

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN Christian Brothers University

The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACSCOC) indicates that the *Quality Enhancement Plan* is an integral component of the reaffirmation of accreditation process and is derived from an institution's ongoing comprehensive planning and evaluation processes. It reflects and affirms a commitment to enhance overall institutional quality and effectiveness by focusing on an issue that the institution considers important to improving student learning outcomes and/or student success. The document submitted by the institution demonstrates that its *QEP* (a) has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes; (b) has broad-based support of institutional constituencies; (c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success; (d) commits resources to initiate, implement and complete the QEP; and (e) includes a plan to assess achievement.

CBU's QEP topic for 2020-2025 is **Community Engagement**. Building on a strong tradition and existing culture of community engagement, we will enhance opportunities for student community engagement by (1) increasing both the quality and quantity of student community-engagement experiences and (2) creating more tangible outputs of this engagement. In particular, our QEP will increase (1) high-impact, transformational learning experiences and (2) persistence in academic programs. We will assess the QEP by tracking both changes in campus programs themselves and the impact these changes have on retention and on student satisfaction and marketability after graduation. Our QEP implementation and assessment will depend on broad involvement of those on the CBU campus, as well as the surrounding community with which we are engaged.

In the following pages, we outline how Christian Brothers University (CBU) is attempting to meet the SACSCOC standards for the QEP.

CBU's QEP has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes;

In late 2015, consultants from the higher education consulting firm, Credo, identified four primary themes on which they believed CBU should focus in efforts to maximize the health of the university: People, Transformational Learning, Strategic Growth and Vitality, and Institutional Story. The QEP is derived from the latter three themes.

In the spring of 2016, CBU formed a Strategic Planning Team, consisting of vice-presidents, members of the faculty and staff, and the president, to spearhead the development of a five-year strategic plan for the university. Members of the Strategic Planning Team engaged individuals at

all levels of the campus community (i.e., students, faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees) in developing a five-year strategic plan (2017-2022) for the university. Thus, even during the strategic planning stage, the ideas that ultimately shaped the QEP were identified organically through dialog with groups of CBU constituents representing the entire campus community. A copy of *Pathways to Success: Christian Brothers University Strategic Plan 2017-2022* is included as a reference.

Through this dialog, the Strategic Planning Team defined the implementation of the three themes that are relevant to the QEP as follows:

Transformational Learning: All CBU students will have more high-impact, transformational learning experiences that foster personal growth and set them apart in graduate school and the job market. To achieve this, CBU will optimize our current learning spaces, and we will develop and expand our programs to meet student needs. The value and impact of all learning experiences, both in and out of the classroom, will be continuously assessed and improved.

Strategic Growth and Vitality: CBU will grow its number of students and significantly improve retention rates. CBU will optimize facilities and other support services necessary for success.

Institutional Story: CBU will articulate and cultivate a distinctive narrative of our Catholic and Lasallian institutional identity. This narrative will permeate the academic, social, and spiritual experiences of our students, faculty, staff, and alumni, and will constitute the foundation of the image of the University to our surrounding communities. Members of the CBU community will embody the Lasallian charism through engaged learning, personal and spiritual growth, and through investments of their time, talent, and treasure in the future of the institution. All members of the CBU community will be able to tell a clear, consistent, and comprehensive story of our University.

One of the four initiatives set under the “Institutional Story” theme was to “Create a Center for Community Engagement at CBU to coordinate, publicize, and track engagement efforts with and for students, alumni, faculty, and staff.” During the next two years (mid-2016 to mid-2018), under the guidance of Dr. Tim Doyle, Associate Vice President for Student Life (again with broad support of campus constituencies), the goal of creating a center for community engagement was molded into a specific plan.

In May 2018, CBU received a grant to establish the AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement on its campus. Members of the Strategic Planning Team recognized the value of

this resource in significantly enhancing student outcomes and student successes, particularly as they relate to CBU's mission and strengths.

CBU's QEP has broad-based support of institutional constituencies;

The CBU community recognized the potential for the center to enhance the quality of the student experience at CBU—to increase student learning and student outcomes. We also recognized that the structure and guidance provided, and the assessment required, in developing and executing a QEP presented an outstanding opportunity to maximize the impact of these efforts.

February 23, 2018: The Strategic Planning Steering Committee gave unanimous approval to a motion from committee member, Dr. Tracie Burke, to adopt the community engagement initiative as the university's QEP topic.

March 14, 2018: Dr. Paul Haught, Vice President for Academics and Student Life, brought the motion to Academic Council, which approved the topic unanimously.

March 26, 2018: Dr. Haught brought the motion before CBU's President's Cabinet. The Cabinet—which consists of CBU's president, all vice presidents, and academic deans, as well as the Associate VP for Student Life, Dean of Academic Services, President of Faculty Assembly, and Director of Human Resources—approved the motion unanimously.

April 5, 2018: Dr. James "Bru" Wallace, co-chair of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, made a motion to the Faculty Assembly¹ that community engagement be adopted as the topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan. Considerable formal discussion was held, and the motion was ultimately tabled for discussion at an extraordinary meeting of the Faculty assembly, to be scheduled prior to the end of the academic year. Considerable informal discussion took place throughout the CBU community prior to this extraordinary meeting.

April 19, 2018: Dr. Wallace re-introduced the motion at an extraordinary meeting of the Faculty Assembly. After further formal discussion, the motion passed by a vote of 31 to 3.

May 1, 2018: Dr. Haught informed the full Board of Trustees of the selection of the community engagement initiative as the university's QEP topic.

Since the formal approval of community engagement as the QEP topic, refinement of the QEP has involved interactions among faculty, staff, students, and administrators across campus. A QEP director was initially hired from within CBU shortly after the topic was widely approved.

¹ Note that CBU has a faculty assembly, rather than a faculty senate or other representation-based system of faculty governance. All members of the faculty are invited and encouraged to actively participate in the Faculty Assembly.

This individual left CBU early in the fall semester, and the current director, Dr. Jeff Sable, took over in October 2018. Dr. Sable immediately began working with Dr. Haught, Dr. Tim Doyle (Associate VP for Student Life), and Dr. Leslie McAbee (Director of the AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement) to refine the QEP topic into a more specific plan. QEP Liaisons were appointed by the deans of each of the CBU colleges and schools (College of Adult Professional Studies, School of Arts, School of Business, School of Engineering, and School of Sciences) to facilitate communication between Dr. Sable and the faculty in each of these campus groups. Representatives of other campus groups, such as the directors of the Honors Program and of Career Services, have been actively involved in the process, as have the co-chair of the CBU Strategic Planning Committee and the immediate past QEP director.

On September 16, 2019, an initial rough draft of the full QEP was shared with the entire campus community in a link shared via the following e-mail:



Dear Fellow Members of the CBU Community,

During the 2019-2020 academic year, CBU is going through the process of evaluation for re-accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACSCOC). This process requires us to propose a Quality Enhancement Plan—or QEP—for the University. If approved by SACSCOC, we will implement and assess the plan over at the next 5 years.

The QEP topic, which has been identified and refined over the course of the last couple of years, is **Community Engagement**. Community engagement is already something that abounds at CBU. The goal of the QEP is to improve the extent to which community engagement *increases student learning outcomes and student success*. This goal is embedded in our 5-year strategic plan (2017-2022) and the AutoZone Center for Community Engagement is at its core.

An initial, rough draft of the QEP is available [at this link](#). We would like input from the entire campus community (including students, staff, faculty, and administrators) as we refine the QEP into a final document to be submitted to SACSCOC early in the spring semester.

If you are so inclined, please take a look and share your thoughts—with your friends, your colleagues, your teachers, your students, members of your organization, and with me. While I am coordinating this document, it is CBU's plan and CBU's story. If your organization, class, or office does an activity that should be listed in our existing activities, please let me know! If you have an idea for something to add to the plan, please let me know that, too! If you know of research that supports what we are doing and/or planning, please point that out to me so we might add it to the literature review! I would be glad to meet with you, to attend a meeting of your school or organization, or to otherwise facilitate communication about CBU's plan for Community Engagement!

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge and thank just a few of the people who already are immersed in the QEP process. Drs. **Leslie McAbee** (Director of the AutoZone Center for Community Engagement) and **Tim Doyle** (Associate VP of Student Life) have shown incredible dedication in the ongoing process of compiling the literature review! Drs. **Leslie McAbee**, **Tim Doyle**, **Scott Geis** (immediate past QEP director), **Bru Wallace** (Co-Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee), and **Tracie Burke** (Honors Program Director), as well as **Amy Ware** (Director of Career Services) and everyone in the **Office of Academics** have provided outstanding support and input in the QEP development process thus far. Also, the **Office of Communications and Marketing** designed the beautiful QEP logo that adorns the top of this email!

Finally, I would like to recognize the QEP Liaisons from each School and College:

- College of Adult Professional Studies: **Margaret Coleman** and **Steve Rivera**
- School of Arts: **Federico Gomez-Uroz** and **Kelly James**
- School of Business: **Andy Morgret** and **Bev Vitali**
- School of Engineering: **Divya Choudhary** and **Falih Ahmad**
- School of Sciences: **Cecilia Garrison** and **David Dawson**

Many thanks and I look forward to a rich dialog about our QEP over the course of the semester!

Jeffrey J. Sable, Ph.D.

(901) 321-3353

jsable@cbu.edu

Following this, dialog continued around the CBU community about various aspects of the QEP. A specific effort was made to solicit input from students through the Coordinator of Student Activities and the president of the Student Government Association (SGA). The SGA president invited Dr. Sable to a meeting with student presidents of campus organizations, where he gave a

brief presentation on (followed by discussion about) the QEP and opportunities for students to provide input during its development. Dr. McAbee was involved in this exchange, as well.

