year 1 report and campus conversations.  
|
### Year 2
**Fall 2016**
- Begin delivery of second round of QEP-designated course sections.
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.

**Spring 2017**
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.

**Summer 2017**
- The QEP Coordinator compiles the data, writes and distributes report. Campus conversations determine needed modifications to implementation plans for Year 3.

### Year 3
**Fall 2017**
- Begin delivery of third round of QEP-designated course sections.
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.

**Spring 2018**
- The Office of Institutional Research administers the National Survey for Student Engagement. Results are compared with baseline data.
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.

**Summer 2018**
- The QEP Coordinator compiles the data, writes and distributes report. Campus conversations determine needed modifications to implementation plans for Year 4.
- WeaveONLINE® audit of degree SLOs that align with QEP SLOs is repeated and compared with baseline.

### Year 4
**Fall 2018**
- Begin delivery of fourth round of QEP-designated course sections.
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.

**Spring 2019**
- The Office of Institutional Research administers Southeastern’s Employer Survey. Results are compared with baseline data.
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.

**Summer 2019**
- The QEP Coordinator compiles the data, writes and distributes report. Campus conversations determine needed modifications to implementation plans for Year 5.

### Year 5
**Fall 2019**
- Begin delivery of fifth round of QEP-designated course sections.
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.

**Spring 2020**
- The Office of Institutional Research administers the National Survey for Student Engagement. Results are compared with baseline and Spring 2018 data.
- Faculty teaching QEP-designated course sections report assessment results to QEP Coordinator in aggregate form. Faculty also submit an action plan which includes analysis of results and plans for future improvements.
SUMMARY

Constructing a plan for assessing the QEP means little if we are not prepared to use the information to improve student learning or, as Mary J. Allen puts it, to turn “raw data into useful information” (131). The QEP assessment plans reflect room for common understanding and process evolution, and provide a basis for measurement across the spectrum of Southeastern programs. Over time, these assessments will serve to determine success of programs and of efforts to improve student performance in those areas.

XI. CONCLUSIONS

Armed with a realistic, well-planned, timeline constructed with direct input from constituencies across campus, Southeastern will provide a meaningful and significant Real-World Ready opportunity to each undergraduate student in all degree programs by May 2019. While there are already a number of degree programs up and running with RWR-type class components, by enhancing and expanding these experiential-learning opportunities through a three-phased approach that establishes infrastructure, launches specific projects, and expands coordination and assessment efforts campus wide, the institution is better preparing students to meet the challenges of the careers they will enter upon graduation.

After reviewing the literature and using our own Vision 2017 as the guide, we have created an overall work-force-ready aim in line with Southeastern’s mission, with specific and measurable learning outcomes (four SLOs), and assessment tools (both rubrics and in-house instruments) to serve as direct and indirect measures of these goals. The method for assessing RWR learning effectiveness will provide needed insight for growing the program and ensuring its effectiveness. Further, the effort, time, and money earmarked for the QEP attest to institutional commitment to successful implementation and ongoing quality of the program. Additionally, a solid organizational structure and trained, qualified, implementation team will help ensure the success of RWR.

Finally, this initiative is one that the Southeastern community considers important for students, crucial to the advancement of our goals as a learning institution, and a solid vehicle for providing assessment of the quality and effectiveness of our student preparation for entering the work force upon graduation. Thus, as Southeastern embarks on this journey, we are connecting practice to theory and the concrete to the abstract for the benefit of student learning. The experiential-learning opportunities will position students not simply as receptacles of learning, but as active designers of their academic and professional careers through the guidance and help from professional mentors. As one pre-law student told the QEP Coordinator in an information-gathering visit to an English 101 class on June 16, 2014, she was “learning, but
lacked experience.” She wanted more experience in her future career to understand more fully how it “operated.” Other students surveyed in this class expressed similar sentiments.

Through this performance-centered learning endeavor, Southeastern is placing value on student voices and nurturing their growth through practice and practical exposure to the careers they will follow. Ultimately, Southeastern’s Real-World Ready initiative strives to create a campus climate that supports a learning environment in which all students have an opportunity to grow more fully as individuals and future professionals. The Southeastern community, at all levels, is committed to mentoring our students to the coveted status of “Real-World Ready.”
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APPENDIX A: SOUTHEASTERN’S VISION 2017

Vision 2017
Southeastern Louisiana University’s Strategic Plan
With Action Plans for the Division of Academic Affairs that apply to the QEP Embedded in Green Font

Mission Statement
The mission of Southeastern Louisiana University is to lead the educational, economic and cultural development of southeast Louisiana.

Core Values
Core Values are the underpinning of a university’s culture and character, and serve as the foundation on which everything else is built. Southeastern Louisiana University’s core values of Excellence and Caring reflect who we are and what you can expect from us.

- EXCELLENCE:
  Continually striving for the highest level of achievement; overcoming challenges with reflection, improvement, innovation and reinvention.

- CARING:
  Serving the needs of others with respect, understanding and compassion; affirming the differences among individuals, values and ideas.

Guided by our core values, Southeastern creates engaging learning opportunities such as residential, distance education and international experiences that extend knowledge and its application in the classroom and beyond.

Southeastern uses technology to provide access to global ideas and information, to an interactive world of knowledge creation and sharing, and to a wealth of online collaboration and communication.

Strategic Priorities
1. To engage a diverse population of learners with powerful experiences.
2. To spearhead collaborative efforts.
3. To foster a climate that nurtures relationships and engages people in the life of the University.
4. To prepare the University community to thrive in a global society.
5. To increase, diversify and manage funding effectively.
6. To communicate the University’s identity and value.
1. To engage a diverse population of learners with powerful experiences.

1.1 The University will provide relevant curricula, emphasizing scholarship and an innovative, engaging pedagogy that creates an intellectually stimulating environment.

1.1.a (AA). Colleges and academic departments will regularly examine and refine curricula in accordance with discipline-specific trends, accreditation requirements, and current and future workforce/economic development needs, including student preparation for (a) job placement upon graduation using information from regional and state workforce and economic development agencies, including the Louisiana Workforce Development Office’s Star Rating System and (b) graduate education.

1.1.c (AA). Academic departments, colleges, and the Provost’s office will promote a culture of educational excellence that recognizes and encourages innovative and engaging pedagogy and scholarship associated with student success.

