The mysterious, invisible gift of time to think beyond is the reading brain’s greatest achievement; these built in milliseconds form the basis of our ability to propel knowledge, to ponder virtue, and to articulate what was once inexpressible—which, when expressed, builds the next platform from which we dive below or soar above.

—Maryanne Wolf, *Proust and the Squid: The Science and Story of the Reading Brain*
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Eastern Kentucky University is pleased to present our Quality Enhancement Plan for 2017, *Read with Purpose*. As the cornerstone of our SACSCOC Reaffirmation of Accreditation, the QEP is based on reflection and assessment of how we can best increase student achievement of their goals. The QEP recognizes the need to more actively engage students in critical reading as the foundation of their college success: it will involve faculty, staff, and students in thinking more deliberately about the role of critical reading for learning. Building on the success of the previous QEP, a focus on purposeful reading will deepen students’ critical thinking and promote the intellectual vitality at the heart of what we value.

*Read with Purpose* has been brought to fruition through extensive idea gathering, discussion, research, assessment, and planning by many people across campus. The end result is a well-structured plan that will help students develop the kind of critical reading necessary for thoughtful action in a complex world. I know that faculty, staff and student leaders across campus are excited to take advantage of QEP professional development opportunities that will allow us “to develop critical readers through the use of metacognitive strategies.”

This QEP is going to transform what it means to be a Colonel by improving teaching and learning on our campus and, thereby, empowering undergraduates to be lifelong, independent learners through critical reading.
INTRODUCTION TO EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Eastern Kentucky University, located at the nexus of the bluegrass region and the Appalachian foothills in Richmond, Kentucky, is a comprehensive regional university dedicated to high-quality instruction, service, and scholarship. From its establishment in 1906 as a normal school to prepare schoolteachers, the University has grown to offer more than 100 degree programs at the associate, baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral levels. Today, approximately 17,000 students come from almost every state and 60 countries, and approximately 140,000 successful alumni worldwide have distinguished themselves in virtually every profession. Many students attend one of three EKU regional campuses scattered throughout the area, helping to serve students from some of the poorest counties in the nation.

Underscoring the University’s legacy as a “School of Opportunity,” many of Eastern’s successful alumni were the first in their families to attend college. Even today, 29 percent of this year’s first-year students are first-generation college students. At the same time, EKU is attracting more of the best and brightest students; the Fall 2016 class is the best academically prepared in the institution’s history.

Just as the vast majority of EKU students come from Kentucky, approximately 76 percent of the University’s graduates are employed in Kentucky one year after graduation, the state’s highest percentage among all its public four-year institutions. Many are employed in service occupations vital to any community’s quality of life: education, health care and public safety.
The University is committed to its strong liberal arts core and its professional programs. Some of the University’s best-known academic programs are housed in its College of Justice and Safety, EKU’s Program of Distinction. The University’s other nationally known programs include Occupational Therapy, Nursing, Environmental Health Science, Aviation, Professional Golf Management, Forensic Science, and American Sign Language-Interpreter Education. In addition, the University’s cross-disciplinary Honors Program has led the nation over the past 27 years in the number of presenters at the National Collegiate Honors Council.

The biggest area of enrollment growth in recent years has been online, extending the University’s global reach. Since 2007, enrollment in online courses has grown from 165 to more than 3,200. In fact, roughly one in five EKU students takes courses online. EKU also has become increasingly popular with military veterans and twice in recent years has been named the No. 1 institution nationally by Military Times EDGE magazine for its efforts to help veterans and their dependents achieve their educational dreams. The University also has taken steps to raise its international profile and now enjoys partnerships with institutions in a dozen countries. Closer to home, Eastern’s growth has been accompanied by a steadfast commitment to service and outreach to a primary service region that includes some of the most economically disadvantaged counties in the nation.

EKU’s Quality Enhancement Plan, Read with Purpose, will further the university’s strategic goals of academic excellence and student success.
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Eastern Kentucky University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), *Read with Purpose*, seeks to develop critical readers who are guided by purposeful inquiry; as such, it reinforces the university’s current emphasis on promoting metacognitive strategies to foster deep learning. The QEP is also grounded in EKU’s strategic vision, “Make No Little Plans: A Vision for 2020,” which commits to “maintaining and enhancing the critical and creative thinking” initiatives that were the focus of the previous QEP. More intentional cultivation of students’ critical reading ability will support this ongoing commitment by helping students transition to the kind of purposeful reading that marks scholarly inquiry and academic and professional achievement.

Critical reading was chosen as the focus of the QEP after a four-year process of broad, inclusive discussion by all university constituencies and a concurrent examination of institutional data. University leaders, faculty, staff, and students agree that developing students’ critical reading ability will improve student learning and academic success at EKU. *Read with Purpose* is guided by a central goal and three Student Learning Outcomes that will provide the measure of success:

**Student Learning Goal:**
The goal of the QEP is to develop critical readers through the use of metacognitive strategies.

