

1. Student Engagement

What is the problem?	Students are not taking full advantage of the engagement opportunities available to them; students who are engaged tend to be high performers.
The goal	Intentionally structure opportunities and integrate requirements for student engagement throughout a student’s career, encompassing course related, program related, and extra-curricular activities. By doing so most students will be exposed to opportunities for engagement and many more will take advantage of them.
What will be done?	
What does the QEP consist of?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entry level Engagement in the major: for new students in the first year (or two) of enrollment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Create a common <u>Engagement Advising Form</u> modeled after the forms used to track students progress towards fulfilling general education and disciplinary requirements towards their degree. The EAF would include, <u>as the department sees fit</u>, engagement with both support services and campus and community enrichment opportunities—anything from attending aUCAE study skills session to a club or student organization to visiting a museum uptown. This form would become part of every student’s advising folder. Academic advisors would discuss the form with students during each advising session, encouraging students to set goals each semester with attempts to fill in the form over their four years. The goal is to plant the idea in students’ minds when they first arrive on campus that engagement outside of the classroom (including summers) is part of their academic education. If a student changes majors (or declares a major late), entries from their old form could be transferred to their new form (just as we do with courses when a student changes majors). Individual departments can decide if it is critical that a student go back and fulfill specific departmental engagement requirements from freshman year, or not. b. Build entry level engagement in the major into required introductory courses and/or a freshman seminar. Again, the EAF could be used in these courses as one of the course assignments. 2. Entry level engagement in courses: faculty build into their syllabi the expectation that students will engage with support services AND campus opportunities. Note that this aspect of the QEP would not be a primary focus for efforts in the early stages of the project. We anticipate that as faculty begin to see the benefits of engagement in their experience with students in their major they will realize that similar engagement opportunities can be built into course requirements. This model assumes that some ‘double counting’ is allowed and even encouraged. 3. In the major, beyond the entry level, engagement structures would be specific to the program. Programs might offer engagement ‘tracks’ – faculty research, campus involvement, community involvement, professional development—or might adopt a smorgasbord, “pick any 5” approach. It would be possible to implement departmental engagement as a strongly encouraged option; a non curricular graduation requirement, a requirement built into one or more required courses, or as a separate one-credit seminar (SOCY 2001—Sophomore engagement seminar). The key point to emphasize is that departments figure out what works best. As students progress through the major, they should move towards increasing ‘ownership’ of their engagement activities. By implication, this QEP would not

	<p>expect the same number of students to participate in engagement as juniors.</p> <p>4. Some departments might choose to develop deep engagement options for students—service leadership, mentoring in the STARS leadership model</p> <p>5. Engagement opportunities using digital platforms are possible.</p>
How many students?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If implemented as a requirement in majors, could reach a significant number of freshmen who start in a major and has the potential to be a quite significant element in their educational experience. • Reach and meaning is somewhat more problematic for students who start as undeclared; students who change majors, or transfer students. How does engagement in the major ‘start’ for a student declaring a major as a 1st semester junior with 9-15 credits in the major taken as electives or transfer classes? One option would be to embed engagement experiences the department feels are essential in required classes—attending a career expo is required in the sophomore methods course-- and more optional engagement experiences in elective classes. Departments will have to determine how to handle transfer students (both internal and external). • In cases where students are not so identified with their major (for example UCOL) how do we ‘sell’ the requirement? There is no ‘required’ entry level class for UCOL students.
At what point (s)?	Potential to impact students from freshmen to senior year.
Required?	Would depend on the major. That is, majors could choose to require either particular engagement activities or a selection of activities or it could make engagement opportunities available and suggested but not require participation.
Exposure vs interaction?	Exposure is reasonable certain; students’ engagement with engagement can’t be guaranteed—ie they could just go through the motions—particularly at the entry level. As students progress, they should increasingly ‘own’ engagement.
QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would it be sufficient to focus engagement efforts on students in the major? That could be the start of the QEP, with a goal of gradually extending engagement outside of the major per se • This QEP makes the most sense for an entering freshmen who chooses and sticks with their major, and it can probably be adapted for new transfers who choose and stick to a major. However, very careful thought needs to be given to how this engagement QEP will work for the large numbers of undeclared students and those who change majors (often 2-3 years into their time here). • Thought also needs to be given to programs, where most of the first year curriculum is outside of the department. How do those departments and those faculty engage their students? • While no one doubts that engagement would benefit all students, this model does make most sense for the new freshman living on campus. Given that we have a large number of commuter students and students who work off campus, will that be an issue? There is something of a catch-22 in that the students who need engagement the most—undeclared, transfer students, commuter students, struggling students—are the ones who Commuter students need engagement even more so than on-campus students, since commuters are more likely not to engage in campus life. Since engagement requirements are integrated into courses, I don’t see this as a problem for commuter students. Engagement requirements can