1.1.c.ii (AA). Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Faculty Annual Evaluation Guidelines will encourage innovative and engaging faculty pedagogical and professional activities associated with demonstrated success of student learning in the classroom and/or in the pursuit of a career and/or graduate/professional school placement upon graduation (e.g., individualized instruction of students outside of the classroom; supervision of service learning, student research, creative activities; faculty-student research/scholarly/creative collaborations; active participation in programs/activities designed to better prepare students for university-level work).

1.8 The University will offer undergraduate and graduate degree programs and post-degree certificate programs to meet regional needs.

1.8.a. (AA). Based on information from entities such as regional economic development agencies (GNO, Inc.; Northshore Business Alliance), the Louisiana Economic Development Office, and professional discipline-specific boards/agencies, faculty, departments heads, deans, and the Provost will work to identify, propose, and implement new concentrations, certificate programs, and/or degree programs that address regional needs; faculty and department heads will work to modify as necessary and appropriate existing degree programs to better align with regional needs (see 1.1.a. AA)
APPENDIX B: Road to the Final Four Report

DATE: October 16, 2012

TO: John L. Crain
    President

FROM: Tena L. Golding, Chair
      John Fischetti
      Jeff Temple
      Eric Johnson
      Eric Summers
      Karen Fontenot
      Gerard Blanchard
      Minh Huyh
      Charlotte Humphries
      Hunter Alessi, SACS Liaison

RE: SACS QEP Organizational Team

As per your June 7 charge to the QEP Organizational Team, we have reviewed the spring 2012 QEP focus groups, engaged the entire campus community in refinement of a QEP, and created a narrowed list of evidence-based QEP topics that are measurable and assessable.

Based on input provided by QEP focus groups (100 participants), a careful review and alignment with existing campus data, a BE HEARD campus survey (683 participants) and a WE LISTENED campus webpage (over 1000 hits), the QEP Organizational Team recommends the Final Four QEP topics presented in the attached chart.

Also attached are a synopsis of the committee’s work and a spreadsheet of ideas for the final four topics suggested by the QEP Organizational Team or postings on the webpage.

Please let us know if you need additional information.
## Final Four QEP Topics

### Findings of the QEP Organizational Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Topic</th>
<th>Ideas</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Real-world experiences** | - More internships  
- Service-learning  
- Capstone courses  
- Undergraduate discipline-based inquiry projects  
- Global competence  
- Study abroad/study away | - Could focus on limited area – e.g., pre-professional areas  
- Many programs have established components that could be expanded | - Harder to implement in the Humanities  
- Could be expensive – global & study abroad  
- Difficult to find community partners  
- Time and travel to community sites difficult for commuter students  
- Difficult to assess across disciplines |
| **Effective Teaching** | - Master Teachers  
- Teaching Fellows  
- Increase faculty development  
- Faculty Learning Community  
- More faculty support  
- Reduction of core courses to reflect active learning | - Enhanced teaching  
- Faculty buy-in  
- Faculty focus may improve morale  
- New and innovative pedagogies  
- Increased classroom engagement | - Hard to assess student-learning outcomes  
- Difficult to evaluate teaching  
- Indirect tie to student learning  
- Incentives for participation |
| **Applied experiences in the classroom** | - Mandatory science labs  
- Career component in 300 and/or 400 level courses  
- Leadership experiences in selected courses | - Labs develop critical thinking  
- Could implement in a designated course  
- Aligns with workforce development in GRAD Act | - Majors are maxed at 120 hours  
- Difficult to implement in all 300/400 level courses  
- Difficult to assess across disciplines |
| **Analytical or critical thinking** | - Freshman-Senior portfolios  
- Critical thinking component in Gen Ed courses  
- Critical thinking component at orientation  
- Experiential learning as a tool for developing critical thinking | - Fill a gap caused by the loss of LS 102 in the core  
- Align with new Gen Ed goals  
- English prof has component  
- Standardized assessments exist  
- Implement in specific course(s) | - E-Portfolio software is expensive  
- Could be difficult for transfer students to meet  
- Critical thinking assessments would have to be generic across disciplines |

*Ideas for implementing real-world experiences and applied experiences in the classroom could be interchangeable. Little, if any, distinction was made between the two in the review of existing QEPs.*

### Road to the Final Four QEP Topics

#### Journey of the QEP Organizational Team

**Phase I: Topic Generation**
- Topic generation began in Spring 2012 with focus groups of students, faculty, staff and administrators (approximately 100 participants). 15 topics were identified as potential QEP topics.

**Phase II: Topic Alignment**
- The QEP Organizational Team reviewed the focus group report and aligned the 15 topics with data provided by a variety of University surveys (e.g., Alumni, Employer, Exit surveys, NSSE, etc.).

**Phase III: Topic Reduction**
- The QEP Organizational Team created a short online survey to share the data-supported 15 topics and gather feedback from a broader audience. Students, faculty, staff, Alumni and community partners were asked to identify their top three choices of the 15 topics. Input was solicited through mass emails and a BE HEARD button posted on the university’s homepage. Nearly 700 people participated in the survey.
  - Michelle Hall compiled survey results and presented to the Org Team. Results showed an emphasis on four of the topic areas:
    - Real-world experiences
    - Effective teaching
    - Applied learning in the classroom
    - Analytical or critical thinking

**Phase IV: Topic Refinement**
- A QEP informational video was created by the Southeastern Channel to announce the four highest ranked topics. This video was posted on the QEP Topic Selection website. The website provided links to relevant data on each of the topics and solicited additional input on possible implementation plans for each topic including suggested student learning outcomes.
  - Mass emails and a WE LISTENED button on the home page directed the University community to the site. This site closed on September 24. Data provided by Amber Dejong indicated over 1,000 visits to the QEP Topic Selection webpage.
  - The Org team reviewed submissions and discussed pros and cons of each idea.
  - The Org team researched existing QEPs on each of the final four topics and expanded the list of ideas.

**Phase V: Topic Recommendations**
- The QEP Organizational Team summarized findings from Phase IV and created a narrowed list of potential QEP topics that are measurable and assessable.
Eight Principles of Good Practice for All Experiential Learning Activities

Regardless of the experiential learning activity, both the experience and the learning are fundamental. In the learning process and in the relationship between the learner and any facilitator(s) of learning, there is a mutual responsibility. All parties are empowered to achieve the principles which follow. Yet, at the same time, the facilitator(s) of learning are expected to take the lead in ensuring both the quality of the learning experience and of the work produced, and in supporting the learner to use the principles, which underlie the pedagogy of experiential education.