CBU's QEP focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success;

The specific student learning outcomes and student successes targeted by the QEP have been derived from the themes listed above, which were identified through CBU's strategic planning process. In particular, there are two broad goals:

“All CBU students will have more high-impact, transformational learning experiences that foster personal growth and set them apart in graduate school and the job market.” This is from the Transformational Learning theme.

“CBU will ... significantly improve retention rates.” This is from the Strategic Growth and Vitality theme.

With the QEP, CBU will increase the quality and quantity of student opportunities for and tangible outcomes of community engagement. The value of community engagement in meeting these goals is heavily supported by research. A review of this research follows.

“All CBU students will have more high-impact, transformational learning experiences that foster personal growth and set them apart in graduate school and the job market.”

CBU's community engagement initiatives will provide high-impact, transformational learning experiences

Service Learning and other Community-Engaged (CE) Practices have consistently been defined as high-impact learning experiences in the scholarly literature (Kuh, 2008; Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Kuh, O'Donnell, & Reed 2013). These learning practices enable institutions to strategically connect students' diverse and otherwise distinct college experiences into a coherent learning practice across all facets of the university (Wawrzynski & Baldwin 2014). The various forms of CE (i.e. service-learning, internships, research and creative activity, social entrepreneurship, co-curricular service projects and initiatives) invite myriad opportunities for integrated and campus-wide implementation of high impact practices (HIPS).

Practitioners and researchers of these approaches continue to examine how combining community engagement practices with other HIPS can foster student learning (McReynolds 2014). The HIPS identified by George Kuh and championed by the Association of American

Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) include first-year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research and creative activity, diversity/global learning, internships, capstone courses and projects, and, more recently, ePortfolios, which encourage students to synthesize their academic experiences and knowledge (Kuh 2008; Hubert, Picavance, & Amanda Hyberger 2015).

For decades, scholars have identified HIPs as impactful instruments of student learning and educational outcomes, ones that transform students' ways of thinking and engaging with others. For this reason, HIPs have long been cited as key to transformative learning theory, a focus of CBU's current strategic plan (2020), that guides students to evaluate and—where needed—revise their perspectives (Cranton 2006). This approach encourages students to make sense of incongruous or diverse experience and to then develop perspectives that engage in complex, inclusive, and discerning thought (Mezirow 2000). Providing academic and co-curricular CE opportunities for students increases their exposure to situations that challenge their assumptions and points of view. Critical reflection, a crucial learning component of CE work, allows students to process their experiences in a structured and supportive way.

In terms of student success and retention, proponents of HIPs have long claimed significant benefits in this area, though recent scholarship has called for further inquiry into these claims (Johnson 2018). Kuh and Kinzie (2018) maintain that how HIPs are designed and implemented determines their effectiveness; offering carefully-crafted HIP opportunities (whether required or not) that fit the students and identity of an institution (and that are tracked and measured) will likely lead to positive effects. Indeed, in Finley and McNair's (2013) research, they observed that underserved students greatly benefited from experiences through HIPs, this being especially true when participating in more than one HIP (Finley & McNair 2013). This effect, however, depends on prioritizing high-quality and equity-focused engaged learning experiences.

CBU's community engagement initiatives will foster personal growth

Over the last three decades, research has demonstrated a number of personal and academic benefits that stem from CE practices. These include increased civic engagement, personal identity development, enhanced moral reasoning, intercultural competence, and leadership skills (Clayton, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2013; Eyler & Giles, 1999). In a large body of research from the early 2000s, researchers examined service-learning students' positive behavioral outcomes, such as development in empathy (Lundy 2007), motivation to study (Flournoy 2007), competency in confronting social issues (Lee, Olszewski-Kubilius, Donahue, & Weimholt 2008), and, more generally, life skills (Astin & Sax 1998).

In a large-scale study, Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee (2010) examined a national sample of undergraduate students, totaling 22,236, to determine whether service-learning positively impacts academic performance, values, self-efficacy, leadership, choice of a service career, and plans to participate in service after college. The results suggested that community engagement (as part of a service-learning course), did not significantly impact the measures related to personal development (interpersonal skills, self-efficacy, and leadership). However, Yorio and Ye (2012) argue that positive or negative changes for “personal insight” measures are ambiguous. Increased levels of confidence and self-perception would certainly seem to be a desirable outcome, but students’ self-reporting that they experience no change or a decrease in these areas may mean that students gained a more realistic sense of their abilities and could thereby benefit professionally from their increased self-knowledge.

Key insights that led to the connection between student development and community service (as it was known then) appeared in texts from the 1970s and ‘80s such as Astin’s 1977 *Four Critical Years: Effects of College on Beliefs, Attitudes, and Knowledge*. While focusing on changes in personal value markers such as religious affiliation, he detected differences between outcomes driven by variables such as race, sex and academic ability, as well as an institution’s religious affiliation. He reports how participation in service work can support positive outcomes across these variables relatively early.

He updated the work with *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited* in 1993, broadening his study of “how undergraduate students are affected by their college experiences,” outlining “how the environmental characteristics and the experiences of involvement” affect the trajectory of students’ lives after their undergraduate years. Political affiliation, values, career choices and religiosity are, according to Astin, shaped by a student’s experience at an institution. A student may accept or reject new influences that are curricular or co-curricular, but effects of the exposure may be lifelong.

Subsequent work by him has continued to develop these insights. The research supporting the ability of Community Engaged Learning (CEL) to advance the personal development of university students is compelling. Research focusing on 11 designated learning outcomes determined that “service participation” (of any kind) showed statistically significant positive effects for all of them (Astin et al. 2000). The authors cluster them into six categories: academic performance (GPA, writing skills, critical thinking skills); values (commitment to activism and to promoting racial understanding); self-efficacy; leadership (leadership activities; self-rated leadership ability; interpersonal skills); choosing a service career; and participating in service after college. Subsequent studies have replicated these results using different samples and methodologies.

This study from 2000 indicated the varying effects curricular and co-curricular CE experiences have on promoting student learning. Specifically, CE as part of a course adds significantly to the eight learning outcomes other than “interpersonal skills,” “self-efficacy” and “leadership,” the latter two outcomes being only borderline positive. Unsurprisingly, curricular CE experiences were most beneficial for the “academic performance” outcomes, particularly “writing skills.” Additionally, CE’s lifelong legacy and greatest effect is the increased likelihood of participants choosing a service field for their careers, “regardless of whether the student’s freshmen career choice is in a service field, a non-service field, or ‘undecided.’”

Parallel work by scholars such as Vince Tinto, Pascarella, Terenzini clustered around student attrition, retention and resilience, with their eventual endorsement of practices such as CEL as avenues to improve student retention. Specifically, Tinto’s 1975 article, “Dropout from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research,” he outlines the now standard distinction between students academically dismissed from those voluntarily dropping out (90). Drawing on Durkheim’s “Theory of Suicide” (summarized by Tinto as “... suicide is more likely to occur when individuals are insufficiently integrated into the fabric of society...”), he theorizes that individuals must integrate into both the academic and social systems equally to be successful through graduation. After considering family background, individual characteristics, and past educational experiences and goal commitment as sequenced factors shaping the likelihood of success, he establishes that these *in toto* influence expectational development, which he characterizes as “a process that leads children of higher status backgrounds to expect more of themselves, other things being equal, than do children from lower status backgrounds.” (103)

For Tinto, these inputs interact with the higher education environment a new student enters. Academic systems affect dropouts through “grade performance: and “intellectual development,” with significant differences for males and females (106). Instructional techniques that maximize either or both of these measures increase the probability of a student being retained.

Equally influential for student success, according to Tinto, is the successful social system integration of students. Specifically, he asserts that “social integration occurs primarily through informal peer group associations, semi-formal extracurricular activities, and interaction with faculty and administrative personnel within the college” (107). The “social rewards” a student gleans from each of these categories shapes the individual’s perception of the value of their education when measured against the costs of attendance. Thus, using Tinto’s theoretical model, “community engaged” activities, as a group, would reinforce both the academic and social factors promoting retention. The formal instruction associated with CEL and the more informal learning that takes place in co-curricular CE experiences reinforce the interpersonal bonds, both among students themselves and with faculty or administrators.

Tinto deepens his analysis and revises his thoughts on student retention in a stream of books and articles from the late 1970s into the 1990s. *His Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition* (originally published 1987, revised 1994), draws on the earlier work while committing to the notion that enduring retention is earned by conveying to students an institution's commitment to their education, rather than merely retaining them. He calls specifically for colleges and universities to live up to their missions, while recognizing that some student will leave them for reasons outside of their responsibility. He stresses the critical role "outside the classroom" interactions (187), ranging from CEL to casual encounters in mail rooms, dining halls or social events as well as formal transitional orientation and institutionally ritualized programming.

Kuh's research themes suggested in his earlier work has specifically focused on the opportunity CEL offers students. In his seminal report, *High-Impact Educational Practices* (2008), Kuh reports that CEL is one of the most effective methods to promote the personal growth of students. This is particularly true for CBU since within the past five years it has emerged as a majority-minority institution, with an approximately 40% white, 30% African-American, 20% Latino/unknown student body, with the balance being Asian or multiracial. Service-learning correlates strongly with deep learning and personal development for both first-year and senior-level undergraduates (the populations targeted by NSSE). Significantly, 'historically underserved students tend to benefit more' from engaged pedagogies, like service-learning, than majority students do, although these practices are 'high-impact' for all types of students (p. 17).

