

**Quality Enhancement Plan**  
*Route 101: Highway to Enhanced Student Learning at Berea College*

**Table of Contents**

**Executive Summary**

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	5
<b>II.</b>	<b>Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Development Process</b> .....	7
	QEP Revision .....	9
	Purpose of the Quality Enhancement Plan .....	9
	Student Learning Goals .....	10
<b>III.</b>	<b>Institutional and National Perspectives</b> .....	12
	The Problem: Academic Probation and Student Learning .....	12
	Berea's Mission .....	14
	Berea Students: Limited Economic Resources .....	15
	Berea Students: Academic Promise .....	17
	Summary .....	18
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Strategic Priorities and Connections to the QEP</b> .....	19
<b>V.</b>	<b>The Berea College Quality Enhancement Plan:</b>	
	<b>Route 101: Highway to Enhanced Student Learning</b> .....	22
	Purpose, Structure, and Learning Goals .....	22
	The Road to Academic Success: GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success .....	23
	Background .....	23
	GST 101 Course .....	27
	Implementation .....	29
	GST 101 Learning Goals .....	30
	BC 101: Charting Your Course .....	30
	Background .....	31
	Implementation .....	31
	BC 101 Learning Goals .....	35
	Faculty and Staff Development .....	36
	Implementation .....	37
	Learning Goals for Faculty and Staff Development .....	37
	QEP Implementation and Assessment Time Line .....	39
	QEP Oversight .....	42
	QEP Budgets .....	43
	GST 101 5-Year Budget .....	43
	BC 101 5-Year Budget .....	44
	Total QEP 5-Year Budget .....	44
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Assessment Plan</b> .....	45
	Student Learning Goals Assessments for GST 101 .....	45
	Student Learning Goals Assessments for BC 101 .....	46
	Faculty and Staff Development Experiences Assessments .....	47
	Shared Assessments for GST and BC 101 Student Learning Goals .....	48
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	51
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Bibliography</b> .....	52
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Appendices</b> .....	54

**Quality Enhancement Plan**  
***Route 101: Highway to Enhanced Student Learning at Berea College***

*Founded in 1855 by ardent abolitionists, Berea College was the first interracial and coeducational college in the South. Still firmly rooted in its radical origins, Berea's contemporary mission is to educate students "primarily from Appalachia, black and white, who have great promise and limited economic resources." All 1525 Berea students receive a four-year tuition scholarship, and each student is required to work a minimum of 10 hours a week in the College's Labor Program. Working in over 140 departments, students earn a portion of their college expenses, develop an appreciation for the dignity and utility of all labor, and gain valuable work experience for future careers. The student/faculty ratio is 11:1. Of the 130 full-time faculty members, 92% hold the Ph.D. or other terminal degrees. The College offers 28 majors and an interdisciplinary general education program.*

**Executive Summary**

The contemporary mission of Berea College is to educate students "primarily from Appalachia, black and white, who have great promise and limited economic resources," as noted in the first of the College's Great Commitments. We are committed to serving well those students we have chosen, believing in their potential to succeed. Yet the students coming to us from the socio-economic backgrounds we target bring with them a number of challenges. This Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) seeks to address those challenges and demonstrates a deep institutional investment in the academic success of our students and in the quality of student learning that occurs on our campus.

The QEP is directly linked to Berea College's Strategic Plan. The 2004-2005 revision of Berea College's Strategic Plan challenged the campus to answer: "What population of students does Berea College seek to serve and how can the College best serve them?" Because Berea's curriculum and high academic standards are exceptionally challenging for many students, campus discussions focused on how to help our students succeed. Occurring concomitantly with discussion on the focus of the QEP, the strategic plan discussions led the faculty to form a "Task Force on Student Success" that is responsible for exploring experimental, systemic, and targeted initiatives and pilot programs to enhance student success and learning. The QEP Team's work thus far has provided many resources and a conceptual framework for this larger initiative.

Shared membership between the Task Force and the QEP Team provides continuity between these two groups. The Task Force will have broad responsibility for recommending programs to enhance learning opportunities for all Berea students. The QEP provides a plan to explore some very specific initiatives with the goal of enhancing students' academic skill strategies and personal attributes required for successful learning. Thus, the present QEP extends work already begun, and it continues a commitment to enhanced student learning at the College.

The SACS on-site team reviewed the original draft of the QEP in September 2005. While they endorsed the core concept of helping academically low-performing students become successful, they recommended that the Plan be more focused, address more directly the connections between the elements of the program and student learning, and include more detailed mechanisms of assessment. The original QEP proposed to implement a specific academic success course designed to support students on academic probation and a smorgasbord of intervention programs that were intended to decrease the number of students placed on probation.

Following the SACS site visit, the QEP Team capitalized on the opportunity for revision to rethink the central elements of the plan and evaluate which ones would have the most impact on enhancing student learning. As a result, the Team decided to focus the new plan, *Route 101: Highway to Enhanced Student Learning*, on two distinct programmatic initiatives:

- GST 101: *Strategies for Student Success*, a reactive corrective course for students who are placed on academic probation that will help students develop better academic strategies aimed at enhanced learning (“learn to learn”); and
- BC 101: *Charting Your Course*, a proactive preventative initiative that will help equip first year students to engage positively in the college learning environment and therefore become successful learners and avoid probation.

GST 101 and BC 101 will be supported by a formative and summative assessment process and close articulation between these two initiatives will be ensured by joint course planning and through faculty development seminars and workshops. Together, these elements of the QEP will benefit the entire campus by providing opportunities to address attitudinal and behavioral issues relevant to engaged student learning as well as specific knowledge and skills

development topics. As the assessment findings from these initiatives reveal the activities having the greatest impact on student learning outcomes, faculty and staff throughout the campus will be able to incorporate similar activities into other courses and activities as appropriate, thereby helping more of our students realize their “academic promise.”

This revised report is divided into nine sections including the appendices. The first three sections (I.-III.) introduce the QEP plan and process, provide a description of the development of the QEP that involved all campus constituents, and document the nature of the problem. Institutional and national perspectives on the challenge of providing educational opportunities to students of limited economic means informed the overall thrust of how to improve student learning at Berea College and to the selection of the specific elements in the revised plan. In Section IV., the connections between the strategic priorities of Berea College and the QEP are presented.

The Plan itself, *Route 101: Highway to Enhanced Student Learning*, is described in Section V. along with a timeline for the entire 5-year period of the plan, the makeup of the QEP oversight team, and budget information in detail for each program in the plan. Assessment plans for each of the major programs in the QEP; GST 101, BC 101, and the faculty and staff development initiatives, are outlined in Section VI. followed by the conclusion in Section VII. The final sections include the bibliography and Appendices A-J.

The process of developing and revising the QEP has led members of Berea College to engage in rich and deep conversations on how to improve student learning and to best serve the student population to whom we are dedicated. The pilot studies for GST 101 show promising outcomes in increasing the student learning and student success for those on probation. Useful perspectives and valuable insights have already emerged from these initial courses, and some of the faculty teaching these courses have begun to apply what they have learned to other courses. The programs described in Berea’s QEP will build on the pilot studies to enhance the learning skills of students on academic probation, and will help prevent students from being placed on

academic probation by equipping them to be engaged and effective learners. The QEP Team is optimistic that, as the initiatives described in the plan are implemented and assessed, student learning will continue to be improved as Berea College moves toward its goal of educating and inspiring leaders for Appalachia and beyond.

## **I. Introduction**

Over the years, Berea College has engaged in many efforts aimed at helping students overcome the challenges associated with their common low socio-economic background status (e.g., academic under-preparation, first generation status, etc.). These efforts have included creating a Learning Center for student and faculty/staff development, the formation of special task forces and committees, enhanced attention to first-year orientation and academic advising; and the creation of an Early Intervention Program designed to identify students experiencing difficulty and direct them toward appropriate interventions.

Despite these efforts and the successes they have realized, on average 27% of Berea students find themselves on academic probation at some time during their enrollment. These students are much less likely to graduate within five years (35% of probationers vs. 73% of non-probationers), and thus much less likely to realize the full benefit of their education at Berea College. The negative financial and social impact of failure to graduate on students is well documented (Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004; Carey, 2005b; Lau, 2003; McClanahan, 2004; Watts, 2001).

We are committed to enhancing student academic success and degree attainment at Berea College beyond current levels. Throughout the last decade it has become clear that Berea must focus more resources, attention, and coordinated programmatic effort on effective means of meeting the needs of the students we serve so they can avail themselves of the full privilege of higher education and the particular advantages of a high quality liberal arts education, such as that offered by Berea College. Berea is charged by its mission to serve students who possess academic promise, limited financial resources, who are primarily from Appalachia. Given this service mission, we are committed to serving well those students we have chosen, believing in their potential to succeed, while realizing the challenges they face. We will continue to demonstrate our initial investment in our students' potential by offering all students a four-year tuition scholarship. This Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) demonstrates an institutional

investment in our students beyond financial support. Through this QEP, we commit ourselves to provide our students the assistance needed to make good on their academic promise. The focus of our Quality Enhancement Plan is to provide that additional assistance, a natural extension of our mission.

## **II. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Development Process**

Our process to establish a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) began with the establishment of a Leadership Team in the Spring Term 2004. Beginning its work in academic year 2004-2005, the Berea College Leadership Team was committed to ensuring broad-based involvement of the community in selecting a suitable topic for the QEP. Faculty, staff, administrators, students, and Board of Trustees members were all involved.

The Leadership Team provided a framework to guide Berea College through its reaffirmation of accreditation process by sending an e-mail to all members of the college community explaining the QEP development process and soliciting suggestions for a suitable topic (Appendix A). In addition, the Dean of the Faculty contacted all academic department chairs separately and asked them to discuss ideas for potential projects within their respective departments. After reviewing approximately 40 suggestions that reflected a wide variety of perspectives and QEP alternatives, the BC Leadership Team developed brief proposals for four different topics (Learning through Service, Universal Access, Probation and Retention, and Health and Wellness Program—Appendix B).

After discussion of each of these alternatives, the faculties (including teaching faculty, staff, and twelve Student Government Association representatives), were asked to rate each proposal on its importance to the College's mission and potential to enhance student learning (Appendix C).

The BC Leadership Team carefully reviewed the results of this survey. The Team considered the benefits and feasibility of selecting each of the alternatives as the College's QEP. The project involving Probation and Retention emerged as the best choice, as it was a topic of great interest and also seemed to offer a significant opportunity for student learning improvement.

The initial thrust underlying the Probation and Retention topic was to address the personal and intellectual needs of students on academic probation. The QEP Team came to agree that a focus on academic probation and retention could lead to enhanced learning for all students.

The question of “How can we help our students develop better learning skills and strategies?” became the primary aim of the QEP. The Board of Trustees reviewed and gave their support to this topic in May, 2004 (Appendix D).

The QEP Team was formed and went to work by taking stock of their charge and the resources available. Over the course of the next year, the QEP Team met regularly under the leadership of its two co-chairs. Throughout their work, the QEP Team recognized that Berea students may face some special challenges. Our students generally represent the lowest one-third of the socioeconomic strata among college-bound students. Consequently many of Berea’s entering students are less likely to possess some of the skills essential for college success.

Because Berea’s curriculum and high academic standards are exceptionally challenging for many students, campus discussions focused on how to help our students succeed. Stimulated in part by the work of the QEP Team, the faculties adopted an initiative as part of the College’s strategic plan in February 2005 to convene a Task Force on Student Success.

This Task Force has met regularly over the 2005-2006 academic year and is responsible for exploring experimental, systemic, and targeted initiatives and pilot programs to enhance student success, specifically related to student learning. The QEP Team’s work thus far has provided many resources and a conceptual framework for this larger initiative. Shared membership between the Task Force and the continuing QEP Team provides continuity between these two groups. The Task Force, which is expected to complete its work during Fall Term 2006, will have broad responsibility for recommending college-wide programs to enhance learning opportunities for all Berea students, while the QEP provides a plan to explore some very specific initiatives with the goal of enhancing students’ learning skills. Additional detail concerning the Task Force can be found in Section IV., Strategic Priorities and Connections to the QEP.

QEP Revision. Although the SACS on-site Team supported Berea's plan to enhance students' ability to become better learners, they found the original QEP did not meet all the criteria necessary to be an approved plan. The on-site Team noted the following requirements for an approvable plan: a) a clear presentation of the problem the QEP intends to address (the reason for the plan); b) a clear presentation of the plan and its central features and purpose, to account for oversight and implementation time-lines; c) a clear methodology of formative assessments and subsequent plan revisions; d) an assessment plan to address individual elements and the plan as a whole; and e) a clear indication of how the plan addresses the problem.

The QEP Team has worked, since September 2005, on re-focusing the initiatives set out in the original QEP, concentrating on issues of scope, purpose, implementation, assessment, and oversight. This work has involved both representatives from the academic and student life divisions of the College. This work has resulted in a QEP that, while somewhat different from the original, is more focused, more clearly connected to our mission, and driven by specific learning goals and assessments.

Purpose of the QEP. To sharpen the focus of the QEP, the Team reviewed again the institutional data and national literature and took stock of the general purpose of the previous QEP report. The result of these efforts was a sharpened definition of the purpose for the QEP. This purpose is: to enhance the learning of students on probation, as well as to prevent students from being placed on probation, by enhancing the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that equip students to be engaged and effective learners. This purpose drives all programming and assessment efforts.

*Student Learning Goals.* The QEP Team has developed explicit student learning goals, constructed multi-dimensional programming, and developed an assessment plan based upon those learning goals. After a re-examination of institutional data and national literature (outlined in Section III., Institutional and National Perspectives), the QEP Team constructed 17 specific QEP learning goals. Students participating in QEP programming will be able to:

- effectively organize coursework
- effectively manage time related to coursework completion
- effectively read assigned texts
- complete assignments appropriately and on time
- seek appropriate assistance in a timely manner
- constructively use instructor feedback to improve
- demonstrate responsibility for their own learning
- be accountable for their own learning
- be self-motivated to learn and perform
- effectively sets goals and priorities related to coursework
- be engaged learners
- demonstrate adequate study skills
- demonstrate adequate test-taking skills
- demonstrate adequate note-taking skills
- demonstrate adequate stress management skills
- demonstrate confidence in their academic skills
- better understand and cope with personal and family challenges

These learning goals and how they will be assessed are described in more detail in Section VI., Assessment Plan.

The current QEP represents a significant refinement of the original reviewed by the SACS on-site committee in September 2005. The result is a QEP that is focused upon facilitating the ability of Berea College students to succeed academically by developing and enhancing the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors critical to effective learning. This will be achieved through a multi-faceted approach that includes: a) corrective/reactive

programming; b) preventative/proactive programming; c) formative and summative assessments; and d) faculty/staff development. If this QEP is acceptable, its implementation will require the expertise and input of faculty, staff, and students and its improvement will be informed by continuous assessment.

### **III. Institutional and National Perspectives**

The QEP Team has developed a plan to a.) improve the learning skills of students who find themselves on probation (correction/reaction); b.) enhance student learning readiness and promote student success before students go on probation (prevention/pro-action); c.) assist faculty and staff so that they may understand better the challenges faced by our students; and d.) equip faculty to enhance student learning (faculty/staff development). This approach to student learning considers performance outcomes (such as successful completion of courses, avoidance of probationary status, increased retention and graduation, grade point average, etc.) as well as the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors associated with successful learning.

