

c-nvolved: A Quick Summary



For a quick summary of any part of the QEP, click a link below.
Click the *home* icon in the document to return here.

[Process Used to Identify and Develop the QEP](#)

[Desired Student Learning Outcomes](#)

[Timeline of Actions to Be Implemented](#)

[Budget and Resources](#)

[Assessment](#)

Process Used to Identify and Develop the QEP

Carson-Newman began its Quality Enhancement planning process in August 2010 with an overview presentation, which Provost Kina Mallard gave at the Fall Faculty Workshop. Shortly thereafter, Provost Mallard appointed the Dean of Library Services, Bruce Kocour, to lead the topic identification phase of the QEP. Mr. Kocour formed a committee with campus-wide representation to ensure broad-based involvement in the identification of the QEP topic. Throughout the fall semester (2010), members of the committee presented information to faculty of each School, Student Affairs staff, and the Student Government Association through open meetings. Additionally, a two-question electronic survey, which was made available to all students, asked what the College should focus on as a way to improve student learning and how the College might implement those improvements. As a result of these requests for input, faculty and staff submitted summaries for 22 topic ideas, and students submitted a list of 25 ideas. In January, 2011, a group of faculty identified three major themes that emerged from these topic ideas, and in May 2011, Mr. Kocour sent white papers on ethics across the curriculum, service-learning, and research-based learning to the Provost. Service Learning emerged as Carson-Newman's QEP topic. In the spring of 2012, a QEP committee formed to write the final proposal and submitted the final draft to SACS in December of 2012.



Desired Student Learning Outcomes

The QEP committee developed the student learning outcomes based on input from the broader faculty, a review of literature on service-learning, and a review of other service-learning QEP's, as well as the committee's multiple conversations regarding our goals for CN and the students involved in service-learning. Our QEP, *c-nvolved*, will fulfill a goal stated in our 2009 Strategic Plan to "create a service-learning program that provides opportunities for service" (p. 8). As the focus of *c-nvolved*, courses identified in the catalog and on transcripts as SL courses within the standardized program will share the common definition of service-learning and common student learning outcomes. All courses designated as SL courses will include these outcomes in addition to their discipline-specific outcomes.

The student learning outcomes (SLOs) help assess movement toward our goal of 70% of C-N graduates having a developmental service-learning experience and 80% of those students showing improvement in the SLOs. The SLOs support the mission of the college, which is "to help our students reach their full potential as educated citizens and worldwide servant leaders by integrating academic excellence and Christian commitment within a caring community" (Carson-Newman, 2011).

The two student learning outcomes include **Critical Reflection** and **Intercultural Knowledge and Competence**. By reflecting critically, students will connect knowledge from an academic discipline to their service-learning experience. In order to gain intercultural knowledge and competence, students will identify the assumptions and attitudes they bring to service-learning issues.



Timeline of Actions to Be Implemented

Carson-Newman will implement an intentional service-learning academic program, known as *c-nvolved*, gradually over the course of five years. In Year One, we will begin implementing introductory service-learning with LA101, a required course for first-year students. Participating departments will implement service-learning in 200-/300-level courses in years two and three, and 400-level courses in year four. Departments will select the majors to be included in the program. Carson-Newman will support the implementation of the plan via periodic faculty development, which will allow faculty the opportunity to develop skills, improve course design, and develop community partnerships. Through *c-nvolved*, students will have a developmental service-learning experience with standardized assessments that track student improvement. By year five of *c-nvolved*, the ongoing assessment will culminate in a regular pattern of faculty development, student participation, and necessary adjustments.



Budget and Resources

The *c-nvolved* budget consists of two sections, direct and indirect costs. The budget details over \$2 million and covers a period of six years (years 0-5).

Carson-Newman's CFO allotted *c-nvolved* \$50,000.00 for direct costs. These direct costs include the funding a QEP Director to oversee the *c-nvolved* budget, the work of the committee, and the implementation of the QEP. Direct costs also include funds for marketing the QEP to the campus and surrounding community. Finally, the direct costs include funds for faculty/staff development, mini-grants for service-learning projects, and support for an annual community banquet.

The *c-nvolved* committee, in consultation with the CFO, determined the following indirect costs totaling \$2,103,215: faculty support, administrative support, public relations/social media, facilities/utilities, service-learning peer mentors, and Operation Inasmuch. Faculty workload is calculated based on an estimated percentage of time devoted to service-learning courses. Administrative support takes into account the amount of time the Associate Provost will spend working on *c-nvolved* and the probability of hiring an adjunct instructor to cover courses for the QEP Director. Public relations/social media includes an estimate of the percentage of time Carson-Newman's Media Specialist will spend on rolling out the *c-nvolved* webpage and social media regarding *c-nvolved*. The facilities/utilities category represents estimated costs for building use (e.g. power and water) and maintenance, as well as IT expenses. The sum for service-learning peer mentors reflects the cost of hiring students to help with service-learning in the classroom; this cost also includes peer mentors who will receive federal work study dollars. Finally, indirect costs include Operation Inasmuch, the annual campus-wide community service blitz, which takes place each fall.



Assessment

Carson-Newman will assess the effectiveness of *c-nvolved* through three specific pathways, individual student-learning outcomes, campus-wide impact, and community partner feedback. Instructors of service learning courses will incorporate assignments that will address the

student-learning outcomes of *c-nvolved*, Critical Reflection and Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. Faculty will have the freedom to determine assignments for assessment, and these assignments will be assessed using a common rubric. To understand the impact of *c-nvolved* on the campus community, two large national instruments will be tracked. Specific indicators of the *National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)* focus upon the academic experience with emphasis on service-learning and the outlined student-learning outcomes. Additionally, the *National Assessment of Service and Civic Engagement (NASCE)* will help understand the various dimensions of service, both in and out of the classroom. Finally, *c-nvolved* seeks to draw community partners into the fold as co-educators. Community partner feedback will be solicited and integrated into the process through a survey tool. Representatives from the highest and lowest rated projects will meet in an effort to capture best practices as well as needs for improvement.