And finally for Kuh, his survey of trends among the various "high impact learning practices" bruited by educators, "High-Impact Practices and the First-Year Student," (New Directions for Institutional Research, August, 2014) concluded that CEL's ability to catalyze student development appears conclusive. By examining the metadata, he determined that CEL was positively associated with promoting moral judgment (King & Mayhew, 2002) and growth in critical thinking, classroom engagement, writing skills, GPA, understanding of the world, one's personal values, and commitment to racial understanding and activism (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000). Additionally, this review found substantial quantitative evidence of the positive effects of CEL regarding identity development, spiritual growth, moral development, and self-efficacy, interpersonal development, leadership and communication skills, promoting cultural and racial understanding, social responsibility and commitment to service along with academic learning (Eyler & Giles, 2001).

These clusters of developmental benefits align closely to CBU's stated mission and strategic goal of "transformational learning" with the added benefit, according to Kuh's survey, of higher retention rates until graduation (Gallini & Moely, 2003; Nigro & Farnsworth, 2009). These findings directly replicate a number of more recent studies using different samples and methodologies, indicated improved "resiliency" and hence "retention" until graduation.

Table 1

Relationships between Selected High-Impact Activities, Deep Learning, and Self-Reported Gains

	Deep Learning	Gains General	Gains Personal	Gains Practical
First-Year				
Learning Communities	+++	++	++	++
Service Learning	+++	++	+++	++
Senior				
Study Abroad	++	+	++	
Student-Faculty Research	+++	++	++	++
Service Learning	++	+++	+++	++
Senior Culminating Experience	++	++	+++	++

+ p < .001, ++ p < .001 & Unstd B > .10, +++ p < .001 & Unstd B > .30

Table 2

Relationships between Selected High-Impact Activities and Clusters of Effective Educational Practices

	Level of Academic Challenge	Active and Collaborative Learning	Student-Faculty Interaction	Supportive Campus Environment
First-Year				
Learning Communities	++	+++	+++	++
Service Learning	++	+++	+++	++
Senior				
Study Abroad	++	++	++	+
Student-Faculty Research	+++	+++	+++	++
Service Learning	++	+++	+++	++
Senior Culminating Experience	++	++	+++	++

+ p < .001, ++ p < .001 & Unstd B > .10, +++ p < .001 & Unstd B > .30

Source: *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter* by George D. Kuh, (Washington, DC: AAC&U, 2008). For information and more resources and research from LEAP, see www.aacu.org/leap.

Furthermore, he details how CEL adds significantly to the benefits associated with community service for all outcomes except “interpersonal skills,” “self-efficacy” and “leadership,” the results of these last two outcomes being borderline.

As mentioned above, perhaps the most long-term benefit of CEL is how it shapes the student’s subsequent working life. Kuh corroborates Astin et al. (2000) conclusion that service activities in higher education positively impacts a student’s choice to pursue a service-related field. While the exact mechanism remains elusive, Kuh does speculate that the key to community engagement in general as a highly effective educational practice is that students will discuss their experiences with each other and that students will receive emotional support from faculty. When probing CE, Kuh discerns value in any form of community work, but his research and analysis of others’ suggests that CEL is much more likely to generate discussions between students than purely volunteer/co-curricular interactions.

Kuh addresses where CEL should appear in a student's educational experience for the maximum benefit according to the research: "The single most important factor associated with a positive service-learning experience appears to be the student's degree of interest in the subject matter. Subject matter interest is an especially important determinant of the extent to which (a) the service experience enhances understanding of the "academic" course material, and (b) the service is viewed as a learning experience. These findings provide strong support for the notion that service learning should be included in the student's major field." Rather than being transitory experiences in initial "General Education" courses, CEL work in the student's major field and presumably career track, according to Kuh, is determinative.

The extent co-curricular community engagement affects the development of students in American higher education remains largely undetermined. When compared to the emerging industry of tracking curricular effects on students, the key mechanisms and limits to non-academic community engagement are poorly understood. For example, two articles (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999) among others demonstrate the proven albeit limited results from single courses on a range of student learning outcomes while acknowledging the existence of co-curricular learning possibilities. Eyler and Giles (1999, originally cited in Keen & Hall, 2009) revealed that single, one-semester CEL courses had "significant, consistent, and modest effects on student personal, civic, cognitive and academic outcomes in multi-campus pre-and post-tests" (Keen & Hall, 2009), yet makes only passing reference to "non-course-based programs that include a reflective component and learning goals" (p. 5) that occurred but were not reviewed.

Yet the limited research regarding co-curricular community engagement suggests it benefits students and may even surpass the transformative effects of CEL in certain areas. Rockenbach, Hudson and Tuchmayer (2014) suggest that students engaging in academic or program based community engagement, while providing external ongoing benefits including "vocational clarity" and "advancement," does not show significant internalized gains for "compassion" and "consciousness," unlike the ongoing benefits of purely non-academic/co-curricular engagement. In an earlier larger, longitudinal study, Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, and Yee (2000) compared the effects of classroom-based service-learning and other forms of community service. Students who participated in at least one CEL course and at least one co-curricular activity with a reflective component were more likely to demonstrate personal and academic growth that lasted through the end of the senior year than were students who participated only in academic service-learning (41–42; originally cited in Keen & Hall, 60). Thus, non-academic community engagement is at least additive and perhaps distinctively superior in some aspects for promoting student learning when compared to purely academic CEL.

The success of a community engagement program—both curricular and co-curricular—seems to be tying the experience to reflection post-engagement. This intentional process intensifies the

developmental effect of whatever community engaged work occurred (Keen & Hall, 76), particularly in dialogue between peers as well as people along the way (such as the people they engage on site, supervisors, and campus community). These peer discussions allow participants to understand their experience and reframe their sense of self within a wider society.

For CBU's purposes, these insights are critical. Our diverse student body participates in a range of existing activities ranging from volunteerism to philanthropy, yet we currently do not routinely offer a reflective experience. Additionally, much of the community engagement has been through complex, one-visit service activities that contained little to no contact with those in the community and only minimal reflection, if any. Instead of promoting student development or pursuing articulated learning outcomes, the activities had a "check the box" or photo-op purpose, often at significant expense and herculean effort. The research on such non-academic activities demonstrates that, absent the reflection and contact with whomever the students may have met on-site, the experience would bear little to no benefit for participants.

CBU's community engagement initiatives will set students apart for post-baccalaureate education and for jobs—both in terms of making them more attractive as candidates and in having a relationship with enhanced performance or other desirable characteristics

Much of the early research on community engagement focused on abstract personal qualities (intercultural competence, confidence, civic development, critical thinking, etc.) as well as in-college impact (engagement, retention). Only recently have scholars begun addressing the long-term impact of CE after leaving the university, in part because only recently has the long-term data become available.

Researchers have found that significant participation in Community-Engaged Practices impacts a student's career in multiple ways. First, perhaps most directly, student participation in CE shapes their career choices, and a number of studies show that CE opens students to career exploration, both influencing their opinions of certain fields (Karlsson, 2016; McElhaney, 1998; Tartter, 1996) and often determining the career that they eventually choose (Smedick, 1996; Smith Korfmacher, 1999; Warchal & Ruiz, 2004; Mitchell and Rost-Banik, 2019). In these career decisions, students invested in CE practices have also tended toward socially-engaged careers (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). In a case study particularly applicable to CBU, Fenzel and Peyrot (2005) focused on students at a Catholic liberal arts college, examining the post-graduate impact of CE practices among undergraduate students, and found a significantly higher percentage in a public-service career field ("education, nonprofit, government, health care, [or] social work") (Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005, p.26). This trend was all the more likely if alumni had completed at least 40 hours of service *and* had taken a service-learning course as an undergraduate.

Using both qualitative and quantitative approaches, scholars have also found that CE practices can impact post-graduate employment in terms of starting wages, promotion, time to find employment, etc. The largest study (Dofrman, Matthews, Wu 2014) used data from over 500 students to model the economic impact of CE. While they found no significant differences in time to employment, they did find a number of economic benefits for students who were involved in CE practices:

- A higher percentage of CE students had full-time employment.
- CE students averaged \$6,500 higher in starting salaries.
- CE students received their first raises significantly more quickly.

While quantitative research of this kind is in the beginning stages, these early results suggest that CE practices have a significant economic impact for students.

Finally, there have been a number of studies focused on employment benefits of CE practices in specific fields, including education (Meaney, Housman, Cavazos, & Wilcox 2012) nursing (Thacker 2005; Tanner 2010), engineering (Huff, Zoltowski, & Oakes 2015), graphic design (Zatz 2013), social work (Hansen, Muñoz, Crist, Gupta, Ideishi, Primeau, & Tupé 2007, and business (Caza, Brower, & Wayne 2015). Students' success in these fields may be due, in part, to the development of skills ("communication skills, problem-solving skills, and research skills" in service-learning courses that contribute to career preparation (Hok-ka et al. 2016, p.52).

Less research has been conducted on CE students who choose graduate school rather than entering the career field after their baccalaureate. As in the case of job placement, studies have suggested that CE practices can influence students' decision to pursue graduate studies, which may in part be due to students' greater appreciation of course material that is enhanced through community knowledge (Raykov & Taylor 2018). Scholars have also shown that CE practices can be an effective way of encouraging underrepresented students to pursue STEM careers (Hundley et al., 2011; Parker 2019). Incorporating community-engaged service projects (one each semester, in the case of Parker 2019) form part of a system of research experiences that encourage underrepresented students to pursue graduate level studies.

“CBU will ... significantly improve retention rates.”