*The Problem: Academic Probation and Student Learning.* Although academic performance and retention may not be direct indicators of student learning, probationary status and/or attrition is usually a result of difficulties students encounter in the learning process, whatever the causes. As previously noted, on average, 27% of all Berea students will be placed on academic probation at least once during their college career and these students are much less likely to graduate. Probationary status is assigned when students do not meet specific performance standards. To maintain good standing, Berea students must successfully complete (“D” or higher) at least three full-credit courses per term and maintain a minimum grade point average.

The role that grade point average plays in college success has been widely studied (Levitz, Noel, & Richter, 1999; Murtaugh, Burns, & Schuster, 1999; Reason, 2003) and first-year college students with GPA’s less than 2.0 are the most likely to withdraw from college (Murtaugh, Burns, & Schuster, 1999). Our own research shows that a number of courses seem to be particularly challenging to all Berea students as measured by “D” and “F” rates of 20% or higher. These courses cover a wide variety of subject areas.

While a deficient GPA may result in an outcome, academic probation, the reasons students find difficulty engaging the educational environment are many. Recent research on student success and retention has focused on a wide range of variables, including academic work ethic, academic preparedness, assimilation into the college culture, aptitude, expectancy for success, learning strategies employed, motivation, personal and family problems, personality characteristics, prior achievement, self-control, self-regulation of learning, and study habits. (Garavalia & Gredler, 2002; Lau, 2003; Lotkowski, Robbins, & Noeth, 2004; Mansfield, Pinto, Parente, & Wortman, 2004; Nausmann, Bandalos, & Gutkin, 2003; Plant, Ericsson, & Hill, 2005; Reason, 2003; Ridgell & Lounsbury, 2004). Students' understanding of the culture of the college, both academic and social; demonstration of the study and classroom behaviors that contribute to college academic success; willingness to seek out and establish relationships with faculty; and feelings of comfort with seeking help if and when needed; and a tendency of institutions to over-estimate student abilities in these areas are also noted in the student success literature (Levitz, Noel, & Richter, 1999).

These various aspects of student success are affected by the students' knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors required to successfully engage the college learning environment. Difficulty encountered in the learning process, such as that evidenced by academic probation and/or attrition, is likely symptomatic of student developmental needs in one or more of these areas. Students bring various knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors to the higher education environment and the degree to which they equip (or do not equip) students to be engaged, successful learners, plays an important role in academic success.

The literature additionally suggests that students who are not academically successful benefit from learning how to plan their study time, set realistic goals, utilize effective learning strategies, monitor their learning and goal obtainment, and persist through difficult situations (Plant, Ericsson, & Hill, 2005; Pintrich & Zusho, 2002). Mansfield, Pinto, Parente, and Wortman (2004) report that a student's level of self-control also affects academic success and

retention. For first-generation college students, self-confidence and the expectancy for success had the greatest impact on GPA.

Colleges and universities have adopted many strategies for helping low-income and first-generation students become successful. These successful programs connect programs to the institutions' core mission. Tailoring efforts to the student population and connecting them to the institutional mission offer colleges the opportunity to take unique and innovative approaches to student learning, academic success, and retention. (Carey, 2005a; Habley & McClanahan, 2004; Hammer, 2003; Tinto, 1993).

Of course, students come to higher education with different sets of knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors. The developmental needs students may have in these areas vary from student to student and from institution to institution. The extent to which student learning may be enhanced by intervention efforts is dependent upon the particular needs of students served by the institution, the capacity of the institution to identify and act upon those needs, and the institutional mission itself. To reflect and act upon this interrelated set of variables is the core component of this QEP.

*Berea's Mission.* The mission of Berea College, expressed through the Great Commitments (Appendix E), directs the college "to serve students, men and women, black and white, primarily from Appalachia and other parts of Kentucky, who have academic promise but limited economic resources." The mission then charges the College to provide these students with an educational opportunity in a liberal arts context. This mission particularly defines the Berea student body as low-income and from an educationally impoverished region – Appalachia. And, it is an education involving learning, labor, and service that directs the activities of the College. Our students, in turn, bring a distinct set of needs and aptitudes to a learning environment that is academically challenging.

*Berea Students: Limited Economic Resources.* The “limited economic resources” that Berea students must demonstrate for admission eligibility set them apart from most entering student cohorts nationwide, particularly those at other private liberal arts colleges. Median family income of all domestic first-year students is below \$30,000/year and 80% of Berea students qualify for a Pell grant. Our students are much less likely than other student cohorts to come from homes where both parents live together. They are about twice as likely as their peers at other colleges to report feelings of depression and anxiety. Many of them come from rural Appalachian counties in which less than 5% of the residents have earned college degrees. Sixty-seven percent of last year’s students reported that neither parent had earned a college degree.

Students of modest economic means have greater difficulty accessing and succeeding in higher education. Data suggest the odds against college graduation for children from low-income families are great. In contrast, for children of families with incomes of \$75,000 or higher, the odds are about even that they will earn a college degree by age 24. In contrast, only 7% of children from families with incomes less than \$25,000 earn a college degree by age 24. (Mortenson, 2001).

A recent article entitled *Class in America: Shadowy Lines That Still Divide* (*New York Times*, May 19, 2005) suggests the way in which class influences students’ chances of admission and subsequent success in college: “But merit, it turns out, is at least partly class-based. Parents with money, education, and connections cultivate in their children the habits that the meritocracy rewards.” The following anonymous survey response from a current Berea College student on academic probation illustrates the challenge faced by some Berea students in this regard:

“My parents never taught me the importance of education. Neither had graduated from high school, so I was not disciplined academically at home. I got yelled at a lot and told that I was not smart enough to become successful. After many years of being told by my mother that I was stupid and stubborn, it made me more stubborn and less inclined to do my studies and homework. I never fully understood the importance... Thus, I was a bad student who had too much pride to ask for help.”

There is also evidence that socio-economic factors can be at least as important as traditional preparedness measures (high school GPA, ACT scores, etc.) in predicting student success in college (Cabrera, LaNasa, & Burka, 2001; Lotkowski, Robbins & Noeth, 2004).

As one might expect, access to the financial resources to pay for college is also an important issue for low-income students. According to a 2001 national report from the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance (Washington, D.C.), unmet financial need can lead to difficulty in persistence and success. However, low-income students who are able to access financial resources for college may have a better chance for success. At least one study by Wei and Horn (2002) finds that students receiving Pell grants perform as well as non-recipients who are academically better prepared.

Berea College uses its endowment to provide 4-year tuition scholarships for each enrolled student and also expects each student to work in a labor position for a minimum of 10 hours per week - for which students receive a Labor Grant and wages (first-year students will earn approximately \$1,300 in their first year of attendance). Students are expected to pay room, board, and fee charges, but only to the extent that they are able. On average, Berea students pay approximately \$1,700 per year (mostly from their Labor and summer wages) for the entire cost of attending Berea, except for books, supplies, and other living expenses. Berea's financial aid program, in combination with the "self-help" students receive through Labor Program wages, generally serve to meet their financial need.

While there is no significant difference in mean parental income between probationers and non probationers at Berea (\$25,369 for probationers, \$25,994 for non-probations [1998 – 2003]), the parental income means of both groups are well below the national average. Moreover, the 30% of Pell grant recipients who are placed on academic probation closely mirror the average number of Berea students placed on probation (27%).

Berea students cannot be solely defined by their socio-economic status or the associated challenges that status may predict. Berea students, on the whole, enter college with above-

average preparation indicators (ACT, class rank, high school grade point average, etc.) and are carefully selected for admission through a competitive process - thus “academic promise” defines them as well.

*Berea Students: Academic Promise.* In Fall Term 2005, fifty-five percent of first-year Berea students ranked in the top fifth (80<sup>th</sup> percentile) of their high school graduating class. These students had an average composite ACT score of 23 (2005 national average = 20.9) and a high school GPA of 3.3 in college preparatory courses. Admission to the College is competitive, with less than 50% of domestic applicants offered admission (27% of domestic and international combined). Thus, Berea students are carefully selected through an initial admissions process, and by traditional academic standards have ACT scores and high school class rankings higher than their cohort averages. While these measures of preparedness are not comparable to cohorts at highly selective institutions, Berea’s entering students possess higher than average academic skills.

However, recent survey data from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) indicate that only 25% of responding faculty perceive Berea College students as academically well prepared compared to 75% of faculty at our benchmark institutions and 45% at other four-year private colleges nation-wide. The survey also indicates that 43% of responding Berea faculty believe that most of their students lack the basic skills necessary for college level work as compared to 11% at benchmark institutions and 30% at other four year private colleges. Moreover, nearly 30% of Berea entering students require remediation in Mathematics (Berea’s only remedial program). Many first-year Berea students report that their experiences in high school did not lead them to develop the skills necessary for college-level learning.

The “limited economic resources” and “academic promise” that Berea students represent make for a distinctive student body, possessed of “academic promise,” but also of significant risk factors and challenges. It is the mission of Berea College to provide educational opportunity for this distinctive set of students. This opportunity is provided financially through Berea’s tuition

scholarship program and financial aid policies. Providing additional opportunity by supporting our students learning, realized through the QEP by impacting the ability of at-risk students to successfully engage the learning environment, deepens our institutional commitment to the students we are charged to serve.

Summary. The students who our mission charges us to serve are often challenged by academic under-preparation, significant personal and family issues, and socio-economic factors. These challenges are manifest in the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors these students bring to the learning environment and result in, on average, 27% of Berea students being placed on academic probation. Only 35% of these students will graduate. To better realize our mission, the College seeks to provide these students with the means to avail themselves of the educational opportunity Berea offers. To realize this opportunity, students must be able to successfully engage and complete Berea's challenging curricular requirements and be supported in their efforts.

In addressing this problem, the QEP Team affirms the belief of faculty, staff, and administrators in the promise our students possess. This belief, as well as our commitment to serve our students well, drives this QEP and is evidenced in Berea's strategic planning initiatives for student success, of which the QEP is a natural extension.

#### **IV. Strategic Priorities and Connections to the QEP**

When Dr. Larry Shinn became President of Berea College in 1994, the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) was constituted with some members by virtue of position and other members elected from the College and General Faculties. Meeting on a weekly basis during the academic year, the SPC produced a strategic plan entitled *Being and Becoming: Berea College in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* in 1996.

Part of the debate about *Being and Becoming* was the expressed desire for Berea to better accomplish its stated mission. An important part of that discussion was whether Berea College's retention and graduation rates suggested that the institution was doing all it could to promote student learning. Recognizing that this was a major concern, the SPC appointed a Retention Subcommittee in Fall Term 1996. The eight-person Subcommittee included faculty, students, an associate dean, a member of the Student Life staff, and the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment. Reporting in 1997, the subcommittee stated: "increased retention is one possible outcome of enhanced student programming, however, it is not in itself the goal. The major goal was to improve the quality of students' experiences which may lead to increased retention." The specific recommendations of the subcommittee included strengthening support through improvements in the first-year curriculum and providing better research and assessment of student progress.

By the spring of 1998, the academic administration presented a retention report to trustees indicating that Berea College had a "serious" problem with retention and had taken the Subcommittee's recommendations seriously enough to look closely at first-year General Studies courses, revise Berea's admissions processes, alter Registration and Orientation Weekends, mandate an advising workshop for freshman advisors, and increase Berea's institutional research and assessment efforts.

In 1998, the Subcommittee's work was continued by a newly-formed Committee on Student Experiences (COSE). COSE released a document in 2000 addressing the continued

efforts to better understand student experiences as they related to retention and graduation.

Successful transition from high school to college, emphasizing the education of the whole person, and encouraging the continued practice of excellence in teaching were among the issues COSE identified for further examination.

More recently, the 2004-2005 revision of Berea College's Strategic Plan, *Being and Becoming*, challenged the campus to answer: "What population of students does Berea College seek to serve and how can the College best serve them?" Because Berea's curriculum and high academic standards are very challenging for many students, campus discussions focused on how to help our students succeed. Stimulated in part by the work of the QEP Team, the faculties adopted the following initiative as part of the College's strategic plan in February 2005:

*Berea College commits itself to provide its students with a high quality liberal arts education that maintains high academic standards. It also seeks to improve its capacity to help the students it seeks to serve by (a) studying the national literature and conducting studies of its particular population of students to better understand the academic, personal, and attitudinal characteristics of Berea students; (b) systematically identifying the diverse strengths and weaknesses that students bring with them to Berea, building on the strengths and addressing the weaknesses; (c) assessing the effectiveness of Berea's current curriculum, teaching, advising, academic support, student services, and residential programs in addressing student preparedness; (d) creating the necessary academic, academic support, faculty/staff development, and residential/student-life structures and programs to better support students' academic and personal success; and (e) monitoring the progress of this initiative.*

*The net effect of this student success initiative is to reaffirm Berea's current admissions goals of supporting a diverse and low-income population of students primarily from Appalachia while providing institutional learning structures and support that enables such students to meet the demands of the high quality liberal arts education, with opportunities for study in pre-professional and professional programs, that Berea College provides.*

*To accomplish this institutional aim, Berea College will:*

- 1. Focus its admissions program on: (a) exploring new ways of identifying students of "great promise"—including ways to measure their educational preparedness and motivation, (b) developing admissions materials to attract the most highly motivated and best prepared students, and (c) emphasizing Berea's high quality academic programs, its residential character, the Labor Program, its inclusive Christian traditions and practices, and its commitment to service and leadership development;*
- 2. Assess the effects of the College's current educational structures (e.g., policies, programs, and practices) and culture (e.g., faculty and student roles, norms, and values) on student learning and achievement. Determine how well the College is*

*achieving its aims of conducting excellent educational programs that provide opportunities to the students it seeks to serve. Retention and graduation rates will provide one set of measures of academic success but must be complemented by others that directly measure student performance; and*

- 3. Ask the Executive Council to form a “Task Force on Student Success” that elaborates and extends the initiative outlined above. The Task Force is encouraged to explore experimental, systemic, and targeted initiatives and pilot projects to enhance student academic success. The Task Force will report back to the faculty each semester and seek to complete its work in one year (including the summer) and submit its recommendations to the College and General Faculties for action or to appropriate administrative or academic support offices for implementation.*

The recommended Task Force on Student Success has met regularly over the 2005-2006 academic year and is responsible for exploring experimental, systemic, and targeted initiatives to enhance student success and learning. The QEP Team’s work thus far has provided many resources and a conceptual framework for this larger initiative. Shared membership between the Task Force and the QEP Team provides continuity between these two groups. The Task Force, which is expected to complete its work in one year, will have broad responsibility for recommending programs to enhance learning opportunities for all Berea students. The QEP provides a plan to explore some very specific initiatives, focusing particularly on students on academic probation, with the goal of enhancing these students’ learning skills, and extending the lessons learned to all students. Thus, the present QEP extends work already begun, and it continues and deepens a commitment to enhanced student learning for all students at the College.

