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Executive Summary
I. Executive Summary

Murray State University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) – *Bring Learning to Life* – was determined to be an institutional priority based on institutional assessment and feedback provided through an environmental study of all constituency groups associated with the University.

The purpose of *Bring Learning to Life* is to improve experiential learning outcomes through the implementation of 1) learning experiences in which students apply principles learned in the classroom in a real-world setting; and 2) professional development opportunities related to such relevant pedagogical areas as problem-solving, critical/creative thinking, and integrative learning. These pedagogical areas also define the student learning outcomes targeted by *Bring Learning to Life* through approved experience-rich activities (ERAs). These student learning outcomes within the ERA framework allow for focused effort, assessment, and scalability in different academic areas, promoting integration in the curriculum without excluding any of MSU’s academic departments.

**Goals and Objectives**

The goals and objectives of MSU’s *Bring Learning to Life* QEP are:

**Goal 1:** To foster an institutional environment that encourages and supports the application of knowledge and skills in a real-world setting through experiential learning opportunities

- **Objective 1a:** To identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;

- **Objective 1b:** To increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;

- **Objective 1c:** To enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning.

**Goal 2:** To provide experiential learning opportunities which benefit the Murray State community

- **Objective 2a:** To increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities;

- **Objective 2b:** To provide platforms for the ongoing exchange of ideas/techniques for developing new and strengthening current experiential learning opportunities;
Objective 2c: To improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved experience-rich activities.

The activities to be implemented associated with each of these two goals are chronologically ordered, with many of the early activities of the Bring Learning to Life QEP focused on the student learning environment in order to construct and facilitate an infrastructure that supports student learning.

Bring Learning to Life was identified through institutional assessment and data, is anchored to the University’s mission, and focuses on student learning outcomes and the environment supporting student learning. Bring Learning to Life has well-defined goals and associated assessment plans that were developed through broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies. Murray State University possesses the capability, resources, and expertise to implement and complete this QEP.
Introduction
II. Introduction

Murray State University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) – *Bring Learning to Life* – was determined to be an institutional priority based on institutional assessment and data provided through an environmental study of all constituency groups associated with the University.

The purpose of *Bring Learning to Life* is to improve experiential learning outcomes through the implementation of 1) learning experiences in which students apply principles learned in the classroom in a real-world setting; and 2) professional development opportunities related to such relevant pedagogical areas as problem-solving, critical/creative thinking, and integrative learning.

Murray State University has selected a Quality Enhancement Plan based on institutional assessment data and a thorough, broad-based environmental study. *Bring Learning to Life* focuses on both the student learning environment and student learning outcomes, having well-defined goals and objectives and a detailed plan of actions and assessments to be implemented. The plan is aligned with MSU’s mission and MSU possesses the capability, resources, and expertise to successfully complete this QEP.
Selecting the QEP Topic
III. Selecting the QEP Topic

The identification of MSU’s QEP used both existing institutional assessment mechanisms and an environmental study involving the entire campus community. The processes of identifying relevant institutional assessment data and soliciting appropriate broad-based feedback are outlined below.

   a. *Institutional Assessment (CR 2.12)*

MSU examined data from six existing institutional assessment mechanisms in order to validate the alignment of the QEP topic with institutional need.

   1. *National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)*

The following figures demonstrate the trends in selected questions from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) from the years 2003 through 2012. Murray State University has participated in NSSE surveys once every three years. The following charts represent the mean sample of both first-year students and seniors to better reflect the general attitude of the whole student body toward questions related to experiential learning.

These figures indicate a general increase in the number of students who either had already participated or intended to participate in programs or projects providing opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills to real-world settings. These ERAs include community-based projects as part of coursework; work with faculty members on activities or research projects outside of coursework or program requirements; practica; internships; field experiences; co-op experiences; clinical assignments; community service; and volunteer work.
Figure 1: Participation in Community-Based Project as Part of Course

Figure 1 represents the means of student responses regarding participation in community-based projects as part of a course between the years 2003 and 2012. Analysis of this data revealed:

- The majority of students reported never having participated in such projects, but those who reported having sometimes participated in such programs remained generally consistent from the years 2003 through 2012.
- Between the years 2005 and 2007, there is a decline in the reports of participating often or very often and an increase in the number of those reporting having never participated.
- Between the years 2007 and 2009, there is a slight reversal in the trend, showing an increased number of those reporting that they participated either often or very often and a slight decrease in those reporting having never participated.
- Between the years 2009 and 2012, there is a sharper increase in those reporting that they participated often or very often and a complementary decrease in those reporting having never participated. This demonstrates an increasing frequency of participants in such projects between the years 2009 and 2012.
Figure 2 represents the means of student responses regarding work on activities with faculty members outside of coursework. Analysis of this data revealed:

- The majority of those polled reported that they had never participated in such work.
- Between the years 2003 and 2005, there is an increased number of students reporting that they participated in such work, and a decline in those reporting that they had never participated.
- Between the years 2005 and 2009, there is a steady decline in those reporting that they had sometimes participated in such work, and an equal increase in those reporting having never participated.
- Between the years 2009 and 2012, the chart indicates that those reporting having sometimes participated begins to rise, along with those reporting having participated often or very often. Those reporting having never participated, in these same years, declines, returning to approximately the same number as in 2005.
- Those reporting having participated often or very often dips slightly between the years 2003 and 2007, with modest growth thereafter.
Figure 3: Student Participation in Practicum, Internship, Field Experience, Co-op Experience, or Clinical Assignment

Figure 3 represents the means of student responses regarding participation in practica, internships, field experiences, co-op experiences, or clinical assignments between the years 2003 and 2012. Analysis of this data revealed:

- The majority of students polled had either participated or planned to participate in one of these programs.
- Between the years 2003 and 2007, there is growth in the number of those who had participated or planned to participate.
- There is a decline in the number of those who had participated or planned to participate between the years 2007 and 2009, though the decline never fell below 2003 levels.
- Between the years 2009 and 2012, the number who had participated or planned to participate began to increase once again.
- Between the years 2003 and 2007, the number of students who planned not to participate fell, rising slightly between the years 2007 and 2009, but declining again between 2009 and 2012, falling below what had previously been the lowest mark of 2007. Though this increase was less drastic, the number of those who were undecided remained low, then rose and followed the trend of those who had decided not to participate in the same years.
Figure 4: Student Participation in Extracurricular Research Projects

Figure 4 represents the means of student responses regarding intention to work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements between the years 2003 and 2012. Analysis of this data revealed:

- For the majority of sample years, those who had no intention to participate in such a project were greater in number than those who had already participated, planned to participate, or were undecided.
- The number of students who planned not to participate declined in the years 2003 through 2007 and 2009 through 2012.
- Between the years 2009 and 2012, there is a sharp increase in the number of those who had participated or planned to participate in such a project, overtaking the number of those planning not to participate in the year 2012.
- The number of those who reported being undecided declined between the years 2003 and 2005, then began to rise and overtook those who had participated or planned to participate between the years 2007 and 2009.
- The number of those who were undecided fell sharply between the years 2009 and 2012, falling below what had previously been the lowest mark in 2005.
Figure 5 represents the means of student responses regarding participation in community service or volunteer work. Analysis of this data revealed:

- The majority of students polled consistently reported having participated in such work or having plans to do so.
- There is growth in the number of those who either had participated or planned to participate in the years 2005 through 2007 and 2009 through 2012, and that number remained generally consistent between the years 2005 and 2009.
- The chart indicates a general declining trend in both those who planned not to participate and those who were undecided.

The NSSE data indicate that Murray State University students generally gravitate toward practica, internships, field experiences, co-op experiences, clinical assignments, community service, and volunteer work as opposed to activities or research projects that involved faculty.

2. **NSSE/FSSE Comparison**

The following four figures present data that originated in the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) 2005 and the NSSE 2005, respectively. Questions were selected on the basis of similarity between faculty and student questions in order to reflect the difference between faculty and student perceptions of programs that encourage the application of skills and knowledge in real-world settings. Each figure contains two charts: on top, faculty data are presented; on bottom, student perception data are presented. Faculty data include either faculty use of ERAs as part of course requirements or the faculty perceptions of the importance of such ERAs. These faculty data were further divided into responses relative to upper- and lower-division courses. Student data include either the students’ intentions to participate in ERAs or the students’ perceived value of such ERAs. Student survey data were further divided by first-year students and seniors. These figures have been designed to illustrate the difference.
between faculty and student perceptions as well as the differences in perceptions that may exist regarding upper- versus lower-division course requirements and first-year students versus seniors.

Figure 6: Differences in Participation in Community-Based Projects as Part of Courses

Figure 6 represents the difference between the faculty’s requirement of community-based projects as part of coursework and the students’ general participation in such programs. In 2005, faculty did not seem to require participation as part of coursework; in fact, the majority of both upper- and lower-division courses never required participation. This finding is reflected in the students’ survey: most respondents reported never being required to participate in such programs as part of coursework. Of the faculty who did require community-based projects, most requirements were found in upper-division courses rather than lower-division ones. Of the students who had participated in such programs, the majority were seniors, which could indicate that participation had been required of them at some earlier point in their time at Murray State.
Figure 7: Perceptions of Practica, Internships, Field Experiences, Co-op Experiences, or Clinical Assignments

Figure 7 represents the faculty’s perception of the value of practica, internships, field experiences, co-op experiences, or clinical assignments compared to the students’ general intentions toward participation in such experience-rich opportunities. The charts indicate that faculty who teach both upper-division and lower-division courses place great value on experience-rich opportunities. This view may be reflected in the seniors’ intentions, as the vast majority of seniors had already participated or planned to participate in such programs. First-year students tended to be undecided about their participation in such programs, though fewer seniors had decided not to participate than first-year students.
Figure 8: Perceptions of Research Outside of Course/Program Requirements

![Bar chart showing faculty perception of value](chart1)

![Bar chart showing students' intention](chart2)

Figure 8 represents the faculty perception of the importance of students working on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements compared with students' intentions to participate in these research projects. The majority of faculty, regardless of what courses they teach, found participation in this kind of research project to be either important or somewhat important. Lower-division faculty found extracurricular research projects to be more valuable than upper-division faculty. Generally, first-year students were undecided about participation in extracurricular research, while seniors had largely decided against participation. This perception could reflect the relative value of group research for different disciplines or the centrality of undergraduate research to teaching undergraduate disciplines. Some disciplines may place a greater value on faculty mentoring, group research, or research as a training technique at the undergraduate level.
Figure 9: Perceptions of Community Service or Volunteer Work

The majority of faculty found community service and/or volunteer work to be either somewhat important or important. Almost an equal portion of faculty teaching upper-division and lower-division courses found such work to be very important. Seniors largely participated in such programs prior to the survey, though a portion still intended to participate in the future. First-year students also tended to have already completed some community service or volunteer work prior to the survey, though a much larger portion intended to do so in the future. A larger portion of first-year students were undecided about participation than those who had already intended not to participate.