As with personal growth, community engagement has been shown to positively impact students' academic success in a number of ways. CE practices help students acquire the kinds of academic skills that make them more successful in college, including higher-order thinking skills like critical thinking and thinking across academic disciplines (Jameson, Clayton, Ash 2013; Warren 2012; Eyler and Giles 1999; Ash et al. 2005; Grossman 2008; and Steinke and Fitch 2003) found that highly structured, scaffolded design of Service-Learning courses, in particular, contributed to higher level learning and that an emphasis on student feedback and opportunities for students

to rethink their responses to community engagement experiences led them to evaluate their thinking through metacognition. A key tool of eliciting these learning outcomes is critical reflection, which promotes meaning making that links the service experience with the course material and--when well-designed--can promote students' critical thinking skills (Jameson, Clayton., & Ash 2013).

Perhaps in part because of this skill development, CE practices have also been shown to lead to a higher level of degree completion. Traditional measures of student success (year-to-year retention, GPA, and completion rates) also suggest that thoughtfully designed CE programming positively impacts students in the areas listed above (Cress, Burack, Giles, Elkins, & Stevens, 2010). Out of the plentiful studies of Service-Learning practice, for instance, researchers have consistently found that students show a greater likelihood of persistence from term to term when part of community-engaged courses, particularly for students in their 3rd year (Reed, S.C., Rosenberg, H., Statham, A., & Rosing, H. 2015). The persistence effect of S-L courses occurs regardless of students' "entering characteristics," such as income level, financial aid status, etc.; in short, students' community-engaged learning experiences supersede students' pre-college status or experiences as strong predictors for student retention (Lockeman & Peleo 2013).

Other categories of student success, such as communication skills and cultural competency, etc., correlate with student involvement in CE activities. The development of these life skills prepares students for becoming fully functional and socially responsible adults (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1999; Fenzel & Peyrot, 2005).

Relatedly, researchers have demonstrated that these effects are particularly salient for students from underrepresented groups, who face higher attrition rates than White students in higher education (Sweat, Jones, Han, and Wolfgram 2013). From multi-faceted community engagement programs to service-learning courses available across the disciplines, these high-impact practices promise significant academic gains and higher retention rates for underrepresented students (Maruyama, G.M., Furco, A., & Song, W. 2017). Community-engaged scholarship programs and Service-Learning courses have been found to increase opportunities for social integration, a key factor for retention of underrepresented, part-time, and commuter students, whose feelings of inclusion and integration on campus increase the likelihood of students' re-enrollment. Combining community engagement practices with a Learning Living Community, which has been found to be a major contributor to retention, likely enhances re-enrollment, as well (Reed, Rosenberg, Statham, Rosing 2015; Caruso, Bowen, Adams-Dunford 2005).

However, researchers warn that a failure to address the specific needs of underrepresented students can negatively impact student success and retention rates (Song, W., Furco, A., Lopez, I., & Maruyama, G. 2017). One consideration pertains to students' relationship to the community

in which they work, as these students may be prepared for work in communities they know well, which may not be case for non-underrepresented students. Without acknowledging or addressing differences in students' experience in the CEL classroom or service experience, underrepresented students may feel all the more marginalized.

Indeed, institutional self-assessments of attitudes and practices concerning equity can produce data that reveal campus-wide areas for improvement and awareness. In turn, this can prompt renewed and intentional efforts to support traditionally underserved students (Bensimon 2005). One such effort might include recognizing and awarding faculty and staff who create community-engagement opportunities for students and the University more generally. Including CE practices as a factor in tenure review, for example, can encourage faculty and instructors--particularly African American women faculty who show high involvement in CE--to enhance their efforts and therefore reduce the impediments for student access to CE programming (Wheatle and BrackaLorenz 2015).

References for Literature Review

- Ash, Sarah, Patti H. Clayton, and Maxine P. Atkinson. "Integrating Reflection and Assessment to Capture and Improve Student Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol.11, no. 2, 2005, pp. 49-60.
- Astin, Alexander W. and Linda J. Sax. "How undergraduates are affected by service participation." *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 39, no. 3, 1998, pp. 251-263.
- Astin, Alexander W., Lori J. Vogelgesang, Elaine K. Ikeda, and Jennifer A. Yee. "How service learning affects students." *Higher Education*, Paper 144, 2000, Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered/144>.
- Bensimon, E. M. "Closing the achievement gap in higher education: An organizational learning perspective." *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2005, pp. 99-111, doi:[10.1002/he.190](https://doi.org/10.1002/he.190).
- Caruso, Robert, Glenn Bowen, and Jane Adams-Dunford. "Student Affairs and Service Learning: Promoting Student Engagement." *College Student Affairs Journal*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2006, pp 186-198.
- Caza, Arran, Holly H. Brower, Julie H. Wayne. "Effects of a holistic, experiential curriculum on business students' satisfaction and career confidence." *The International Journal of Management Education*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2015, pp. 75-83.
- Clayton, P. H., R. G. Bringle, and J. A. Hatcher (Eds.) *Research on service-learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2013.
- Cranton, P. *Professional development as transformative learning: new perspectives for teachers of adults*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2006.
- Cress, Christine M., Cathy Burack, Dwight E. Giles, Jr., Julie Elkins, Margaret C. Stevens. (2010) *A Promising Connection: Increasing College Access and Success through Civic*

- Engagement*. Boston: Campus Compact, 2010. <https://kdp0143vw6z2dlw631ififc5-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/large/2015/04/A-Promising-Connection-corrected.pdf>
- Dofrman, Jeffrey H., Paul Matthews, Xuedong Wu. “The Employment Impacts of Service-Learning Classes.” *Agricultural and Applied Economics Association (AAEA)*, Conference Paper for AAEA Annual Meeting, July 27-29, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2014.
- Eyler, J., and D. E. Giles, Jr. “Where’s the learning in service-learning?” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 6, no. 1, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999, pp 142-143.
- Eyler, J. S., D. E. Giles, Jr., and J. Braxton. “The Impact of Service-Learning on College Students.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 4, 1997, pp. 5-15.
- Fenzel, L.M., and M. Peyrot. “Comparing college community participation and future service behaviors and attitudes.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2005, pp. 23–31.
- Finley, Ashley and Tia McNair. “Assessing underserved students’ engagement in high-impact practices.” *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, 2013, Accessed 10 Aug. 2019, <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/87004/AssessingUnderservingStudents.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.
- Flournoy, C. “Investigative reporting and service learning.” *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, vol. 62, no. 1, 2007, pp. 47-61.
- Grossman, Robert. “Structures for facilitating student reflection.” *College Teaching*, vol.16, 2008, pp.15-22.
- Hansen, A. M. W., J. Muñoz, P. A. Crist, J. Gupta, R. I. Ideishi, L. A. Primeau, and D. Tupé. “Service learning: Meaningful, community-centered professional skill development for occupational therapy students.” *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, vol. 21, no. 1-2, 2007, pp. 25-49.
- Hok-ka, C., C. Wing-fung, and A. Cheung-ming. “The Long-Term Impact of Service-Learning on Graduates’ Civic Engagement and Career Exploration in Hong Kong.” *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 20, no. 4, 2016, pp. 37-56. Retrieved from <http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/jheoe/article/view/1755/972>.
- Hubert, David, Jason Pickavance, and Amanda Hyberger. “Reflective ePortfolio: One HIP to Rule Them All?” *peerReview*, vol. 17, no. 4, 2015.
- Huff, James L., Carla B. Zoltowski, and William C. Oakes. “Preparing engineers for the workplace through Service Learning: Perceptions of EPICS Alumni.” *Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 105, no. 1, 2015.
- Hundley, Stephen P. et al. “Developing a STEM talent expansion pipeline in higher education: a work in progress.” *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers*, Proceedings of PICMET ’11: Technology Management in the Energy Smart World, Portland, OR, USA, 2011.

- Jameson, J. K., P. H. Clayton, and S. L. Ash. "Conceptualizing, assessing, and investigating academic learning in service learning." *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment. Volume 2a: Students and faculty*, edited by P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher, Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2013, pp. 85-110.
- Johnson, Sarah R. "Academic engagement and student success: do high impact practices mean higher graduation rates?" *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 89, no. 5, 2018, pp.753-781.
- Karlsson, Claire. "Assessment of career development in community-based learning: a case study among American university students." *The International Undergraduate Journal for Service-Learning Leadership, and Social Change*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2016, pp. 22-35.
- Keen, C., and K. Hall. "Engaging with Difference Matters: Longitudinal Student Outcomes of Co-Curricular Service-Learning Programs." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 80, 2009, pp. 59-79.
- Kuh, G. *High-impact educational practices: what they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2008.
- Kuh, G. and Jillian Kinzie. "What really makes a 'High-Impact' Practice high impact?" *Inside Higher Ed*, 2018, <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2018/05/01/kuh-and-kinzie-respond-essay-questioning-high-impact-practices-opinion>.
- Kuh G. D., O'Donnell, K., & Reed, S. *Ensuring quality and taking high-impact practices to scale*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013.
- Lee, S.Y., P. Olszewski-Kubilius, R. Donahue, and K. Weimbolt. "The civic leadership institute: a service-learning program for academically gifted youth." *Journal of Advanced Academics*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2008, pp.272-308.
- Lockeman, K. and L. Peleo. "The relationship between service-learning and degree completion." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 20, no.1, 2013, pp. 18-30.
- Lundy, B.L. "Service learning in life-span developmental psychology: Higher exam scores and increased empathy." *Teaching of Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2007, pp.23-27.
- McElhaney, K. A. "Student outcomes of community service learning: A comparative analysis of curriculum-based and non curriculum-based alternative spring break programs." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, 1998.
- McReynolds, Mandi. "A new era for service-learning: designing an intentional high impact practice." *Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education*, vol. 3, 2014, pp. 81-101.
- Maruyama, G. M., A. Furco, and W. Song. "Enhancing underrepresented students' success through participation in community engagement." *Educating for Citizenship and Social Justice: Practices for Community Engagement at Research Universities*, Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp.221-235, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62971-1_16.
- Meaney, K. S., J. Housman, A. Cavazos, and M.L. Wilcox. "Examining service-learning in a graduate physical education teacher education course." *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2012, pp. 108-124.