## V. The Berea College Quality Enhancement Plan: Route 101: Highway to Enhanced Student Learning

*Purpose, Structure, and Learning Goals.* The primary purpose of the Berea College QEP is to enhance the learning of students on probation, as well as prevent students from being placed on probation, by affecting knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that equip students to be engaged and effective learners. The plan proposes an integrated and articulated approach, leading to enhanced student learning capabilities. Ultimately, we intend to help these students “learn how to learn.” The plan is composed of GST 101, a reactive/corrective course for probationers, and BC 101, a proactive/preventative initiative. GST 101 and BC 101 are being developed from the realization that many Berea students, as a result of academic preparation and socio-economic factors, face specific challenges in how well they are equipped to positively engage in the college learning environment. GST 101 and BC 101 will target primarily the Berea students most at risk of not completing their Berea education. Both will also build upon the various strengths and “academic promise” our students possess.

The GST 101 course and BC 101 initiative are and will be shaped through both a formative and summative assessment process. Their success is and will be measured through specific learning goals. Formative assessments will be utilized for program/course creation and revision. The overall success of the QEP will be measured by specific goals associated with GST 101 and BC 101 and also through a set of shared learning goals pertinent to both. These shared learning goals will be assessed to measure the degree to which student knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors have been affected.

By working with students in GST 101 and BC 101, faculty and staff will gain valuable insights into our students, the learning process, and the types of support our students need. In turn, these insights will be shared with the larger campus community, contributing to a more informed and supportive learning environment for all students. Shared learning goals connect

GST 101 and BC 101 and measure campus impact of the QEP, while faculty and staff development connect the QEP to the larger campus community.

*The Road to Academic Success: GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success.* The GST 101 course, “Strategies for Academic Success,” was offered as a pilot during Fall Term 2004 as a means of supporting and assisting students on academic probation in their efforts to become engaged and successful learners. It was conceived and implemented by the Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success. Prior to this course, there was little beyond advisor and instructor support/encouragement for students who found themselves on academic probation. During the past two years, the course has been taught by members of the College teaching faculty and credentialed Student and Residential Life staff. Instructors have been chosen from a pool of interested faculty/staff volunteers or intentionally recruited by the Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success. Course coordination has also been provided by the Associate Provost.

While there is a common text (*On Course: Strategies for Creating Success in College and in Life* [4<sup>th</sup> edition]) for the current pilot GST 101 course, common points of instruction and support between course sections, instructors have been granted significant latitude in how they approach the course content and activities. Each course section has, however, included an emphasis on issues relating to a) personal responsibility and maturity; b) recognizing and responding to personal learning styles; c) the importance of developing skills essential for student success (e.g. time management skills, study skills, note taking skills, test taking skills); d) ways to understand and cope with personal and family challenges; and e) ways to address and overcome obstacles to academic and personal success. This course serves as the pilot for the GST 101 element of Berea’s QEP.

*Background.* In Fall Term 2004, the first term of the GST 101 pilot, of the 78 students on academic probation, 64 (82%) enrolled in GST 101. In the initial GST 101 offering, all probationary students were automatically registered in the course with an advisor-approved ‘opt out’ option. In Spring Term 2005, with strong encouragement but not automatic enrollment, 60

of 107 probationers (56%) enrolled in the course. In Fall Term 2005, 62 probationers were automatically enrolled in the course and given the “opt out” option. Of these students, 25 remained enrolled (40%). The course is being offered again during Spring Term 2006 with 49 students automatically enrolled.

At that same time, QEP Team members began conversations about *why* certain students go on probation. These discussions led the Team to consider students’ attributional styles. Studies show that attributional style may influence how an individual views and acts upon issues, problems, or successes in one’s life. For example, a person who attributes successes and failures to strictly internal causes (e.g., “I’m very smart and that is why I succeed” or “I’m not smart and that’s why I fail”) may not understand the influences that others or situations have on personal outcomes. On the other hand, some individuals may see their successes as due to something internal (e.g., “When I succeed it’s because of my own hard work”) and their failures due to something external (e.g., “When I fail, it’s because of what other people have done” or “Something about this situation caused me to fail”). Early research by Martin Seligman (1975) says that “learned helplessness” (the belief that one can exert no control over one’s environment) may lead to profound feelings of hopelessness or depression. Later research has shown that individuals who are prone to feeling overwhelmed are more likely to possess certain attributional styles (Alloy, Lipman & Abramson, 1992). They generally attribute good outcomes to something external to themselves and negative outcomes as being due to something personal.

QEP Team members began to ask if students who go on academic probation were more or less likely to blame someone else or themselves for their course failures. Faculty members of the QEP Team cited cases of students who would not take responsibility for their own learning, always blaming the teacher or others for their own failures. The question, “What do probationers attribute their academic probation to?” became a point of interest to the Team.

In order to study this phenomenon and assess the impact the GST 101 course had on enrollees, a survey instrument was created for all probationers (for both those who took the GST

101 pilot course as well as those who did not). The survey included some global attributional measures asking students what led to their academic probation (i.e., something about themselves, something about others, something about the situation). The survey also included numerous specific reasons that could lead to academic probation. Student rated each in terms of how relevant it was to them.

In Fall Term 2004 and Spring Term 2005, students were surveyed at the end of the term only. In Fall Term 2005, a pre- and post-course survey was conducted of all probationary students. The response rate of GST 101 enrollees for Fall Term 2004/Spring Term 2005 was 61% (54/88), for non-enrollees 72% (26/36). The response rate of Fall Term 2005 students completing both the pre-and post-course surveys was 55% for enrollees (16/29) and 71% for non-enrollees (15/21).

At the end of the first set of GST 101 sessions, probationers enrolled in the GST 101 pilot course (versus those who did not enroll) rated the following factors significantly higher in regard to why they went on academic probation: a) something about themselves; b) something about their situation; c) lack of motivation; d) life events/personal issues; e) lack of effort; f) lack of skills; g) lack of self-confidence/self-esteem; h) lack of time spent studying; and i) lack of seeking assistance/support. Non-enrollees generally tended to feel that these characteristics played less of a role in their probationary status. These results are still preliminary; additional student response data and will allow a more accurate and descriptive analysis as the plan progresses.

It is interesting to note that, upon completion of the GST 101 pilot course, probationers reported on the survey that the effectiveness of their GST 101 instructor and course discussions contributed most to the success they experienced in their other courses that term. When asked what it was they found most useful about the pilot course, enrollees responded with comments such as:

“(the course) gives students an opportunity to reflect upon their own progress and discuss it with others who are in the same situations,”

“(the) instructor worked with us...to help us find out what learning style is best for us,” and

“(the course) allowed me to see myself in a new light and begin to improve the weaknesses I display and help others in areas I am better at.”

When asked how they changed personally, enrollees responded with comments such as:

“I am now a happier person. I am using my skills (time management, self-management, emotional intelligence) every day. ...I am balancing my life and my school life ..... I am using the skills that I learned through this class to see myself finish here at Berea College,”

“I am much more responsible, and I know exactly what I came here for” and “I do not blame people for my mistakes and I can live up to the responsibilities,”

“I care about being better than mediocre. I have more confidence as a student (in my abilities” and

“I have changed my attitude towards school – I am now more focused and responsible about my academic work, .....Because of this change in my perspective not only on school, but life in general, I have realized that reflection, learning from my mistakes, and moving on, rather than living in the past, will help me be successful in other aspects of my life as well.”

Many pilot course instructors have asked their GST 101 students to write final reflective essays at the end the course, and the reflections and statements in these essays are similar to the comments provided above. In general, probationers enrolled in the pilot GST 101 reported that the experience led to a positive change in their academic and personal life.

It should be noted that GST 101 pilot course instructors have reported that data and comments from these pilot course assessments have helped them modify and refine their own GST 101 course, and thus the learning of their GST 101 students. These instructors have also reported that they have used student feedback from the GST 101 pilot course to modify how they approach and teach their regular term courses. In this way, the impact of the GST 101 pilot course has reached beyond the probationary students enrolled into the general student population in a wide variety of courses. [Note: Pilot GST 101 instructors are drawn from diverse groups of

academic departments and administrative offices across campus including Biology, Business, Chemistry, Child and Family Studies, English, General Studies, Music, Nursing, Psychology, Technology and Industrial Arts, Theatre, and Student Life.]

Preliminary data indicate a positive relationship between participation in GST 101 and academic success. For the past two years, the following performance outcomes have been observed for probationers who enrolled in the course and those who did not:

Academic Probationers Who:

	<u>Did Not Enroll in GST 101, N=94</u>	<u>Enrolled in GST 101, N=159</u>
Still Enrolled in College	23 (24%)	97 (61%)
Graduated	5 (5%)	1 (1%)
Dismissed for Academics	34 (36%)	31 (19%)
Dismissed for Other Reasons	9 (10%)	2 (1%)
Withdrew Voluntarily	23 (24%)	28 (18%)

The GST 101 Course. The QEP GST 101 course is based on the GST 101 pilot but is proposed as a more coherent curricular experience with greater programmatic consistency across sections. The goal of GST 101 is to assist probationary students by helping them to acquire and develop the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors key to student success.

Probationary students enrolled in the course will work individually and in small course groups ( $\leq 8$  students) to explore attitudinal/behavioral issues as well as relevant successful learning and study skill topics. Attitudinal and behavioral issues will include the following topics: (a) personal responsibility and accountability; (b) self –confidence as a learner; and (c) self-motivation, especially as connected to the roles each of these areas play in engaged and effective learning. Faculty development workshops, seminars, and other activities will provide additional focused instructor training in appropriate skill, attitudinal, and behavioral issue areas.

These GST 101 faculty development workshops will also help to improve faculty training and consistency across all course sections.

GST 101 topic areas will include fundamental skill issues such as: a) time management; b) note and test-taking skills; c) study strategies and skills; d) textbook reading skills; and e) priority and goal setting skills. These topics were routinely covered in the GST 101 pilot course with very positive student feedback. It is expected that direct participation with staff from the Learning Center, Information Resources (library, computer center), and Career Development staff will assist GST 101 instructors to develop appropriate course activities/experiences as they have been doing during the GST 101 pilot on an instructor-by-instructor basis. Common course goals and embedded assessments, which were not part of the pilot GST 101 course, will be implemented across all sections.

This plan ensures a more systematic and formalized approach to faculty/staff development, primarily through workshops. Informal faculty development has already been reported by instructors of the GST 101 pilot course and is expected to continue. As noted previously, instructors report that they used strategies that they covered in GST 101 for enhanced learning in their regular courses. Several reported that they used those strategies as a result of their effectiveness with GST 101 students. Both formal and informal faculty and staff development will be assessed to determine the extent to which they have impacted the manner in which participants approach their work with students.

It is also important to note that many GST 101 pilot course instructors have reported that they have applied their experiences and strategies in GST 101 to their academic advising and feel that their effectiveness as advisors has been significantly enhanced and improved as a result. Several have reported that participating in the GST 101 pilot course has had more impact on how they approach student learning at all levels than has participation in other on- and off-campus development workshops or meetings. Thus, as a consequence of both formal and informal faculty/staff development resulting from the QEP, learning in the larger Berea student population

is likely to be enhanced as well. The faculty/staff development element is treated more specifically below in *Faculty and Staff Development*, with assessment strategies outlined in Section VI., Assessment Plan.

Implementation. The GST 101 course will be offered during all five years of the QEP. During August, 2006, QEP Team members and GST 101 faculty will conduct a summer workshop to commence Year 1 of the GST 101 offering as part of the QEP. This workshop, coordinated by the Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, will focus on understanding the shared learning goals across course sections as well as construct the course-embedded common assignments. Enrollment options (e.g., continue with automatic enrollment with the “opt-out” option, select enrollment, or voluntary enrollment, etc.) will be determined at this time as well. The course will be offered in both Fall Term 2006 and Spring Term 2007. Assessment will occur during each term, including pre- and post- attitudinal measurements, progress tracking (i.e., Did the student come off of probation? Was the student retained?), and learning goal measurements as determined through surveys, course-embedded common assignments, and reflective essays. The QEP Team and GST 101 faculty will also work closely with the members of the BC 101 Planning Seminar (described below in *BC 101: Charting Your Course*), with two formal meetings during Year 1, to ensure articulation between these efforts as well as to inform the research and planning process. At the conclusion of Spring Term 2007, QEP Team members and GST 101 faculty will come together to discuss assessment findings and revise the course as necessary.

The course will proceed similarly in Years 2, 3, 4, and 5. However, in Years 2, 3, and 4, the QEP Team and GST 101 faculty will plan, coordinate, and deliver half-day workshops for up to 25 members of the larger campus community per year. These workshops will be offered three times per year. The goal of these workshops is to share the lessons learned from the GST 101 experiences (and later BC 101 experiences) and to stimulate discussion about how these lessons may be applied more widely throughout the campus and curriculum. These workshops will be

assessed formatively to gather faculty feedback and then again six months and one year later to determine to what extent the workshops did (or did not) impact teaching and learning in the larger campus community (see Section VI., Assessment Plan). At the conclusion of Years 2, 3, and 4, joint GST 101 and BC 101 August workshops will be implemented. A complete implementation timeline is provided below in QEP Timeline and faculty and staff development is discussed in more detail in Faculty and Staff Development.

The GST 101 budget assumes seven sections per term. Included in the budget are resources for conference participation, professional association dues, and other course-related and professional development expenditures. A complete budget is provided in *QEP Budgets*.

*GST 101 Learning Goals.* The study of national literature, examination of institutional data and studies, as well as data from the GST 101 pilot have led the QEP Team to develop specific learning goals for GST 101. By completing the GST 101 experience, probationary students will:

- develop, improve, and reinforce their concrete student success skills (i.e. time-management skills, study skills, test taking skills, note-taking skills, priority and goal-setting, stress management)
- develop, improve, and reinforce their attitudinal/behaviors student success skills (e.g. personal responsibility and accountability, self-motivation);

GST 101 learning goals will be assessed in each course section every term. Shared learning goals will be assessed in Years 2, 3, and 4, with the Year 2 assessment providing baseline data. These assessments are described in Section VI., Assessment Plan.

*BC 101: Charting Your Course.* BC 101, a parallel program to GST 101 will serve as a proactive/preventative initiative. This initiative will likely involve the creation of a course, seminar, or series of workshops. BC 101 will build upon and extend the lessons learned from the reactive/corrective GST 101 course for students on academic probation. The creation of BC 101 will be informed by these lessons as well as by additional targeted research. The intention is to

develop and implement a program (primarily aimed at first-year students) to enhance students' learning success *before* they go on probation. This part of our work will involve an initial year of studying, planning, and implementing a proactive initiative (BC 101) to assist first-year students to become active, engaged, and effective learners. Thus, the QEP will provide support for students at key phases in their academic career – upon entry and upon being placed on academic probation.

*Background.* During Fall Term 2005, several members of the Residential Life Collegium, a group of Student Life professionals, offered a series of six interactive workshops open to all first-year students. These workshops, titled BC 101, focused on healthy relationships and student success skills (e.g., study skills, time management, test taking, etc.). Although the number of students attending these workshops was not large, facilitators and participants felt they were helpful and the QEP Team saw considerable promise in applying their central purpose, that is, early and proactive intervention with first-year students to promote their learning success.

Although it may not replicate this informal workshop series, BC 101 is designed to be the proactive, early intervention learning improvement element of the QEP. BC 101 will be planned, piloted, assessed, and refined over the next five years. The purpose of BC 101 will be to improve students' learning skills and ability to more fully engage the learning environment, to inform the development of the GST 101 course, and to assist faculty and staff in their efforts to enhance student engagement and success both in and outside the classroom.