Comparisons of NSSE and FSSE data demonstrate that there is a positive correlation between student participation in programs such as community-based projects as part of coursework,
practica, internships, field experiences, co-op experiences, clinical assignments, research projects with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements, community service, and volunteer work and the faculty perception of such programs.

3. Student Demographic and Academic Achievement Data

Student demographic and academic achievement data for two calendar years (Spring 2010 to Summer 2012) were used to create baselines for experiential learning outcome data. Analyses were conducted to determine baseline measures by examining performance in courses that included significant experiential learning components with respect to student demographics and academic achievement, to identify any specific demographic or academic indicators of experiential learning performance, to determine the relationship between experiential learning and retention, and to compare performance and participation in required and optional experiential learning-related courses. Experiential learning components were defined as critical thinking, creative thinking, analysis, problem-solving, and integrative learning. Courses were identified as experiential-learning-related through an analysis of course objectives. Courses with more than 95% of the course objectives related to one or more of these components were considered experiential-learning-related for the purposes of this study.

Baseline grade distributions were created for all of these courses by aggregating enrollment files across the available semesters (Spring 2010, Summer 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Summer 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Summer 2012) as well as across course sections within semesters. Grades were coded as A, B, C, D, E (failure), AU (audit), and W (drop).

Participation in optional experiential learning courses is extremely low, averaging only 21% of those students enrolled in experiential learning courses across the University, and ranging from 0.7% to 32% of enrollment in all colleges or schools except for the College of Business. The College of Business is an anomaly, with 76% participation in optional experiential learning courses.

Grades in both required and optional experiential learning courses were positively skewed. Required courses are often pass/fail, but, if graded, predominantly A's were earned. Accordingly, graded courses were divided into two groups: those in which 80% or more of the students earned A's, and those in which fewer than 80% of students earned A's. In 41% of all required courses, 80% or more of the students in that class earned A's. When the target was lowered to 70% of students in the course earning A's, the sample of required courses was evenly split, with 50% of all required courses awarding A's to 70% or more of enrolled students.

A similar analysis conducted on pass/fail required courses revealed that 86% of required courses using a pass/fail grading scheme awarded passes to 80% or more of enrolled students.
Optional courses were also positively skewed in student performance. In 66% of optional experiential learning courses, 80% or more of the students in that class earned A’s. In 76% of optional experiential learning courses using a pass/fail grading scheme, 80% or more of the students in that course earned passes.

While predictive analyses were planned prior to data analysis, interpretation of the descriptive statistics led us to abandon these predictive analyses. For optional courses, enrollment was too low to provide meaningful results. Even collapsing data across courses would not provide a useful prediction of student success because the few courses that have higher enrollments would carry the bulk of the variance and thus skew the results. Similarly, the lack of variance in grade distributions in required experiential courses did not provide enough variance to predict any meaningful outcomes.

### 4. Student Internships: Supervisor Survey Data

MSU’s Office of Career Services, which helps coordinate student internships, regularly distributes a survey to internship supervisors. Baseline data were acquired from evaluations of ninety-eight Murray State student interns. These student internships were completed from the summer of 2008 until the spring of 2012. Supervisors/internship (S/I) directors rated their interns on twenty-seven different characteristics. Each characteristic was part of one general domain: work performance; employability; work qualities; or personal qualities. Using a Likert scale ranging from “1” (Unsatisfactory) to “5” (Excellent), S/I directors scored each student intern on how well he/she embodied the characteristic. The S/I directors were able to write comments and suggestions for each student intern. The evaluation also asked S/I directors if they would consider hiring the student intern and if the results of the evaluation were discussed with the student intern.

On all twenty-seven characteristics and four domains, Murray State students’ average scores were between “4” (Above Average) and “5” (Excellent). Of the ninety-eight student interns, ninety-seven (99% of sample) were recommended for hire by their internship director.

While Murray State student interns are succeeding, there are areas in which improvement is needed. Student interns show strengths in all four domains, but there are deficiencies in three of the four domains as well. The “Employability” domain showed the highest means, while the “Work Qualities” domain showed the lowest means. To determine if specific characteristics were strengths or deficiencies, the following operational definition was used: if a characteristic had an average mean .05 points or more above the overall sample mean it would be considered a strength. If a characteristic had an average mean .05 points or more below the overall sample mean it would be considered a deficiency. Table 1 provides a summary of data on strengths and deficiencies.
Table 1: *Strengths and Deficiencies of Murray State Students in Work Performance, Employability, Work Qualities, and Personal Qualities* \((N = 98)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for the Job (Technical)</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Work Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of Work (Speed)</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Work Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Work Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Work Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Work</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation/Co-operation with Coworkers</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/Adherence to Rules</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes Clearly and Effectively</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Work Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks Clearly and Effectively</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Work Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks Critically and Analytically</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Work Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves Complex Real-world Problems</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Work Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance (Appropriate to Work)</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (Enthusiastic About Work)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Overall sample mean used for comparison was 4.64.*

Table 2 represents target skills addressed by the *Bring Learning to Life* purpose statement and the particular evaluation characteristics that embody them. As a side note, the term “On Par” is introduced in this table. A characteristic that is “On Par” shows a difference between the characteristic and sample means that is not more than ±.04 points.
Table 2: Target Skills in Quality Enhancement Plan (N = 98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Target Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinks Critically and Analytically</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves Complex Real-world Problems</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns Effectively on His/Her Own</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>On Par</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for the Job (Technical)</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Apply Education to Job</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>On Par</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Overall sample mean used for comparison was 4.64. 1 = Critical Thinking; 2 = Creative Thinking; 3 = Real-world problem solving; 4 = Integrative Learning.

These findings were significant to the identification of the topic, as only one of the target skills was found to be a strength.

The full report related to data provided by internship supervisors is available on the Bring Learning to Life website.

5. MAP-Works

In 2012, MSU implemented MAP-Works, a retention identification system. According to the MAP-Works website, the system is a platform that “empowers faculty and staff to positively impact student success and retention by identifying at-risk students early in the term. It efficiently and effectively provides faculty and staff the information they need to identify and coordinate interventions with at-risk students.”

An element of MSU’s implementation of MAP-Works was the utilization of a number of surveys targeting incoming freshmen, twice in the fall semester and once in the spring semester. In addition to the standard survey questions provided by MAP-Works, MSU added additional institution-specific questions, among them questions that probed items associated with the QEP topics under consideration. These data were incorporated into the environmental study, described below.

The institution-specific questions relevant to Bring Learning to Life were:

- How effectively are your courses teaching you problem solving skills? (Fall Survey 1; Fall Survey 2)
- How effectively are your courses teaching you to apply skills in a real-world setting? (Fall Survey 1; Fall Survey 2; Spring Survey)
- Do any of your classroom activities apply what you know to a new situation? (Spring Survey)
- Do your courses invite you to think creatively about problems and tasks? (Spring Survey)
- Are you aware of opportunities to do internships/co-ops? (Spring Survey)
- Are you aware of opportunities to engage in service-learning? (Spring Survey)
- Are you aware of opportunities to engage in undergraduate research or creative activity? (Spring Survey)

Students responded to these questions on a seven-point Likert scale. The responses were grouped into three categories: red (1-3); yellow (4, 5); and green (6, 7). These categories correlated with students’ risk levels for withdrawing from MSU, with red indicating high-risk and green indicating low-risk. Consistently, the majority of student responses to these questions were clustered in the yellow and red categories.

Table 3: MAP-Works Institution-Specific Survey Results (Fall Survey 1: N = 901; Fall Survey 2: N = 698; Spring Survey: N = 481)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Green (%)</th>
<th>Yellow (%)</th>
<th>Red (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your courses teaching you problem solving skills? (Fall Survey 1)</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your courses teaching you to apply skills in a real-world setting? (Fall Survey 1)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your courses teaching you problem solving skills? (Fall Survey 2)</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your courses teaching you to apply skills in a real-world setting? (Fall Survey 2)</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your courses teaching you to apply skills in a real-world setting? (Spring Survey)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any of your classroom activities apply what you know to a new situation? (Spring Survey)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your courses invite you to think creatively about problems and tasks? (Spring Survey)</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of opportunities to do internships/co-ops? (Spring Survey)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of opportunities to engage in service-learning? (Spring Survey)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of opportunities to engage in undergraduate research or creative activity? (Spring Survey)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of particular note is the fact that students classified in the red category demonstrate a much lower awareness of opportunities to engage in undergraduate research, service learning, and internships/co-ops. The identical responses to the questions on awareness of service learning and undergraduate research opportunities indicate that incoming freshmen are not able to differentiate between the two, or that they are equally aware/unaware of the existence of these programs.
Responses to the question “how effectively are your courses teaching you apply skills in a real-world setting?” showed some improvement from the fall semester to the spring semester, particularly among first-generation students and honors students (there was a slight decrease among undeclared students). As this survey was distributed solely to incoming freshmen for its inaugural deployment, there is an opportunity to examine longitudinal changes in responses to this question as MSU expands the use of the survey in 2013 to all undergraduate students. This will be discussed in more detail under Assessment Strategies.

6. Senior Survey Results

MSU issues a Senior Survey to graduating students, which polls student perceptions of various elements of their time with the University. Data examined in consideration of various QEP topics ranged between the years 2005 and 2011. The same questions appear on all questionnaires issued to the students regardless of program or major, and the results that appear in these charts are collective responses from the whole senior classes of respective years.

Figure 10 represents the students’ perception of off-campus co-op and internship experiences. Of those polled, the majority had no such experiences, but the perception of those who did have such experiences remained positive. The trend from years 2005 through 2011 shows little change, demonstrating consistency in the perception of the value of this experience-rich activity.

Figure 11 represents the students’ perception of on-campus, faculty-directed projects. Of those polled, the majority had no such experiences, but the perception of those who did have such experiences remained positive. The trend from years 2005 through 2011 shows that those who believed the program was valuable and those who found the program very valuable were roughly equal; the chart demonstrates consistency in the perception of the value of this experience-rich activity.

Figure 10: Students’ Perceptions of Off-Campus Co-op and Internship Experiences
Figure 11: *Students’ Perception of On-Campus, Faculty-Directed Projects*

![Student Perception of On-Campus Faculty-Directed Projects](image)

Figure 12 represents the students’ perception of the availability of faculty-mentored projects. Of those polled, the majority were satisfied with the availability of faculty-mentored projects. Those who were very satisfied consistently represented a larger portion of the student body than those who were dissatisfied. Figures 11 and 12 indicate that although the students generally agree that faculty-mentored projects are available, the majority of those polled have not participated in such projects.