- Mezirow, J. "Transformative learning as discourse." *Journal of Transformative Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2003, pp. 58-63.
- Mitchell and Rost-Banik. "How sustained Service-Learning Experiences Inform Career Pathways." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2019, pp.18-29.
- Parker, Mary Jo. "A STEM model encouraging post-baccalaureate pathways for first generation, underrepresented undergraduates." *5th International Conference on Higher Educations Advances*, Universitat Politecnica de Valencia, 2019.
- Raykov & Taylor. "Beyond learning for earning: the long-term outcomes of course-based and immersion service learning." Vancouver: University of British Columbia/St. Francis Xavier University, 2018.
- Reed, S.C., H. Rosenberg, A. Statham, and H. Rosing. "The effect of community service learning on undergraduate persistence in three institutional contexts." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 22-36.
- Rockenbach, A. B., T. D. Hudson, and J.B. Tuchmayer. "Fostering Meaning, Purpose, and enduring Commitments to Community service in College: A Multidimensional Conceptual Model." *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 85, 2014, pp. 312-338.
- Smedick, W. D. *A study of the effect of a volunteer service program at an urban-based institution of higher education on the current level of service achieved by alumni who had participated in the program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD, 1996.
- Smith Korfmacher, K. "Alumni perspectives on environmental service-learning: Implications for instructors." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1999, pp. 38-52.
- Song, W., A. Furco, L. Lopez, and G. Maruyama. "Examining the relationship between service-learning participation and the educational success of underrepresented students." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2017, pp. 23-27.
- Steinke, P., and P. Fitch. "Using written protocols to measure service-learning outcomes." *Deconstructing Service Learning: Research Exploring Context, Participation, and Impacts*, edited by Shelley H. Billig and Janet Eyler, Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2003, pp. 171-194.
- Sweat, Jeffrey, Glenda Jones, Suejung Han, and Susan M. Wolfgram. "How Does High Impact Practice Predict Student Engagement? A Comparison of White and Minority Students." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 7, no. 2, Article 17, 2013, <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2013.070217>.
- Tanner, Christine A. "Transforming Prelicensure Nursing Education: Preparing the New Nurse to Meet Emerging Health Care Needs." *Nursing Education Perspectives*, vol. 31, no. 6, 2010, pp. 347-353.
- Tarter, V. C. City College report to FIPSE. New York: City College Research Foundation, 1996.

- Thacker, Karen. "Academic-Community Partnerships: Opening the Doors to a Nursing Career." *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2005, pp.57-63.
- Vogelgesang, L. J., and A. W. Astin. "Comparing the effects of service-learning and community service." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 7, 2000, pp. 25-34.
- Warchal, J., and A. Ruiz. "The long-term effects of undergraduate service-learning programs on postgraduate employment choices, community engagement, and civic leadership." *New perspectives in service-learning research to advance the field*, edited by M. Welch and S. Billig. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2004, pp. 87-106.
- Warren, J. L. "Does service-learning increase student learning?: A meta-analysis." *Michigan Journal of Community Service*, vol. 18, no. 6, 2012, pp. 56-61.
- Wawrynzki, Matthew and Roger Baldwin. "Promoting high-impact student learning: connecting key components of the collegiate experience." *New Directions for Higher Education*, vol. 2014, no. 165, 2014, pp. 51-62.
- Wheatle, K. I. E., and A. BrckaLorenz. "Civic Engagement, Service-Learning and Faculty Engagement: A Profile of Black Women Faculty." *National Survey of Student Engagement*, Paper presented at the 2015 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Chicago, IL, 2015, http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/presentations/2015/AERA_2015_Wheatle_BrckaLorenz_paper.pdf.
- Yorio, Patrick and Feifei Ye. "A meta-analysis on the effects of service-learning on the social, personal, and cognitive outcomes of learning." *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2012, pp. 9-27.
- Zatz, Diane. "Social Engagement in Practice: Graphic design service-learning and its impact on gainful employment." *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, vol. 6, no.1, 2013, pp. 539-546.

QEP Action Plan

The implementation of the QEP will consist of three phases: (1) Collection of formative data, (2) enhancement of quality and quantity of existing programs, and (3) enhancements to infrastructure, curriculum, and policies. The phases are symbiotic with one another and each will inform and support the others. The bulk of the QEP action plan is based on the literature reviewed above. However, the Memphis community and the CBU community within it create unique opportunities for optimizing student learning and student success. Therefore, we believe that formative guidance from CBU and the surrounding community is essential to the success of the QEP. We will solicit guidance through formative assessment initially and throughout implementation to inform and guide us in details of plan implementation. However, the execution of the QEP does not *depend* on this formative data; it will rather be refined by it.

The evidence reviewed in the literature review shows that community engagement has positive effects on retention rates, personal growth, and student success after graduation. These are the key student outcomes and key student successes we are targeting with this QEP. However, additional data will guide specific details of our QEP implementation.

Collection of formative data

Potential employer survey

Since student success after graduation is so heavily influenced by the perceptions of potential employers, we plan to survey businesses that recruit from CBU about what community engagement-related activities and outcomes do and/or would make CBU students most attractive as potential employees (including what enhances job performance). This online survey will be based, at least in part, on career readiness competencies identified by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE): critical thinking/problem solving, oral and written communication, teamwork/collaboration, digital technology, leadership, professionalism/work ethic, career management, and global/intercultural fluency.

Graduate and professional school survey

For the benefit of students who desire to continue their education in graduate or professional school, we will also survey individuals in graduate and professional schools about what community engagement-related activities and outcomes make students most attractive as applicants and what enhances their performance once in the programs.

CBU student, faculty, and alumni survey

Finally, we will survey CBU students, faculty, and alumni about how to maximize high-impact, transformational learning through community engagement activities. This survey, in particular, will give us insight into the implantation of the QEP in our unique CBU culture and organizational structure.

Enhancement of quality and quantity of existing community-engagement programs

Existing community engagement activities

Community engagement is a central component of CBU's identity. This far precedes the establishment of CBU, going back to the development of the Brothers of the Christian Schools (De La Salle Christian Brothers) in Rheims, France, in the late seventeenth century. From the beginning, the Brothers emphasized a practical education (e.g., teaching French before Latin and

Greek) designed to make students good citizens and workers that would contribute to society. Throughout the history of the order, Lasallian institutions typically have been started by request of local officials because of a perceived community need.

Community engagement abounds at CBU. Here are brief summaries of just a few of many examples that were shared by the CBU community at the request of the QEP Liaisons:

- Courses with (newly developed) formal community engaged learning designation:
 - ENGL 355 Jane Austin and the Civic Commons: Partnered with Memphis Public Libraries, this course asks students to develop the concept for a digital app that empowers community member participation in and creation of public spaces.
 - SPAN 380 Spanish Interpretation in Professional Settings: Students practice Spanish interpretation skills by participating in a local organization that serves Latino/a refugees.
 - RS 331 Spirituality & Ethics of Eating: Integrated into course assignments and reflections, service opportunities with food related community organizations enhance student understanding of course material.
 - HUM 210 Introduction to Sustainability: Students joined Memphis City Beautiful and Memphis Storm Drains city office to educate 4th graders about the local aquifer. Stemming from this educational outreach project, CBU students developed campus-based service workshops and projects.
 - MGMT 490 Seminar in Leadership: Students oversee programming for a DECA and FLBA conference at CBU and develop leadership workshops to deliver to leaders of local high school organizations.
 - CHEM 429 Research Seminar IV: Students help guide, organize, and judge local middle and high school science fairs.
 - PSYC 380 SPTP: Autism in the Community: Students work with local organizations that serve individuals on the spectrum and their families.
 - CPSY 105 General Psychology: Students facilitated parent meetings and home visitations as part of a child development and parental well-being program.
 - ENG 460 SPTP: Food Justice Garden Lit.: Students engage in community gardening projects, community dinner programs, and digital transcriptions of Early Modern texts to connect food and garden literature to local food issues and to contribute to the field of literary study.
- Courses with community engagement elements:
 - MKTG 411 Marketing Policy and Strategy: Students partner with a local company, taking on the role of a marketing agency.
 - MKTG 433 Promotional Strategy: Pairs of students partner with local companies to prepare a promotional strategy proposal.
 - NURS 406 Community Health Nursing and NURS 413 Professional Practice and Leadership: Students work with five local non-profit organizations in Memphis

for hands-on learning about health-related challenges and to apply their skills in various types of institutional contexts.