*Implementation.* In Year 1 of the Quality Enhancement Plan, an intensive yearlong BC 101 Planning Seminar will be devoted to research and study in order to conceive and plan BC 101. Eight to ten faculty members and Student Life staff (including some who have taught GST 101), as well as select members of the QEP Team, will examine the literature and best practice relevant to first-year student academic success initiatives beyond what has already been done in the course of the QEP development process. Participants will research effective student success

intervention/preparation programs and services relevant to the particular characteristics of our students (e.g., from South-Central Appalachia, 20% African-American, largely first-generation, and of modest to low socio-economic status). Participants will research literature, examine first-year programs' best practices, assess student success experience on our own campus, and examine the learning goals and outcomes of the existing GST 101 probation correction course.

Seminar topics are expected to include:

- Who are Berea students within the larger American educational landscape and what does the student success literature suggest about effective means of promoting engagement and academic success for such students?
- What are we learning from our GST 101 probation course about why Berea students don't engage or succeed (i.e. go on academic probation or are not retained) and what interventions are most effective in getting them back on track?
- What characterizes "best practice" among institutions with effective first-year student success services and programs in institutions with students like ours?
- What are the most significant academic intellectual hurdles for Berea students?
- What are the psychological and cultural characteristics that negatively affect student engagement and academic success?
- What are the cognitive and intellectual elements of successful engagement?
- What measures can be taken to assist all Berea students in their transition to college and better ensure their success?

The Seminar will be co-chaired by a faculty member and a Student Life professional.

Participants will review the relevant first-year student success theory and research literature.

They will review existing studies and data about Berea College students along with assessment data on the GST 101 course and systematically apply those studies to the development of BC 101.

Seminar participants will also review recommendations forthcoming from the Strategic Planning Committee's Task Force on Student Success and meet with GST 101 instructors to discuss the experiences and observations of those who have taught that course.

External educational consultants with expertise relevant to the topic (first-year student engagement and academic success) and to the Berea context (the students we serve and our academic program) will be employed, as necessary and appropriate, to work with Seminar participants as they plan the BC 101 experience. At this time we have identified three persons we will invite to work with us in this way. John N. Gardner, Executive Director of the Policy Center on the First Year of College, is internationally recognized for research on programs to enhance the learning, success, retention, and graduation of first-year students. Gardner's best practice resources and consultation would prove immensely valuable to Seminar participants early in their work. Claude M. Steele, Professor of Psychology at Stanford University, is known for his research on the construct of "stereotypic threat" which examines how group stereotypes (specifically those pertaining to African-Americans and women) influence students' intellectual performance and academic identity. Steele has visited the Berea campus before for a faculty development workshop on this topic. We would plan to have him work more in-depth with the Seminar participants once they have studied his theory as it relates to characteristics of the particular students Berea serves (e.g., race, geographic region, socio-economic status, etc.) J. Herman Blake, sociologist, college and university senior administrator, and former Berea College Trustee, has focused his research at Iowa State University on using high level academic research and engagement for the retention of under-represented minorities in higher education. We have already had some conversation with Dr. Blake about working with us during Year 1 to apply his research and experience in this area to the Quality Enhancement Plan topic. He, too, would work with Seminar participants as Year 2 planning proceeds. Participants will also visit effective first-year student programs at other institutions identified as serving students like those Berea admits.

The BC 101 Planning Seminar will provide for close articulation between the GST 101 course and BC 101 planning. Therefore, in addition to on-going informal conversation between

Seminar participants and GST 101 instructors, there will be at least two formal extended opportunities for the groups to come together. One will take place at the beginning of the Seminar to explore what may be learned from the GST 101 course pedagogy, curriculum, instructor experiences, and student assessments. Another will occur near the end of the Seminar to share with GST 101 faculty the results of the Planning Seminar. In addition, GST 101 faculty will be invited to campus sessions with visiting consultants whenever possible. The Seminar will end in the spring of 2007 with a culminating retreat to finalize plans for the BC 101 initiative. These plans will include a.) the selection of a delivery method (course, seminar, workshop series, etc.), b.) the establishment of specific learning goals and specific assessment methods (both formative and summative), and c.) a decision about which first-year students should participate in BC 101. Because BC 101 will be a work in progress, the exact learning goals have not been established. Therefore, the assessments as outlined in Section VI., Assessment Plan, do not include explicit learning goals. However, the learning goals that are chosen will be assessed using methods similar to the GST 101 assessment. That is, we will use both formative and summative measures and gather feedback from both faculty and students.

In Year 2, the BC 101 pilot initiative will be implemented. For purposes of this QEP, BC 101 is conceived as an academic year program consisting of a series of faculty and Student Life staff facilitated workshops, or possibly a course on the order and magnitude of GST 101. Like GST 101, BC 101 will facilitate the ability of Berea College students to succeed academically by developing and enhancing the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors critical to effective learning.

The QEP budget assumes ten pilot courses/workshops for 100 first-year students (approximately 25% of our new students) in Year 2, and 16 sections for 160 first-year students (approximately 38% of our new students) in Year 3. For budget purposes, costs of instruction and materials are similar to those of GST 101. Formative and summative assessment of program

outcomes and effectiveness (to include comparisons between BC 101 participants and appropriate others), articulation with GST 101, and formative faculty development will be conducted throughout. An implementation plan is included below in QEP Time Line.

Resource budgets for Years 1 – 3 are included in this QEP proposal. Resource budgets and assessment plans will be devised for Years 4 and 5 when we have determined the shape and scope of BC 101, but are assumed to be comparable to Years 2 and 3. The Administrative Committee (i.e., the President, the Dean of the Faculty, and all Vice Presidents) commit to finding the budgetary and personnel resources necessary to carry out the extension of BC 101 (or its successor programming for student success) not only through the five years of our QEP but into the future. Budgets are more fully presented below in QEP Budgets.

BC 101 Learning Goals. Using what is learned from GST 101, its learning goals, outcomes, and continuing assessments, and after thorough investigation of best practices and research on the particular characteristics and needs of Berea students conducted during Year 1 of the QEP, learning goals for students engaged in BC 101 will be developed. They likely will include many of the same learning goals associated with GST 101 as well as others. For example, BC 101 may seek to help students develop an understanding of their: a.) preferred learning styles, b.) personal interests and values, and c.) personal career goals.

Assessment will play a major role in BC 101, from the Planning Seminar through its implementation and pilot phases. GST 101 learning goal assessments will inform the BC 101 planning and implementation process in Years 1 and 2. By the end of Year 2, sufficient data will have been collected to revise and expand BC 101 for Year 3 implementation. Continuing assessment in Year 3 will determine scope and structure for following years. After studying the results of these assessments, we will have sufficient experience and data from both BC 101 and GST 101 to more formally address such questions as:

- Which students should participate in BC 101?
- Should BC 101 content or enrollment/participation be linked to the formal General Studies first-year curriculum through particular courses, e.g., GSTR 110, Wellness, etc.?
- Should BC 101 programming be integrated with summer or fall Orientation for first-year students?
- Should BC 101, GST 101 and residence halls be linked through a Residential Learning Community program?
- Should students identified as having characteristics of those whose success is improved by participation in BC 101 be required to participate in a pre-college summer preparation seminar or course?
- Should BC 101 become an academic credit course?
- Should BC 101 be facilitated by certain individuals, such as academic advisors, first-year General Studies faculty, and residence life staff?
- How might BC 101 articulate with GST 101?

The set of shared learning goals, discussed previously in *GST 101*, will provide additional outcome measures. Specific assessment activities are discussed in Section VI., Assessment Plan.

*Faculty and Staff Development.* The literature indicates that to be successful, programs designed to impact student performance and success must invest in faculty and staff development activities (Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004; Moxley, Najor-Kurack, & Dumbrigue, 2001; Tinto, 1993). Berea's QEP includes formal and informal faculty and staff development activities. These activities are designed to better equip faculty and staff to support student learning across the campus. Informal faculty and staff development, which as noted previously has proven successful in the GST 101 pilot, will include:

- Participation in the delivery of the GST 101 course and the BC 101 initiative (instructors, course coordinators, etc.)
- Participation on the continuing QEP Team

Formal faculty and staff development activities include:

- Participation in the GST 101 and GST 101/BC 101 joint August workshops (GST 101 and BC 101 instructors, coordinators, etc.)

- Participation in the BC 101 Planning Seminar (Seminar co-chairs and participants; reading, travel, benchmarking)
- Participation in BC 101 implementation retreat and subsequent August workshops (Seminar co-chairs and participants)
- Participation in Campus Community Workshops (wider campus community)

While the focus of this QEP is not upon faculty and staff development particularly, such development supports the overall purpose of the QEP by assisting faculty and staff to understand our students, both those who are and are not at risk, and to apply lessons learned from these development experiences to their work with students. For those directly participating in GST 101 and BC 101, these lessons will be more readily realized through instructional and other activities. For faculty and staff who are not directly participating in QEP activities and programs, these lessons may be utilized in their work with the larger student population as teachers and advisors.

*Implementation.* Faculty development programming will be planned, coordinated, and implemented through GST 101 and BC 101 coordinators, instructors, and the continuing QEP Team. August workshops will be developed during June and July of each year and are intended to provide training and learning opportunities for those directly involved with the delivery of GST 101 and BC 101. Campus community workshops will be planned in September of each year, with delivery scheduled the three times per year during Years 2, 3, and 4. Campus Community Workshops are intended to provide members of the larger campus community an opportunity to learn from those who have participated in GST 101 and BC 101. Other formal and informal development activities (such as GST 101 and BC 101 participation) will occur throughout the five-year QEP schedule.

*Learning Goals for Faculty and Staff Development.* Specific learning outcomes in this QEP are primarily concerned with student learning – the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that enable learning among students on probation and that prevent students from going on probation. However, a general learning goal for faculty and staff development is: through participation in both informal and formal faculty and staff development activities (workshops,

QEP participation, etc.), faculty and staff will gain a better understanding of our students and apply these lessons to their work with students.

We will solicit feedback from participating faculty and staff, asking all to evaluate the effectiveness of development activities. They will also be asked to describe how they may apply what they have learned in their work (e.g., in teaching courses, working with students in Student Life areas, academic and other types of advising, etc.). At six month and one year intervals, we will ask participants for this same type of feedback. This information will be used by GST 101 and BC 101 coordinators, the Provost, and the QEP Team to determine the impact of these development offerings and to improve faculty and staff development initiatives arising from the QEP.

*QEP Implementation and Assessment Time Line.* A time line including program delivery, faculty/staff development, and assessment activities is outlined on the next three pages.

**Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)  
Implementation and Assessment Time Line**

	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Year 1 2006-07</b>	<b>Year 2 2007-08</b>	<b>Year 3 2008-09</b>	<b>Year 4 2009-10</b>	<b>Year 5 2010-11</b>
<b><u>GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success</u></b>						
<b><i>Course Planning and Implementation</i></b>						
Identify/recruit GST 101 Instructors	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success	April - May	April - May	April - May	April - May	April - May
Plan August workshop (Years 2 - 5 in cooperation with BC 101)	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success	June - July	June - July	June - July	June - July	June - July
Deliver August faculty workshop (communicate common learning goals, course embedded assessments, etc.)	Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, QEP Team*	Aug	Aug	Aug	Aug	Aug
Enroll probationers in course	Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, Office of Academic Services	Aug/Feb	Aug/Feb	Aug/Feb	Aug/Feb	Aug/Feb
Review term course assessments	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA)		Jan/June	Jan/June	Jan/June	Jan/June
Review academic year course assessments	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, OIRA		June	June	June	June
Review shared learning goal assessments	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, OIRA	Aug		June		June
Revise course as assessments indicate	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, OIRA		July - Aug		July - Aug	
Determine continuation of course	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success					Aug
<b><i>Student Assessments</i></b>						
Administer pre attitudinal survey	GST 101 faculty	Sept/Feb	Sept/Feb	Sept/Feb	Sept/Feb	Sept/Feb
Administer course embedded assignments	GST 101 faculty	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May
Administer post attitudinal survey	GST 101 faculty	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May
Administer reflective essays	GST 101 faculty	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May
Compile course assessments for term	GST 101 faculty, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, QEP Team*	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May	Dec/May
Compile course assessments for academic year	GST 101 faculty, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, QEP Team*	June	June	June	June	June

**Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)  
Implementation and Assessment Time Line**

	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Year 1 2006-07</b>	<b>Year 2 2007-08</b>	<b>Year 3 2008-09</b>	<b>Year 4 2009-10</b>	<b>Year 5 2010-11</b>
<b>BC 101, Planning Seminar</b>						
<b>Course Planning and Implementation</b>						
Identify BC 101 Planning Seminar co-chairs and participants	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life	April (pre-Year 1)				
Develop BC 101 Planning Seminar	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, Planning Seminar co-chairs	June/Jul (pre-Year 1)				
Deliver summer retreat (determine learning goals, delivery method, etc.)	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, Planning Seminar co-chairs and participants	June/July (pre-Year 1)				
Deliver BC 101 Planning Seminar	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, Planning Seminar co-chairs and participants	Sept - May				
Implement BC 101	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, Planning Seminar co-chairs, BC 101 faculty		Aug	Aug	Aug	Aug
Plan August workshops (in cooperation with GST 101)	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, BC101 Coordinators		June-July	June-July	June-July	June-July
Deliver August workshops	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, BC 101 Coordinators		Aug	Aug	Aug	Aug
Review term course assessments	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, BC 101 Coordinators		Jan/June	Jan/June	Jan/June	Jan/June
Review academic year course assessments	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, BC 101 Coordinators		Jan/June	Jan/June	Jan/June	Jan/June
Review shared learning goal assessments (Year 1 with BC 101 Planning Seminar)	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, OIRA	Sept		June		June
Revise course as assessments indicate	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, Planning Seminar co-chairs, BC 101 faculty			July - Aug	July - Aug	July - Aug
<b>Assessments</b>						
Formative assessment/study in BC 101 Planning Seminar and follow-up	QEP Team*, V.P. Labor/Student Life, Planning Seminar co-chairs and participants	Aug-May				
Administer BC 101 course assessments (TBD)	BC 101 faculty		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Compile BC 101 assessments for term (TBD)	BC 101 faculty, BC 101 coordinators, QEP Team*		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Compile BC 101 assessments for academic year (TBD)	BC 101 faculty, BC 101 coordinators, QEP Team*		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

**Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)  
Implementation and Assessment Time Line**

	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Year 1 2006-07</b>	<b>Year 2 2007-08</b>	<b>Year 3 2008-09</b>	<b>Year 4 2009-10</b>	<b>Year 5 2010-11</b>
<b><u>Faculty/Staff Development</u></b>						
<b><i>Planning and Delivery</i></b>						
Plan campus community workshops (GST 101)	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, GST 101 faculty		Aug			
Deliver campus community workshops (GST 101)	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, GST 101 faculty		Sept/Nov/ Feb			
Plan campus community workshops (GST/BC 101)	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, GST/BC 101 faculty		Sept	Sept	Sept	Sept
Deliver campus community workshops (GST 101/BC101)	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, GST/BC 101 faculty		Sept/Nov/ Feb	Sept/Nov/ Feb	Sept/Nov/ Feb	Sept/Nov/ Feb
<b><i>Assessments</i></b>						
Deliver campus community workshop feedback surveys	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, GST 101 faculty		Sept/Nov/ Feb	Sept/Nov/ Feb	Sept/Nov/ Feb	Sept/Nov/ Feb
Deliver GST 101/BC 101 faculty/staff participant feedback surveys	QEP Team*, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success	March/May	Aug/March/ May	Aug/March/ May	Aug/March/ May	Aug/March/ May
<b><u>Shared Learning Goals</u></b>						
<b><i>Assessments</i></b>						
Administer shared learning goal faculty survey	QEP Team*, OIRA	Apr		Apr		Apr

\*The QEP Team consists of: Vice President for Labor and Student Life, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Director of Admissions, 2 teaching faculty, a student representative, Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, and the Faculty and Student Life staff members co-chairing the BC 101 Planning Seminar.