	<p>offer an assortment of experiences to help students work around work and commuter schedules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do engagement activities ‘grow’ in sophistication as students progress in the major? How will that work with large majors? Would it be ok to have heavy expectations about engagement in the first two years and then make it more optional? Should the focus in the junior and senior years move to summer engagement? • It is relatively easy to imagine the ‘high-end’ intensive engagement opportunities that serve relatively small numbers of students in a very meaningful way: service learning classes, internships, research with faculty. It is also relatively easy to imagine the suite of less intensive engagement activities that would be available to a large number of new students—the check list of activities for freshmen. How does this QEP bridge the gap with mid-range engagement available to a good number of students? • What are the realities for very large majors? • Should the campus institute a freshman seminar requirement to institutionalize new student engagement?
Faculty	
What do faculty have to do?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the major, faculty teaching an introductory course in which engagement was embedded would need to restructure the course so that required engagement elements were included. For engagement beyond the introductory level a faculty member(s) would need to coordinate departmental engagement seminars and the offerings that go into them. Depending on the size of the major and the number of engagement activities that are required, the total capacity for all of a department’s engagement options might be fairly substantial 2. In the major some faculty might be expected to build engagement into key classes in the curriculum—for example a capstone course. 3. Faculty advisors (and others who do advising) would need to integrate discussions on engagement into the advising sessions. Advising folders and websites would also need to integrate engagement. <p>NOTE: in many cases departments and colleges already have a wide array of engagement opportunities and expectations. In such cases, this QEP would not necessarily require any additions to that inventory.</p>
Which faculty?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gen ed faculty? • Some faculty in the major • Advisors (faculty and staff)
What is the pedagogical setting(s)?	<p>Classroom Advising sessions Out-of-class settings</p>
What is the administrative setting(s)?	<p>Departments define engagement options for students; however the engagement activities might require coordination with a range of units – for exampleUCAE, Performing Arts Departments etc.</p>
Ownership and oversight?	<p>Departments would “own” oversight of engagement requirements for their majors. Units could serve as engagement “service providers” (e.g., units that offer student services), and therefore, these units would provide oversight to specific sets of offerings.</p>
Incentives?	<p>Larger departments might need to adjust teaching loads for faculty coordinating engagement program in the unit.</p>

<p>QUESTIONS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that QEP is departmentally based, what are the mechanisms to ensure that there is some coherence to the QEP across majors? This might be achieved by getting agreement on a common format for an Engagement Advising Form (described earlier) which could indicate things about engagement (e.g., content, quantity) that are recommended for all students during their four years. The form could also categorize engagement based on targeted SLOs, requiring departments to require engagement that hits specific SLOs during years 1 through 4, but leaves it up to the department to decide how to do that. The QEP could identify important areas of engagement and ask each departmental plan to address those areas: examples might include personal academic success, campus activities, campus groups, diversity, Charlotte.
<p>Assessment (conceptual outline)</p>	
<p>What are SLOs?</p>	<p>Some majors may choose to have engagement fulfill discipline-specific SLOs, e.g., those related to professional development or relationship of discipline with society. Some SLOs can be common across disciplines. Here are some examples of both types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students have knowledge of campus resources for academic success. Students have knowledge of summer and academic year experiential learning opportunities. Students have knowledge of professional opportunities in the discipline. Students have knowledge of the regional and global impact of their discipline (e.g., economic, social, interdisciplinary, on K-12 education, on sustainability, on social justice, on innovation). Students demonstrate the ability to evaluate a presentation. Students demonstrate the ability to write a thoughtful written reflection (e.g., to reflect upon engagement experiences). Students demonstrate the ability to articulate a related set of goals, activities, outcomes, and assessment measures (e.g., exercises to set goals etcetera for engagement would hopefully transfer to student's ability to set goals for life, career, and family). Students participate in on-campus and/or discipline-related out-of-class activities Students demonstrate help-seeking ability (e.g., from faculty, their advisors, and their peers) Students participate in study groups Students socialize with other students <p>There are lots of online references for articulating and measuring learning outcomes resulting from engagement, learning communities, student services (including advising) and student affairs.</p> <p>The typical out-of-class engagement activity will likely be geared towards increasing knowledge. Deeper engagement activities (e.g., internships, service-learning courses) will more likely increase skill and ability.</p>
<p>What will be assessment method?</p>	<p>Sets of rubrics will need to be developed just as we do for other SLOs. Different rubrics may be defined in disciplines. Rubrics can be used by course lecturers and by advisors to assess students.</p> <p>Institutional data on retention and graduation rates.</p> <p>Participation numbers in engagement activities (counted by the service-providers).</p> <p>Exit interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Campus results on NSSE survey</p>
<p>Implementation</p>	
<p>Budget</p>	<p>Provision of sufficient numbers, range, and types of engagement activities.</p>
<p>Curriculum Change</p>	
<p>Administrative structures</p>	
<p>QUESTIONS</p>	<p>If instituted campus-wide, will there be sufficient non curricular engagement options to accommodate all students?</p>