1. Intention: All parties must be clear from the outset why experience is the chosen approach to the learning that is to take place and to the knowledge that will be demonstrated, applied or result from it. Intention represents the purposefulness that enables experience to become knowledge and, as such, is deeper than the goals, objectives, and activities that define the experience.

2. Preparedness and Planning: Participants must ensure that they enter the experience with sufficient foundation to support a successful experience. They must also focus from the earliest stages of the experience/program on the identified intentions, adhering to them as goals, objectives and activities are defined. The resulting plan should include those intentions and be referred to on a regular basis by all parties. At the same time, it should be flexible enough to allow for adaptations as the experience unfolds.

3. Authenticity: The experience must have a real world context and/or be useful and meaningful in reference to an applied setting or situation. This means that is should be designed in concert with those who will be affected by or use it, or in response to a real situation.

4. Reflection: Reflection is the element that transforms simple experience to a learning experience. For knowledge to be discovered and internalized the learner must test assumptions and hypotheses about the outcomes of decisions and actions taken, then weigh the outcomes against past learning and future implications. This reflective process is integral to all phases of experiential learning, from identifying intention and choosing the experience, to considering preconceptions and observing how they change as the experience unfolds. Reflection is also an essential tool for adjusting the experience and measuring outcomes.

5. Orientation and Training: For the full value of the experience to be accessible to both the learner and the learning facilitator(s), and to any involved organizational partners, it is essential that they be prepared with important background information about each other and about the context and environment in which the experience will operate. Once that baseline of knowledge is addressed, ongoing structured development opportunities should also be included to expand the learner’s appreciation of the context and skill requirements of her/his work.

6. Monitoring and Continuous Improvement: Any learning activity will be dynamic and changing, and the parties involved all bear responsibility for ensuring that the experience, as it is in process, continues to provide the richest learning possible, while affirming the learner. It is important that there be a feedback loop related to learning intentions and quality.
objectives and that the structure of the experience be sufficiently flexible to permit change in response to what that feedback suggests. While reflection provides input for new hypotheses and knowledge based in documented experience, other strategies for observing progress against intentions and objectives should also be in place. Monitoring and continuous improvement represent the formative evaluation tools.

7. Assessment and Evaluation: Outcomes and processes should be systematically documented with regard to initial intentions and quality outcomes. Assessment is a means to develop and refine the specific learning goals and quality objectives identified during the planning stages of the experience, while evaluation provides comprehensive data about the experiential process as a whole and whether it has met the intentions which suggested it.

8. Acknowledgment: Recognition of learning and impact occur throughout the experience by way of the reflective and monitoring processes and through reporting, documentation and sharing of accomplishments. All parties to the experience should be included in the recognition of progress and accomplishment. Culminating documentation and celebration of learning and impact help provide closure and sustainability to the experience.

Source: National Society for Experiential Education. Presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting, Norfolk, VA
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Guiding Principles of Ethical Practice

Adopted by NSEE Professional Development Committee, October 30, 2009

Introduction:
The National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) is an open and pluralistic society of individuals and institutions dedicated to mutual learning and support across the varied roles and responsibilities represented in the field of experiential education. Founded in 1971, the mission of NSEE is to foster the effective use of experience as an integral part of education in order to empower learners and promote the common good. In fulfilling this mission, the Society works to advocate for the use of experiential learning throughout the educational system; to disseminate principles of best practices and innovations in the field; to encourage the development of research and theory related to experiential learning; to support the growth and leadership of experiential educators; and to create partnerships with the community.

Since the founding of the Society, the Board of Directors, staff, and membership have been governed by policies and practices that guide ethical actions, relationships, and decisions. The distinctive purposes and conditions of experiential learning demand that all those involved in the process of learning through experience are held to the highest standards of mutual respect and responsibility, and that ethical behavior is understood and practiced at every level of the learning process. Experiential educators recognize their responsibility to the student, the community, and the learning process, and are informed and guided by the NSEE Principles of Best Practices (1998, 2009), as well as ethical principles such as beneficence and justice as promulgated by the Statement of Shared Ethical Principles (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education).
Furthermore, experiential educators are guided in their research, teaching, and practice by the ethical documents of their professional disciplines and the mission and values of their respective institutions. In addition, NSEE recognizes and embraces the following ethical statements that have special resonance for experiential educators: *Commitments to the Student and to the Profession* (National Education Association); *Statement on Professional Ethics* (American Association of University Professors); and *Code of Ethics for Education Abroad* (Forum on Education Abroad).

The above documents along with members and friends of NSEE have contributed to the following *NSEE Guiding Principles of Ethical Practice*:

**Principle One:** Experiential educators uphold the principles of engaged education and democratic societies, the pursuit of truth, and the freedom of students to express their viewpoints, engage in critical thinking, and develop habits of reflection and civil discourse, listening and learning from those whose experiences and values differ from their own.

**Principle Two:** Experiential educators use recognized, quality standards and practices in the placement and supervision of students engaged in field-based learning experiences and in the creation and maintenance of ethical partnerships with the communities and organizations that host and support these students, maintaining privacy, confidentiality and reciprocity throughout.

**Principle Three:** Experiential educators recognize the depth of responsibility in teaching and modeling the values, skills, and relationships that foster a spirit of inquiry and fairness without discrimination or disempowerment.

**Principle Four:** Experiential educators are informed and guided by a body of knowledge, research and pedagogical practices recognized by and specific to the field of experiential education, including reflection, self-authorship, assessment and evaluation, civic engagement, and the development of personal and social responsibility.

**Principle Five:** Experiential educators are committed to excellence through active scholarship, assessment and instruction, and the creation of shared knowledge and understanding through affiliation with networks and organizations that advance experiential learning.

**Principle Six:** Experiential educators create informed learning contexts that foster student growth and actualization of potential, achieve academic and civic goals, and reflect excellence in curriculum design and quality.

**Principle Seven:** Experiential educators are aware of and sensitive to recognized legal, ethical and professional issues germane to the field of experiential education and act in accordance with established guidelines to ensure appropriate practice, for example, *SEE Principles of Best Practices* (1998, 2009).
APPENDIX D: QEP MARKETING PLAN

VISIBILITY
- The program will be visible on campus through signage.
  - 2015-2016: Place signage no later than Fall 2015 semester.
  - 2016-2020: Update signage as needed.
- The office location will be highly visible in the renovated Student Union with appropriate entrance, and exterior and interior signage.
  - 2014-2015: Student Union renovation.
  - 2015-2016: Open office during or before Summer 2015 semester.
- Campus-wide displays will be designed for main areas of all academic hub buildings and general gathering buildings.
  - 2015-2020: Launch displays and update as needed.