- PSYC 354 Correlational Research Methods and Statistics, PSYC 355 Experimental Research Methods and Statistics, PSYC 372 Psychophysiology: Students (in groups) in these courses develop and complete original research projects. Results of these projects are shared with the CBU community as slide presentations (PSYC 354 and PSYC 372) and as poster presentations (PSYC 355). In addition, students often present their work at regional conferences, and sometimes at international conferences. Some of this work is even published in scientific journals.
- Required internships/practica:
 - All majors in the School of Business
 - All psychology majors
 - All majors in the College of Adult Professional Studies
- September of Service: 30 Days of Good Deeds (SOS): This program has been coordinated by the CBU Honors Program and involves arranging and executing at least one group community service project per day for the entire month of September. During the 2018 SOS, 276 members of the CBU community (including students, staff, faculty, administrators, trustees, and Brothers) donated 1,796 hours of service.
- KIVA microlending program and Change4Good: Honors students coordinate fundraising efforts to benefit multiple groups.
- Nerds4Needs: Honors students repeatedly perform service with numerous agencies in Memphis.
- Science Olympiad: CBU hosts this annual event for middle- and high-school students, and students, faculty, and staff in the School of Sciences assist in numerous activities.
- Memphis-Shelby County Science and Engineering Fair: Students work this event in numerous capacities.
- Local and National Chemistry Olympiads and other local high school chemistry competitions: Chemistry students proctor and assist with setup and cleanup.
- Tennessee Mathematics Teachers Association High School Tests: The Department of Mathematics and Computer Science has hosted these tests for many years.
- Pascal Fellows: Students in Mathematics and Computer Science provide community service and interact with community companies in the Memphis community.
- Students in Mathematics and Computer Science and Physics serve as tutors and lab facilitators.
- Society of Physics Students (CBU chapter) conducts “Science Nights” for students and families at a local elementary school. This group also participate in a Science Trivia Contest with students from other Memphis institutions.
- Students in the Physician Assistant program apply their skills in many community engagement activities, including blood pressure screening and “hands-only” CPR

demonstrations at the CBU Health Fair, participation in a multi-institution poverty simulation, hands-on experience with the challenges of using our local bus system, analysis of resource availability (grocery stores, pharmacies, hospitals, and health-care clinics) in various areas of Memphis, and participation (in collaboration with other local health-care students) in a local free clinic for people with diabetes.

- Students in the College of Adult Professional Studies, by the nature of the program, apply what they are learning in their academic programs to their workplaces, and vice versa.

Thus, there are ample opportunities for community engagement at CBU. However, widespread organization and tracking of these activities is lacking, as is formal, institution-wide recognition of student participation in these activities. Thus, an emphasis in this QEP is to build on CBU's existing tradition of community engagement by students and increase both the accessibility of these opportunities to students (in addition to adding more) and the benefits to students when they participate in community engagement activities.

AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement at CBU

Establishment of the AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement stems from CBU's current strategic plan (2017-2022), which included the goal of creating a center that would “coordinate, publicize, and track engagement efforts with and for students, alumni, faculty, and staff.” Funding from AutoZone® enabled the university to hire a founding director—Dr. Leslie McAbee, who began in January 2019. The Center has already initiated the following activities: Community-Engaged Learning (or Service Learning) Program, a first-year service experience that incorporates critical reflection activities, and partnership with a community agency on a flagship STEM program for elementary-aged refugee students.

Although academic courses with a service learning component exist at CBU, they generally have been developed by individual faculty members in the absence of formal institutional guidance or assistance. The AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement and the Office of Student Life has developed a program to support faculty in implementing service learning activities in courses. The framework for this support includes several facets, including (1) a faculty advisory board for Community-Engaged Learning (CEL), (2) an award cycle for Community-Engaged Course Development Grants for CBU faculty and instructors, (3) an annual CEL course development workshop open to all CBU faculty and staff, (4) community engagement and pedagogy discussions/collaborations, and (5) an annual event each spring semester that recognizes accomplishments in CEL courses.

In keeping with the wealth of research on service-learning best practices, a major focus of CEL programming is the implementation of critical reflection activities throughout coursework. From informal discussions to formal reflection-based assignments, students in CEL courses have

ample opportunity to recognize personal values and important facets of their identity, examine previously held assumptions, and understand systemic inequality and, in response, advocate for social justice.

Given the promising learning and development outcomes of critical reflection, co-curricular forms of community engagement, such as one-time service events, philanthropy, and advocacy work, also includes activities that encourage students to examine their service experiences and the impact of their work on communities. Reflection programming has recently become part of Welcome Weekend's CBU Serves event in which incoming first-year students contribute to the work of various community agencies in Memphis. Students completed pre- and post-surveys on each end of the service projects and attended a session of discussion-based and active-learning reflection activities in the afternoon following the service experience. While the AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement will continue to host formal reflection activities, the Center will also provide tools for student organizations to independently incorporate reflection activities as part of their community-engaged programming. Reflection activities will also be implemented for students participating in September of Service.

Guided by the institutional goal to engage and invest in the traditionally underserved neighborhoods adjacent to the university (Orange Mound and Binghampton), the AutoZone® Center is proposing a three-year investment in intellectually and practically investigating asset-based community development and its associated best practice as the guiding methodology for community engagement at CBU. The ACCE aims to promote asset-based community development through the following goals and initiatives:

- Apply to engage an Americorps VISTA volunteer(s). Focused on alleviating issues of poverty, these volunteers will coordinate relationships and community engagement experiences between CBU and local agencies. They will develop educational programming focused on supporting and lifting up existing and ongoing community initiatives that seek to remediate poverty in Memphis and the Mid-South.
- Expand on September of Service programming (summarized above under Existing community engagement activities) to include reflection activities that promote student self-assessment and recognition of broad systemic issues related to Memphis but also the community efforts mobilized to address identified social challenges
- The most recent CBU Serves event (part of Welcome Weekend, 2019 for incoming students) included a service event to introduce students to community and cultural institutions and agencies in the city; however, new additions to this programming included pre- and post-surveys and reflection activities conducted by student leaders. The ACCE seeks to reinvent CBU Serves once again to better introduce students to Memphis in an immersive way that helps them recognize the history and current direction of the city in terms of community initiatives.

- Host monthly conversations on best practices in community engagement and service at CBU that are open to the public.
- Host speakers who will deepen conversations on effective community development and initiatives on campus.

Communication and social media

Ownership of and pride in CBU's community engagement efforts activities is an important aspect of the QEP. We want this to come from the students, faculty, staff, and *other entities* with whom we are engaged—and who are, consequently, engaged with us! We have already begun a social media campaign to promote our QEP, including a social media hashtag, #CBUEngage. We hope this social media campaign will add excitement among students and encourage them to post photos and descriptions in community engagement activities. We also hope that our community partners will boost this spirit by sharing and otherwise promoting social media posts associated with them.

Enhancements to infrastructure, curriculum, and policies for community engagement

These aspects of the plan will be more heavily influenced by the data we collect in the initial stages of QEP implementation. In all of these efforts, we will emphasize NACE career readiness competencies and data-driven, high-impact, transformational learning (summarized above in the literature review).

Tracking, monitoring, and assessment of community engagement

As described above, community engagement activities abound at CBU. However, we lack any kind of institution-wide organization and tracking of these activities. In addition, there is no centralized record of student participation in community engagement activities. Creating and implementing such a tracking system is critical to both the implementation and the assessment of the QEP. A centralized system will allow us to do the following:

1. Create a record of each community engagement activity, including details about the activity.
2. Create a “storefront” (portal?) for community engagement, where students (and other members of the CBU community) will
 - a. see at a glance what opportunities for community engagement are available, when they are available, what is involved, etc.,
 - b. readily see how to enlist in each community engagement activity—in some cases directly through the portal,

- c. track execution of the required elements of participation in the activity (e.g., a student scans her ID card when she arrives to participate, a student completes a reflection activity after the activity).
3. Maintain a record of student completion of community engagement activities. For individual students, this could provide verification of student involvement in activities. Such verification could be provided to faculty who are serving as references for students (e.g., writing letters of recommendation). If completion of particular activities is required for certain organizations, courses, academic minors, scholarships, etc., this record would provide an easy and secure validation of student participation.

Access to the tracking system will be limited to members of the CBU community and community partners (e.g., to post information, to verify volunteer hours), so it will be secure (i.e., it will require a login and password, similar to our learning management system or numerous other online campus resources).

In addition to being a one-stop shop for CBU community engagement activities, the tracking system will provide data for assessment of the QEP.

Community Engagement Advisory Boards

We plan to establish Community Engagement Advisory Boards that include CBU faculty, staff, and students. The Advisory Boards also will include community partners, such as employers who recruit from CBU and institutions who host CBU students on internships. We may solicit Advisory Board members from local institutions with graduate and professional programs who recruit from CBU. Having these multiple perspectives should maximize the impact of CBU's community engagement experiences on student learning and student success in both the short and long terms.

Expansion of formal academic offerings related to community engagement

Guided by initial data gathered, we will consider creating specific academic offerings at CBU to enhance community engagement-related student learning and student outcomes. At this time, we specifically intend to explore two possibilities: (1) an academic minor or certificate in community engagement and (2) one or more courses on community engagement (i.e., courses *about* community engagement, rather than necessarily including a community engagement activity).

The academic minor or certificate in community engagement is initially proposed as an interdisciplinary minor that includes both community engagement-related coursework and engagement in community engagement activities (e.g., a practicum or internship). We already

have a minor in sustainability studies, which has many goals that may be shared with the minor in community engagement.

Specific courses on community engagement would be based on needs or priorities identified in initial data and/or by the Community Engagement Advisory Board. The emphasis in these courses would be teaching students *about* some aspect of community engagement, rather than *participating in* community engagement activities (although such activities certainly would not be excluded).

Formal support and acknowledgement of faculty, staff, and students for community engagement efforts

In addition to the efforts described above to promote the development of courses with substantial service-learning components, additional efforts will be made to formally emphasize the importance of community engagement efforts by faculty, staff, and students.

We will review faculty and staff guidelines for review, promotion, and tenure. Where needed, revisions to these guidelines will be proposed to explicitly emphasize that efforts to support community engagement among our students (e.g., teaching service-learning courses, supervising programs that emphasize community engagement, mentoring students in community engagement activities) are viewed favorably.