Figure 12: *Students’ Perception of the Availability of Faculty-Mentored Projects*

![Student Perception of the Availability of Faculty-Mentored Projects](image)

In summary, the data from these six existing institutional assessment mechanisms served to validate the alignment of the choice of an experiential-learning QEP with institutional need. Analysis of institutional assessment data found that although the students perceive that faculty-mentored projects are available, a relatively small portion of the student body is participating in them. This finding dovetails with faculty perceptions of the relative value of faculty-mentored projects and experiences: faculty place more value on practica, internships, field experiences,
co-op experiences, and clinical assignments than they do upon faculty-mentored projects. Student participation reflects the value that faculty place on these programs in terms of applying knowledge and skills in a real-world setting: students participate more in practica, internships, field experiences, co-op experiences, clinical assignments, community service, and volunteer work than they do in activities involving faculty. The consistency between faculty perceptions of value and student participation suggests efforts to improve attitudes regarding ERAs, especially among faculty, may have a positive impact on student participation in ERAs. There is an obvious discrepancy between students reporting through the NSSE their intent to participate in ERAs and seniors reporting on the Senior Survey having successfully completed such experiences. This inconsistency may serve as an indication of the existence of barriers to participation. Accordingly, one of the goals of Bring Learning to Life is to identify and remove such barriers.

**b. Environmental Study (CS 3.3.2)**

The analysis of institutional data available through existing assessment practices supplemented an environmental study of the MSU campus and community. The environmental study was an iterative and emergent process by which the examination of institutional assessment data combined with campus and community feedback served to narrow the range of possible QEP topics. This study culminated in a clear consensus among all University constituency groups for a QEP topic that is in alignment with MSU’s mission and is a relevant need based on institutional assessment data. The alignment of the QEP with MSU’s mission is described more below.

The environmental study consisted of a series of surveys, forums, and opportunities for feedback distributed to MSU faculty, staff, and students. Additionally, survey instruments and feedback opportunities were distributed to known employers of MSU graduates, the University’s *Town and Gown* partners, members of regional Chambers of Commerce, and the advisory board of MSU’s Office of Regional Stewardship. Distribution of these instruments began in December 2011 and concluded with a final survey to all constituency groups presenting the two final, narrowed topic options. The table below provides an overview of these instruments and the constituency groups reached through the instruments. The table is followed by a brief summary of each instrument or feedback activity.
Table 4: Environmental Study Summary of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town and Gown</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers of Commerce</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Stewardship Advisory Board</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Study Activities:
1. In December, 2011 a voluntary, anonymous survey was offered at the annual 12 Gadgets of Christmas Library Open House event. This event targets faculty and staff in order to showcase various instructional technologies, along with drawings for prizes. This targeted survey was an initial examination of issues related to student learning and the student learning environment as viewed by faculty and staff.

2. A second targeted survey was distributed via email to all students in January 2012. Much like feedback activity 1, this survey was an initial examination of topics resonating with this constituency group.

3. Based on the initial results from the targeted surveys used in activities 1 and 2, a more focused survey on educational issues was distributed to all University constituencies: faculty, staff, students, alumni, employers of MSU graduates, Town and Gown partners, regional chambers of commerce, and the advisory board of MSU’s Office of Regional Outreach. This focused survey was distributed in winter, 2012.

4. Results of activity 3 were further narrowed in a follow-up all-user and alumni survey in May, 2012.

5. MSU faculty and professional staff were invited to respond to the question “what is your biggest concern about student learning at Murray State?” at the Faculty/Professional Staff lunch in August 2012 prior to the start of the 2012-13 academic year. Responses to this question were clustered according to general topics: student preparedness; technology; faculty issues; grade inflation; physical/facility issues; critical thinking; academic honesty; preparedness for careers, including analytical and technical knowledge; budget; and student health and wellness. These clusters and their associated responses provided validation of the themes emerging from the increasingly focused surveys above.

6. Results of activities 1-4 were narrowed into 6 possible general topics for the QEP. During the summer of 2012, six teams were asked to write white papers for each of the possible topics. These white papers, validated with the results of feedback activity 5, were provided to a review committee comprised of faculty and staff in Fall 2012. This committee further
narrowed the possible topics; two topics emerged as clear priorities. These two topics, along with their accompanying white papers and relevant institutional assessment data, were provided to all University constituency groups for a final round of feedback in November, 2012. A clear consensus on a topic of priority was identified through this process. The topic – application of knowledge and skills in a real world setting – was endorsed in a joint meeting of the QEP Steering Committee with the presidents of Faculty Senate, Staff Congress, and Student Government.

7. Following the identification of “application of knowledge and skills in a real world setting,” a naming competition open to all University constituents was conducted in January/February 2013. A student entry was selected as the winner of the competition, resulting in the name of MSU’s QEP – Bring Learning to Life.

Throughout the process of conducting the environmental study, various work teams and committees narrowed possible areas of interest into workable topics for the QEP. The various committees and work teams involved in the selection of the QEP topic included significant numbers of faculty and staff. Each group was asked to select appropriate student representation as they fulfilled their particular charge.

Following the identification of Bring Learning to Life as MSU’s next QEP, a nineteen-member faculty/staff Development Team was assembled to compile a literature review of best practices; identify appropriate goals, objectives, and measureable outcomes; develop a timeline of implementation; and advise the QEP Co-Directors on integration of the topic into the curriculum. This work team was comprised of faculty and staff associated with University initiatives relevant to experiential learning.

With its focus on analysis of institutional data and a multiple-stage, University community-wide environmental study, MSU’s QEP, Bring Learning to Life, is directly related to institutional planning. Furthermore, the inclusion of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and employers throughout the topic selection process ensured a broad-based, representative involvement from all relevant University constituencies during the development of Bring Learning to Life.
Focus of the QEP
IV. Focus of the QEP

The focus of the Bring Learning to Life QEP is the “application of knowledge and skills in a real-world setting.” This focus is rooted in the Association of American Colleges and University’s (AACandU) vision of a twenty-first century liberal education, as articulated through the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) project. According to the LEAP project, modern liberal education is integrative in nature, helping students develop transferable intellectual and practical skills that may be applied in a variety of settings.

For the purposes of the Bring Learning to Life QEP, the “application of knowledge and skills in a real-world setting” is grounded in the field of experiential learning. Integration of the QEP into the curriculum at MSU uses the principles of experiential learning outlined by the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE). Bring Learning to Life makes use of the LEAP project’s Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics to assess student learning outcomes (SLOs) associated with ERAs relevant to the different academic disciplines at MSU. Specific SLOs which are targeted for improvement through Bring Learning to Life are creative and critical thinking, problem solving, and integrative learning.

a. Goals and Objectives (CS 3.3.2)

The goals of MSU’s Bring Learning to Life QEP are:

Goal 1: To foster an institutional environment that encourages and supports the application of knowledge and skills in a real-world setting through experiential learning opportunities

Goal 2: To provide experiential learning opportunities that benefit the Murray State community

Each of these goals has associated objectives and measurable outcomes.

Goal 1: Objectives and Measureable Outcomes

Goal 1 of the QEP is to foster an institutional environment that encourages and supports the application of knowledge and skills in a real-world setting through experiential learning opportunities. Three objectives are associated with this goal.

Objective 1a: To identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities

Measureable outcomes associated with Objective 1a include:
- Barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities are identified
- Barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities are removed
Objective 1b: To increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning

Measureable outcomes associated with Objective 1b include:
- University support for experiential learning opportunities is increased
- University infrastructure supports an array of experiential learning opportunities

Objective 1c: To enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning

Measureable outcomes associated with Objective 1c include:
- Stakeholders are aware of experiential learning opportunities
- Marketing provides accurate and timely information regarding experiential learning opportunities

Goal 2: Objectives and Measureable Outcomes

Goal 2 of the QEP is to provide experiential learning opportunities that benefit the Murray State community. Three objectives are associated with this goal.

Objective 2a: To increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities

Measureable outcomes associated with Objective 2a include:
- Engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities will increase
- The Murray State community values experiential learning opportunities

Objective 2b: To provide platforms for the ongoing exchange of ideas/techniques for developing new and strengthening current experiential learning opportunities

Measureable outcomes associated with Objective 2b include:
- Ideas and techniques for developing new experiential learning opportunities are exchanged
- Ideas and techniques for strengthening existing experiential learning opportunities are exchanged

Objective 2c: To improve Murray State students' learning outcomes in approved experience-rich activities
Measureable outcomes associated with Objective 2c include:

- Murray State students’ critical thinking is improved in approved experience-rich activities
- Murray State students’ creative thinking is improved in approved experience-rich activities
- Murray State students’ problem-solving is improved in approved experience-rich activities
- Murray State students’ integrative learning is improved in approved experience-rich activities

These learning outcomes allow for targeted effort and assessment in different academic areas. This flexibility promotes integration of the QEP in the curriculum without excluding any of MSU’s academic departments, allowing Bring Learning to Life to act as a transformative experience while keeping the scale of the implementation manageable and sustainable. Achievement targets for each objective will be established at the beginning of the 2014-15 academic year, following the compilation and analysis of baseline data for all assessment mechanisms associated with measuring the activities of the QEP.

b. **Alignment with the Mission of Murray State University** (CR 2.12)

MSU has a long institutional tradition of supporting the western Kentucky and Jackson Purchase region; this support is explicitly addressed in MSU’s mission statement:

*Murray State University places a high premium on academic outreach, collaborative relationships with alumni, the public schools, business and industry, governmental agencies, and other colleges and universities at home and abroad.*

MSU’s mission further states the institution’s commitment to such academically engaging practices as internships, study abroad, service learning, and research and creative projects, each of which is relevant to Bring Learning to Life. This QEP gives Murray State University the opportunity to help students solidify the skills they need to “function in a culturally diverse, technologically oriented society and increasingly interdependent world,” while building or strengthening reciprocal relationships throughout the region. This applied approach is particularly important given MSU’s large proportion of first-generation college students.

MSU’s [Comprehensive Plan](#) outlines both Characteristics of MSU and Characteristics of an MSU Graduate. These statements of what the University and its graduates will embody include several characteristics that demonstrate the alignment between Bring Learning to Life and institutional priorities.
Specific points in the Characteristics of MSU relevant to the development and implementation of *Bring Learning to Life* include:

- The University sustains a balanced range of liberal and professional programs of excellence and endeavors to prepare students for their chosen professions.
- The University continues to provide greater educational access and academic outreach to Kentucky’s population.
- The University encourages academic innovation.
- The campus focus is on developing information literacy and academic excellence through active learning.
- The University maintains regular communication with alumni and involves them in the University, its priorities, goals and objectives.
- The University engages in public service programs with business, industry and labor, public and private schools, governmental agencies and the general public.