QEP Oversight. The QEP Team will continue to meet on a regular basis throughout the five-year QEP project. While specific administrators, faculty, staff, and administrative offices will be involved in planning, coordination, and implementation of specific QEP initiatives, the continuing QEP Team will provide general oversight for these efforts.

The Academic Vice President and Provost will assume the leadership role for directing the QEP Team. Other members of the QEP team will include the Vice President of Labor and Student Life, the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, the Director of Admissions, two teaching faculty members, a student representative, the Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, and the Student Life staff and faculty members co-chairing the BC 101 Planning Seminar.

The Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success will continue to coordinate GST 101 in consultation with the QEP Team. BC 101 will be coordinated by a member of the Student Life staff in consultation with the QEP Team. Faculty/Staff development initiatives will originate from both GST 101 and BC 101 coordinators, but will also be realized through cooperation with the QEP Team.

QEP Budgets

**GST 101 5-Year Budget**

Line Items	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>Instruction/Course Support</b>					
<i>course releases*</i>	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000
<i>supplies</i>	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
<i>printed materials</i>	\$300	\$450	\$450	\$500	\$500
<b>Instruction/Course Support Total</b>	\$15,300	\$15,450	\$15,450	\$15,500	\$15,500
<b>Faculty/Staff Development</b>					
<i>professional association membership dues</i>	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$500
<i>outside speakers</i>	\$0	\$300	\$0	\$300	\$0
<i>conference attendance</i>	\$1,500	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$1,500	\$1,500
<i>learning center/learning commons/QEP Team retreat</i>	\$500	\$500	\$0	\$0	\$500
<i>campus community workshops**</i>	\$0	\$1,875	\$1,875	\$1,875	\$0
<i>refreshments for workshops, forums, etc.</i>	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250
<b>Faculty/Staff Development Total</b>	\$2,750	\$6,425	\$5,625	\$4,425	\$2,750
<b>Total GST 101 Budget</b>	<b>\$18,050</b>	<b>\$21,875</b>	<b>\$21,075</b>	<b>\$19,925</b>	<b>\$18,250</b>

\* 3.5 course releases @ \$4,000 each (one course release = two GST 101 sections)

\*\*3 per year, 25 instructors @ \$25 per half-day workshop

**BC 101 5-Year Budget**

Line Items	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>Planning Seminar</b>					
<i>course release (5 faculty) @ \$4,000</i>	\$20,000				
<i>salary (seminar co-chairs)</i>	\$20,000				
<i>seminar materials</i>	\$1,000				
<i>consultants</i>	\$7,000				
<i>conferences and other travel</i>	\$10,000				
<b>Planning Seminar Total</b>	<b>\$58,000</b>				
<b>Instruction/Course Support</b>					
<i>course release*</i>		\$10,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
<i>supplies</i>		\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
<i>course coordinator replacement salary</i>		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
<i>summer course revision Retreat**</i>		\$2,000			
<b>Instruction/Course Support Total</b>		<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>\$39,000</b>	<b>\$39,000</b>	<b>\$39,000</b>
<b>Faculty/Staff Development</b>					
<i>conferences, workshops, etc.</i>		\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
<b>Faculty/Staff Development Total</b>		<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>
<b>Total BC 101 Budget</b>	<b>\$58,000</b>	<b>\$37,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>

*\*Year 2: 2.5 @ \$4,000 each (one course release = four BC 101 sections)*

*Year 3-5: 4 @ \$4,000 each*

*\*\*1 week @ \$75/day for 5 people*

**Total QEP Budget**

Line Item	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
GST 101	\$18,050	\$21,875	\$21,075	\$19,925	\$18,250
BC 101	\$58,000	\$37,000	\$41,000	\$41,000	\$41,000
<b>Total QEP Budget</b>	<b>\$76,050</b>	<b>\$58,875</b>	<b>\$62,075</b>	<b>\$62,925</b>	<b>\$59,250</b>

## VI. Assessment Plan

The evaluation of BC 101 and the GST 101 will involve some shared assessment strategies. Also, specific strategies will be used for each. Faculty/staff development experiences will be assessed using immediate and follow-up feedback instruments related to the goals of individual workshops or seminars.

*Student Learning Goals Assessments for GST 101.* The assessments for the GST 101 course include pre- and post- attitude/self-reported learning surveys, course-embedded common assignments, and faculty observations of students' learning skills. All students on academic probation will be asked to complete a survey containing pre- and post- attitudinal and self-report measures. The results of academic probationers who took the course will be compared to those who chose not to take the course. The survey contains items about why the student went on probation, several ratings of the course itself (instructor, text, assignments, discussions, etc.), general ratings of how much the course helped with the major aims of the course (non course-takers will not complete this section), and agreement rating scales for the 17 learning goals (these will be compared before and after the course to see if students report changes—comparing those who took the course who did not). The pre and post instruments may be found in Appendix I. The administration, analysis, and reporting of the survey results will be conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) and reported to the Provost and the QEP Team as well as GST 101 faculty.

Also, probation students who take the GST 101 course will be required to write reflective essays about their learning in the course and how it will be used in other courses.

The student essay prompts are as follows:

- *This class has helped me to ...*
- *My academic skills have changed in the following way ...*
- *I will be able to more effectively\_\_in other classes.*

- *The major strength of this class is...*
- *The major way in which this class could be improved is...*

Further, students enrolled in GST 101 will be given common course-embedded assignments at the end of the course. These will be constructed in August of 2006 in the faculty development workshop for all GST 101 instructors coordinated by the Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success. The common assignments will involve a) constructing a time management plan and b) demonstrating how to organize the work involved in a complex task. Each GST 101 instructor will work with the other instructors to grade the assignments using a commonly agreed upon evaluation rubric. The assignments and grading rubrics will be a primary focus of the August 2006 instructor development workshop.

GST 101 instructors will administer the reflective essay prompts and the course-embedded assessment assignments toward the end of the course. The results of all GST course-embedded assessments will be compiled and summarized by each GST 101 instructor and shared with the Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success, all GST 101 instructors, the Provost and QEP Team. The results will be used to improve the GST 101 course.

*Student Learning Goals Assessments for BC 101.* BC 101 will include both formative and summative assessments aimed at students and BC 101 faculty beginning in Year 2. The formative assessments aimed at students will solicit feedback from students and BC 101 faculty about how clear and helpful the sessions are, and strengths and weaknesses of each module. These will be constructed and administered by the coordinators in charge of BC 101 and shared with the Provost and the QEP Team. These assessments will be used to make on-going improvements in the sessions. BC 101 Formative Assessment examples:

- *Please describe the strengths and weaknesses of BC 101. Any suggestions for improvement?*
- Using an agreement rating scale, *“In general, how effective was this experience in helping you with the following skills”:*

A list appropriate to BC 101 subject matter will be developed. Below are examples of various topics that may be included in specific courses.

- Effective test taking skills
- Time management and study skills
- Public speaking and presentations
- Encouraging healthy personal relationships
- Note taking skills
- Understanding what plagiarism is and how to avoid it.
- Personal boundary setting (understanding how to set boundaries around themselves, roommate issues, drinking and driving, etc.)
- Ability to understand and cope with personal and family issues
- Building academic self-esteem
- Motivating one's self
- Stress management

Rating scale assessments will be developed around the specific goals of each course session and used by students and BC 101 faculty. These types of assessments will be summative in nature. The results will be compared for students who take BC 101 versus those who do not.

See Appendix J for examples of BC 101 assessments. The formative structured data and the open-ended comments will be summarized by the BC 101 coordinator and shared with the Provost and the QEP Team. These results will be used to improve the experiences (course, workshops, etc.). All summative assessments will be developed, administered, and summarized by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in consultation with members of the Planning Seminar and BC instructors. The results will be used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the B.C. 101 experience on student learning.

*Faculty and Staff Development Experiences Assessment.* Faculty and staff development occur during the course of the QEP both formally (workshops, seminars) and informally (while instructing GST 101 and BC 101). The aim of both formal and informal faculty/staff development is to increase knowledge and understanding of Berea students - how they learn, and

the kinds of support they need to be better learners - and for faculty and staff to apply this understanding to their work with students.

Faculty/staff development will be assessed using open-ended written feedback strategies. After each development opportunity (e.g., the August GST 101 instructor workshops, the BC 101 Planning Seminar sessions, etc.), participants will be asked to provide feedback pertaining to the usefulness of each experience with emphasis on how it may be applied in their future work with students (both inside and outside the classroom).

We also will ask participants for feedback six months and one year after each particular experience (including teaching a GST 101 course or guiding a BC 101 experience or participating in the related workshops and Planning Seminar) to determine if and how lessons learned through both formal and informal faculty and staff development experiences are impacting their work with students. This information will be used by the GST 101 and BC 101 coordinators, the Provost, and the QEP Team to improve the faculty/staff development and provide feedback to the entire QEP project. Performance data (GPAs, retention/graduation rates, and probation rates) will also be monitored to track the overall effect of the QEP and will be used to inform faculty and staff.

*Shared Assessment for GST 101 and BC 101 Student Learning Goals.* In April 2006, April 2008, and April 2010, all faculty members will be surveyed by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) and asked to rate (using a 10-point agreement scale) 17 attributes (see bullets below) as they pertain to students in the bottom third of the faculty members' classes, the middle third, and the top third.

The scales will also be further divided so that faculty members will rate the attributes for first-year students versus upper-class students. Therefore, faculty members will rate six groups of students including 1) bottom third first-year students, 2) bottom third in all other classifications, 3) middle third first-year students, 4) middle third all other classifications, 5) top third first-year

students, and 6) top third in all other classifications with a 10-point scale across the following:

10=strongly agree      (points in-between)      1=strongly disagree

- Effectively organizes coursework.
- Effectively manages time related to coursework completion.
- Effectively reads assigned texts.
- Completes assignments appropriately and on time.
- Seeks appropriate assistance in a timely manner.
- Constructively uses instructor feedback to improve.
- Demonstrates responsibility for one's own learning.
- Are accountable for one's own learning.
- Are self-motivated to learn and perform.
- Effectively sets one's goals and priorities related to coursework.
- Are engaged learners.
- Study skills are adequate.
- Test-taking skills are adequate.
- Note-taking skills are adequate.
- Stress management skills are adequate.
- Confidence in academic skills is adequate.
- Understands and copes with personal and family challenges.

See Appendix F for a copy of the faculty survey. Results will be analyzed and summarized by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) and the results of each administration will be shared with the Provost and the QEP Team, the faculty, and administrators and instructors of both the GST 101 and the BC 101 courses. The April 2006 results will be used along with other assessment results to determine which students need which interventions (courses, etc.). The April 2006 administration will also provide baseline data for GST 101 and the April 2008 administration will provide baseline data for BC 101 as well as comparative data for GST 101. The list of learning goals will be increased as BC 101 is developed. These will be added to the faculty instrument and used in later administrations of the survey (2008, 2010). Results from each subsequent administration of the survey will thus be used to assist in

monitoring improvements, if any, in student learning strategy skills and other attributes. These results will also be used to improve both BC 101 and GST 101 content and approaches. The April 2010 administration will additionally provide comparative data for GST 101 and BC 101, as well as summative data for assessing the effectiveness of the QEP as a whole in combination with GST 101 and BC 101 specific assessments noted above.

Also, across this time period (2006-2010), the following will be closely monitored each term and will provide additional evidence of student learning success:

- graduation rate (Appendix G)
- rate of academic probation (Appendix H)

The data above, in addition to student survey results (see instrument in Appendix I), will serve as the primary learning outcomes assessments for the entire project, both direct (faculty observation and student feedback) and indirect (student persistence). The statistics will all be updated and shared annually with the Provost and the QEP Team, faculty, and administrators. These data will also allow other campus initiatives, including those forthcoming from the Task Force on Student Success, to chart their progress (e.g., special course support efforts, enhanced advising programs, etc.)

## **VII. Conclusion**

Berea College is driven by its mission to seek out students of “great academic promise” and “limited economic resources” and provide them with educational opportunity. To more fully realize this mission, the College must ensure that students are equipped to successfully engage the learning environment and graduate. However, many Berea students face significant challenges that impede their ability to be successful learners and complete degree requirements. This is particularly so for academic probationers and first-year students. This QEP directs multi-faceted programming at academic probationers (GST 101), first-year students (BC 101), and the faculty and staff who support their learning (Faculty and Staff Development). This programming will enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that lead to academic success and, ultimately, student learning. Through such enhancement, Berea students will have a greater likelihood of academic success and increased educational opportunity. The overall QEP, as well as each programmatic component, is informed and shaped through formative assessment processes and success is measured through summative assessment processes. Ultimately, this QEP provides a means for Berea students to “learn how to learn” and deepens Berea’s institutional commitment to serve students “of great academic promise” and “limited financial resources.”

## VIII. Bibliography

- Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance. (2001). *Access denied: Restoring the nation's commitment to equal educational opportunity*. Washington, D.C. Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance.
- Alloy, L.B., Lipman, A. J., & Abramson, L.Y. (1992). Attributional style as a vulnerability factor for depression: Validation by past history of mood disorders. Special Issue: Cognitive vulnerability to psychological dysfunction. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 16, 391-407.
- Braxton, J. M., Hirschy, A. S., & McClendon, S. A. (2004). *Understanding and reducing college student departure*. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 30-3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cabrera, A. F., La Nasa, S. M., & Burkam, K. R. (2001). *On the right path: The higher education story of one generation*. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved February 1, 2006, from <http://www.sheeo.org/diversity/On%20the%20Right%20Path.pdf>
- Carey, K. (2005a). *Choosing to improve: Voices from college and universities with better graduation rates*. (A Report from the Education Trust). Retrieved February 25, from 2005, [http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/40EEF8D0-1257-48C2-8622-10AEB8988727/0/Choosing\\_to\\_improve.pdf](http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/40EEF8D0-1257-48C2-8622-10AEB8988727/0/Choosing_to_improve.pdf).
- Carey, K. (2005b). *One step from the finish line: Higher college graduation rates are within reach*. (A Report from the Education Trust). Retrieved February 25, 2005, from <http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/10D6E141-08E4-42D7-B7E5-773A281BCDB7/0/onestep.pdf>
- Garavalia, L. S. & Gredler, M. E. (2002). Prior achievement, aptitude, and use of learning strategies as predictors of college student achievement. *College Student Journal*, 36 (4), 616-625.
- Habley, W. R. & McClanahan, R. (2004). *What works in student retention? Four-year private colleges*. (ACT Report). Retrieved June 1, 2005, from <http://www.act.org/path/postsec/droptables/pdf/FourYearPrivate.pdf>.
- Hammer, B. (2003). Award-winning approaches to retention. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 20 (11), 28-31.
- Lau, L. K. (2003). Institutional factors affecting student retention. *Education* (Chula Vista, CA), 124 (1), 126-136.
- Levitz, R. S., Noel, L., & Richter, B. J. (1999). Strategic moves for retention success. In G. H. Gaither (Ed.), *Promising practices in recruitment, remediation, and retention* (pp. 31-50). (New Directions for Higher Education, no. 108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lotkowski, V. A., Robbins, S. B., & Noeth, R. J. (2004). *The role of academic and non-academic factors in improving college retention*. (ACT Policy Report). Retrieved February 25, 2005, from [http://www.act.org/path/policy/pdf/college\\_retention.pdf](http://www.act.org/path/policy/pdf/college_retention.pdf).