Example information to integrate into an **Engagement Advising Form** to be included in students' advising folders is listed below. These could also be organized according to what is being emphasized in a particular year and/or according to what SLOs are targeted by each activity.

Categories

- Academic success (e.g., mentoring, tutoring, learning center, writing center)
- Experiential learning (e.g., internships, research experiences, competitions)
- Civic engagement (e.g., volunteer service, community-based service-learning)
- Professional (e.g., professional and research seminars, performances, participation in student Chapters of professional societies)
- Social (e.g., student organizations, intramural sports)

Types

- Attendance (e.g., being in the audience of seminars, exhibits, performances)
- Involvement (e.g., being the participant in volunteer service, competitions, performances, exhibits)

Themes

- General
- Disciplinary
- Community
- National or global

Timing

- Space to enter goals and example activities for next semester and outcomes from prior semester – similar to how advising form has space to enter what courses one intends to take in a semester, and then this is updated to reflect what was actually taken at the end of the semester.
- Include space for Fall, Spring, and Summer (to emphasize that summer is part of the academic experience)
 - Fall 2011
 - Spring 2012
 - Summer 2012
 - Fall 2012, etcetera

2. DIGITAL CITIZENSHIP

What is the problem?	Students are ill equipped with critical thinking skills: the ability to identify an issue, find information, judge reliability, come to conclusions. The rapidly developing digital environment exacerbates this problem since there's more information, a multiplicity of sources, and it's easier to avoid ideas and evidence counter to one's preconceptions. In addition, there are clearly important respects in which technology has changed the way in which we communicate and organize our social and political live.
The goal	Develop free standing online mini courses or modules to use in an existing course that require students to use digital tools in ways that promote critical thinking. These units would be embedded in a range of courses either in Gen Ed or the major. The idea is to use the technology (online, social, real time, asynchronous – whatever) to teach about the change that the technology is making in our lives.
What will be done?	
What does the QEP consist of?	<p>Central to the QEP is the development of learning modules that develop critical thinking skills particularly as related to digital issues. Modules could be developed in several different formats. Some might be integrated into a faculty member's course as an assignment or activity; several of the modules might be packaged together as an optional for-credit seminar for students enrolled in a particular class; or the modules might be available as an independent for credit course. The modules would (of course) be on line requiring students to develop substantive facility with information retrieval, analysis, and digital presentation formats.</p> <p>The modules might focus on a variety of topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basic digital literacy—ensuring that students really do have the full range of appropriate technology skills they will need. 2. Social implications of technological change—understanding what changes have taken place, what kinds of consequences have emerged and what can be expected. 3. Ethics—what are the ethical issues that emerge in a digital environment 4. Laws and government—policy issues raised by the increasing penetration of information technology into everyday life 5. Diversity <p>In the case of bullets 2-4 in particular, modules might be refreshed each year as part of an ongoing faculty development project. For example, a faculty group might schedule a speaker series that examined a topic from different disciplinary perspectives. These speakers' presentations could be recorded and used as the basis for modules developed for students in the following year.</p>
How many students?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One option would be to make this QEP optional for students, and to ensure sufficient participation by making modules available it many different kinds of courses, through coordinated advising messages, and by means of the attractiveness of the topic. • A second option would be to build digital citizenship modules into the curricula of one or more general education courses.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A third option would be to embed digital citizenship modules into the curricula for required introductory courses in the major (and perhaps in methods seminars and/or capstone courses.) •