Specific points in the Characteristics of an MSU Graduate relevant to the development and implementation of *Bring Learning to Life* include:

- Engage in mature, independent and creative thought, and express that thought effectively in oral and written communication.
- Understand and apply the critical and scientific methodologies that academic disciplines employ to discover knowledge and ascertain its validity.
- Apply sound standards of information gathering, analysis and evaluation to reach logical decisions.
- Understand the roles and applications of science and technology in the solution of the problems of a changing world.
- Understand the dynamics of cultural diversity, of competing economic and political systems, and of complex moral and ethical issues.
- Understand the importance of and engage in ethical behavior and responsible citizenship.
- Demonstrate mastery of a chosen field of study.
- Value intellectual pursuit and continuous learning in a changing world.

Finally, *Bring Learning to Life* is anchored in elements of MSU’s Board of Regents’ *Strategic Directions Statement*. Specifically, MSU’s QEP addresses the Board’s call for MSU to provide distinctive academic programming and superior educational and co-curricular experiences, to act in support of community and regional economic development, and to provide continuing education for the region’s workforce.

A matrix outlining the relationships among institutional need, the objectives of *Bring Learning to Life*, and the measurable outcomes is attached.
V. Literature Review

Experiential learning is a pedagogy that actively engages students in the phenomena they are studying, which occurs in co-operative education, internships, clinical experiences, service learning, outdoor leadership, organizational development, and activity-based learning. When students develop their own research agendas, engage in critical thinking, and test their interpersonal skills, they encounter alternative worldviews, learning through both action and reflection, including the consequences of the larger social and ethical implications of this knowledge. This type of learning engages students in a deliberate process of hands-on problem solving and critical thinking (Montrose, 2002).

Kolb (1984) drew from Dewey, Lewin, and Piaget, as well as his own learning style research, to conceptualize the experiential learning model (see Figure 13).

Figure 13: The Kolb Experiential Learning Model (1984)

Experiential learning theory is grounded on the assumption that learning is based in both content and process (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). The experiential learning model is a cyclical and continuous process. The model begins with a concrete experience that engages students in a manner they find relevant and meaningful. The second step involves reflective observation facilitated by the educator that draws on the immediate experience of students. Experiential theorists, like Dewey, advise that the process should not be sacrificed in favor of the content. Instead of immediately participating in another experience, students must have time to engage in guided reflection (Proudman, 1992). As students reflect on each subsequent experience, they gain valuable insight and readiness for the next step in the process. Proudman notes, “The need to mix experience with associated content and guided reflection is critical. The dissonance created in this mixing allows the learner opportunities to bring the theory to life” (p. 22).
The historical reason for many of the experiential opportunities that exist, such as internships, practica, and clinical experiences, is the opportunity to develop work skills and competencies. Industry-based experiential learning assignments prepare students for the workplace by allowing students to “take what they have learned in the classroom and apply it to something considerably more than situational classroom simulations” (Nasr, 2004, p. 13). However, employers demand abilities such as critical thinking, communication, teamwork, and problem solving, all of which are enhanced through co-operative education (Marini and Tillman, 1998). These skills “are more sought after by employers than technical capabilities and high grade-point averages” (Langford and Cates, 1995, p. 134).

Experiential learning provides the motivation necessary for students to apply content knowledge, thus using the ability of the brain to solve problems and to assimilate that knowledge in a way that can be useful in new situations (Parnell, 1996). Experiential learning has proven to be an effective technique that promotes a learner’s cognitive development (Cantor, 1992). Due to its hands-on aspect, experiential learning also benefits students with physical and/or learning disabilities. Involvement in hands-on activities and close relationships with faculty appear to contribute to students’ sense of efficacy and self-confidence and support their efforts to persist (Kaul, 2010). Gillen, et al. (1984) reported improved student self-confidence, self-concept, and improved social skills. Busby (2005) discovered that students involved in experiential learning opportunities gain greater maturity and self-confidence.

The Carnegie Foundation’s Integrative Learning Project recommends the creation of a campus culture in which the majority of the academic community engages in integrative learning (Hutchings, 2007). One effective approach to convincing faculty and administrators of the value of experiential learning is curricular reform focusing on the general education core or on requirements for a major (Hutchings, 2007). According to Moon (2004), although job experience or internship as a curricular requirement is typically justified in terms of employability, “the potential for learning is far greater than the most generous definition of employability” (p. 164).

The primary obstacle to implementing experiential learning on college campuses is cost. Travel entails substantial logistical and financial costs, which must be borne by students, the institution, or a combination of both (Mitchell, 2011). However, new technologies may make this challenge less problematic. The use of technology to aid in experiential learning is well documented, ranging from the utilization of Web 2.0 technology to create user (learner)-driven academic environments (London & Hall, 2011b; Granitz & Koernig, 2011, p. 57) to e-portfolios for experiential learning to create a virtual place to showcase students’ abilities, knowledge, and experiences to potential employers (Brown [2009], Bruguier & Amador [2012], and Lester & Nicholls [2013]). Mobile technologies, such as mobile phones, GPS receivers, iPods, MP3 players, game consoles, digital cameras, and video cameras, can enhance active, experiential learning (Dyson et al., 2009; Lai et al., 2007; Pfeiffer et al., 2009; Song et al., 2012). Mobile technologies are useful for field-based and out-of-the-classroom learning because they can provide instant note-taking capabilities, recording applications, and built-in photographic
documentation. Mobile technologies not only allow students to organize knowledge formed in the field or outside of the classroom, but also help students in the abstract conceptualization stage record their impressions (Lai et al., 2007).

**Benefits of and Challenges to Involving the Community**

Experiential learning is not based solely on community service; instead, it is based on principles of conflict resolution, adaptation to the real world, and a constructivist pedagogy (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). Universities are developing new opportunities for learning that emphasize a collaborative experience with organizations and businesses in the community. Many of these businesses and organizations have long supported internships and practicum experiences, which are important for introducing students into real-life professional practice (Gronski & Pigg, 2000). These experiences are important opportunities for not only the acquisition of collaborative skills but also the application of concepts learned in the classroom. Experiential learning projects emerge from community needs and community members' knowledge (Farnsworth, 2010).

In rural communities, the collaboration between the University and local businesses/organizations is extremely important concerning the social capital; that is, the ability of a community to collaborate toward improving its well-being (Miller, 1997). Through creative partnerships with the community, universities can help fulfill the needs that local businesses cannot address with their limited resources. In this way, “the University is responsive and accountable to the community in which it exists; and the community's needs are met” (Kaiser-Drobney, 1997, p.177).

While assisting the community, the University's use of experiential learning simultaneously benefits students. For example, research shows that students participating in experiential learning opportunities with community businesses/organizations reported that the interaction helped them professionally, they felt a greater sense of ownership in the project being conducted, and they felt their work was a more valuable contribution to the world than students who conducted faculty-based research projects (Witesman, 2012).

Some challenges to the development of experiential learning opportunities with the community include managing time, locating community partners, and satisfying those partners’ expectations (Witesman, 2012). Nandan (2010) also stated that it is difficult and time consuming to access the appropriate person in a particular business/organization. Another challenge is minimizing the legal risk associated with student involvement in experiential learning projects with community partners. The students may need to be supervised by a licensed professional when participating in certain projects. Careful planning can help reduce the potential legal liability (Bender & Randall, 2005).
These and many other studies regarding the effectiveness of experiential education have led to the identification of eight principles of good practice, as documented by the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE). These eight principles are: intention; preparedness and planning; authenticity; reflection; orientation and training; monitoring and continuous improvement; assessment and evaluation; and acknowledgement. These practices have guided the development of actions to be implemented through Bring Learning to Life.
Actions to be Implemented
VI. Actions to be Implemented

The two goals of Bring Learning to Life target both the student learning environment and student learning outcomes. Based in large part on the experience MSU gained in the completion of its first QEP, On the Write Path, the Bring Learning to Life QEP is a two-step process. The implementation of the On the Write Path QEP demonstrated that the best way to impact student learning was to positively impact the student learning environment, changing faculty, staff, and student attitudes toward writing while establishing an infrastructure to engage students in such a way as to improve student learning. This model is applicable in the current QEP, and materializes in two distinct goals, one of which is predominantly oriented toward the student learning environment, while the other specifically addresses student learning outcomes. The activities to be implemented associated with each of these two goals are chronologically ordered based on this context, with many of the early activities of the Bring Learning to Life QEP focused on the student learning environment to construct and facilitate an infrastructure which supports student learning.

Goal 1 of the QEP is to foster an institutional environment that encourages and supports the application of knowledge and skills in a real-world setting through experiential learning opportunities. Three objectives are associated with this goal:

Objective 1a: to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
Objective 1b: to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
Objective 1c: to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning.

Goal 2 of the QEP is to provide experiential learning opportunities that benefit the Murray State community. Three objectives are associated with this goal:

Objective 2a: to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities;
Objective 2b: To provide platforms for the ongoing exchange of ideas/techniques for developing new and strengthening current experiential learning opportunities;
Objective 2c: to improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved experience-rich activities.

In order to achieve these goals, MSU has implemented or is in the process of implementing numerous activities in the areas of general QEP implementation, curricular integration, faculty development, and assessment. Assessment strategies for the actions to be implemented are aligned with the specific measurable outcomes associated with each goal and objective, and are discussed in more detail in the Assessments section. Each QEP activity description contains a brief outline of budgeted funds for the activity. The Capability and Timeline section of the report
provides a summary of the budget dedicated to *Bring Learning to Life*, along with an indication of the parties responsible for completing each action described below.

**General QEP Implementation**

Five-year Budget: $498,878

*Attached* is a chart depicting the organizational relationship of the various individuals and committees responsible for elements of *Bring Learning to Life* and for coordination of University initiatives related to experiential learning. Primary responsibility for the QEP is assigned to two QEP Co-Directors, who report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Central to achieving both goals is the appointment of two experiential learning coordinators, who report directly to the QEP Co-Directors. The Co-Coordinators of Experiential Learning are charged with the coordination of an Experiential Learning Advisory Board, the Collegiate Experiential Learning Ambassadors, and the Assessment Scoring Team. The QEP Co-Directors meet weekly in Executive Committee with the Co-Coordinators of Experiential Learning and the Director of Institutional Assessment to maintain close oversight of activities implemented. This Executive Committee is charged with coordinating faculty development, assessments, marketing, and general implementation of the QEP.