- Mansfield, P. M., Pinto, M. B., Parente, D. H., & Wortman, T. I. (2004). College Students and Academic Performance: A Case of Taking Control. *NASPA Journal* 41(3), 551-587.
- McClanahan, R. (2004). Review of retention literature. In *What works in student retention?* (ACT Report). Retrieved June 2, 2005, from <http://www.act.org/path/postsec/droptables/pdf/Appendix1.pdf>.
- Mortenson, T. (2001). Family income and higher education opportunity, 1970 to 2002. *Postsecondary Education Opportunity*, 120.
- Moxley, D., Najor-Kurack, A., & Dumbriue, C. (2001). *Keeping students in higher education: Successful practices and strategies for retention*. Kogan Page, Publishers.
- Murtaugh, P.A., Burns, L. D., & Schuster, J. (1999). Predicting the retention of university students. *Research in Higher Education*, 40, 355-371.
- Nausmann, W. C., Bandalos, D., & Gutkin, T. B. (2003). Identifying variables that predict college success for first-generation college students. *Journal of College Admission*, 181, 4-8.
- Pintrich, P. R. & Zusho, A. (2002). Student motivation and self-regulated learning in the college classroom. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: A handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 17, pp. 55-128). New York: Agathon.
- Plant, E. A., Ericsson, K. A., & Hill, L. (2005). Why study time does not predict grade point average across college students: Implications of deliberate practice for academic performance. *Contemporary Education Psychology*, 30 (1), 96-116.
- Reason, R. D. (2003). Student variables that predict retention: Recent research and new developments. *NASPA Journal (online)*, 40 (4), 172-191.
- Ridgell, S. D. & Lounsbury, J. W. (2004). Predicting academic success: general intelligence, "Big Five" personality traits and work drive" *College Student Journal*, 8 (4), 607-618.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Watts, A. L. (2001). *Education and the common good: Social benefits of higher education in Kentucky*. Kentucky Lon-Term Policy Research Center. Retrieved July 1, 2005 from [http://www.kltprc.net/books/educationcommongood/education\\_and\\_the\\_common\\_good.pdf](http://www.kltprc.net/books/educationcommongood/education_and_the_common_good.pdf).
- Wei, C. C. & Horn, L. (2002). Persistence and attainment of beginning students with Pell Grants. (NCES 2002-169). *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 4 (2). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved February 1, 2006, from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol\\_4/4\\_2/4-1.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol_4/4_2/4-1.asp)

## **IX. Appendices**

## **Appendix A**

Memo dated March 3, 2004 from Judith Weckman on behalf of the Leadership Team to Faculty, Staff and Students of Berea College Entitled *Choosing a Topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), A Requirement of Accreditation*



---

**From:** Judith Weckman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 03, 2004 2:45 PM  
**To:** #Students; #Staff; #Faculty  
**Subject:** Accreditation Requirement, Your Help is Critical  
**Importance:** High

To: Faculty, Staff, and Students of Berea College

From: Judith Weckman, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment

Date: March 3, 2004

Re: Choosing a Topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), **A Requirement of Accreditation**

Dear Bereans,

I am writing on behalf of the Leadership Team (Larry Shinn, Dave Porter, Stephanie Browner, Mike Berheide, and myself) appointed to guide Berea College through its reaffirmation of accreditation process. Our regional accrediting organization is the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). We are now in the process of preparing ourselves for reaffirmation and we need your immediate assistance. This entire process will be somewhat different than in past years when institutions conducted a comprehensive self-study and documented their compliance with a large number of standards. For example, the new process for reaffirmation no longer involves the efforts of an entire campus working to ensure compliance. Instead, the compliance part of accreditation will now be handled administratively.

However, the new process does include a very new kind of core requirement. The requirement is: *The institution has developed an acceptable **Quality Enhancement Plan** and demonstrates that the plan is part of an ongoing planning and evaluation process.* The topic of the QEP must be selected by the end of April.

The following describes what a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is and how we will work, as a campus, to identify and complete one.

The Quality Enhancement Plan is a document describing a carefully designed and focused course of action aimed at *enhancing student learning*. In the past, the accreditation process focused on the past (what has the institution done to improve its quality); the focus is now on what can the institution do in the future to improve the quality of education. The QEP should complement the institution's ongoing integrated planning and evaluation processes.

The subject of the QEP must be selected by engaging an institution's faculty, staff, students, Board members, administrators, and other stakeholders. So, this is what we need your help with immediately. We have less than 18 months to choose the topic of a QEP, select a group of faculty and others to research and write the plan, and submit it for review to SACS. SACS review will involve peers from other institutions who will assess the viability of the plan (e.g., the use of appropriate student learning measures, the ability to monitor and evaluate progress, and the plan's broad-based support on campus).

Very few institutions in our region have completely gone through the new reaffirmation process but following are some examples of Quality Enhancement Plan topics:

- How can we maximize the potential of our general education requirements to enhance students' skill development (critical thinking, writing, quantitative reasoning, etc.)?

- How can we enhance overall student learning through the Labor Program; how can we deepen or broaden learning through labor?
- How can we maximize the student learning potential of internationalizing the campus?
- What effect has *learning through service* had on learning in the classroom, retention, and skill development and how can we maximize its potential for student learning?
- How can we use Universal Access (laptops, technological services, faculty development, etc.) to enhance student learning?

These are just some examples to give you an idea of what might be the topic of a QEP. The document itself is intended to be less than a 100 pages but contain a solid review of institutional data, a literature review, and a main body that describes a plan for study and quality enhancement. Five years from now, the institution will be required to submit an *impact report* that addresses the effect the QEP had.

Please help us, the Leadership Team for Reaffirmation, begin the process of selecting the topic for a QEP. We need to have one identified by April of this year so that a team can be recruited and supported to begin this work.

We ask that you give us your ideas using a web-based instrument. We are using this to give everyone an initial voice, to efficiently gather ideas, and let the process be anonymous if you choose. When you arrive at the web site, you will simply be asked to answer one demographic question (student, faculty, etc.) and then write your ideas for an appropriate topic for the QEP. The Leadership Team will then look for patterns of interest and report the ideas back to campus. We intend to involve departments, program areas, and campus organizations in further selection. We will then share the top ideas with the General Faculty and move to select the final topic.

Thank you for your thoughts and ideas. Please be clear about what the study should focus on; provide as much detail as you can on the topic and outcomes of interest. The site will be open until **Sunday, March 14**. We will close it at that time to summarize the responses and prepare for further discussion on campus.

<http://apps-server/QualityEnhancementPlan>(website was taken offline March 14,2004)

## **Appendix B**

Document Entitled *Possible Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topics, Developed by the Berea College Leadership Team*



## Possible Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topics

1) *Learning through service* is an educational experience based upon a collaborative partnership between college and community. *Learning through service* enables students to apply academic knowledge and critical thinking skills to meet genuine community needs. Through reflection and assessment, the intention is for students to gain a deeper understanding of course content and to enhance their sense of civic responsibility.

What effect has *learning through service* had on learning in the classroom, skill development, retention, and civic responsibility, and how can we maximize its potential for student learning?

2) Berea's *Universal Access* initiative has included a number of program pieces. These include:

- providing laptops to all students (the EDGE program)
- placing multi-media equipment in classrooms
- providing network access in residence halls and many classrooms
- expanding electronic resources in the library
- expanding the availability of software and training for both students and faculty

For example, WebCT is an example of a course management technology that has changed the way many faculty teach and organize their courses.

Has Universal Access made a difference in student learning? How can we use the technology associated with Universal Access to enhance student learning?

3) Recently Berea College attained its highest 5-year graduation rate in decades (60%). But what about the 40% who still do not graduate? Many students (approximately 140 each spring and half as many each fall) are placed on academic probation for substandard academic performance. Many of their rights and privileges are restricted (participation in activities such as athletics and student organizations as well as study abroad) but little is done on a systematic basis to understand their individual or collective needs. Many students on probation subsequently are suspended and withdraw from the College. The educational literature suggests that approaches other than punishment and restriction might achieve better results. This proposal calls for the development and testing of a course specifically designed to provide these students with the insight, support, and assistance necessary for them to become academically successful at Berea College. Such a course might count for partial course academic credit but not toward graduation (in a manner similar to convocations).

4) In the 1990s, Berea instituted a Wellness Program and modified the curriculum to reflect an emphasis on developing habits of "lifetime wellness" in students. The construction of the new Seabury Center and its programming was designed with this aim in mind. But we have not examined the "wellness" of our students, the extent to which they have incorporated principles of wellness into their lives, or the impact of any such adoption on physical fitness, educational achievement, emotional well-being, or quality of life. The QEP should address these issues by (1) investigating the relationship between physical fitness and educational achievement, the actual fitness of our students, and the effect of the Wellness Program on these variables; and (2) recommending any needed changes.

Alternatively:

The physical fitness of students affects a wide range of other variables, from educational achievement to emotional well-being, from retention to health-care delivery. Which current college practices serve to encourage physical fitness in our students, and which discourage it?



## **Appendix C**

### Documents Entitled

- *Choosing a Topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) April 8, 2004 Faculty Meeting (Results of the Survey)*
- *Copy of April 22, 2004 Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes (Faculty vote on QEP topic)*



## Choosing a Topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Updated April 13, 2004

April 8, 2004 Faculty Meeting

**N =56**

Given our mission of educating and inspiring service-oriented leaders for Appalachia and beyond, the challenge or opportunity this proposal addresses is particularly important.

If enacted, this plan has the potential to significantly enhance student learning by providing more engaging and meaningful learning experiences for our students.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
Universal Access	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.7%)	13 (24.1%)	21 (38.9%)	17 (31.5%)	3.94	2 (3.9%)	2 (3.9%)	12 (23.5%)	21 (41.2%)	14 (27.5%)	3.84
Learning through Service	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.8%)	11 (20.0%)	17 (30.9%)	25 (45.5%)	4.16	0 (0%)	2 (3.8%)	15 (28.8%)	21 (40.4%)	14 (26.9%)	3.90
Academic Probation	2 (3.6%)	2 (3.6%)	14 (25.5%)	14 (25.5%)	23 (41.8%)	3.98	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	12 (23.1%)	23 (44.2%)	15 (28.8%)	3.96
Wellness	3 (5.4%)	3 (5.4%)	13 (23.2%)	27 (48.2%)	10 (17.9%)	3.68	3 (5.5%)	3 (5.5%)	14 (25.5%)	26 (47.3%)	9 (16.4%)	3.58

### Willing to Serve:

#### ***Universal Access***

Scott Steele  
Paul Smithson  
Mary Lamb

#### ***Learning through Service***

Scott Steele  
Michelle Tooley  
Deborah Martin  
Betty Hibbler  
Ashley Cochrane  
Brad Christensen  
Meta Mendel-Reyes

#### ***Academic Probation***

Scott Steele  
Deborah Martin  
Dawn Anderson  
Jeff Richey  
Don Hudson  
Shan Ayers  
Gail Wolford  
Tom Boyd  
Oliver Keels  
Margaret Dotson

#### ***Wellness***

Dawn Anderson  
Gail Wolford  
Oliver Keels  
Jeff Pool  
Martha Beagle  
Joy Hager (only if needed)  
Sandy Pennington

#### ***No Specific Plan***

Bob Hoag  
Gordon McKinney

### Comments:

Mission question: When did this come to be?

If enacted question: Weard-words! -- This query is poorly formulated, given the actual topics. Also, why assume "engaging" & "meaningful" are what most matters to "enhanced" learning?!?

If enacted (wellness): Answered a 3 -- not sure of plan.

If enacted question: Answered a 3 on all -- can't judge a plan till we have one.

## **Choosing a Topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)**

April 8, 2004 Faculty Meeting

Updated April 13, 2004

If enacted question: odd

**GENERAL AND COLLEGE FACULTY MEETING**

Thursday, April 22, 2004

Trustees Room, Seabury Center

4:15 p.m.

**AGENDA**

- I. Approval of Minutes of the April 8, 2004 meeting (Attachment #61)
- II. Response to Motion of April 8, 2004 – Larry Shinn
- III. Approval of Degree Candidates – Delphia Canterbury  
(Attachment #62) - *For vote by College Faculty Members*
- IV. **Quality Enhancement Plan Motion**  
(Attachment #63) - *For vote by General Faculty Members*
- V. Executive Council Business – Gary Mahoney
  - A. Election of Committee Members  
(Attachment #64) - *For vote by General Faculty Members*  
(Attachment #65) - *For vote by College Faculty Members*
  - B. Nominations for Honorary Degree Candidates (**Attachment #66 to be distributed via email**)  
*For vote by College Faculty Members*
- VI. Academic Program Council Business – Lee Roecker
  - A. Proposal from the Sociology Department  
(See Attachment #53 from the April 8, 2004 agenda) *For vote by College Faculty Members*
  - B. New Course Proposal from Political Science, Women’s Studies and Black Studies  
(See Attachment #54 from the April 8, 2004 agenda) *For vote by College Faculty Members*
  - C. Proposals from the Philosophy and Religion Department
    - 1. Philosophy Curriculum Revision Proposal  
(See Attachment #55 from the April 8, 2004 agenda) *For vote by College Faculty Members*
    - 2. Religion Curriculum Revision Proposal  
(See Attachment #56 from the April 8, 2004 agenda) *For vote by College Faculty Members*
  - D. Proposal from the Art Department  
(See Attachment #57 from the April 8, 2004 agenda) *For vote by College Faculty Members*
  - E. Proposal regarding Special Topics Courses  
(See Attachment #58 from the April 8, 2004 agenda) *For vote by College Faculty Members*
  - F. Proposal regarding Academic Probation Policy/New Course (Attachment #67)  
*For vote by College Faculty Members*
- VII. Faculty Affairs Council Business – Mike Berheide  
Proposal regarding Instructor Evaluation Questionnaires  
(See Attachment #59 from the April 8, 2004 agenda) *For discussion only*
- VIII. General Education Review Committee – Steve Pulsford
  - A. Interim Report from the General Education Review Committee, reflecting discussions among faculty through April 15, 2004 (Attachment #68) *For information only*
  - B. Continued Review of the Proposed Amendments to “Proposal for Revision of Berea College’s General Education Program” (See Attachment #46 from the March 11, 2004 meeting—Amendments 23 and 24) *For vote by College Faculty Members*
- IX. New Business
- X. Announcements

## The Quality Enhancement Plan: Probation and Retention at Berea College

### Campus Process Used to Select a Plan

Berea College, in partial fulfillment of the reaffirmation requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools will devise a Quality Enhancement Plan whose impact will be assessed five years from now. Using e-mail and a web-based survey, the Leadership Team sent a letter to all faculty, staff, and students describing the Quality Enhancement Plan and solicited ideas for topics. Departmental leaders were also contacted separately and asked to discuss ideas within departments and respond to the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team reviewed all faculty, staff, and student responses to this inquiry and developed four major topics. These were articulated in brief proposal formats and brought to a meeting of the general and college faculties (which includes student government members). Faculty/staff members (and student representatives) were asked to rate each of the four plans in terms of how important it was to the mission and its potential to improve student learning. Individuals were also asked to indicate whether they would be willing to serve on a QEP committee. The Leadership Team then evaluated the faculty responses and the level of personal support and chose the topic of Academic Probation.