**Student Learning Outcomes:**
- Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.
- Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.
- Students will express confidence in their abilities as critical readers.

To achieve these outcomes, EKU faculty, staff, and student leaders will use and teach metacognitive strategies that promote critical reading. Through online resources, in-person workshops, professional learning communities, and scholarly projects, EKU instructors will explore and develop innovative pedagogies to help students analyze, synthesize, and evaluate texts across disciplines. Professional development of instructors is concentrated in two areas: in first-year courses that impact nearly all students and in courses across the disciplines, including targeted General Education courses and other courses where faculty self-select to participate. Professional development of student leaders who serve as peer mentors and tutors across the university will focus on ways to recognize students’ reading challenges and to support their development as critical readers. Online resources and workshops will provide student leaders with strategies to reinforce critical reading instruction in classrooms and help students have greater success with course assignments.
A comprehensive assessment plan provides summative assessments that will measure achievement of Student Learning Outcomes. These include a direct measure of students’ critical reading in both General Education and upper-level courses through applying an EKU developed Critical Reading Rubric to students' written work, an indirect measure of students’ awareness of metacognitive reading strategies through the use of the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI), and an indirect measure of students’ confidence in their abilities as critical readers through an EKU-developed confidence scale. Data will also be used formatively to guide adjustments to professional development and classroom pedagogy.

Additional formative assessments will include participant surveys after each professional development event to evaluate faculty, staff, and student leader learning and to inform design of future professional development. Faculty promotion of metacognitive strategies will be assessed through EKU’s student course evaluation instrument, eXplorance Blue. Assessment of the impact of student leaders in developmental reading and writing courses will be measured through analysis of student reflection essays.

EKU has committed sufficient funds to initiate and sustain the QEP and it does so efficiently by capitalizing on structures and expertise already in place at the University. The budget reflects significant investment in the professional development of faculty, staff, and student leaders. Reassigned time for faculty members to serve as QEP Co-Directors and a Faculty Assessment Liaison will provide leadership, facilitation, and oversight of QEP professional development and assessment initiatives. An Assistant Director of Assessment, housed in the Office of Institutional Research, will manage QEP data that will inform professional development, curriculum and course design, and indicate achievement of Student Learning Outcomes. The QEP budget also supports leadership grants and stipends for summer training incentives for intensive faculty and staff development projects. Funding for course-embedded peer leaders in developmental reading and writing courses provides support for underprepared students’ critical reading development, helping to increase their academic persistence and success.

Direct instruction and support of metacognitive practices will help students read with purpose and develop the critical reading skills needed for deep learning. Ultimately, the work of the QEP will contribute to EKU’s mission, which seeks to prepare “students to contribute to the success and vitality of their communities, the Commonwealth, and the world.”
QEP TOPIC
SELECTION
PROCESS
Identification of Potential QEP Themes

The QEP theme, critical reading, was determined through broad-based discussion and data analysis over a four-year period, from 2011-2015. Dr. Rose Perrine, Professor of Psychology & Associate Dean of University Programs, led the topic-selection and initial planning efforts based on her expertise in student learning outcomes assessment. Dr. Jaime Henning, Associate Professor of Psychology and Program Coordinator for the Industrial/Organizational Psychology Graduate Program, was selected as co-leader based on her expertise in applied organizational research. Dr. Henning also supervised graduate students who assisted with QEP development.

Potential themes for the QEP were gleaned from multiple sources, including current and former students, staff, faculty, administrators, members of EKU’s Board of Regents, and community partners. Initial ideas for EKU’s QEP 2017 came from discussions held by EKU’s Implementation Team during meetings convened from 2011-2014. EKU’s Implementation Team, which includes leaders across the University in Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Financial Affairs, and Student Government, meets regularly to identify obstacles and solve problems in all areas of University functioning. These obstacles generated themes that were considered as potential QEP topics.

Additionally, during a two-year strategic planning process (2012-2014), students, staff, faculty, administrators, members of EKU’s Board of Regents, and community partners provided input for EKU’s 2016-2020 strategic plan via open forums, workshops, focus groups, and surveys. As part of this process, participants were asked to suggest topics for EKU’s QEP-2017.

Because most issues affecting student success are not unique to a single institution, graduate students in the Master’s Program in Industrial/Organizational Psychology were charged with reviewing recent QEP themes at other SACSCOC accredited institutions in order to capitalize on what others had learned. This research suggested that other institutions’ themes either duplicated or were very similar to the themes already identified from the EKU sources above, and we were then confident that we had a comprehensive list of student-learning obstacles and goals that were important to consider for EKU’s next QEP theme.