**Experiential Learning Advisory Committee** (objectives 1a; 1b; 1c; 2a; 2b)
The Experiential Learning Advisory Committee is charged with advising the Co-Coordinators of Experiential Learning on issues related to curricular integration, assessment, faculty development, student resources, awareness initiatives, and budget. The committee meets biweekly. The membership of the committee consists of:

- Service Learning Coordinator;
- Director of Undergraduate Research;
- Career Services Internship Coordinator;
- Director of Study Abroad;
- Regional Outreach Project Specialist;
- Three student representatives (this will be expanded to include representatives from each of the experiential learning areas included on this committee as the QEP progresses);
- Collegiate Ambassadors for Experiential Learning (described in more detail under Faculty Development).
External Experiential Learning Advisory Committee (objectives 1a; 1c; 2a; 2b)

Because Bring Learning to Life is grounded in experiential learning, the involvement of parties external to MSU is necessary both for the development of the QEP and for the success of its ongoing activities. To facilitate external review of the activities to be implemented through Bring Learning to Life, an external advisory board has been commissioned. This board is charged with helping MSU identify strengths and shortcomings of MSU interns and graduates, identifying barriers that prevent community partners from hiring graduates or interns, and advising the QEP leadership on possible curricular changes or other opportunities to expand and improve experiential learning opportunities. Feedback from the external advisory board will help identify barriers inhibiting experiential learning practices and provide insight into the real-world application of knowledge and skills gained from academic study at MSU. The external advisory board will review and/or validate data gathered from a much larger survey instrument distributed to all Chamber of Commerce members and non-profit organizations within MSU’s designated service region.

Faculty Development

Five-year Budget: $267,000

Collegiate Ambassadors for Experiential learning (1a; 1b; 1c; 2b)

Colleges, schools, and the University Libraries have each identified a Collegiate Ambassador for Experiential Learning. The Collegiate Ambassadors serve on the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee, and are charged with convening college/school-level workgroups designed to identify discipline-specific faculty workshops related to experiential learning and organizing at least one workshop per year on experiential learning. As part of the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee, Collegiate Ambassadors also review applications for academic program ERAs and mini-grants, and provide feedback to the Experiential Learning Co-Coordinators on assessment and other QEP initiatives.

Collegiate Ambassadors also contribute to monthly electronic newsletters. These newsletters report on best practices in experiential learning, experiential learning practices used at MSU, and upcoming professional development seminars, as well as providing links to or descriptions of useful experiential learning for faculty and students. In addition, a Bring Learning to Life Program website will provide a means for the distribution of experiential learning pedagogical resources. Finally, the Collegiate Ambassadors serve as discipline-specific marketers of ERAs relevant to the programs in the colleges and as liaisons to the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee for faculty.
Golden Key Fellowship Program (1b; 1c; 2a; 2b; 2c)

The Golden Key Fellowship Program promotes experiential education at MSU by providing faculty and staff an opportunity to obtain additional training in experiential education and to share new knowledge with the campus community through presentations and the creation or enhancement of an ERA for students.

Fellows will receive $5,000 towards conference travel, ERA support, and other experiential education expenses. After training (through conferences, etc.), the fellow will advocate for experiential education on campus and will provide at least one workshop for faculty/staff. The fellow will also use the new training to develop or enhance an ERA. The Fellow must also participate in one Real-World Marketplace QEP event.

Other Faculty Development

While the Collegiate Ambassador Program is the flagship for faculty development of experiential learning instruction and pedagogy at MSU, a number of other faculty development initiatives also fall under the umbrella of the QEP.

Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology Events: The MSU Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology (CTLT) is the University’s primary faculty support unit. CTLT offers several faculty development workshops, both large- and small-scale, each year. Among these is the 12 Gadgets of Christmas event held in Waterfield Library each December featuring new and improved technology that can be used for instruction. One of CTLT’s premier events is the annual Fall Forum, which focuses on different pedagogical techniques each year. The Fall Forum for 2014 is already earmarked for a focus on experiential learning.

Adventures: Life and Its Experiences Series: This series of seminars, assembled by the MSU Faculty Regent during the 2013-14 academic year, allowed students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the community to be involved in interactive sessions with speakers who have a wealth of academic and entrepreneurial experience. Speakers discussed their experiences related to their successes and their challenges, and provided the audience with the opportunity to interact with, and learn from, the life stories of others.

Curricular Integration (objective 2c)

Budgeted expenses contained within assessment and faculty development activities

Of the objectives associated with Bring Learning to Life’s two goals, objective 2c directly addresses student learning. Specifically, objective 2c is to improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved experience-rich activities (ERAs). The learning outcomes
associated with this objective are ones which are typically fostered through engaging in experiential learning, specifically critical and creative thinking, problem-solving, and integrative learning. These learning outcomes are also predictive of significant learning development as a result of engagement in experiential learning.

In order to bring this objective to fruition, MSU is requiring each academic program to identify an experience-rich activity in the areas of service learning, undergraduate research, internships/co-ops, study abroad, or containing an embedded course or co-curricular project. The program requirement and criteria were presented to and approved by MSU’s Academic Council. Criteria for the ERAs were established by the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee and the Experiential Learning Co-Coordinators, and are designed around the NSEE Principles of Practice. ERAs identified by the academic departments must:

- Involve the application of knowledge and skills in a real-life setting, typically outside of the classroom, resulting in a final product;
- Involve a third party outside of the traditional faculty-student interaction. This third party must be able to provide feedback on the final product;
- Begin with a reflection by students on their existing skills/knowledge and what they hope to gain by the experience;
- Conclude with a reflection by each student on the experience.

Academic department curriculum committees and department chairs must identify program ERAs by March, 2015 using an application form. ERAs are reviewed for alignment with the criteria and approved by the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee and the Experiential Learning Co-Coordinators. Approved ERAs do not necessarily have to be required of all students, but all students must have the opportunity to engage in the activities. Support for the revision or extended provision of ERAs and other experiential learning activities is provided through a mini-grant program. Approved ERAs are to be implemented beginning in Fall 2015.

In-depth descriptions of the assessment strategies associated with this activity are in the Assessment Strategies section of this plan.

*Bring Learning to Life Mini-Grants (objectives 1a; 1b)*

The purpose of the *Bring Learning to Life* Mini-Grants is for faculty, staff, and/or students to develop new activities or improve existing activities that help meet one or more of the QEP’s stated objectives. The Experiential Learning Advisory Committee acts as the selection committee for mini-grant awards.

All faculty or staff who wish to create new or improve existing experiential learning opportunities are eligible to apply. Furthermore, full-time students may also apply for grants that assist them in completing ERAs. Grant recipients will be required to complete a Grant Report Form at the end of the grant period. This form must be submitted before any future proposals from a grant recipient’s department will be considered.
Eligible ERAs include, but are not limited to, course-embedded or co-curricular projects, service learning, internships, co-ops, practica, and clinical experiences. It is anticipated that awards will range between $500 and $1,500. Proposals for new activities are encouraged, as are collaborative proposals. Matching funds are not mandatory, but will be taken into consideration by the selection committee. Student proposals that impact multiple students will be given stronger consideration than individual requests. A faculty sponsor on student proposals is encouraged but not mandatory.

**Real World Market (1b; 1c; 2b)**

The Real World Market is a student-designed event to raise awareness of Murray State’s experiential learning opportunities. The inaugural Real World Market will take place in the Curris Center on Thursday, February 13, 2014 and will feature “booths” by already established experiential learning units such as Service Learning, Study Abroad, and several departments that have strong internship programs in place. In subsequent years, the Real World Market is intended to grow as programs establish their approved ERAs and employers gain familiarity with the opportunity to market their positions.

**Assessment**

Five-year Budget: $98,000

Assessment strategies within *Bring Learning to Life* are organized in association with the two goals of the QEP. These two goals, as described above, target both the student learning environment and student learning outcomes. This section provides an overview of the assessment mechanisms; each assessment mechanism is more fully detailed in [Assessment Strategies](#) below.

The first goal of *Bring Learning to Life* targets the student learning environment. As this goal has broad associated objectives, focusing on such issues as awareness and the identification and removal of institutional barriers, assessment mechanisms for this goal are diverse. Strategies for assessment of this goal range from faculty and staff surveys to the development of a unified feedback form for external partners and other third parties serving as a host for MSU’s ERAs. MSU is also increasing the frequency of its participation in the NSSE and FSSE surveys in order to gather more data on student and faculty engagement during the implementation of the QEP. The establishment of achievement targets for these assessment mechanisms will take place in 2014-15, following the collection and analysis of baseline data.

The second goal of *Bring Learning to Life* targets student learning. Student learning is directly impacted through the Curricular Integration program described above. Assessment of the
Curricular Integration program takes place through three primary methods: direct assessment of student learning by faculty; direct assessment of student learning by the third party, where appropriate; and indirect assessment of student learning through written reflection papers. Direct measures of student learning resulting from participation in approved ERAs will be assessed by ERA faculty mentors using a modified VALUE rubric (the rubric is presented in the Assessment Strategies section of this report). In some cases, these data will be gathered through the annual submission of Student Learning Outcome reports to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. ERAs that are not assessed as part of approved departmental assessment methods will also be collected annually. The establishment of achievement targets for these assessment mechanisms will take place in 2014-15, following the collection and analysis of baseline data.

A significant component of the QEP’s Curricular Integration is student reflections, in accordance with NSEE’s principles of best practice for experiential learning. Student reflections, guided by prompts developed by the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee, will take place before and after completion of identified/approved ERAs. Assessment of these reflections will be managed centrally by an Assessment Scoring Team, which will use a modified VALUE rubric to assess student artifacts both analytically and holistically (the rubric is presented in the Assessment Strategies section of this report). Holistic scores provide reliable, valid assessment of reflection because they allow a range of responses within broad categories, designating overall quality without disrupting the accuracy of the single descriptive score. Analytic scores allow for the identification of specific strengths and weaknesses in the learning outcomes associated with experiential learning. The Assessment Scoring Team will begin scoring initial reflective pieces in existing ERAs in spring, 2014 in order to calibrate the scoring rubric, to establish inter-rater reliability, and to gather baseline data.

Actions to be implemented as part of MSU’s Bring Learning to Life QEP are organized around the two goals of the plan: to impact the student learning environment and to positively impact student learning. Based on experience from a previous QEP, MSU’s current QEP sequences the actions to be implemented in order to positively impact the student learning environment, helping foster an institutional climate that makes student learning sustainable. The Curricular Integration component directly targets student learning, and is structured to provide the flexibility needed by diverse academic programs. The identification and approval of ERAs on a programmatic basis allows departments to foster student engagement in experiential learning in a manner consistent with each discipline. The outcomes associated with Curricular Integration, while flexible, focus on student learning typically improved by participation in experiential learning. This flexibility allows Bring Learning to Life to be transformative for a broad range of undergraduate students while still maintaining sufficient focus for the initiative to be sustainable and measurable.

A matrix outlining the relationships among institutional need, the objectives of Bring Learning to Life, and the activities to be implemented is attached.
Assessment Strategies
VII. Assessment Strategies (CS 3.3.2)

Assessment of Bring Learning to Life is comprised of individual assessment strategies aligned with the actions to be implemented as a part of the QEP, as well as an overarching operational effectiveness assessment mechanism to ensure that the implementation of Bring Learning to Life is successful.

a. Assessment Strategies: Actions to be Implemented

Each of the actions to be implemented has one or more associated assessment strategies. Below are detailed descriptions of the assessment strategies aligned with these actions. The table below provides a graphic representation of the various assessment strategies and their alignment with the objectives of Bring Learning to Life. As Table 5 illustrates, all objectives and their related outcomes will be assessed with both direct and indirect measures.