### Rationale for Choice

This topic is particularly relevant to student outcomes at Berea. Last year we achieved a 60% five-year graduation rate, the highest in 40 years. However, 10% of Berea students are placed on academic probation each year, and of these, about half subsequently dropped out or were suspended for academic reasons.

Our current academic probation policies may be construed as punitive in nature and do not include any defined institutional support for rectifying student problems. This past year, the Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success has been developing a course to be offered to probationers, which is intended to help them identify and resolve the problems which led to their probation. This course may become one part of an overall Quality Enhancement Plan but this project is more extensive than this course alone. For example, our current attempts to redesign the General Education program seem likely to result in some common course or first-year experience intended to help new students develop personal habits, skills and attitudes needed for success in college. A well-researched QEP that includes a variety of experimental components could provide an excellent opportunity to enhance the effectiveness of the institutional support we provide to all our students.

### Initiation of the Project

The goal of this QEP is to reduce the number of students going on academic probation and also provide more effective support for those students whose performance places them on probation. Therefore, the QEP will be dedicated to designing, implementing and evaluating an effective Academic Probation Program. It may take various forms depending on the initial thinking of the group appointed to undertake this effort. For example, a review of the literature may lead the team to devise several strategies and then compare the outcomes. These strategies *may* include a formal probation course that students would be required to take, a series of workshops, and/or individualized programs to enhance student engagement or improve a particular student's general skill level, well-being, and adjustment to college.

It will be the responsibility of the appointed team of volunteer faculty, academic administrators, academic support professionals and students to review the relevant literature; become familiar with relevant College data, programs, and policy; construct a plan for enhancement, and choose the strategies required to carry out the plan. The plan must include defined outcomes or educational goals that can be measured to evaluate the success of the Plan. The full faculty and academic support staff will be kept informed throughout the process and included as required in the development and implementation of the QEP project.

### Motion:

*The General Faculty supports the adoption of the project described above and entitled, "Probation and Retention at Berea College," as its Quality Enhancement Plan.*

**Berea College General and College Faculty Meeting  
Thursday, April 22, 2004  
Trustees, Room, Seabury Center**

Provost Porter called the meeting to order at 4:15 and called on J. Pool who led the faculties in prayer.

S. Pennington announced that a reception would be held for B. Hosley (May 10, 3:00-5:00 in Baird Lounge) to celebrate the successful defense of her dissertation Wednesday. H. Barton invited all to attend 'Jazzy Nights, Midnight in Paris.'

- I. Provost Porter called for consideration of the minutes of the April 8, 2004 meeting (Attach. 61). Following a motion to approve and a second, and hearing no call for corrections, **the minutes were approved**.
- II. President Shinn briefly discussed his email message, "Response to the Motion of April 8, 2004," noting that the Administrative Committee also feels outsourcing is the last resort. Two of the four options involve Collegis; another option would be to hire an interim director. The President welcomed comments, noting that as a community we must feel good about reaching decisions. The Provost has spent time with CIRC about this matter; CIRC will continue to be involved in the process, acting as a sounding board for the faculty at large.

G. Mahoney read the following statement:

"As stated in the April 8 Faculty Meeting, Dave and Larry shared with Executive Council the information contained in the president's special report. They also brought to the Executive Council, in confidence, some candid information concerning the evaluations of IS&S and our computing infrastructure. First, I would agree that this information is sensitive and has to remain in confidence. Secondly, in light of this information, so far I find the process appropriate and the actions of the Administrative Council [sic] to be responsible."

In response to a question, G. Mahoney noted that he had distributed the text to all Executive Council members for their consent. Since he had not received responses from all, he used 'I' instead of 'we', speaking for himself and not the entire E.C.

- III. D. Canterbury presented corrections to the distributed list (Attach. #62): pg.3: add Robert S. McGraw (Independent: Graphic Communication); pg. 4: delete George W. Webb (Education Studies) and Andrea Michelle Williams (Biology). Hearing no further corrections, the Provost called for the vote. **The motion was adopted.**

- IV. On behalf of the SACS Leadership Team M. Berheide presented the motion at the bottom of the Quality Enhancement Plan proposal (Attach. #63). Many parts of the SACS review process involve only certain areas, but this part of the review requires participation by all on campus. He then reviewed the process to this point.

S. Powell observed that the proposal rationale speaks of current policies as being punitive. He would like to see students more clearly accepting responsibility for their actions. According to M. Berheide this proposal suggests that the SACS Team step back further than that, and review theories of education, probation, etc. The motion is whether to even have this discussion. S. Powell also noted that the proposal contains no discussion about identifying students who have matriculated but do not belong at Berea. M. Berheide agreed that we might well address that point, but repeated that the proposal is about whether to discuss the entire issue or not. Of the twelve candidates, this suggestion received the most support from respondents to last month's campus-wide email.

In response to O. Keels, M. Berheide replied that the proposal would not make mo ot the necessity of approving the course for students on probation. However, the new course proposal would be regarded with some interest if this QEP were adopted.

B. Hoag expressed concern about the rationale and asked for clarification of what the faculty was being asked to approve. M. Berheide referred to the motion at the bottom of the proposal. When asked what part of the above program was being approved, M. Berheide explained the process in general: the team would be selected from the entire faculty, undertake a literature review, present their report, and begin a campus-wide discussion on developing a campus probation program. At this point there is no clear idea what the program would look like. The SACS Leadership Team feels that there is evidence that something isn't working with the current Academic Probation program. Identifying the problem(s) and responding to it/them would be the focus of the study. Concerned that the proposed topic affects only a small number of students, A. Lahamer expressed his preference for a QEP that would affect more people.

President Shinn reminded the faculty that similar conversations occurred during a 1996 yearlong study that found that Berea College was about average in the area of retention. Six months later, when the College had its worst retention rate ever, the committee identified 19 variables for the College to examine and improve. Some of those have been addressed and retention figures have improved. Considering the results of time spent on just a few of those items, it could prove beneficial to also strengthen the entire first-year program. This QEP could produce results and impact the entire curriculum.

B. Suder suggested striking the word 'adoption' and substituting 'initiate discussion.' Provost Porter stressed the need to move forward because of the timeline. At this point the Team needs to know whether this is the topic the faculty want to pursue for the QEP or not. If not, the Team will identify another project.

B. Hoag voiced his concern about the rationale's second paragraph and his desire for a more open-ended process rather than the assumption of a problem, diagnosis and solution. If approved, he fears the charge would be guided in part by the rationale. The rationale should simply state that this is an important issue. M. Berheide responded that if the rationale were being seen as restrictive, it should not be considered as part of the proposal. The proposal is simply to agree upon the issue to address.

D. Hudson noted that this topic includes the issue of suspension, affects a significant number of students, and has been a point of discussion over the past year. In response to A. Lahamer's suggestion that the EDGE program be the QEP issue, M. Berheide noted that EDGE had been a candidate but did not receive as much support as the probation and retention issue. J. Weckman explained the process further, noting that most people had not voted. Because it is important to have broad based participation she mentioned the option of slowing down the process.

O. Keels observed the confusion about exactly what would be approved and asked for clarification. He asked if approval of this proposal means approval to create a team to construct proposals to reduce students on probation. M. Berheide concurred that the faculty was being asked for their agreement that the College address the issue of probation and retention, and construct appropriate proposals that would be implemented after two years, and reported on after five years. L. Roecker suggested deleting the words "described above" from the motion. M. Berheide reinforced that the rationale is simply to provide reasons why this is a good project to select.

G. McKinney observed that since the process assumes there would be findings that would be acted upon, it is not truly open-ended. In light of that, SACS would not find it convincing if we report that we examined the issue and found everything was okay with no need for further action. While noting he doesn't think that would be our finding, M. Berheide mentioned that these could be experimental programs, open to future adjustment. Because this will involve all of us, in the long run we need more support for whatever issue we select. It needs to be something that everyone really feels deserves the time and attention necessary. In response to G. McKinney, he said SACS requires that, as a part of the proposal, we implement a plan. The plan itself would still be brought to the faculty for a vote.

B. Hoag suggested the following changes: strike the second paragraph of the rationale section, omit the last two sentences of first paragraph under "Initiation of the Project" (beginning with "For example, ...") and rewrite the first sentence of the same paragraph to read: "The goal of this QEP is to address questions about probation and retention and to consider ways of improving relevant policies and structures related to academic probation and retention at the College." The suggestion was considered a friendly amendment and included as part of the original motion. **Upon voice vote, the motion was adopted.**

V. G. Mahoney presented two items from the Executive Council for discussion and vote.

A. On the General Faculty ballot for Election of Committee Members (Attach. #64). Following nomination by K. Thomas, Ann Mary Quarandillo was added as an additional candidate for SPC. On the College Faculty ballot (Attach. #65) G. Mahoney indicated that the faculty should strike Jim Dontje's name from the slate. J. Blythe said that the nominating subcommittee would be willing to make an appointment to avoid forcing the solitary candidate into office. G. Mahoney instructed the faculty not to vote for the SGA Faculty Representative position listed on the ballot.

B. Nominations for Honorary Degree Candidates (Attach. #66 - distributed via email)

Having instructed the faculty to remove candidate #2 from the list (would be reconsidered at a later date), G. Mahoney placed in nomination the remaining names one at a time.

H. L. Gates - There was no discussion; **the motion was adopted.**

In reply to J. Baltisburger, G. Mahoney confirmed that, for various reasons, these nominations are open-ended; if not accepted this year they would be good for another future year. President Shinn noted that the College bestows one honorary degree at the December ceremony and two at the spring graduation. D. Nelson also noted that Gates had won the Weatherford-Hammond prize.

Eula Hall

O. Keels recalled that in a faculty discussion a few years ago on categorizing honorary degree candidates and service award winners, the focus for honorary degree candidates would be on their academic work, creative endeavor, etc. G. Mahoney replied that the criteria is one stage; the committee then goes through the supporting documentation looking at the criteria and forwards their recommendations to the Executive Committee, then to the faculty. **The motion was adopted.**

Liane Russell - There was no discussion; **the motion was adopted.**

Bishop Desmond Tutu - Following clarification about a previous nomination of Bishop Tutu that he declined to accept, **the motion was adopted.**

Billy Edd Wheeler - There was no discussion; **the motion was adopted.**

VI. L. Roecker presented items from the Academic Program Council for discussion and vote. He first requested unanimous consent to move items A-D as one; the faculty would discuss individual proposals but vote only once. Hearing no dissent, he moved the adoption of items A-D as listed in the agenda:

A. Proposal from the Sociology Dept. (Attach. #53, April 8, 2004 agenda) - no discussion

B. New Course Proposal from Political Science, Women's Studies and Black Studies (Attach. #54, April 8, 2004 agenda) - no discussion

C. Philosophy Curriculum Revision Proposal (Attach. #55, April 8, 2004 agenda) - no discussion

Religion Curriculum Revision Proposal (Attach. #56, April 8, 2004 agenda) - no discussion

D. Proposal from the Art Dept. (Attach. #57, April 8, 2004 agenda) - Two changes were noted by B. Boyce: The title of ART 2XX should read "Colonial and Modern Latin American Art" (p.1) and the course title in the first sentence of the final paragraph on p. 2 should read "ART 275, Pre-Columbian Latin American Art."

Following the two corrections, **the motion was adopted.**

E. L. Roecker presented the Proposal regarding Special Topics Courses for discussion and vote (Attach. #58, April 8, 2004 agenda).

B. Hoag expressed concern about the consequences of this proposal, that the logic of special topics courses would put APC out of business and that it would work against student planning. The proposal would allow departments to offer courses without informing the rest of the faculty, which would affect advising. He also found the rationale troubling, building on the

## **Appendix D**

Document Entitled *Agenda, May 7, 2004 Meeting of Board of Trustees Committee on Educational Policies.*



## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

Friday, May 7, 2004  
8:45 - 10:00 a.m.  
Draper Third Floor Conference Room

### AGENDA

#### I. Recurring and Consent Items (Trustee Action Required)

- Approval of Degree Candidates for May 2004 and September 2004 (EP-2)
- Recommendations for Honorary Degrees (material to be supplied at meeting)
- Faculty Promotions (EP-7)

Kathy Bullock to Professor  
Gary Mahoney to Professor  
Ed McCormack to Professor  
Roy Scudder-Davis to Professor

#### II. Policy and Strategy Items and Major Projects (Trustee Action Ultimately Required)

- None

#### III. Informational Reports and Discussion (Trustee Action not Required)

- Presentation of Quality Enhancement Plan for SACS Review (material to be supplied at meeting)
- Report on sabbatical leaves requested and approved for 2004-05 (A summary list will be supplied at the meeting)
- Core Program Preview: Focus on Berea College Students - Engagement, Inclusion, Achievement; Our Measures and their Meaning (BCP-2)



## **Appendix E**

Document Entitled *The Great Commitments of Berea College*



## THE GREAT COMMITMENTS OF BEREA COLLEGE

Berea College, founded by ardent abolitionists and radical reformers, continues today as an educational institution still firmly rooted in its historic purpose "to promote the cause of Christ." Adherence to the College's scriptural foundation, "God has made of one blood all peoples of the earth," shapes the College's culture and programs so that students and staff alike can work toward both personal goals and a vision of a world shaped by Christian values, such as the power of love over hate, human dignity and equality, and peace with justice. This environment frees persons to be active learners, workers, and servers as members of the academic community and as citizens of the world. The Berea experience nurtures intellectual, physical, aesthetic, emotional, and spiritual potentials and with those the power to make meaningful commitments and translate them into action.

To achieve this purpose, Berea College commits itself:

- To provide an educational opportunity primarily for students from Appalachia, black and white, who have great promise and limited economic resources.
- To provide an education of high quality with a liberal arts foundation and outlook.
- To stimulate understanding of the Christian faith and its many expressions and to emphasize the Christian ethic and the motive of service to others.
- To provide for all students through the labor program experiences for learning and serving in community, and to demonstrate that labor, mental and manual, has dignity as well as utility.
- To assert the kinship of all people and to provide interracial education with a particular emphasis on understanding and equality among blacks and whites.
- To create a democratic community dedicated to education and equality for women and men.
- To maintain a residential campus and to encourage in all members of the community a way of life characterized by plain living, pride in labor well done, zest for learning, high personal standards, and concern for the welfare of others.
- To serve the Appalachian region primarily through education but also by other appropriate services.