Perception Survey #1 (Fall 2014)

To ascertain broad interest in the potential themes identified and to generate additional themes, graduate students in Industrial/Organizational Psychology also developed a survey and conducted focus groups with faculty, staff, administrators, and students to identify primary areas of concern regarding student learning. Seventeen potential QEP themes were presented on
Perception Survey #1. Survey respondents were asked to rate the themes and were encouraged to write in additional themes. Participation in the survey and focus groups was encouraged via flyers and email invitations from the Provost, department chairs, and student group leaders; through multiple issues of EKU Today (online newsletters sent to employees’ and students’ EKU email addresses), and through a student drawing for a $50 dollar bookstore voucher.

Respondents included students (73), staff (208), faculty (221), and administrators (22), with six top themes identified as most important for EKU student success: Information Literacy, Applied/Experiential Learning, Quantitative Literacy, Ethics/Values, Metacognition, and Reading Culture. The results of Survey #1 and the focus groups, as well as next steps in QEP planning, were shared with students, administrators, faculty, and staff in January 2015 via the QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 1 (Appendix A).

Refining and Narrowing the Potential QEP Themes
QEP Co-Leaders next determined which of the top themes were outcomes (information literacy, quantitative literacy, ethics, reading) and which were processes (applied learning, metacognition) and concentrated on identifying a student-learning outcome that was most important for students’ success. Toward that goal, the Co-Leaders researched data for further evidence of student strengths and weaknesses in the six areas.

A thorough analysis of institutional data, as well as data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), provided little direct evidence to support application of knowledge, cultural sensitivity, or ethics/values as QEP topics. Evidence did suggest student weakness in quantitative literacy. Although each of these are areas of importance to the University, and the data show room for improvement in each area, the data suggested greater need in the areas of information literacy and reading.

Information Literacy
Direct evidence of students’ information literacy skills came from assessment of EKU’s General Education Program, specifically in ENG 102: Research, Writing and Rhetoric (the second required first-year writing course). At the end of the semester, students complete a common, faculty-developed writing assignment, which is evaluated by faculty teams using a standard scoring rubric which includes a competency related to information literacy: Students will select relevant, accurate, and appropriate sources. In Fall 2014, 91% of students met this competency. However, these data may be misleading for several reasons: only students who remain actively
engaged in the class complete the end-of-term assignment. Thus, poor-performing students are underrepresented. Additionally, students are categorized as either beginning, developing, competent, or accomplished, and for General Education program reporting purposes, developing students are included in the statistic of those who meet the competency. Developing is roughly interpreted as C—D work. Parsing the data more narrowly, only 44% of students scored at least competent (A—B work) on the information literacy criterion of the assignment. Other limits to the generalizability of General Education program data as an indicator of information literacy skills are the narrow definition used for this assessment (selection of sources) and the nature of the assignment itself. The shared assignment for assessment is an 8 to 10 page academic research essay or project equivalent; individual instructors are able to adapt this framework for their classes so long as they remain within the general guidelines, so there may be inconsistencies in students’ responding to different assignment contexts.

Importantly, when EKU faculty talk about information literacy, their definitions include critical thinking about sources, which extends beyond locating and selecting sources. This conceptualization of information literacy overlaps considerably with critical reading. Thus, much of the evidence presented below about EKU students’ reading skills applies to information literacy as well.

Table 1. Retention and Graduation Rates by ACT Reading Scores around Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Cohort Reading ACT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1-yr Retention Rate</th>
<th>2009 Cohort Reading ACT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>6-yr Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (KY Benchmark)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20 (KY Benchmark)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Total Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading

EKU freshmen students’ average ACT Reading score is similar to students across Kentucky and other states (Fall 2014 Mean = 22.9). However, each year substantial numbers of students enter EKU with an ACT Reading score below 20, the Kentucky benchmark for college readiness in reading. For example, in 2014, 27% of freshmen entered EKU with an ACT reading score below 20. EKU students with a Reading ACT score of less than 20 must take developmental coursework during their first college year; providing students with this extra support increases their time to and financial costs of a college degree.

Retention and graduation data suggest that students with higher Reading ACT scores tend to be retained and graduate at higher rates. Table 1 presents ACT data within 5 points of the EKU benchmark for college readiness (20). The patterns are non-linear and small sample sizes for some scores make data less reliable. Nonetheless, the positive relationships between ACT reading scores and retention and graduation rates are evident.

| Table 2. Percent of EKU Students, by Race and Gender, with ACT Reading Scores below 20 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|
|                  | Female   | Male     |
| White            | 18%      | 25%      |
| Black            | 60%      | 64%      |
| Hispanic         | 37%      | 31%      |
| Multi-race       | 24%      | 37%      |

Additionally, subgroup scores show disparities by race, gender, county of residence, and first-generation status. Table 2 shows the percentage of students, by race and gender, who entered EKU in Fall 2014 with an ACT Reading score below 20.