INTERNAL LAUNCH
- The Southeastern Channel, the campus television station, will promote the internal launch in a number of ways:
  - The channel has produced a short infomercial for station broadcast. This infomercial will be placed on the Office of Experiential Learning website, and streamed to all students registered in SE101, Freshman Academic Success at Southeastern. All new students are required to take this course.
    - Aug. 2014: Infomercial complete for internal review.
    - 2015-2016: Full launch (including new-student orientations).
  - The channel will produce a separate commercial for both broadcasting and streaming.
  - The channel will plan for a 15-minute studio interview appearing on its talk show, “Movers and Shakers,” a show which will air on the channel and stream on the Southeastern Channel website. The 15-minute studio interview will also stream on the Experiential Learning website.
    - Fall 2015: Production/taping.
    - 2016-2020: Update annually.
  - The channel will include a regular 5- to 6-interview segment about Real-World Ready applications and examples during each episode of the monthly Southeastern talk show, “Campus Talk.”
    - 2015-2020: Produce/tape three to four segments each semester.
    - 2015-2020: Spotlight Year 1 through Year 5.
  - The channel will broadcast each “Campus Talk” Real-World Ready interview as filler/interstitial programming and will stream each on both the Southeastern Channel website and the Experiential Learning website.
- KSLU, the campus radio station, will promote the initiative in three ways:
  - The station will produce and run a PSA/Radio Spot.
    - 2014-2015: Produce for review by SACSCOC visiting team.
  - Todd Delaney, General Manager, will spotlight experiential-learning opportunities through an interview program, “Point of View” hosted by Rosa Dunn. Delaney plans
Southeastern Louisiana University

to establish “a regular monthly segment to spotlight the various internships and other applied learning experiences. The monthly segment will be called ‘Southeastern Workforce Spotlight’ and will feature students, advisors, professors, workplace members and/or others involved with internships. KSLU has broadcast “Point of View” for over 30 years. It is a 30-minute community-issues program which airs Thursdays and Fridays from 11:00 to 11:30 a.m.

  - KSLU will produce podcasts (mp3 audio recording) of its programs related to the QEP. The Office of Experiential Learning will feature these podcasts on its website.

- The QEP Coordinator on behalf of the Office of Experiential Learning will promote the QEP over the course of the initiative in a number of ways including, but not limited to, the following:
  - The QEP Coordinator will approach the campus newspaper staff, Lion’s Roar, about launching opportunity stories.
    - 2014-2015: Meetings with student staff and faculty mentors.
  - The QEP Coordinator will work closely with Director of Marketing & Communications, on the design and launch of a webpage for the Office of Experiential Learning. A password-protected link of the frame for this site is available for review: username is exp_user and password is Roomie4Lions.
  - In close collaboration with the Director of Marketing and the Public Information Office, the QEP Coordinator will budget for the design and printing of brochures and opportunity papers to be available 2014-2016, upon QEP approval.
  - As a marketing strategy, the QEP Coordinator will budget for simple takeaway items, including pens, bookmarks, etc.

- Additional QEP promotion is planned campus-wide including, but not limited to, the following:
  - The Southeastern homepage will feature promotional stories for RWR on a regular basis. These stories will link to the Office of Experiential Learning.
  - Social media promotions on Southeastern’s Facebook page will link to the Office of Experiential Learning.
  - An awareness brochure will be designed by the Office of Public Information and printed for distribution to faculty and staff in Spring 2015.
  - Campus-wide communications from the Office of the President and Provost.

EXTERNAL LAUNCH
  - Announcement news release on the RWR initiative.
  - News releases throughout the year highlighting RWR programs.
  - Media “pitches” to select business reporters and feature writers to place by-lined articles in the newspapers or on television.
  - In-house brochure distributed to campus and outside stakeholders.
  - Specialized direct mail brochure.
  - Inclusion in recruiter presentations.
  - Inclusion in any branding concepts in media and social media.
  - Specialized emails with video stories.
- The Southeastern Channel will produce two short (up to five-minute) video stories per year about Real-World Ready students (for email, broadcast, and streaming).
APPENDIX E: EXPERIENTIAL-LEARNING TEAM

Let’s get ready to be REAL-WORLD READY (RWR)

The Center for Faculty Excellence and the Office of Experiential Learning are creating a team of eight faculty to promote and facilitate campus discussions on experiential learning. You are invited to join the

EXPERIENTIAL-LEARNING (EL) TEAM

“Real-World Ready” (RWR) emerged as the topic of Southeastern’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) after multi-year conversations with students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, and community partners on how to improve student learning. Through this QEP initiative, the University is responding to students and departments with a commitment to organize, reassert, and institutionalize experiential learning as a meaningful method for guiding students to a fuller understanding and application of classroom instruction. The Experiential-Learning Team will support faculty in their efforts to develop and implement authentic, real world, experiences to supplement classroom instruction and is in keeping with the goal of the QEP:

To prepare students for a professional life after academics by providing authentic learning opportunities that connect academic courses with real-world experience.

EL Team Benefits

- Expenses paid (as per State guidelines) for participants to attend the 44th Annual Conference of the National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE) in St. Pete Beach, FL, October 5-7, 2015.
- $1,200 individual stipend ($600 for fall and $600 for spring) for full participation in team activities.
- $400 team budget for workshops and reference materials
- Opportunity to influence your colleagues and your students as we create a Real-World Ready campus!

EL Team Requirements

- Team members will share knowledge gained at the conference by presenting a minimum of four workshops/discussions/activities on experiential learning for faculty over the 2015-16 academic year.
- Team members will assist the Office of Experiential Learning in promoting experiential learning by serving as a faculty mentor for your colleagues.