Achievement targets for each assessment mechanism will be established in 2014-15 following the collection and analysis of baseline data.

Table 5: Alignment of Assessment Strategies with QEP Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instrument</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>2c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use Data</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSE</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-Works</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Surveys</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Surveys</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-grant Reports</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Region Surveys</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Team Assessments of Student Reflections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Assessment of Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/Host Feedback on Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Student Learning Outcome Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Questionnaire</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I = indirect measure; D = direct measure)

Use Data
Objectives:

- 1a (indirect): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1b (indirect): to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
- 1c (indirect): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (direct): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities;
- 2b (direct): to provide platforms for the ongoing exchange of ideas/techniques for developing new experiential learning opportunities and for strengthening existing ones.

Increased student utilization of experiential learning activities should be a natural outcome of increased engagement and awareness of ERAs and other experiential learning activities. Use data serve as indirect measures of objectives 1a, 1b, and 1c, and serve as direct measures of objective 2a and 2b. Specific use numbers that will be captured include total number of internships/co-ops completed, total number of service learning placements completed; number of students applying for undergraduate research support; and number of students participating in approved study abroad experiences. A baseline of these use numbers will be gathered at the conclusion of the 2013-14 academic year, prior to the widespread implementation of the activities associated with Bring Learning to Life.

The first goal of Bring Learning to Life focuses on the student learning environment and faculty development is a significant component of achieving this goal. As such, an examination of utilization of faculty development resources provided through the auspices of the QEP will provide a measure of faculty engagement and the provision of platforms for the exchange of ideas. Specific use data that will be captured include access provided to faculty development newsletters and the resources provided through a Bring Learning to Life faculty development website, as well as attendance at faculty development events such as workshops and CTLT’s Forum.

**National Survey of Student Engagement**

Objectives:

- 1a (indirect): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 2a (indirect): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities.
The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is designed to measure two features of collegiate quality: the amount of time and effort students put into educationally purposeful activities; and how the institution deploys its resources to get students to participate in educationally purposeful activities. The NSSE is a nationally validated assessment; a psychometric portfolio of validity and reliability studies on the NSSE is available online.

As it relates to experiential learning, the NSSE contains questions related to the synthesis of information; application of skills and knowledge to practical problems or new situations; using numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue; participation in internships, practica, study abroad, research, and/or culminating senior experiences; and the institution’s role in developing students’ skills in solving complex real-world problems. Other student engagement data may also provide information about patterns of success or potential barriers related to engagement in ERAs. Additionally, MSU has elected to include the Development of Transferable Skills topical module, which surveys students’ engagement in activities that develop transferable skills for the workplace.

The Kentucky Council for Postsecondary Education requires MSU to administer the NSSE every three years. However, as part of Bring Learning to Life, MSU has elected to increase the frequency of NSSE administrations. The NSSE was last administered at MSU in 2012; results from that administration were factored into institutional assessment used during the selection of the QEP topic, described above. The NSSE is being administered in 2014 to gather baseline data for the establishment of achievement targets and will be administered again in 2016 to gauge progress toward the achievement targets in the items identified above. Data gathered through the 2016 administration of the NSSE will allow for further refinement of activities and assessment strategies associated with Bring Learning to Life.

**Faculty Survey of Student Engagement**

**Objectives:**

- 1a (indirect): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 2a (indirect): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities.

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) is designed to complement the NSSE. According to the FSSE website, the FSSE focuses on “faculty perceptions of how often students engage in different activities; the importance faculty place on various areas of learning and development; the nature and frequency of faculty-student interactions; and how faculty members organize their time, both in and out of the classroom.”

As it relates to experiential learning, the FSSE contains questions related to faculty’s perceptions regarding the importance of students’ participation in internships, practica, study abroad, research, service learning, or culminating senior experiences; the amount of time spent
supervising student research, internships, or field experiences; the amount of service learning incorporated into undergraduate courses; students’ use of numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue; students’ ability to synthesize information; students’ application of skills and knowledge to practical problems or new situations; the proportion of class time spent in experiential activities; and the faculty’s role in developing students’ skills in solving complex real-world problems. Other data revealing faculty perceptions may also provide information about potential barriers to engagement in ERAs. Additionally, MSU has elected to include the Development of Transferable Skills topical module, which surveys faculty about students’ engagement in activities that develop transferable skills for the workplace.

Unlike the NSSE, MSU is not mandated by the Kentucky Council for Postsecondary Education to administer the FSSE. MSU’s last administration of the FSSE was in 2005. As part of Bring Learning to Life, the FSSE will be administered on the same schedule as the NSSE, in 2014 (baseline and setting achievement targets) and 2016 (measuring progress toward targets). As with the NSSE, data gathered through the 2016 administration of the FSSE will allow for further refinement of activities and assessment strategies associated with Bring Learning to Life.

MAP-Works

Objectives:
- 1b (indirect): to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
- 1c (direct): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (direct): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities;
- 2c (indirect): to improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved ERAs.

Data from MSU’s 2012 implementation of MAP-Works were used in the QEP topic identification and selection process. As described in the QEP Selection portion of this report, an element of implementing MAP-Works as a retention management system is the distribution of a survey to students. The survey gauges students’ transition to life in higher education. The initial survey deployment in fall 2012 targeted incoming freshmen students. The distribution of the survey was broadened to all undergraduate students in the fall of 2013, and will continue at this scale henceforth.

The MAP-Works transitions survey is administered twice each academic year, once in the fall semester and once in the spring semester. Administration of the survey typically takes place following the first three weeks of the semester. Locally developed questions added to the survey relate to MSU’s QEP, providing direct assessment of objectives 1c and 2a and indirect
assessment of objectives 1b and 2c. The following matrix outlines how each question on the survey aligns with the objectives of *Bring Learning to Life*.

Table 6: MAP-Works Transition Survey Alignment with QEP Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your courses teaching you problem solving skills?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your courses teaching you to apply skills in a real-world setting?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any of your classroom activities apply what you know to a new situation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your courses invite you to think creatively about problems and tasks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of opportunities to do internships/co-ops?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of opportunities to engage in service-learning?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of opportunities to engage in undergraduate research or creative activity?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline data on these questions will be compiled following the spring, 2014 administration, followed by the establishment of achievement targets for each question.

**Faculty/Staff Surveys**

Objectives:
- 1a (direct): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1b (indirect): to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
- 1c (direct): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (direct): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities.

Throughout the implementation of *Bring Learning to Life*, various survey instruments will be deployed to MSU’s faculty and staff. The surveys provide directly assess objectives 1a, 1c, and 2a and indirectly assess objective 1b. An [initial survey](#) will be distributed to all MSU faculty and staff in January 2014, providing baseline data. Analysis of the baseline data will be used to establish achievement targets. Further surveys will be deployed annually each spring, as noted in the [Capability and Timeline](#) section of this report.

Different sections of the survey will measure select outcomes for both goals. Faculty and staff will have an opportunity to gauge their changing awareness of experiential learning opportunities for students, to reflect on their views towards experiential learning, and to indicate the degree to which their engagement in these practices has changed over the QEP’s
implementation. Surveys will also contain open-response questions asking MSU faculty and staff to help identify barriers to effective experiential learning practice as well as their perceptions regarding MSU’s support and infrastructure for experiential learning.

**Student Surveys**

Objectives:
- 1a (direct): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1b (indirect): to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
- 1c (direct): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (direct): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities.

Just as with MSU’s faculty and staff, the implementation of Bring Learning to Life will involve the deployment of surveys to MSU’s students. These surveys provide direct measures for objectives 1a, 1, and 2a and indirect measures for objective 1b. An initial survey will be distributed to all MSU students in January 2014, providing baseline data. Analysis of the baseline data will be used to establish achievement targets. Further surveys will be deployed annually each spring, as noted in the Capability and Timeline section of this report.

While the surveys used with faculty/staff and students will have some elements in common, there will be some markedly different questions as well. Survey questions will gauge student perception of the ease of access to and University infrastructure/support for experiential learning opportunities. Data will also be collected on awareness of experiential learning activities and the value students attribute to these experiences.

**Senior Survey**

Objectives:
- 1a (indirect): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1c (indirect): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (indirect): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities.

MSU distributes a survey to graduating seniors each year, soliciting data on student perceptions of various elements of the University. Questions pertaining to experiential learning include
queries on engagement in co-op experiences, undergraduate research, and the availability of faculty-mentored projects. These questions, which are consistent from year to year, provide indirect measures of 1a, 1c, and 2a. Baseline data will be collected in 2014 and analysis of this data will be used to establish achievement targets for this measure.

**Faculty Development Surveys**

Objectives:

- 1a (indirect): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1b (indirect): to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
- 1c (direct): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (direct): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities;
- 2b (indirect): to provide platforms for the ongoing exchange of ideas/techniques for developing new experiential learning opportunities and for strengthening existing ones.

Based on the results of a prior QEP, MSU has structured *Bring Learning to Life* to address environmental issues earlier in the QEP’s implementation, followed by more targeted work on student learning outcomes. MSU’s previous QEP created a significant attitudinal shift toward the topic of the QEP among the faculty and staff, which in turn led to more positive effort dedicated towards the activities that impacted student learning.

Toward that end, *Bring Learning to Life* has a sizable faculty development component. As described above, faculty development activities include collegiate workgroups led by the Experiential Learning Ambassadors, a University-wide Forum organized through MSU’s Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, and workshops resulting from the Experiential Learning Fellowship.

Various feedback instruments used throughout the faculty development activities will provide direct measures of objectives 1c and 2a and indirect measures of objectives 1a, 1b, and 2b. These instruments will gather data on changes in faculty values, awareness, and perceptions of University support for experiential learning, as well as feedback on the perceived barriers to experiential learning.
**Bring Learning to Life Mini-Grant Reports**

Objectives:
- 1a (direct): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1b (direct): to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
- 2b (indirect): to provide platforms for the ongoing exchange of ideas/techniques for developing new experiential learning opportunities and for strengthening existing ones.

The QEP provides funds for faculty and staff to use towards developing new or improving existing ERAs, and for students to use toward completing ERAs. Recipients of mini-grant funds are required to submit a final report. These reports serve as direct measures of objectives 1a and 1b, and as indirect measures of objective 2b. Mini-grant reports will include notes on how the grant-funded activity removed barriers to participation in experiential education, how the grants developed or enhanced an ERA or some other element of University infrastructure, and how the results of the grant-funded work were disseminated among other faculty. The Experiential Learning Advisory Committee will use a rubric to analyze the impact of the mini-grants. The results of the analysis will be sent to the Experiential Learning Coordinators, who will report the findings to the QEP Co-Directors. Baseline data will be collected in 2014 and analysis of this data will be used to establish achievement targets for this measure.