For more details, please visit

<<http://www.berea.edu/catalog/bereasstory.asp#greatcommitments>>



## **Appendix F**

Document Entitled *Survey of All Teaching Faculty*



**Survey of All Teaching Faculty  
April 2006, April 2008, April 2010**

**For the following set of student attributes, please consider first-year students only. Furthermore, think of those students you would consider to be in the bottom third of your classes. (If you have not taught first-year classes, please check here  and continue to the next set of ratings.**

*Rate your level of agreement with the following statements:*

Berea students: (First year, bottom third)	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Effectively organize their coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Effectively manage their time related to coursework completion.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Effectively read assigned texts.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. Complete assignments appropriately and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. Seek appropriate assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. Constructively use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. Demonstrate responsibility for learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. Are accountable for one's own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. Are self-motivated to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. Effectively set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. Are engaged learners.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. Have adequate study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. Have adequate test-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. Have adequate note-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. Have adequate stress management skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. Have adequate confidence in their academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. Understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Survey of All Teaching Faculty  
April 2006, April 2008, April 2010**

**For the following set of student attributes, please consider first-year students only. Furthermore, think of those students you would consider to be in the middle third of your classes. (If you have not taught first-year classes, please check here  and continue to the next set of ratings.**

*Rate your level of agreement with the following statements:*

Berea students: (First year, middle third)	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Effectively organize their coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Effectively manage their time related to coursework completion.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Effectively read assigned texts.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. Complete assignments appropriately and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. Seek appropriate assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. Constructively use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. Demonstrate responsibility for learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. Are accountable for one's own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. Are self-motivated to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. Effectively set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. Are engaged learners.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. Have adequate study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. Have adequate test-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. Have adequate note-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. Have adequate stress management skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. Have adequate confidence in their academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. Understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Survey of All Teaching Faculty  
April 2006, April 2008, April 2010**

**For the following set of student attributes, please consider first-year students only. Furthermore, think of those students you would consider to be in the top third of your classes. (If you have not taught first-year classes, please check here  and continue to the next set of ratings.**

*Rate your level of agreement with the following statements:*

Berea students: (First year, top third)	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Effectively organize their coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Effectively manage their time related to coursework completion.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Effectively read assigned texts.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. Complete assignments appropriately and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. Seek appropriate assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. Constructively use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. Demonstrate responsibility for learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. Are accountable for one's own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. Are self-motivated to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. Effectively set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. Are engaged learners.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. Have adequate study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. Have adequate test-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. Have adequate note-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. Have adequate stress management skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. Have adequate confidence in their academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. Understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Survey of All Teaching Faculty  
April 2006, April 2008, April 2010**

**For the following set of student attributes, please consider students other than first-year students only. Furthermore, think of those students you would consider to be in the bottom third of your classes.**

*Rate your level of agreement with the following statements:*

Berea students: (Students other than first-year, bottom third)	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Effectively organize their coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Effectively manage their time related to coursework completion.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Effectively read assigned texts.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. Complete assignments appropriately and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. Seek appropriate assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. Constructively use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. Demonstrate responsibility for learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. Are accountable for one's own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. Are self-motivated to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. Effectively set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. Are engaged learners.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. Have adequate study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. Have adequate test-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. Have adequate note-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. Have adequate stress management skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. Have adequate confidence in their academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. Understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Survey of All Teaching Faculty  
April 2006, April 2008, April 2010**

**For the following set of student attributes, please consider students other than first-year students only. Furthermore, think of those students you would consider to be in the middle third of your classes.**

*Rate your level of agreement with the following statements:*

Berea students: (Students other than first-year, middle third)	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Effectively organize their coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Effectively manage their time related to coursework completion.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Effectively read assigned texts.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. Complete assignments appropriately and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. Seek appropriate assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. Constructively use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. Demonstrate responsibility for learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. Are accountable for one's own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. Are self-motivated to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. Effectively set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. Are engaged learners.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. Have adequate study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. Have adequate test-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. Have adequate note-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. Have adequate stress management skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. Have adequate confidence in their academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. Understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Survey of All Teaching Faculty  
April 2006, April 2008, April 2010**

**For the following set of student attributes, please consider students other than first-year students only. Furthermore, think of those students you would consider to be in the top third of your classes.**

*Rate your level of agreement with the following statements:*

Berea students: (Students other than first-year, top third)	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Effectively organize their coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Effectively manage their time related to coursework completion.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Effectively read assigned texts.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. Complete assignments appropriately and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. Seek appropriate assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. Constructively use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. Demonstrate responsibility for learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. Are accountable for one's own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. Are self-motivated to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. Effectively set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. Are engaged learners.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. Have adequate study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. Have adequate test-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. Have adequate note-taking skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. Have adequate stress management skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. Have adequate confidence in their academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. Understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

## **Appendix G**

Document Entitled *Graduation Rates for New Freshman Matriculants*



**GRADUATION RATES FOR NEW FRESHMAN MATRICULANTS  
ENTERING FALL TERMS**

Percent of Original Class\* Graduated on or before September 1, 2005  
Lapsed Time in Years\*\* (Fall Term to Fall Term)

<u>Year Entered</u>	<u>1 Yr.</u>	<u>2 Yrs.</u>	<u>3 Yrs.</u>	<u>4 Yrs.</u>	<u>5 Yrs.</u>	<u>6 Yrs.</u>	<u>7 Yrs.</u>	<u>8 Yrs.</u>	<u>9 Yrs.</u>	<u>10 Yrs.</u>
1995	0	0	0.2	35.1	49.8	51.7	52.2	52.4	52.4	52.4
1996	0	0	0.0	31.6	46.7	49.7	51.3	51.5	51.5	
1997	0	0	0.2	29.2	46.8	49.3	50.0	50.2		
1998	0	0	0.7	38.9	60.4	62.6	63.0			
1999	0	0	0.2	35.5	60.8	61.9				
2000	0	0	0.5	39.9	59.6					
2001	0	0	0.1	45.0						
2002										
2003										
2004										
2005										
2006										
2007										
2008										
2009										
2010										

\*Students who withdraw and return are included in their original class.

\*\*If a student graduates mid-year, the additional fall term is counted as another year.



## **Appendix H**

### Documents Entitled

- *Number and Percentage of Entering New Freshman Who Go on Academic Probation During their First Year*
- *Number and Percentage of Degree-Seeking Fall Enrollment Who Go on Academic Probation During the Academic Year*



**Number and Percentage of Entering New Freshmen  
Who Go on Academic Probation During their First Year**

Entering Year (Number of New Freshmen)	Number and Percentage On Academic Probation During First Year
1998 (N = 415)	74 (17.8%)
1999 (N = 423)	97 (22.9%)
2000 (N = 421)	68 (16.2%)
2001 (N = 424)	84 (19.8%)
2002 (N = 356)	69 (19.4%)
2003 (N = 396)	76 (19.2%)
2004 (N = 400)	
2005 (N = 378)	
2006	
2007	
2008	
2009	
2010	

**Number and Percentage of Degree-Seeking Fall Enrollment\*  
Who Go on Academic Probation During the Academic Year**

Fall Term (Number of Degree- Seeking Students*)	Number and Percentage On Academic Probation During Academic Year
2001 (N = 1,618)	210 (13.0%)
2002 (N = 1,524)	176 (11.5%)
2003 (N = 1,511)	204 (13.5%)
2004 (N = 1,514)	
2005 (N = 1,523)	
2006	
2007	
2008	
2009	
2010	

\*Includes entering new freshmen.



## **Appendix I**

Document Entitled *Students on Academic Probation: Beginning and End of Term Surveys (GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)*



**Students on Academic Probation: Beginning of Term Surveys  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

**Beginning of Term Survey**

Dear #FirstName#,

One of the goals in the Office of Academic Services is offering appropriate support to students on academic probation. It is important that we understand as much as we can about our students who are on academic probation.

Therefore, I am asking that you fill out the survey (link below) within the next week. It will take about 15 minutes and it is completely anonymous. The survey should be completed by (fill in date).

The link to the survey is:  
#SurveyLink#

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Janice Blythe  
Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success

---

1. Because you are on academic probation, you were automatically enrolled in GST 101. Did you drop this course or are you still enrolled?

- a. I am still enrolled in GST 101
- b. I have dropped GST 101

For those still enrolled:

GST 101 Instructor:

For All Probation Students:

2. What is your classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

**Students on Academic Probation: Beginning of Term Surveys  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

3. To what extent did the following contribute to your academic performance that led to probation?

	To a great extent						Not at all
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Something about me.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Something about others.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Something about my situation.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. My own self-confidence, self-esteem, or psychological state.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. Un-engaging or inadequate teaching.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. My own lack of problem-solving skills (talking to teachers, seeking support, meeting academic obligations).	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. My own motivation/effort and the time I committed to studying.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. Poor or unclear advising.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. Life events that got in the way (family issues, illness, relationship problems).	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. Personal illness.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. My own lack of academic skills and knowledge.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. Poor learning environments (classmates).	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. I was taking too many courses.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. I did not have the prerequisites or the background needed to be successful in the course(s).	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. My instructor's standards were set so high, I had trouble meeting them.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. My instructor expected too much of me.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. Matters outside my control at the College (e.g. labor or residence hall).	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
r. Not understanding College requirements or consequences.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
s. I did not understand what my instructor wanted or expected.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
t. I needed more support from the instructor.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
u. I did not go to my instructor to ask for help.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Students on Academic Probation: Beginning of Term Surveys  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

3. To what extent did the following contribute to your academic performance that led to probation?, continued

	To a great extent						Not at all
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
v. Lack of clear guidance from my advisor.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
w. I did not follow my advisor's advice.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
x. Lack of effort on my part.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
y. Lack of particular skills (e.g. time management, task prioritization, writing, etc.)	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
z. Lack of general academic ability on my part.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
aa. Distractions – my involvement with other activities was too extensive.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ab. Difficulty in transitioning to College life.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ac. Inadequate class attendance.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ad. Not turning in homework assignments.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ae. Lack of personal college study skills.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
af. I thought my abilities and skills were sufficient, but they were not.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ag. I didn't realize how difficult college work would be.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ah. I didn't spend the time necessary to do good work.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ai. The textbooks were not available at the beginning of the term.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
aj. I did not know where to go to get help.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ak. I did not feel comfortable asking for help.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
al. I did not realize how much work it would take to succeed in college.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
am. I did not have much time to study because I went home every or most weekends.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
an. I did not have as much to study because I had another job off-campus.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
ao. Other, please describe _____	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Students on Academic Probation: Beginning of Term Surveys  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

4. Rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. I organize my coursework effectively.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. I manage my time related to coursework completion effectively.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. I read assigned texts effectively.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. I complete assignments fully and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. I seek assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. I use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. I am responsible for my own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. I am accountable for my own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. I motivate myself to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. I set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. I am engaged in my own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. I am confident in my study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. I am confident in my ability to take tests.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. I am confident in my ability to take notes.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
o. I am confident in my ability to manage stress.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. I am confident in my academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. I understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

5. Please briefly describe what you now know about achieving academic success. Give specific examples.

**Students on Academic Probation: Beginning of Term Surveys  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

6. What are you now doing to achieve academic success?
  
7. Describe your current attitude toward your academic work.
  
8. Overall, how can the College help you to achieve academic success?
  
9. What odds do you give yourself for graduating from Berea College?

100% Absolutely

90%

80%

70%

60%

50% Uncertain

40%

30%

20%

10%

0% Impossible

**Students on Academic Probation: End of Term Survey  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

**End of Term Survey**

Dear #FirstName#,

One of the goals in the Office of Academic Services is offering appropriate support to students on academic probation. You may recall that I sent you a survey in (fill in month) regarding your academic probation. I am now asking you to complete a similar survey so that we can see what changes have occurred since then.

Therefore, I am asking that you fill out the survey (link below) within the next week. It will take about 15 minutes and it is completely confidential. The survey should be completed by (fill in date).

The link to the survey is:  
#SurveyLink#

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Janice Blythe  
Associate Provost for Advising and Academic Success

- 
1. Because you are on academic probation, you were automatically enrolled in GST 101. Did you drop this course or are you still enrolled?
    - a. I am still enrolled in GST 101
    - b. I have dropped GST 101

For those still enrolled:

GST 101 Instructor:

For All Probation Students:

2. What is your classification?
  - Freshman
  - Sophomore
  - Junior
  - Senior

**Students on Academic Probation: End of Term Survey  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

3. To what extent did the following contribute to your academic performance that led to probation?

	To a great extent						Not at all
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Something about me.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Something about others.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. Something about my situation.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

4. Rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. I organize my coursework effectively.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. I manage my time related to coursework completion effectively.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. I read assigned texts effectively.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. I complete assignments fully and on time.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. I seek assistance in a timely manner.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
f. I use instructor feedback to improve.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
g. I am responsible for my own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
h. I am accountable for my own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
i. I motivate myself to learn and perform.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
j. I set goals and priorities related to coursework.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
k. I am engaged in my own learning.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
l. I am confident in my study skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
m. I am confident in my ability to take tests.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
n. I am confident in my ability to take notes.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**Students on Academic Probation: End of Term Survey  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

o. I am confident in my ability to manage stress.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
p. I am confident in my academic skills.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
q. I understand and cope with personal and family challenges.	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

5. Please briefly describe what you now know about achieving academic success. Give specific examples.

6. What are you now doing to achieve academic success?

7. Describe your current attitude toward your academic work.

8. Overall, how can the College help you to achieve academic success?

9. What odds do you give yourself for graduating from Berea College?

- 100% Absolutely
- 90%
- 80%
- 70%
- 60%
- 50% Uncertain
- 40%
- 30%
- 20%
- 10%
- 0% Impossible

**Students on Academic Probation: End of Term Survey  
(GST 101, Strategies for Academic Success)**

*For those still enrolled:*

9. My attendance in GST 101 has been about:

- 0 – 20%
- 21 – 40%
- 41 – 60%
- 61 – 80%
- 81 – 100%

10. Have you changed personally as a result of your experience in GST 101?

Yes, please describe the change. \_\_\_\_\_ No

11. Rate the effectiveness of each of the following in terms of how much it has contributed to your success in other classes?

	Extremely effective 7	6	5	4	3	2	Not at all 1
a. The GST 101 text	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. The GST 101 instructor	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. GST 101 writing assignments	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. GST 101 classroom activities	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
e. GST 101 discussions	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

13. Specifically, what did you find the most useful about this course?

14. What else would have been helpful to you in this course?

*For those who dropped the course:*

9. Why did you drop the course?



## **Appendix J**

Document Entitled *BC 101 Assessment Instrument: Example of Possible Items, Year 2*



## BC 101 Assessment Instrument: Example of Possible Items Year 2

*The actual assessment instrument will be constructed and administered by the faculty and staff coordinators in charge of BC 101.*

BC 101 formative assessment examples:

1. Please describe the strengths of this experience.
  
2. Please describe the weaknesses of this experience.
  
3. Do you have any suggestions for improvement to the experience? Please describe them below.
  
4. In general, how effective was this experience in helping you with the following skills?  
(The appropriate items will be selected for each BC 101 experience. These are examples.)

	Very Effective 5	4	3	2	Not at all Effective 1
Test taking skills	5	4	3	2	1
Time management skills	5	4	3	2	1
Study skills	5	4	3	2	1
Public speaking skills	5	4	3	2	1
Making presentations	5	4	3	2	1
Developing healthy personal relationships	5	4	3	2	1
Note taking skills	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding what plagiarism is and how to avoid it	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding how to set boundaries around themselves	5	4	3	2	1
Roommate issues	5	4	3	2	1
Handling stress	5	4	3	2	1
Becoming more motivated in my coursework	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding my preferred learning style	5	4	3	2	1
Understanding my own interests and values	5	4	3	2	1
Articulating my career goals	5	4	3	2	1