Application

Application consists of a letter addressed to “EL Team” and abbreviated curriculum vitae (two-page maximum). In the letter please state your reason for seeking participation on the EL Team, and confirmation that you will commit to the terms outlined in this announcement. Original and 3 copies must be delivered to the Center for Faculty Excellence, Tinsley Annex room 6 by 4:30 on Monday, April 27. No applications will be accepted after this deadline.
APPENDIX F: CERTIFICATE OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING AND LEARNING (CUTL)

The Center for Faculty Excellence and the Office of Experiential Learning have partnered to offer a Certificate for University Teaching and Learning on

**Experiential Learning**

*Certificates of University Teaching and Learning (CUTL)* are offered to assist you in meeting and documenting your professional goals. This program allows faculty a structured, concentrated way to expand the practice, art and scholarship of teaching and learning. These certificates may be included in your professional portfolio as evidence of your continued professional growth in your commitment for teaching excellence.

**Why Experiential Learning?** “Real-World Ready” (RWR) emerged as the topic of Southeastern’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) after multi-year conversations with students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, and community partners on how to improve student learning. Through this QEP initiative, the University is responding to students and departments with a commitment to organize, reassert, and institutionalize experiential learning as a meaningful method for guiding students to a fuller understanding and application of classroom instruction. This CUTL on experiential learning is designed to support faculty efforts in developing and implementing authentic, real world, experiences to supplement classroom instruction and is in keeping with the goal of the QEP: *To prepare students for a professional life after academics by providing authentic learning opportunities that connect academic courses with real-world experience.*

The Spring 2015 CUTL will provide foundational knowledge to help participants develop or redesign a course curriculum to include an experiential-learning activity. This series of four workshops will be led by Southeastern’s Jayetta Slawson, Department of English and Coordinator of Southeastern’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), Real World Ready. Jayetta has attended national training by the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) and will assist faculty in developing the knowledge and skills needed to get your students Real-World Ready!

For your convenience the workshops are offered at two different times during the week. You may attend one, two, three, or four sessions. Faculty successfully completing all four steps will receive a *Certificate of University Teaching and Learning.*

**Session 1: Fundamentals of Experiential Education**  
Tuesday, March 3, 10:00-11:00  OR  Wednesday, March 4, 2:00-3:00

**Session 2: Identifying, Understanding & Applying Outcomes Assessment in Experiential Learning**  
Tuesday, March 10, 10:00-11:00  OR  Wednesday, March 11, 2:00-3:00

**Session 3: NSEE Principles of Ethical and Best Practice for Experiential Education**  
Tuesday, March 17, 10:00-11:00  OR  Wednesday, March 18, 2:00-3:00

**Session 4: Using Reflection to Make the Experience Educativ**e  
Tuesday, March 24, 10:00-11:00  OR  Wednesday, March 25, 2:00-3:00

For reservations, contact: The Center for Faculty Excellence, Ext. 5791 or email center@selu.edu. For questions about the workshops and the QEP, email Jayetta Slawson, jslawson@selu.edu.
APPENDIX G: FACULTY GRANTS

REAL-WORLD READY (RWR)
Faculty Grants
Criteria and Application

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW. “Real-World Ready” (RWR) emerged as the topic of Southeastern’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) after multi-year conversations with students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, and community partners on how to improve student learning. Through this QEP initiative, the University is responding to students and departments with a commitment to organize, reassert, and institutionalize experiential learning as a meaningful method for guiding students to a fuller understanding and application of classroom instruction. The Real-World Ready Faculty Grant initiative is designed to support faculty efforts in developing and implementing authentic, real world, experiences to supplement classroom instruction and is in keeping with the goal of the QEP:

To prepare students for a professional life after academics by providing authentic learning opportunities that connect academic courses with real-world experience.

ELIGIBILITY. All full-time university faculty members who wish to develop or redesign a course curriculum to include an experiential-learning activity are eligible to apply for up to $3,000 in support funds. Experiential-learning activities may include service-learning, civic engagement, internships, study abroad, research or scholarship/creative activity. The commonality within these activities is the intent to help students connect their academic experience more fully with their future profession, and to gain meaningful skills and knowledge for the careers they have chosen.

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS. Faculty submissions will indicate the course in which the experiential-learning activity will occur. This course will become a QEP-designated course and as such, will be required to align with the QEP student learning outcomes.

1. Students will apply professional (discipline-specific) knowledge in an authentic setting;
2. Students will demonstrate effective communication in a professionally authentic form;
3. Students will reflect on their work—identifying strengths and weaknesses of product and process, and deriving directions for future efforts; and
4. Students’ professional behaviors reflect a commitment to quality work.

Utilization of the QEP-designated assessments is also required. These will include assessment of the experience, the work and the behavior as described in the QEP Assessment Plan.

GRANT RECIPIENT EXPECTATIONS. In addition to the program requirements, faculty receiving funding through the RWR Faculty Grant initiative will agree to the following:

1. Permanently incorporate the experiential-learning component into the course curricula as informed by assessment results.
2. Submit assessment results to Office of Experiential Learning at the end of each semester including an action plan for future improvements.
3. Share your experiential-learning experience in campus-wide discussions including Southeastern’s annual Faculty Conference on Teaching, Research and Creativity.
4. Comply with Southeastern’s policies and procedures for purchasing, travel, inventory and budget management.
GRANT APPLICATION

Complete applications include the following.

1. Cover Page
2. Narrative (three-page maximum): Response to I-V as indicated in below.
3. Completed Template for section III.
4. An abbreviated curriculum vitae (two-page maximum)
5. Course syllabus of the proposed QEP-designated course.

For the narrative, please follow this format and respond to all items, providing corresponding headers.

I. Project Description. Describe the proposed experiential-learning component for the course, and how this component will enhance instruction and improve student learning. Include information on the proposed community partner/site supervisor for the real-world experience and the potential for reciprocal and sustained partnership within the community. Also include how you will orient and prepare students for the experience.

II. Best Practices. Describe how the proposed experiential-learning experience addresses best practices of experiential education, including critical reflection components. See the National Society of Experiential Education’s (NSEE) eight principles of good practice at http://www.nsee.org/8-principles.

III. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) for your course and indicate how the proposed experiential-learning experience aligns with your course SLOs and the QEP SLOs (template provided). Clearly describe how you will implement the QEP assessment strategies within your course.

IV. Qualifications. Describe your current involvement with experiential learning and how the proposed component represents a new or expanded experiential-learning initiative. Also describe any training you have received in experiential education.

V. Budget. Please provide a detailed description of the budget. Allowable expenses include supplemental/overload pay and/or reassigned time (may not exceed three workload hours and must be clearly justified), educational materials, supplies, equipment, consultant fees, professional development and exploratory travel related to curricula revision. A clear, itemized justification with appropriate budget code for each item is required. Proposals are limited to a maximum of $3,000.