At what point (s)?	Probably in General Education courses or other introductory courses for sure, perhaps also in upper level classes in the major—methods/capstone
Required?	See above
Exposure vs interaction?	This QEP can expose students to Digital Citizenship but cannot ensure they embrace the opportunity.
QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not embedded in required courses it is difficult to imagine how this QEP would be structured to ensure substantial participation by students. Taking this question to its logical conclusion, one possibility is to create a NEW course in the Gen Ed curriculum that covers both digital literacy and the critical thinking. Or we could build these expectations into the curriculum for one or more current Gen Ed classes. A Gen Ed introduction to digital citizenship would then be bookended by adaptations to an upper level course(s) in the major where digital citizenship in the discipline was discussed. • In cases where the modules are adopted by faculty for use in a particular class, the specificity of content and the work of grading is clear. However, for the optional seminar model and above all for the free standing 1 credit course model the labor of curriculum design and of grading, not to mention faculty responsibility/oversight, is not clear. • Most discussions of this QEP have a fairly easy time of identifying the digital literacy needs of students (eg the Georgia Tech requirement for a ‘computational literacy class for all students). There is more uncertainty about the citizenship / critical thinking elements; all agree that they are important but find it harder to imagine how they can be implemented. • If this QEP is not extended into the major it runs the risk of being somewhat superficial ; if it is extended into the major then there is an issue of being sure that the Digital Citizenship concept plays equally well in all disciplines.
Faculty	
What do faculty have to do?	<p>Design: Some faculty and/or staff would need to take responsibility for designing and producing modules. In most cases what will be required is a partnership between staff in the Center for Teaching and Learning to provide the technical expertise and faculty who will provide the intellectual leadership to develop workable, engaging materials that work towards the QEP’s goals.</p> <p>Adoption: Some faculty would need to adopt modules for use in their classes, and if modules were designed to be embedded in some required classes then any instructor of those courses would need to adapt their syllabus.</p> <p>Majors: if adopted as an element in the major, then faculty teaching those classes would need to help develop modules and adapt them for use in those courses.</p> <p>Free standing classes need to be managed, graded, etc.</p>
Which faculty?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many different kinds of faculty would be involved, depending on whether the modules are required • If faculty self select then there may be areas of the curriculum with significant coverage and others with little or no coverage. (Eg the differential use of clicker technology)
What is the pedagogical setting(s)?	On line either as a free standing course or as an enhancement to a ‘regular’ course

What is the administrative setting(s)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the QEP is implemented, in part, in the major, that administrative location would be clear. • However, for elements of the QEP implemented in Gen Ed or other introductory courses the administrative location is not clear.
Ownership and oversight?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, ownership and oversight for the portions of this QEP that are implemented outside of the curriculum of a major need to be developed • To some extent, digital citizenship is something that faculty need to master.
Incentives?	
QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What ensures that sufficient numbers of faculty take part in this QEP • How to ensure consistency in the modules and other aspects of the QEP
Assessment (conceptual outline)	
What are SLOs?	
What will be assessment method?	One form of assessment would be to build quizzing and feedback directly into the modules themselves. A macro level assessment would be done through analyzing the NSSE data related to technology, preparation for the workforce, etc.
Implementation	
Budget	
Curriculum Change	
Administrative structures	
QUESTIONS	