For students, we will explore the possibility of formal positions to promote development of community engagement skills. Again, the value and nature of any such positions will be guided by initial data and/or by the Community Engagement Advisory Boards. For example, an internship with our AutoZone[®] Center for Community Engagement might be an excellent opportunity for students interested in careers that involve community engagement. There are models of such positions at other institutions (e.g., CELFs at Lewis University, SFUServes Ambassadors at Saint Francis University).

We will also explore the establishment of a service-focused living learning community, in which students will be immersed in community engagement activities and reflection as part of an ongoing cohort. We would also like to increase the number of other immersive service experiences, such as community engagement-based alternative break opportunities and/or study abroad opportunities that include community engagement. These will be supported and facilitated by the enhanced faculty and student support systems described above.

Plan Ownership

Members of the following offices and groups will be responsible for the implementation and assessment of the activities described above.

Plan Activity	Owner
Data collection to guide QEP implementation	
<i>Potential employer surveys:</i>	QEP Leadership Committee AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement Office of Student Life Career Services
<i>Graduate and professional school surveys:</i>	QEP Leadership Committee AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement Office of Student Life Career Services
<i>CBU student, faculty, and alumni surveys:</i>	QEP Leadership Committee AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement Office of Student Life Career Services
QEP-related action already underway	
<i>Existing community engagement activities:</i>	AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement Office of Student Life
<i>AutoZone Center for Community Engagement at CBU</i>	Office of Student Life Office of Academics
<i>Communication and social media:</i>	AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement Communications and Marketing Office of Student Life
QEP-related activities under consideration that may be affected by data collection described above	
<i>Tracking, monitoring, and assessment of community engagement:</i>	Information Technology Services Office of Academics Office of Student Life AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement
<i>Community Engagement Advisory Boards:</i>	AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement Career Services
<i>Expansion of formal academic offerings related to community engagement:</i>	Faculty Assembly Office of Academics

Formal support and acknowledgement of faculty, staff, and students for community engagement efforts:

Faculty Assembly
 Human Resources
 AutoZone® Center for Community Engagement
 Office of Student Life

Timeline

The following table shows an estimated timeline for the implementation and assessment of the QEP. Many efforts to enhance community engagement opportunities for students will occur on a continuous basis, with a goal of continuously building and improving programs and resources. Likewise, many of the data points described below will be acquired on an annual basis and compiled at the end of the QEP implementation period.

Year	Implementation	Assessment
Year 1 (Spring 2020- Summer 2021)	Promote #CBUEngage and other information about the QEP. Develop and administer surveys to guide QEP implementation: -Potential employers -Graduate and professional programs -CBU students, faculty, and alumni Identify, acquire, and begin to implement infrastructural resources to track, monitor, and assess community engagement. Establish Community Engagement Advisory Boards. Complete initial year of establishing a support structure for community-engaged learning. Attend community-based events in the Binghampton and Orange Mound neighborhoods of Memphis as part of a year of listening with the aim of joining and supporting ongoing community initiatives and goals.	Acquire and compile available baseline data on QEP outcomes. Compile survey results from potential employers, graduate/professional programs, and CBU students/faculty/alumni. Administer 2020 NSSE to first-year and senior students.

<p>Year 2 (Fall 2021-Summer 2022)</p>	<p>Continue to implement infrastructural resources to track, monitor, and assess community engagement.</p> <p>Design and implement criteria for community engagement learning course designation for which faculty can apply.</p> <p>Enhance the support structure for community-engaged learning.</p> <p>Apply to engage one or more Americorps VISTA volunteers.</p> <p>Implement reflection activities into September of Service programming.</p> <p>Begin strategic planning process for a large-scale community development project in the Binghampton and Orange Mound neighborhoods of Memphis.</p>	<p>Assess needs and potential for increasing community engagement-related curricular offerings: -academic minor or certificate -courses about community engagement</p> <p>Review, promotion, and tenure guidelines for ways to enhance support student community engagement activities.</p> <p>Assess potential for a service-focused living learning community.</p> <p>Assess potential for community engagement ambassadors-type positions for students."</p>
<p>Year 3 (Fall 2022-Summer 2023)</p>	<p>If deemed appropriate, introduce community engagement-related curricular changes.</p> <p>If deemed appropriate, propose revisions to review, promotion, and tenure guidelines to enhance support for student community engagement activities.</p> <p>If deemed appropriate, establish a service-focused living learning community.</p> <p>If deemed appropriate, establish community engagement ambassadors-type positions for students.</p> <p>Continue development of neighborhood community development project.</p>	<p>Evaluate effectiveness of infrastructural resources to track, monitor, and assess community engagement.</p> <p>Administer 2023 NSSE to first-year and senior students.</p>
<p>Year 4 (Fall 2023-Summer 2024)</p>	<p>Implement any approved revisions to review, promotion, and tenure guidelines.</p> <p>Develop memorandum of understanding with each community partner with which CBU affiliates engage to formally outline expectations from each party.</p>	

Year 5 (Fall 2024-Fall 2025)	Continue with implementation of existing community engagement programming efforts.	Administer alumni self-report surveys to assess perceptions of community engagement opportunities among graduates. Compile and analyze all summative assessment data that have been collected across the 5-year QEP implementation period.
---------------------------------------	--	---

CBU’s QEP commits resources to initiate, implement and complete the QEP

The resources CBU has committed, and plans to commit, to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP are integrated throughout this document. Many individuals and offices have contributed to the QEP planning and the initial efforts to implement the QEP. These efforts will continue and expand throughout the CBU community (and even beyond) through the execution of the plan.

Details of the financial resources dedicated to the QEP are detailed in the table that spans the next two pages.

5 year needs for QEP	Phase in QEP	Total 5 YR budget for QEP	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	Notes
AutoZone Center Director Salary & Benefits	ongoing	\$377,293	\$72,500	\$73,950	\$75,429	\$76,938	\$78,476	2019-2022 AutoZone grant funded
AutoZone Center Intern	ongoing	\$15,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	2019-2022 AutoZone grant funded
AutoZone Center support staff (e.g., Lasallian Volunteers)	Phase 2 - Improve Existing Programs	\$48,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	
AutoZone Center Operating Costs non-salary	ongoing	\$20,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	2019-2022 AutoZone grant funded
Student Tracking and Online Portal Software	ongoing	\$24,000		\$12,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	2019-2022 AutoZone grant funded
Course Development Grants	ongoing	\$34,000	\$9,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	2019-2022 AutoZone grant funded
QEP Administration	ongoing	\$42,153	\$8,100	\$8,262	\$8,427	\$8,596	\$8,768	

AmeriCorps VISTA employee	Phase 2- Improve Existing Programs	\$36,000			\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,500 annual living allowance plus health benefits. 2019-2022 AutoZone grant funded
NSSE	Phase 2- Improve Existing Programs	\$1,800				\$1,800		Budgeted in Academic Affairs
Community Engagement LLC Coordinator	Phase 3- Curriculum and Policies	\$30,000				\$15,000	\$15,000	Cost estimate = 1 faculty course release per semester
Community Engagement Ambassadors Program	Phase 3- Curriculum and Policies	\$3,000				\$1,500	\$1,500	
		\$631,246	\$102,600	\$117,212	\$123,856	\$143,833	\$143,744	
	Grant Funded	\$294,500	\$94,500	\$100,000	\$100,000			AutoZone grant total = \$300,000 over three years
	Operating	\$336,746	\$8,100	\$17,212	\$23,856	\$143,833	\$143,744	

CBU's QEP includes a plan to assess achievement.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviews the document and conducts interviews to determine whether the institution has demonstrated compliance with Standard 7.2.

“All CBU students will have more high-impact, transformational learning experiences that foster personal growth and set them apart in graduate school and the job market.”

With the QEP, CBU will increase student opportunities for and tangible outcomes of community engagement. Following are specific goals. Achievement of these goals will be used to assess the QEP and its implementation.

Opportunities for and Engagement in Community Engagement Activities

Goals for Enhancing Community Engagement-Based Curriculum

- Establish a formal process by which courses with a community engagement component are approved and identified across campus.
- Increase the number of courses identified as having a community engagement component. During the current academic year (2019-2020), there are nine classes that are formally recognized by the AutoZone[®] Center as being community-engaged learning courses.
- Increase the number of faculty members teaching courses formally identified as having a community engagement component. During the current academic year, there are nine faculty who are teaching courses formally recognized by the AutoZone[®] Center as being community-engaged learning courses.
- Increase the number of students enrolled in courses identified as having a community engagement component. During the current academic year, a total of 113 students (63 fall and 50 spring) were/are enrolled in formally recognized community-engagement courses.
- Develop and initiate a minor or certificate program in community engagement.

Goals for Faculty Development

- Expand the support network of faculty and staff formally identified as actively supporting community engaged teaching and scholarship. During 2019, this network included 34 members of the faculty and staff who have participated in community-engaged learning activities through the AutoZone[®] Center.
- Establish and expand a dedicated (and searchable) library of resources related to community engagement.

- Increase the number of community engagement-related workshops and presentations available to the CBU community. This will include workshops on community-engaged learning at the end of each semester that emphasize evaluation and recognition of faculty involved in development of community-engaged learning courses during that semester. During 2019, the AutoZone® Center hosted two sessions on community-engaged learning: (1) an orientation workshop at the end of the spring semester and (2) a panel discussion at the end of the fall semester featuring faculty members who taught community-engaged courses during that semester.

Goals for Institutional Infrastructure to Promote Community Engagement

- Establish Community Engagement Advisory Boards that includes CBU faculty, staff, students, and community partners.
- Establish formal criteria for relationships (new and existing) with community partners with which students can do community engagement activities.
- Establish a database for community engagement activities.
- Establish an online portal through which students, faculty, staff, and other members of the CBU community can identify opportunities for community engagement and initiate participation (i.e., sign up to participate).
- Establish a system to track and assess community engagement by students, faculty, staff, and other members of the CBU community.
- Establish suggested guidelines and other resources for community engagement-related reflection activities.