Original and 3 copies of the complete application must be delivered to the Center for Faculty Excellence, Tinsley Annex Room 6, by 5:00 p.m. on April 7. No applications will be accepted after this deadline. Funded proposals will be announced by April 21.
REAL-WORLD READY (RWR)
Faculty Grants
Criteria and Application

REAL-WORLD READY FACULTY GRANT COVER PAGE

Faculty Name: ______________________________________ Rank: ______________________

Department: __________________________ College: __________________________

Faculty SLU box_______ Phone Ext. _________ email______________________________

Amount requested: ________________ (Maximum request is $3,000).

Please provide the details below about the course you plan to teach as a QEP-designated course section.

Course title: __________________________________________________________________

Course number: __________ Course section(s): _______ 1st Semester to be taught: ______

Estimated number of experiential contact hours in the RWR activity:____________________

Please describe the proposed experiential-learning activity in the course (i.e. service-learning, civic engagement, internship, study abroad, research or scholarly/creative activity).

Does the proposal involve research on human or vertebrate animal subjects: (Yes/No) ______

(If yes, include a brief statement describing the status of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC application. Enhancement grant proposals may be reviewed before approval but funds cannot be made available until the applicant provides the Center a copy of the approval document(s).)

Have other funds been obtained to support this project? (Yes/No) __________
If yes, indicate source ____________________________________________________________

Signature of Applicant __________________________ Date ______________

Your signature indicates your agreement to utilize the funds for the purposes described in this application AND your acceptance of all RWR Faculty grant guidelines.

Signature of Department Head __________________________ Date ______________

Your signature indicates the applicant is a full-time faculty in your department and your support of this project (including the budget) and its potential to assist your department in achieving QEP objectives.
## REAL-WORLD READY FACULTY GRANT Template for Section III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Assessment</th>
<th>QEP Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Student Learning Outcomes that align with QEP Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Describe the learning activities that will be used to measure the SLOs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Experience</strong></td>
<td>SLO 1: Student will apply professional (discipline-specific) knowledge in an authentic setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity in which the student can connect and apply academic work in a setting authentic to the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Work</strong></td>
<td>SLO 2: Student will demonstrate effective communication in a professionally-authentic form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance, act, or product by which the student communicates information on the experience in a method in line with the discipline (such as an oral presentation, an essay, a video, a graphic design, etc.).</td>
<td>SLO 3: Student will reflect on the work, identifying strengths and weaknesses of product and process, and deriving directions for future efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Behavior</strong></td>
<td>SLO 4: Students’ professional behavior will reflect a commitment to quality work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The actions, conduct and performance of the student throughout the course and the RWR experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H: Results of Campus Inventory and WeaveONLINE® audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Degree program indicated a current experiential-learning opportunity in the 2013 campus inventory</th>
<th>SLOs of Degree Program posted in WeaveONLINE® (Fall 2014)</th>
<th>SLO 1: Student will apply professional (discipline-specific) knowledge in an authentic setting.</th>
<th>SLO 2: Student will demonstrate effective communication in a professionally-authentic form.</th>
<th>SLO 3: Student will reflect on the work, identifying strengths and weaknesses of product and process, and deriving directions for future efforts.</th>
<th>SLO 4: Student behavior reflects a high standard of ethics and commitment to quality work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BA Art</td>
<td>YES (But not for the proposed Theatre Design concentration.)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BA Communication</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BA Criminal Justice</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BA English</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BA English Education Grades 6-12</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BA History</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BA Management</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BA Marketing</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BA Organizational Leadership (new program 2013)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Not in WEAVE</td>
<td>Not in WEAVE</td>
<td>Not in WEAVE</td>
<td>Not in WEAVE</td>
<td>Not in WEAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BA Political Science</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>BA Social Studies Education Grades 6-12</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>BA Social Work</td>
<td>Not on inventory</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>BA Sociology</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>BA Spanish</td>
<td>Concentration: Spanish Education</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BBA Business Administration</td>
<td>Concentration: Economics</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>BGS General Studies</td>
<td>Concentrations: Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Applied Sciences, Behavioral Sciences, Applied and Behavioral Sciences, Business minor</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>BM Music</td>
<td>Concentrations: Instrumental, Vocals, Piano, Instrumental Music Education, Vocal Music Education</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>BS Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>BS Athletic Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>BS Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Concentrations: Biology Education Ecology, Environmental, and Evolutionary, Integrative Biology, Microbiology/Molecular Biology, Plant Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>BS Chemistry</td>
<td>Concentrations: American Chemical Association, Biochemistry, Business &amp; Industry, Political Science/Pre-Law, Forensic Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>BS Communication Sciences and Disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>BS Computer Science</td>
<td>Concentrations: Pre-MBA, Scientific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>BS Early Childhood Education Grades PK-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>BS Elementary Education &amp; Special Education Mild/Moderate Grades 1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>BS Elementary Education Grades 1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>BS Engineering Technology</td>
<td>Concentrations: Mechanical Engineering Technology, Computer Engineering Technology, Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>BS Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentrations: Family Studies, Fashion Merchandising, Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>BS Finance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>BS Health &amp; Physical Education Grades K-12</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>BS Health Education &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>BS Industrial Technology</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentrations: Automated Systems, Drafting/Design, Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>BS Information Technology</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>BS Kinesiology</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentrations: Exercise Science, Fitness &amp; Human Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>BS Mathematics</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentrations: Mathematics Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>BS Middle School Education &amp; Special Education Mild/Moderate Grades 4-8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>BS Middle School Education Grades 4-8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>BS Nursing</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>BS Occupational Safety, Health, &amp; Environment</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>BS Physics</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>BS Sport Management</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>BS Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration: Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: QEP STAFF JOB DESCRIPTIONS

The QEP Coordinator will:

- Establish and represent the Office of Experiential Learning, including rolling out and maintaining active communication with the University community
- Cultivate community-based partnerships and in-house partnerships between existing resources such as Career Services, the Center for Faculty Excellence, and Student Government Association
- Take an active role in writing and compiling proposals, reports, and other documents related to the QEP
- Oversee the implementation of assessment instruments and data collection
- Chair and/or participate in other QEP committees and councils
- Administer budget
- Procure new equipment and services as needed
- Work with RWR faculty, programs, and administrators to ensure the development and ongoing success of performance-based learning experiences
- Work with the Center for Faculty Excellence in processing and awarding faculty grants
- Train, supervise, evaluate, and mentor the initiative’s GA and work-study students
- Ensure the timely implementation of the phases of the initiative
- Remain familiar with current experiential-learning pedagogy, practices, and publications and serve as a resource for the campus community
- Participate in professional experiential-learning discourse (e.g., listservs, conferences, memberships)
- Work to develop instructional materials and handouts
- Plan and handle logistics for the events calendar and speaker visits
- Maintain records and data for the initiative
- Participate actively in professional training for experiential-learning practices