3. Themes in General Education / Global Competency / Sustainability / Community

What is the problem?	Lack of coherence in gen ed curriculum & lack of curricular focus on key issues including global competencies, sustainability, and community involvement.
The Goal	To develop themes within the general education curriculum – ie the option for a student to take 4-6 of his/her gen ed courses in a particular theme. Faculty interest to determine which themes but these three are possible starting points. Diversity is another possible theme. It would be possible to frame these themes in terms of key issues on which the educated citizen should be informed taking care to emphasize that the issues are multi disciplinary
What will be done?	
What does the QEP consist of?	<p>In its fully developed format, the QEP consists of 4-6 (?) thematic concepts that serve to organize and connect students’ general education experiences. If students fully participate in the theme they will have the opportunity to learn about the topic from multiple disciplinary perspectives, building both knowledge and an awareness of the value of diverse intellectual perspectives. A given theme might be available in 5-7 of the 11 gen ed courses students must take. Individual courses would remain true to the disciplinary and gen ed curricula of which they are a part, but they would be infused with or oriented towards the theme: for example an LBST 2101 course that explores the environmental, economic and cultural implications of the frontier in US History would fit in a sustainability theme; an LBST 2102 course on global climate change could fit in both the sustainability and global themes. As these examples indicate, a course that is part of a theme is perfectly accessible to student not participating in the theme but is more meaningful to those who are.</p> <p>Several enhancements to this concept are possible all of which would serve to extent the themes concept beyond the Gen Ed curriculum per se.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificate program: if faculty interest and institutional capacity allowed it, we could develop certificate programs in some or all of the themes. Students who complete a specified number of Gen ed classes in a theme and/or specified extracurricular activities and/or specified upper level course work would get a certificate indicating that accomplishment. • Tracks or options in the major: if departments saw an alignment between some of the themes and work students do in the major they could offer a track or option for the major that would be designated on the transcript. (Georgia Tech’s QEP involved the development of two such designations: Global Education and Student Research.) • A citizenship requirement in the major: picking up on the notion that these themes are all issues important for an active citizen, majors could have the option/obligation to define citizenship in disciplinary terms and including it in the curriculum. Majors will be encouraged to approach this question in light of the themes that are emphasized in general education, but it is likely that they will combine aspects of several themes as well as introduce new issues. For example, students in one of the fine arts majors might be asked to think about how the creative process has a role in community identity; students in one of the health professions might be asked to consider the social value of health.
How many	A minimum goal would be to have perhaps 50% of the total capacity in appropriate gen ed classes

students?	designated as part of at least one theme. (For example, if there were 3 themes developed, 50% of the seats in Gen Ed social science classes would be designated as parts of one of those themes. Of course, some courses might be appropriate for multiple themes.) This will ensure that most students have at least some exposure to a theme and that students who want to fully pursue the theme can do so. However, if faculty buy-in permits it, having a much higher percentage of Gen Ed seats in a theme would be desirable.
At what point (s)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that the focus is on Gen Ed, this QEP would have the most impact on students in their first two years; with perhaps the greatest impact in the first semester where, if possible advising in SOAR would encourage students to pick a 'theme' to study in the first semester perhaps by selecting two courses. The enhancements described would provide continuity beyond the Gen Ed curriculum for students. Although the details would need discussion, there is no intrinsic reason why a particular academic program could not suggest / encourage (and maybe even require) students to pursue a particular theme. For example, the College of Education might steer students towards the global competency theme because that issue has particular relevance for future teachers. <p>Note that planning for a Certificate in Global Engagement is already under development by OIP and GIAS.</p>
Required?	The original proposal does not perceive of this QEP as a requirement. Students would be encouraged to pick a theme when registering during SOAR; but thereafter we would need to rely on intrinsic interest and advising to get students to continue in a theme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it possible to imagine the themes requirement as a requirement? How would that work for transfer students?
Exposure vs interaction?	This QEP exposes students to the Gen Ed themes but cannot ensure they fully embrace the learning potential
QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As described above, this QEP is not intended to require that students will complete multiple courses in a theme. Since that will limit the number of students who participate in the QEP, this is potentially problematic for SACS. There is no guarantee that the themes that faculty think are important and interesting will appeal to students. Thus what we intend as a mechanism to spark students' curiosity may not have that outcome. There are potential issues in ensuring that there is a sufficient balance of different courses within a theme Transfer students will be intrinsically less able to participate in a theme since they will have credit for some of the courses Care needs to be taken to ensure that any theme that is developed is complementary to existing academic programs (majors and minors) rather than in competition with them. This is particularly true if the certificate option becomes a reality.
Faculty	
What do faculty have to do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty interest groups (academies?) would need to form to define a theme and develop the common idiom (questions, approaches, common readings) that would put their courses into 'conversation' with each other. Having formed these interest groups faculty would need to