**Rubric for review of Bring Learning to Life Mini-Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Removes barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Meets expectations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Benchmark</strong></th>
<th><strong>Marginal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Not applicable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removed more than one barrier to participation in experiential learning opportunities or includes plans for removing additional barriers</td>
<td>Removed barrier to participation in experiential learning opportunities</td>
<td>Some attempt is made to remove a barrier to participation in experiential learning opportunities</td>
<td>No clear link between ERA or approved project and a barrier to participation in experiential learning opportunities</td>
<td>Not designed to remove a barrier to participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Improves infrastructure for experiential learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Meets expectations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Benchmark</strong></th>
<th><strong>Marginal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Not applicable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved infrastructure in a significant way or in multiple ways</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure in targeted way outlined in proposal</td>
<td>Progress made toward improving the infrastructure</td>
<td>Limited or vague discussion of impact on infrastructure</td>
<td>Not designed to improve infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Improved an ERA</strong></th>
<th><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Meets expectations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Benchmark</strong></th>
<th><strong>Marginal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Not applicable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved existing ERA in a significant way or in multiple ways beyond the scope outlined in the proposal</td>
<td>Improved existing ERA in targeted way outlined in proposal</td>
<td>Progress made toward improving existing ERA</td>
<td>Limited or vague discussion of improvement of existing ERA; or, discussion limited to plans to improve ERA in</td>
<td>Developed a new ERA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed an ERA</td>
<td>Disseminated information</td>
<td>Impact on student learning</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed an ERA in a significant way or in multiple ways beyond the scope outlined in the proposal</td>
<td>Shared information at the state, national, or international level, as well as with MSU community</td>
<td>Reports impact on student learning with two measures; analyzes results to explain meaning within context of ERA and indicates how information will be used for ERA improvement</td>
<td>Improved an existing ERA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed an ERA in targeted way outlined in proposal</td>
<td>Shared information with college/school</td>
<td>Reports impact on student learning with one direct measure; analyzes results to explain meaning within context of ERA</td>
<td>Limited or vague discussion of development of ERA; or, discussion limited to plans to develop ERA in future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress made toward developing an ERA</td>
<td>Shared information with faculty/staff within department</td>
<td>Reports impact on student learning with indirect measures (such as faculty or student perceptions of learning)</td>
<td>Did not disseminate information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Region Surveys**

Objectives:

- 1a (direct): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1c (direct): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (direct): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities;
- 2c (indirect): to improve Murray State students' learning outcomes in approved ERAs.

MSU’s eighteen-county service region contains many business and non-profit organizations. Each year, a survey will be distributed to Chamber of Commerce members, non-profit organizations, and United Way organizations in the western Kentucky region. This survey provides a direct measure for objectives 1a, 1c, and 2a and an indirect measure of objective 2c. The initial administration of the survey in 2013-14 will provide baseline data; moreover, analysis of that data will result in achievement targets for subsequent administrations.

Questions gauge awareness and engagement of MSU’s external constituencies, along with changes in student performance in the QEP’s targeted learning outcomes. The survey also asks MSU’s external constituencies to provide information about existing barriers to further engagement with MSU in the realm of experiential learning.
**Scoring Team Assessments**

**Objective:**
- 2c (indirect): to improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved ERAs.

As part of the Curricular Integration component of *Bring Learning to Life*, each program is required to identify an Experience-Rich Activity. Students who participate in an approved ERA are required to prepare two reflective writing assignments. In the first reflective assignment, students will reflect on their current skills and knowledge, and on what they hope to gain by participating in the ERA. The second assignment, given at the completion of the experience, will ask students to reflect on the experience and to provide feedback on the process. Prompts will be provided for each of these reflective assignments. The prompts will be developed by the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee and program coordinators.

Assessment of these reflective assignments will be completed by a multi-disciplinary Scoring Team. The Assessment Scoring Team will begin scoring initial reflective pieces in existing ERAs in spring, 2014 in order to calibrate the scoring rubric (below), to establish inter-rater reliability, and to gather baseline data. Department chairs will be provided summary reports of the findings related to their programs. Achievement targets will be established in conjunction with the approval of each program’s ERA.

**Rubric for Assessment of Reflections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Master 4</th>
<th>Exceeds Benchmark 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Marginal 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others’ points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others’ points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.</td>
<td>Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.</td>
<td>Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.</td>
<td>Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Experience</td>
<td>Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such</td>
<td>Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g. family life, artistic participation, civic</td>
<td>Compares life experience and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and</td>
<td>Identifies connections between life experiences and those academic texts and ideas perceived as similar and related to own interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Learning—Reflection and Self-Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) incorporating multiple and diverse contexts.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Articulates strengths and challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts through increased self-awareness.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Describes own performances with general descriptors of success and failure.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Assessment of Student Learning**

Objective:

- 2c (direct): to improve Murray State students' learning outcomes in approved ERAs.

Faculty who mentor students participating in approved ERAs will be required to provide assessments of student learning taking place in the ERA. This serves as a direct measure of objective 2c. Assessments of pilot ERAs will begin in the spring 2014 semester. Programmatic ERA assessments will begin in the 2015-16 academic year.

Participation in an approved ERA will result in a product or artifact that will be assessed for learning outcomes using the rubric below. Faculty reviewers who are experts in their fields will set the appropriate achievement targets for the rubric-based assessment of the student artifacts. These faculty will also discuss and interpret the results within the context of the outcome and the ERA. These assessment reports will be used to determine the University-wide impact on student learning resulting from the Curricular Integration component of the QEP. Department chairs will be provided summary reports of the findings related to their programs. Analysis of the results will be used at the program level to make improvements to the ERA and the degree program and at the QEP-level to make improvements to the implementation of the QEP.
### Rubric for Faculty and Employer/Host Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Master 4</th>
<th>Exceeds Benchmark 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Marginal 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative Thinking—Innovative Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.</td>
<td>Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td>Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td>Reformulates a collection of available ideas. Nothing new or novel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative Thinking—Risk Taking</strong></td>
<td>Actively seeks out and follows through on untested and potentially risky directions in creating/developing the final product.</td>
<td>Incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment in creating/developing the final product.</td>
<td>Considers new directions or approaches but does not incorporate them in creating/developing the final product.</td>
<td>Stays strictly within the given guidelines in creating/developing the final product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Learning—Knowledge Transfer</strong></td>
<td>Independently adapts and applies knowledge and/or skills gained in class to experience-rich activity to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways.</td>
<td>Adapts and applies knowledge and/or skills gained in class to experience-rich activity to solve problems or explore issues.</td>
<td>Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained to contribute to understanding of the problems addressed in the experience-rich activity.</td>
<td>Little to no application of knowledge and skills gained in class to experience-rich activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Learning—Integrated Communication</strong></td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) in ways that enhance meaning, making clear the interdependence of language and meaning, thought, and expression.</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) to explicitly connect content and form, demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience.</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) that connects in a basic way what is being communicated (content) with how it is said (form).</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) (e.g., to produce an essay, a poster, a video, a PowerPoint presentation, etc.) at a superficial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving—Solution Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.</td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a basic manner.</td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.</td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employer/Host Feedback on Student Learning

**Objective:**
- 2c (direct): to improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved ERAs.
Employers or hosts of students participating in approved ERAs will be asked to provide assessments of student learning taking place in the ERA. This assessment serves as a direct measure of objective 2c. This assessment of student learning will be used in addition to existing employer/host feedback mechanisms. Achievement targets for aggregated employer/host assessment of student learning will be established by the Experiential Learning Advisory Committee.

Participation in an approved ERA will result in a product or artifact that will be assessed for learning outcomes using the rubric above. These assessment reports will be used to determine the University-wide impact on student learning resulting from the Curricular Integration component of the QEP. Department chairs will be provided summary reports of the findings related to their programs.

**Program Student Learning Outcome Reports**

Objective:
- 2c (direct): to improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved ERAs.

While academic programs are required to offer only one approved ERA, some programs may offer additional experiential learning opportunities. If data are gathered on these additional experiential learning opportunities, then these data can be submitted using the Academic Program Student Learning Outcome reporting procedure, beginning with the 2014-15 academic year. This procedure requires academic programs to submit assessment plans and reports annually, which are then reviewed by the University’s Assessment Committee. Revisions are conducted as needed. Programs identify their student learning outcomes, aligned measures, achievement targets and report results, analysis of the results, and a description of the use of the results to make improvements to the program.

**Department Questionnaire**

Objective:
- 1a (in/direct): to identify and remove barriers to participation in experiential learning opportunities;
- 1b (in/direct): to increase University support and improve infrastructure for experiential learning;
- 1c (in/direct): to enhance stakeholders’ awareness of opportunities related to experiential learning;
- 2a (in/direct): to increase the engagement of the Murray State community in experiential learning opportunities;
- 2b (in/direct): to provide platforms for the ongoing exchange of ideas/techniques for developing new experiential learning opportunities and for strengthening existing ones;
• 2c (indirect): to improve Murray State students’ learning outcomes in approved ERAs.

At the mid-point and conclusion of the QEP, department chairs will be asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding the impact of Bring Learning to Life. This questionnaire will provide both direct and indirect measures of each objective of the QEP, with the exception of 5c (which this instrument measures only indirectly).

The questionnaire will probe department chairs’ perceptions of the impact of faculty development activities and assessment results on faculty attitudes/engagement with experiential learning and the continued or reduced presence of barriers to experiential education. The questionnaire will also ask department chairs to report changes that have been made to the curriculum or to departmental operations as a result of assessment findings and feedback from employers/hosts of MSU students. Analysis of the mid-point questionnaire data will provide information useful for needed revision to the QEP as well as for establishing achievement targets for the conclusion questionnaire.

**b. Assessment Strategies: Bring Learning to Life Operational Effectiveness**

In addition to assessment strategies targeting the actions to be implemented through Bring Learning to Life, the QEP will also undergo operational effectiveness assessment to monitor the overall progress of the QEP towards its goals. This oversight will be completed in a four-stage process.

**Stage 1: Annual Reports**

The first stage of the QEP’s operational effectiveness assessment is the compilation of an annual report designed to extract data from the many different assessment mechanisms, organized by objective. A template for this annual report is available online at the Bring Learning to Life website. The report template provides a structure for the comparison of current-year data to baseline figures and achievement targets. It also provides prompts for reflection on the indirect measures provided by the assessment mechanisms on the progress toward the goals of the QEP. An example of each structure is provided below:
Example 1: Direct measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there barriers to participation in experiential learning?</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>Current Year Ending</th>
<th>% Change from Previous Year</th>
<th>% Change from Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Example 2: Indirect measure
What do the results of Use Data analysis reveal as an indirect measure of the identification and removal of barriers to participation in experiential learning activities? Reflect on achievement targets and progress toward completing Goal 1.