Graduate Assistant Job Description

- Assist the QEP Coordinator in managing the day-to-day operations of the OEL Office
- Order and maintain supplies, including bookstore and computer resale orders
- Maintain and update materials
- Monitor and track the RWR inventory
- Report and monitor problems with computers and printers
- Monitor and maintain the office library, including all campus materials, community partners materials, subscriptions
- Receive training in updating and maintaining the office’s webpage
- Assist in managing data and schedules, and prepare reports and manuals as needed
- Manage and take a lead role in student work-study meetings, including compiling agendas
- Prepare materials and take minutes for committee meetings as needed
- Other duties as assigned
APPENDIX J: VITA FOR QEP COORDINATOR (Abbreviated)

Dr. Jayetta Slawson, Associate Professor
QEP Coordinator
Southeastern Louisiana University

EDUCATION
2002 Ph.D. New York University
1993 M.A. Arkansas State University
1985 B.A. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
2008-Present Southeastern Louisiana University, Associate Professor
2002-2008 Southeastern Louisiana University, Assistant Professor
2002-spring Monroe Community College, Rochester, New York
1998-2001 Arkansas State University, full-time--1999-2000
2000-fall University of Memphis

HONORS/BOARDS
--2012 Recipient of the President’s Award for Excellence in Teaching
--2012 Recipient of the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Award for Excellence in Teaching
--Distinguished Teaching Professorship in the Humanities, Southeastern Louisiana University, 2010 to 2013
--Board Member, Tennessee Williams Literary Festival, New Orleans, 2010 to present
--Advisory Board, Board of Regents Grant, Online Graduate Program in Nursing, 2010
--Alumni Advisory Board, Performance Studies, New York University, 2004, 2005

QEP COORDINATOR, SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY, Dec. 2013 to Present
Responsible for writing documents for QEP, overseeing the Office of Experiential Learning, cultivating community-based and in-house partnerships, overseeing implement of assessment instruments and data collection for the initiative, administering budget, working to ensure the development and ongoing success of performance-based learning experiences across campus.

DIRECTOR, SOUTHEASTERN WRITING CENTER, May 2006 to Aug. 2011
Duties: Administering budget; Procuring funding for new equipment and services as needed; Working with department head and graduate coordinator to recruit and hire staff; Training, supervising, evaluating, and mentoring staff in tutoring, administration, budget document preparation, public relations, Internet services, and student publications; Overseeing and ensuring the timely publication of the student journals PICK (once each semester), GAMBIT (annual print publication), and GAMBIT ONLINE (annual online publication); Coordinating with the university’s Supplemental Instruction Program including adding SI tutors as part of the Writing Center staff; Remaining familiar with current Writing Center pedagogy, practices, and publications; Participating in professional Writing Center discourse (e.g., listservs, conferences, memberships); Working to develop instructional materials and handouts; Supervising staff’s computer outreach including website and online tutoring; Empowering staff to conduct outreaches (orientations, advertising, etc.); Chairing the Writing Center faculty committee; Chairing the PICK and GAMBIT faculty committees; Planning and handling logistics for events, Speaker Series including negotiating with, and bringing national and international speakers to campus; Coordinating instructional and non-instructional use of the premises;
Representing the Writing Center to and serving as a resource for colleagues; and supervising the maintenance of tutorial records and usage data.

**PUBLICATIONS (selected)**


“Writers are Possessed: An Interview with Ngugi wa Thiong’o.” *Writing on the Edge* 18.2 (Spring 2008): 46-51. Print.


**EXPERIENTIAL-LEARNING ACTIVITIES**

--University of Louisiana System Service-Learning Committee (2014)
--Reviewer for *Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education* (2014 to present)
--National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) Conference. Completed 2 of 6 workshops required for Certification in Experiential Learning. (Fall 2014). Certification should be complete by Fall 2015.


--NSEE Conference. Completed 2 of 6 workshops for Certification in Experiential Learning through the Society’s Academy. (Fall 2013).

--Used $5,000 CITI grant awarded to Drs. Cynthia Elliot, Frances Wood, and me for our interdisciplinary project, “University-Community Collaboration: Enhancing Pedagogy and Publication through Service-Learning.” We worked in collaboration with Chalmette High School in St. Bernard Parish, through service-learning at the undergraduate level in teacher preparation, and through an independent study at the graduate level in the English Department to assist high school English students in publishing their writing in a print publication that documented everyday life and times in the St. Bernard Parish community.

--The Writing Center offered in-house and online professional development/grammar for eighteen Head Start directors and educators during Summer 2008.

--The Writing Center collaborated with the Management Department at Southeastern on a service-learning project in which business students and one of our GAs worked to create a database on all essays appearing in back issues of THE PICK.

--The Writing Center collaborated with Computer Science at Southeastern on a project in which student Willis Bezue designed an electronic banner advertising GAMBIT ONLINE.

**PRESENTATIONS/PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY (INTERNATIONAL/NATIONAL)**


PRESENTATIONS/PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY (STATE, REGIONAL, AND LOCAL)
2013 “Re-Telling Gilgamesh” for Yusef Komunyakaa Lecture Series, October
2012 “Beyond the Objective” presentation for Lyceum Lights, October, Twelve Oaks.
2012 “Performing Civil Disobedience,” presentation with Mat Johnson and Michelle Brown, October.
2012 Writing Project Marathon Participant at Tennessee Williams Literary Festival.
2011 The Art of Storytelling, three area schools, Educational Outreach/October, Columbia Theatre.
2011 Advanced Teaching Institute, Hammond and New Orleans, LA.
2011 “Damsels” Speaker Series of the Southeastern Writing Center, Hammond, Louisiana.
2009 Served on a team of faculty members to promote and facilitate campus discussion on civic engagement during the 2008-2009 academic year—“Civic Engagement: Connecting Citizenship with the Classroom.” Our team was responsible for organizing and presenting a minimum of four “focus area” workshops/discussions for faculty over the 2008-09 academic year. As a part of this endeavor, I did the following:
--participated in the poster session at the Center’s Faculty Conference on Teaching, Research, and Creativity held in the spring 2009 semester.
--made a presentation with the other team members to Southeastern faculty on connecting citizenship with the classroom.
--hosted the web-design workshop for student publications (a Writing Center event).


PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS
Association of Caribbean Studies, 2005
International Association for Research on Service-learning and Community Engagement, 2008, 2009
Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities, 2004, 2005
Mid-Atlantic Popular/American Culture Association, 2005
Modern Language Association, 2005
National Society for Experiential Education, 2013-2014
South Central Writing Center Association 2008
Southeastern Writing Center Association 2007, 2008
The Society for the Study of the Multi-Ethnic Literature of the U.S., 2005
APPENDIX K: MASTER RUBRIC: Holistic guidelines for development of analytic rubrics

Every element of the rubric should be interpreted as fostering professional growth and development in students. These are deliberately broad to allow for the variety of programs that will use them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Category and Responsible Party</th>
<th>Misses expectations 1</th>
<th>Meets expectations 2</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Experience Faculty supervisor evaluates student reflection. SLO 1</td>
<td>The reflection is a simple description of the experience with little or no connection between the student’s academic work and the real-world application of this academic knowledge.</td>
<td>The reflection describes the experience and the application of academic knowledge to the experience. Specific examples of connections are provided. The reflection demonstrates the student’s awareness of the impact of the experience on the chosen profession.</td>
<td>The reflection moves beyond a basic description of the experience and academic connections to an analysis of how the experience contributed to the student’s understanding of the connectedness of academic material across the curriculum. The reflection demonstrates the student has meaningfully synthesized the connections among academics and the experience to deepen understanding of the field of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Performance Observed behavior: Site supervisor rates the student’s ‘job’ performance. SLO 1</td>
<td>One or more aspects of performance are lacking, so that overall performance falls short of expectations. While there may be potential for the student to become a successful professional, extra mentoring and supervision in the first job would probably be required.</td>
<td>Student can perform the job associated with the profession. Any weaknesses are minor, so that the student functions at the professional level, carrying out duties competently and successfully. Students can use higher order thinking skills to overcome real world challenges and/or problems.</td>
<td>Student performance is above the basic standard across all aspects of the profession, so that expectations are exceeded. Can use different techniques as needed. Performance integrates knowledge from different courses. Students can use higher order thinking skills to overcome real world challenges and/or problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Communication Observed behavior: Faculty supervisor evaluates the student’s communication skills demonstrated in the ‘work’. SLO 2</td>
<td>In the professionally authentic setting, communication skills are deficient.</td>
<td>In the professionally authentic setting, student can explain, describe, justify or inform so that the audience/reader understands the content. Has command of language including appropriate vocabulary and standard grammar.</td>
<td>In the professionally, authentic setting, student uses multiple approaches to explain, describe, justify or inform so that the audience/reader understands the content. Has command of language including appropriate vocabulary and standard grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment Faculty supervisor evaluates student reflection. SLO 3</td>
<td>Student’s reflection is inaccurate, incomplete, or fails to address what changes might be made and how they would affect future performance.</td>
<td>Student’s reflection accurately assesses performance, identifying how strengths can be maintained or increased, and how weaker areas can be improved. Has command of language including appropriate vocabulary and standard grammar.</td>
<td>Student’s reflection is not only accurate and supportive of continued growth, but shows understanding that different behaviors interact so that a change in one area affects overall performance, not just that aspect. Student can synthesize connections between coursework and actions, and predict how changes would lead to greater success in future efforts. Has command of language including appropriate vocabulary and standard grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behavior Observed behavior: Faculty supervisor AND/OR site supervisor evaluate student behavior throughout the course and/or experience. SLO 4</td>
<td>Student needs guidance in making the right decision, or supervision to ensure behaviors are appropriate and work is completed. Must be encouraged to collaborate in a productive, collegial manner.</td>
<td>The student carries out responsibilities without prompting, and behavior consistently meets the expectations, whether formal or informal, of the profession. Collaborates in a productive, collegial manner.</td>
<td>The student seeks out responsibilities, supporting not only his or her success but that of others. Professional behavior aspires to the highest expectations. Initiates collaboration in a productive, collegial manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L: NSSE QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?</th>
<th>Done or in progress</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a study abroad program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with a faculty member on a research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About how many of your courses at this institution have included a community-based project (service-learning)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing numerical and statistical information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving complex real-world problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an informed and active citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX M: EMPLOYER SURVEY**

**SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY**

**Employer Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKING INSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use a No. 2 pencil only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use ink, ballpoint, or felt tip pens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make solid marks that fill the response completely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make no stray marks on this form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORRECT: ✗ INCORRECT: ✗ ✗ ✗ ✗

For each of the following skills or characteristics, please rate on the left how important it is to the Southeastern graduate's job, and on the right, please rate the level of the Southeastern graduate's skills in that area. Mark not applicable (last column) if the factor does not apply to the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to apply mathematical skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to apply scientific skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer application skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic computer skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical computer skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to plan projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to think creatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to integrate knowledge and information from different areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in an ethical manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to accept new responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work with persons from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to learn independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work under pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of the following, please indicate how important it is when you hire a new employee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Educational preparation and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>General work- or job-related experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Ability to work in teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Work attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Technical knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Motivation/initiative/desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Desire to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Ability to adapt to changes and pressures on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Ability to work independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>Ability to work with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, compared to other employees, how well prepared for employment was the employee named in the cover letter?

Better than most  About the same as most  Worse than most

Do you supervise other employees whom you know are Southeastern graduates?  

Yes  No

Would you hire another Southeastern graduate?  

Yes  No

Why? or Why not?

Which of the following categories best describes your organization? (Check only one please)

- Service Organization
- Higher Education
- K-12 Education
- Nonprofit Organization
- Professional firm
- Military/Armed Services
- Temporary Service
- Industry
- Government
- Business
- Health Agency
- For Office Use Only

Approximately how many people does your organization employ?

- Less than 50 employees
- 50 to 99 employees
- 100 to 249 employees
- 250 to 499 employees
- 500 or more employees

Thank you for your important contribution! Please return in the pre-addressed envelope.