	<p>adapt their courses to the theme, incorporating some new material, new approaches etc. These faculty groups would need a critical mass and would need to be distributed somewhat evenly between different curricular areas in Gen Ed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty in a theme would need to commit to teaching gen ed courses on a rotation that is regular enough to allow for planning. • Given faculty turnover, departments and members of faculty interest groups will undoubtedly need to recruit new faculty to teach in the theme. (Faculty's shared interest in the theme will provide opportunities for cross disciplinary graduate and research collaborations as well.)
Which faculty?	More so than the curriculum in the major, the Gen Ed curriculum is disproportionately taught by lecturers and part time faculty (significant numbers of tenured/tenure track faculty do teach these classes). Including part time faculty in this effort poses concerns.
What is the pedagogical setting(s)?	Most Gen Ed classes have fairly large enrollments
What is the administrative setting(s)?	Faculty interest groups would need to be self regulating in regards curriculum; defining what the theme's idiom is and articulating expectations for faculty whose courses are included in a theme. For departments with significant involvement in a theme there might be expectations about securing continued faculty participation. Finally there would need to be some coordinating structure at the university level to sanction themes, coordinate scheduling etc.
Ownership and oversight?	Primarily faculty, but there would be a coordinating group over the whole program. However, this faculty ownership is only voluntary.
Incentives?	Faculty development opportunities to create and maintain thematic focus; mini grants to support teaching; a theme coordinator role?
QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the continuity and coherence of the faculty interest groups that own the curriculum of each theme could prove a challenge over time particularly as the original interest wears off and founding members move on. That is, would this QEP still be thriving 5 years on? (a fair question to ask about all of the topics) • This QEP's focus on Gen Ed means that the numbers of faculty who will be involved is limited, and particular it will primarily involve faculty in CLAS faculty since those individuals teach the vast majority of Gen Ed seats. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In one sense this concentration of faculty effort is a benefit because it means that support and resources can be concentrated. ○ In another sense, however, it is a potential problem since this QEP becomes 'someone else's problem.' By the same token, faculty in colleges that are not heavily involved in Gen Ed do not have the same opportunity to participate in the QEP. <p>Is it possible to imagine how the themes could be structured beyond Gen Ed, particularly by having them adopted in the major somehow? What would that look like?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One suggestion along that line would be to redefine this QEP as in terms of Citizenship. At the entry level, 'citizenship' would be developed through the Gen Ed themes on the grounds that the themes chosen are crucial issues on which citizens require a multi disciplinary perspective. In the major, citizenship might take quite different shaped depending on the discipline. • A second suggestion would be to have colleges/departments steer students towards 1-2 of the themes based on fit to their curriculum.
Assessment	

What are SLOs?	
What will be assessment method?	
Implementation	
Budget	
Curriculum Change	
Administrative structures	

4. Active Learning and E-portfolio for Communication Skills

What is the problem?	Students need opportunities to enhance their communication skills as they progress through their undergraduate career and those opportunities need to be linked together in an intentional fashion. In particular that means that we need to increase the number of entry level classes in which writing and speaking are intrinsic to the learning process and we need to ensure that students have the chance to reflect on the development of their communication skills particularly as the develop expertise in the discipline of their major.
The Goal	To use an e-portfolio as a focusing device to engage students in collecting and reflecting on their communication skills. Use of the e-portfolio would be built into course redesign efforts that foster active learning by means of low stakes, writing to learn assignments with a particular emphasis on working with faculty teaching large enrollment lower division courses. Students' e-portfolios are used in structured ways in the major to develop student communication skills.
What will be done?	
What does the QEP consist of?	<p>Entry Level Courses: The QEP promotes the redesign of entry level courses –in Gen Ed and the major—around active learning principles, particularly ones that focus on the development of student enquiry, critical thinking and communication skills. The redesigned courses would make students partners in the learning experience and develop their critical thinking skills with activities such as writing to learn, peer critiques, enquiry projects. A common feature of these redesign projects would be the use of an e-portfolio. Use of the e-portfolio would enhance the value of the active learning strategies adopted in these redesigned courses because students would recognize approaches and expectations in the different classes they take. It would be desirable, but not essential, for instructors to include activities that ask students to reflect on the contents of their portfolios, particularly in ways that have students consider their own engagement with learning.</p> <p>The major: The e-portfolio students build in their entry level courses become the basis for more formal development in the major. The particular focus of the QEP is to use the e-portfolio to develop the students' professional and academic communication skills as defined by the major. The contents of students e-portfolios will thus vary considerably: the e-portfolio in Religious Studies might consist largely of research papers and presentations; in Dance it might be performances and analysis; and in Software and Information Systems it might be a design project. However, common across all majors would be the use of the e-portfolio as a tool to have students reflect on the development of their communication skills.</p>
How many students?	Unless the e-portfolio was adopted as a common element in a required course, the involvement of students at the entry level would not be guaranteed. However, since current redesign efforts are focused on large enrollment classes, it is likely that most students would encounter the QEP in their entry level classes. Over the duration of the QEP the goal would be to continue to increase the numbers of entry level courses using the active learning format.