**Stage 2: Departmental Questionnaires**

As described above, a Departmental Questionnaire will be distributed to department chairs at the mid-point of the QEP. The questionnaire will probe department chairs’ perceptions of the impact of faculty development activities and assessment results on faculty attitudes/engagement with experiential learning and the continued or reduced presence of barriers to experiential education. The questionnaire will also ask department chairs to report changes that have been made to the curriculum or to departmental operations as a result of assessment findings and feedback from employers/hosts of MSU students. The questionnaire will also ask department chairs to identify which assessment results they have used, which ones they found to be the most useful, and what other data they need.

**Stage 3: Bring Learning to Life Mid-point Review Summit**

Following the collection of the Departmental Questionnaires, the QEP directors will conduct a mid-point review summit of the QEP. The summit will include focus groups of department chairs, faculty, students, and external partners with MSU. Data from the previous years’ annual reports will be presented, and attendees will be asked for feedback on the progress of *Bring Learning to Life*. This summit is intended to determine further steps or changes to the plan to be implemented in the second half of the QEP.

**Stage 4: Summary of Revisions to QEP Actions/Assessments**

Based on the results of the *Bring Learning to Life* Mid-point Review Summit, the QEP directors will prepare a summary of necessary revisions to the QEP, coordinating changes to actions or assessment mechanisms with the Coordinators of Experiential Learning. This summary will also guide revisions to the annual report template, helping guide the continued implementation of the QEP following its mid-point review.
Capability and Timeline
VIII. Capability and Timeline (CS 3.3.2)

**Capability**

MSU possesses the capability, resources, and expertise to initiate, implement, and complete *Bring Learning to Life*.

**Attached** is a chart depicting the organizational relationship among the various individuals and committees responsible for elements of *Bring Learning to Life* and for coordination of University initiatives related to experiential learning. Primary responsibility for the QEP is assigned to two QEP Co-Directors, who report to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Reporting directly to the QEP Co-Directors are the two Co-Coordinators of Experiential Learning. The Co-Coordinators of Experiential Learning are charged with the coordination of an Experiential Learning Advisory Board, the Collegiate Experiential Learning Ambassadors, and the Experiential/Integrative Learning Scoring Team. The QEP Co-Directors meet weekly in Executive Committee with the Co-Coordinators of Experiential Learning and the Director of Institutional Assessment to maintain close oversight of activities implemented. Coordination of University initiatives related to experiential learning is handled by several individuals across the University, including the Service Learning Coordinator, Coordinator of Co-operative Education and Internships, Faculty Coordinator of Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activities, Office of Regional Outreach Project Specialist, and the Associate Director for Education Abroad.

Expenditures associated with QEP planning and the anticipated budget for implementing *Bring Learning to Life* fall into four categories: 1) planning (pre-implementation); 2) general implementation; 3) faculty development; and 4) assessment. The following table offers an overview of expenditures and anticipated budget. A more detailed spreadsheet is attached.

**Table 7: QEP Planning Expenditures and Budget Outlook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>80,557</td>
<td>118,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>198,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Implementation</td>
<td>83,878</td>
<td>80,200</td>
<td>80,200</td>
<td>87,200</td>
<td>87,200</td>
<td>80,200</td>
<td>498,878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>267,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80,557</td>
<td>118,135</td>
<td>128,378</td>
<td>144,700</td>
<td>149,700</td>
<td>148,700</td>
<td>150,700</td>
<td>141,700</td>
<td>1,062,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14: QEP Planning Expenditures and Budget Outlook**
The coordination of these resources and personnel to successfully complete *Bring Learning to Life* is guided by a detailed timeline of activities (below) to be implemented and a thorough Annual Report template. The Annual Report template serves as an assessment strategy for the operation of the QEP overall, consolidating data and findings from targeted assessment strategies. The report structure prompts reflection on the progress of the QEP, which actions are functioning successfully, and what steps need to be taken to adjust the plan for unforeseen circumstances.

**Timeline**

Table 8 presents the preliminary timeline of the actions to be implemented (in green) and assessment strategies (in blue) described above, along with responsible parties. This timeline will be reviewed and modified on an annual basis as part of the Operational Effectiveness assessment.
Table 8: *Timeline of QEP Actions and Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action/Assessment</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fall 2013  | 1. Identify Scoring Team members  
2. Create Experiential Learning Advisory Committee (Collegiate Ambassadors)  
3. Create reflection and ERA SLO rubrics for use in Spring 2014  
4. Identify Pilot ERAs  
5. Host Adventures: Life and its Experiences Series  
6. Distribute Senior Survey  
7. Distribute Service Region Survey | 1. Experiential Learning Coordinators (ELC)  
2. ELC  
3. ELC  
4. ELC  
5. Provost’s Office  
6. Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE)  
7. QEPL |
| Spring 2014| 1. Host Real World Marketplace  
2. Begin training of Scoring Team  
3. Refine reflection and ERA SLO rubrics  
4. Collect reflections for pilot activities  
5. Create External Experiential Learning Advisory Committee  
6. Develop prompts for ERA participant reflections  
7. Implement CANVAS for evaluation of ERAs  
8. Call for/review applications for Experiential Learning Fellowship program  
9. Collect baseline use data  
10. Collect baseline faculty/staff survey data  
11. Collect baseline student survey data  
12. Distribute Senior Survey  
13. Distribute newsletters/update website  
14. Provide workshops  
15. Consult community constituents  
16. Support NSSE/FSSE administration | 1. ELAC  
2. ELC  
3. Holistic Scoring Team (HST)  
4. ELC  
5. QEPL  
6. HST  
7. ELC  
8. Experiential Learning Advisory Committee (ELAC)  
9. ELC  
10. ELC  
11. ELC  
12. OIE  
13. ELC  
14. ELAC  
15. External Experiential Learning Advisory Committee (EELAC)  
16. OIE |
| Summer 2014| 1. Gather baseline data: assess pilot ERAs (reflections and SLOs) and analyze data  
2. Identify second group of pilot ERAs  
3. Refine rubric and prompts  
4. Compile QEP expenditures | 1. HST and Faculty/third party  
2. ELC  
3. HST  
4. QEP Leadership (QEPL) |
| Fall 2014 | 1. Review assessment data  
2. Identify achievement targets  
3. Begin Experiential Fellowship Program  
4. Call for mini-grant applications  
5. Distribute MAP-Works fall transitions survey  
6. Review mini-grant applications; award funds  
7. Analyze data from MAP-Works fall transitions survey  
8. Host *Forum* on experiential learning  
9. Distribute newsletters /update website  
10. Provide workshops  
11. Distribute assessment data for pilot ERAs to departments  
12. Distribute Senior Survey  
13. Submit 2015 NSSE/FSSE application and data (state-mandated administration) | 1. ELAC and QEPL  
2. QEPL  
3. ELAC  
4. ELC  
5. Office of Retention  
6. ELAC  
7. QEPL  
8. Center for Teaching and Learning (CTLT) and ELC  
9. ELC  
10. ELAC  
11. ELC  
12. OIE  
13. OIE |
| Winter 2014 | 1. Participate in CTLT’s *12 Gadgets* faculty development event  
2. Departments report on use of ERA data (closing the loop)  
3. Gather 2nd pilot ERA data: assess pilot activities and analyze data  
4. Review department assessment reports of use of ERA data  
5. Identify third group of pilot ERAs  
6. Analyze 2014 NSSE and FSSE data | 1. ELC  
2. Academic departments / schools  
3. HST and faculty/third party  
4. ELAC and QEPL  
5. ELC  
6. OIE |
| Summer 2015 | 1. Assess 3rd pilot ERAs; analyze data | 1. HST |
| Summer 2015-2019 | 1. Compile QEP expenditures  
2. Prepare annual report | 1. QEPL  
2. ELC |
| Fall 2015 | 1. Submit 2016 NSSE/FSSE application and data | 1. OIE |
| Fall 2015-2019 | 1. Review assessment data  
2. Review and score mini-grant reports  
3. Review applications and award Experiential Learning Fellowships  
4. Call for mini-grant applications  
5. Implement ERAs  
6. Distribute faculty/staff survey  
7. Distribute student survey  
8. Distribute faculty development survey  
9. Distribute MAP-Works fall transitions survey  
10. Review mini-grant applications; award funds  
11. Analyze data from MAP-Works fall transitions survey  
12. Distribute newsletters / update website  
13. Provide workshops  
14. Distribute assessment data to departments  
15. Participate in 12 Gadgets to highlight experiential learning  
16. Distribute Senior Survey  
17. Report on ERAs from previous academic year | 1. ELAC and QEPL  
2. ELAC  
3. ELAC  
4. ELC  
5. Academic departments or schools  
6. ELC  
7. ELC  
8. ELAC  
9. Office of Retention  
10. ELAC  
11. QEPL  
12. ELC  
13. ELAC and EL Fellows  
14. ELC  
15. ELCC/CTLT and ELC  
16. OIC  
17. Faculty / third party |
| Winter 2015 | 1. Analyze 2015 NSSE and FSSE data | 1. OIE |
| Winter 2015-2019 | 1. Departments report on use of ERA data (closing the loop)  
2. Review department assessment reports of use of ERA data  
3. Assess identified ERAs  
4. Review ERA reports from previous academic year  
5. Analyze program SLO reports for other ERAs | 1. Academic departments / schools  
2. QEPL  
3. HST  
4. ELAC  
5. OIC |
| Spring 2016 | 1. Distribute departmental questionnaires  
2. Support 2016 NSSE/FSSE administration | 1. QEPL  
2. OIE |
| Spring 2016-2019 | 1. Distribute MAP-Works spring transitions survey  
2. Distribute Service Region survey  
3. Provide workshops  
4. Distribute newsletters / update website  
5. Collect use data  
6. Distribute faculty/staff survey  
7. Distribute student survey | 1. Office of Retention  
2. QEPL  
3. EL Fellows and ELAC  
4. ELC  
5. ELC  
6. ELC  
7. ELC |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Summer 2016 | 8. Distribute faculty development survey  
9. Distribute Senior Survey  
10. Analyze data from MAP-Works spring transitions survey |
| Fall 2016 | 1. Compile data for Mid-Point Review Summit |
| Winter 2016 | 1. *Bring Learning to Life* Mid-Point Review Summit  
2. Preparation of Mid-Point Review Summary and Action Plan |
| Summer 2018 | 1. Distribute departmental questionnaires |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. ELAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. QEPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion
IX. Conclusion

Murray State University has selected a Quality Enhancement Plan based on institutional assessment data and a thorough, broad-based environmental study. *Bring Learning to Life* focuses on both the student learning environment and student learning outcomes, and the plan has well-defined goals and objectives as well as detailed action and assessment plans to be implemented. This QEP is aligned with MSU’s mission and MSU possesses the capability, resources, and expertise to successfully complete it.
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