Goals for Increasing other Community Engagement Opportunities for Students

- Established a service-focused living learning community.
- Establish consistent guidelines for new and existing alternative break immersion experiences that include a community engagement component.
- Establish study abroad opportunities that include a community engagement component.
- Establish community engagement ambassadors-type positions.
- Increase the rigor and the number of opportunities for students to participate in formal reflection activities related to their community engagement.
 - For class-based community engagement activities:
 - Ten community-engaged learning courses currently include a reflection component.
 - For community engagement activities that are not tied to a specific course.
 - CBU Serves (part of Welcome Weekend activities for all new students): Students currently participate in a service event, which is followed by an hour of reflection activities related to the event.

- Lasallian Leadership Awards: Individual and organizations applying for these awards are currently required to submit a reflective essay.

Self Reports

In part, the plan will be assessed through self-reported data from students, alumni, employers, and graduate and professional schools. Across respondents, data will be analyzed in two ways:

- (1) We will assess changes in the responses across implementation of the QEP, where more positive responses indicate more successful attainment of QEP goals.
- (2) We will examine the relationship between item responses and the amount and type of student community engagement, where higher positive correlations indicate more successful attainment of QEP goals.

Student self reports

Student perceptions will be obtained early and late in their college career, first as first-year students and again as seniors or recent graduates. Questions with very high face validity will simply ask students their perceptions about our first goal as it relates to CBU. Responses will be made on a 9-point scale, where 1 indicates strong disagreement, 5 indicates neutral, and 9 indicates strong agreement.

- Incoming:
 - CBU will provide high-impact, transformational learning experiences.
 - These experiences will foster my personal growth.
 - These experiences will set me apart in graduate or professional school and/or on the job market.
- Outgoing:
 - CBU has provided high-impact, transformational learning experiences.
 - These experiences fostered my personal growth.
 - These experiences set me apart in graduate and professional school applications and/or the job market.

We will use data from selected items of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), as administered by CBU. This will include data from both first-year students and from seniors. Data from the 2014 and 2017 administrations will be used as baseline data (prior to QEP implementation). Data from the 2023 administration will be used as post-implementation data. Data from the upcoming 2020 administration will allow us to examine the effect of certain elements of the plan which are being implemented during the first year. The goal is to produce an increase in in positive responses across the specific items selected. The following NSSE items will be used, and the baseline data are provided:

- During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

- Connected your learning to societal problems or issues

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Never	16%	2%	10%	8%
Sometimes	36%	18%	41%	37%
Often	34%	47%	35%	26%
Very often	13%	33%	14%	28%

- Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Never	21%	9%	16%	10%
Sometimes	44%	35%	42%	25%
Often	23%	22%	33%	46%
Very often	12%	33%	9%	19%

- Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?

- Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Have not decided	11%	0%	8%	6%
Do not plan to do	4%	24%	2%	8%
Plan to do	85%	6%	80%	11%
Done or in progress	0%	71%	11%	75%

- Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Have not decided	30%	6%	20%	6%
Do not plan to do	15%	43%	19%	30%
Plan to do	35%	4%	47%	9%
Done or in progress	20%	47%	14%	55%

- Participate in a study abroad program

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Have not decided	33%	12%	28%	6%
Do not plan to do	20%	63%	31%	69%
Plan to do	42%	10%	39%	11%
Done or in progress	4%	14%	2%	14%

- Work with a faculty member on a research project

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Have not decided	54%	6%	45%	13%
Do not plan to do	7%	53%	17%	58%
Plan to do	39%	4%	36%	4%
Done or in progress	0%	37%	2%	25%

- About how many of your courses at this institution have included a community-based project (service-learning)?

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
None	30%	30%	42%	28%
Some	54%	58%	42%	64%
Most	15%	12%	11%	7%
All	0%	0%	5%	1%

- How much does your institution emphasize the following?
 - Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Very little	5%	17%	17%	11%
Some	16%	28%	28%	45%
Quite a bit	42%	33%	30%	33%
Very much	37%	12%	25%	12%

- About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing the following?
 - Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
0 hours	17%	36%	28%	28%
1-5 hours	37%	26%	45%	31%
6-10 hours	17%	13%	10%	15%
11-15 hours	10%	9%	5%	11%
16-20 hours	10%	9%	7%	9%
21-25 hours	2%	17%	3%	9%
26-30 hours	7%	0%	2%	2%
More than 30 hours	0%	6%	0%	4%

- Doing community service or volunteer work

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
0 hours	50%	28%	40%	51%
1-5 hours	40%	46%	45%	32%
6-10 hours	2%	17%	9%	9%
11-15 hours	2%	7%	3%	4%
16-20 hours	5%	0%	2%	2%
21-25 hours	0%	2%	2%	1%
26-30 hours	0%	0%	0%	0%
More than 30 hours	0%	0%	0%	1%

- How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?
 - Solving complex real-world problems

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Very little	7%	6%	11%	9%
Some	34%	30%	39%	26%
Quite a bit	45%	30%	23%	34%
Very much	14%	34%	28%	31%

- Being an informed and active citizen

	2014		2017	
	Freshmen	Seniors	Freshmen	Seniors
Very little	11%	15%	16%	6%
Some	30%	23%	30%	38%
Quite a bit	34%	34%	28%	29%
Very much	25%	28%	26%	27%

Self-reports of career readiness based on the NACE competencies will be collected from incoming and outgoing students. We plan to create a survey that is similar to the [Professional Competency Self-Assessment Tool](#) from Virginia Tech, but more sensitive.

Alumni self reports

In order to assess more long-term perceptions of CBU graduates, which should be more valid with respect to long-term student success, we will invite alumni (5-10 years after graduation) to respond to items that are similar to those asked of current students:

- CBU provided high-impact, transformational learning experiences.
- These experiences fostered my personal growth.
- These experiences have set me apart in graduate or professional school and/or in my job.

Employer self reports

CBU Career Services regularly surveys various employer sites where CBU students hold internships. This survey is based, at least in part, on NACE competencies. Using this survey, we will invite (1) employers of CBU graduates and (2) sites that host student interns from CBU to provide feedback on performance. Data from the most recently completed academic year and the target percentages for achievement are shown below. In general, the goal is to shift the distribution of responses toward the left (positive side) of the tables. This is especially true of ratings on “Global Citizenship”, which we expect to be most affected by community engagement experiences.

Baseline data from 2018-2019 academic year (209 interns):

NACE Career Readiness Competency	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair/Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Critical Thinking	56.73%	28.65%	10.53%	2.34%	0.00%
Communication Skills	56.52%	26.09%	15.94%	1.45%	0.00%
Cooperation/Teamwork	83.04%	13.45%	2.92%	0.58%	0.00%
Use of Technology	71.93%	16.96%	7.02%	0.58%	0.00%
Leadership	38.60%	34.50%	11.70%	2.34%	0.00%
Professionalism	66.67%	26.32%	5.26%	1.17%	0.00%
Career Management	49.71%	26.90%	13.45%	0.58%	0.00%
Global Citizenship	74.85%	21.05%	1.75%	0.58%	0.00%
	62.26%	24.24%	8.57%	1.20%	0.00%

Note: Percentages may not total 100% because respondents had an N/A option, which is not shown.

Target percentages for end of QEP period:

NACE Career Readiness Competency	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair/Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Critical Thinking	60.00%	32.00%	7.00%	1.00%	0.00%
Communication Skills	62.00%	30.00%	7.00%	1.00%	0.00%
Cooperation/Teamwork	85.00%	14.00%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Use of Technology	75.00%	18.00%	7.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Leadership	45.00%	36.00%	8.00%	1.00%	0.00%
Professionalism	70.00%	27.00%	2.00%	1.00%	0.00%
Career Management	55.00%	28.00%	9.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Global Citizenship	85.00%	15.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	67.13%	25.00%	5.13%	0.50%	0.00%

Note: Percentages may not total 100% because respondents had an N/A option, which is not shown.

Graduate and professional school self reports

We will invite graduate and professional schools to provide feedback on performance on CBU graduates in their respective programs.

Other Data

Compare community-engagement activities between students who are and those who are not accepted to graduate and professional programs: Include factors such as prestige of programs and how high they are on students' "lists" of programs

Examine the relationships between community-engagement activity variables and job placement variables, such as job preference (i.e., do students get a job they really want), job satisfaction, and job search, application, and interview factors.

“CBU will ... significantly improve retention rates.”

The assessment of the relationship will be relatively straightforward. Throughout the implementation of the QEP, we will compare participation in community engagement activities between students who are and who are not retained, respectively, at various points in their academic career. This will include the number and type of activities, as well as the presence and type of reflection activities about their community engagement. We will also use responses to student self-report items to examine the influence of student perceptions in retention.

Retention data for the most recent 5 years available are as below, followed by targets for retention following implementation of the QEP:

Year Entered (Fall)	Number of Students	Retained to Sophomore Year	Retained to Junior Year	Retained to Senior Year
2013	265	220 (83.3%)	182 (68.7%)	165 (62.3%)
2014	351	281 (80.1%)	225 (64.1%)	208 (59.2%)
2015	310	244 (78.7%)	211 (68.1%)	193 (62.3%)
2016	334	266 (79.6%)	232 (69.5%)	<i>Not yet available.</i>
2017	381	301 (79.0%)	<i>Not yet available.</i>	<i>Not yet available.</i>
Mean % Retained		80.14%	67.6%	61.27%
Target %		82%	72%	66%