	All students would encounter the QEP in the major
At what point (s)?	Both in entry level and advanced classes
Required?	Yes
Exposure vs interaction?	This QEP has the potential to fully engage students in its goals.
QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In entry level classes the link between active learning strategies and a communications based e-portfolio is potentially problematic. Active learning can include activities that would promote communication skills—for example writing or speaking or drawing to learn – but it is by no means limited to that. Moreover, redesign for active learning is important in many different types of classes including ones where communication skills may not be the primary focus—for example science and math classes. Thus, while complementary to the overarching goals of active learning course redesign, this QEP only focuses on one aspect of that larger effort. • There is a related question of how the e-portfolio functions between entry level classes and the major. In some majors this will work well since some of the entry level classes students take will be classes in the major. In other cases, however, the link will be less clear. • There is no particular need for this QEP to be limited to communication skills. Majors could, for example, use the portfolio to emphasize the importance of certain concepts, the connection between courses in the major and required elements of the curriculum outside the major. However, as imagined, the focus of the portfolio on communication skills may make it less valuable for some disciplines where, for example, the most important value added activity a student could pursue would be undergraduate research. • To some extent both the e-portfolio and active learning are shells—ways of teaching—that could be adapted to other QEP topics. The link created here, a focus on communication skills, may not be sufficiently strong or important enough to hold them together. • There is a difference between an e-portfolio that is developed primarily for internal purposes (essentially something that’s a step or two up from Facebook) and one that is developed for formal presentation to external audiences—future employers, outside assessors. The differences between the two kinds of portfolio will shape how they are use and how students perceive their importance.
Faculty	
What do faculty have to do?	<p>Entry-level: In all likelihood the adoption of active learning redesign elements in entry level classes will be a choice made by faculty/departments. It is hard to imagine that the QEP could require participation. If faculty/departments choose to include their entry level classes in the QEP, they will need to accept some common elements.</p> <p>Major: How majors implement the use of the e-portfolio will be, to an extent, up to them. At a minimum, it would be expected that a formal use of the portfolio would be built into 2-3 courses in the major—for example a sophomore methods course and a senior design/capstone—classes which may already be designated as writing or oral intensive. Ideally, of course, the e-portfolio is integrated throughout the curriculum of the major, more intensively in some classes than others but part of how the major communicates with students about learning expectations. Given this context, the faculty involvement will vary. At a minimum, the handful of faculty who teach the 2-3 key courses will need to make adaptations to their courses to incorporate the e-portfolio as a learning tool. That requires in turn, however, departmental agreement on the communication outcomes it</p>

	has for students. In a more expansive version other faculty would also make adaptations to their courses, though the number of faculty who were required to do so and the extent of those adaptations would be a departmental decision.
Which faculty?	See above
What is the pedagogical setting(s)?	Use of the e-portfolio in entry level classes is likely to be in large enrollment classes; in the major it is most likely to be an element in smaller majors-only classes.
What is the administrative setting(s)?	Largely departmental
Ownership and oversight?	Departmental
Incentives?	
QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because this QEP is departmentally based, ensuring a degree of coherence between what goes on in different majors is potentially problematic. (By analogy consider the current state of coherence in courses designated as writing intensive.) • In some disciplines the portfolio is fully integrated into how students learn (as is the case for example in the Arts). In disciplines where that is not the tradition, getting faculty up to speed on how to use a portfolio, and making the portfolio genuine make take significant effort. • There are questions about how much faculty involvement is required. Colleges with an existing portfolio requirement (Education) note that it does involve considerable amounts of effort, though that particular portfolio is one that must meet State Department of Instruction mandates.
Assessment (conceptual outline)	
What are SLOs?	
What will be assessment method?	
Implementation	
Budget	Developing the computer platform for these e-portfolios may be expensive.
Curriculum Change	
Administrative structures	