As seen in Table 2, the reading deficits evidenced by 2014 ACT scores range between 18% and 64% for subgroups of EKU students by race and gender. Additionally, approximately 40% of EKU students are first generation college attenders, and in Fall 2014, 28% of these students entered EKU with ACT scores below 20, compared to 21% of non-first-generation students. EKU in-state
students are drawn from 120 counties, and there are significant disparities in ACT Reading scores by county of residence. For example in Fall 2014, the three counties from which the greatest number of students were drawn and the percentage of students with ACT reading scores below 20 were Madison (23%), Fayette (32%) and Jefferson (33%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>06%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with information literacy, General Education assessment data do not indicate obvious weaknesses in reading. On the General Education Scoring Rubric used in ENG 102, one criterion is related to critical reading: Students will fairly and accurately synthesize sources and integrate relevant information. In Fall 2014, 94% of students met this competency. However, these data may be misleading for the reasons noted above. Only students who remain actively engaged in the class complete the end-of-term assignment. Thus, poor-performing students are underrepresented. Additionally, students are categorized as either beginning, developing, competent, or accomplished, and for General Education reporting purposes developing students are included in the statistic of those who meet the competency. Developing is roughly interpreted as C—D work. Parsing the data more narrowly, only 50% of students scored at least competent (A—B work) on the reading criterion of the assignment. Other limits to the generalizability of General Education data as an indicator of reading skills are the narrow definition of critical reading on the General Education rubric and the nature of the assignment itself.

Reading and writing are interdependent tasks and institutional data show a direct relationship between performance in ENG 101: Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric and ENG 102: Research, Writing, and Rhetoric (General Education first-year writing courses) and graduation rates. As seen in Table 3, 33-62% of students who earn A, B, or C in ENG 101 graduate, compared to 6-20% of students who earn D, F, or W. The pattern is the same for ENG 102. Indeed, based on these data indicating the importance of meeting the competencies of ENG 101 above the “D” level, EKU recently changed the prerequisite for ENG 102 to a grade of at least C in ENG 101.
Indirect assessment data related to reading and information literacy were also gleaned from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Table 4 shows no obvious problems based on comparisons between EKU and benchmark institutions, but there are areas of concern based on EKU data alone. For example, 48% of seniors and 53% of first-year students reported spending five or fewer hours on reading per week, and 24-26% reported that their coursework in the current year had not emphasized evaluation of information sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. EKU Students’ Reading Behaviors and Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During current year frequency of going to class without completing readings/assignments <em>(Often or Very Often)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In current year, spent 0—5 hours per week on reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In current year identified key information from reading assignments <em>(Never or Sometimes)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In current year coursework emphasized evaluating point of view, decision, or information sources <em>(Some or Very Little)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the University has direct and indirect evidence of weaknesses in EKU students’ reading/information literacy skills:

- ACT Reading scores show that a substantial number of students enter EKU underprepared for college, and many of these students are in high-risk populations (first generation; non-White). Retention and graduation rates are lower for these at-risk populations.
- General Education data indicate that 44% of students score at the competent level on a narrowly-defined information literacy task and 50% score at the competent level on a narrowly-defined critical reading task (assessed via students’ writing).
- There is a direct relationship between ENG 101/102 course grades and graduation.
- NSSE data suggest areas for improvement.
Further Refinement of Top Themes through Perception Survey #2 (January 2015)

In addition to institutional evidence, the University sought additional guidance from students, staff, faculty, and administrators about potential QEP topics. On perception survey #2 we asked “Based on your knowledge of students in your program, which of the following would have the greatest positive impact on your (or your students’) success?” Respondents could choose up to three topics, and could write in additional outcomes that were not on the list. The six topics were presented as below:

- Improved reading skills
- Improved information literacy skills
- Improved quantitative literacy skills
- Improved ability to apply knowledge
- Improved/revised ethics or values
- Improved cultural sensitivity

Survey respondents included Chairs of academic programs (27), Deans in Academic and Student Affairs (12), students (212), full time faculty (275), part time faculty (109), and staff (44).

Reading and application of knowledge were in every group’s top three themes, and ethics and cultural sensitivity were consistently the lowest ranked. Information literacy and quantitative literacy were more variable by group, although there was more support from faculty (full and part time), chairs, deans, and students for information literacy than for quantitative literacy. For ethics/values and cultural sensitivity these survey results aligned with institutional evidence suggesting that these themes were not the highest priority needs for EKU students; therefore, these themes were removed from further consideration.

Three themes (reading; application of knowledge; information literacy) were perceived by respondents as having the greatest potential for positive impact on student success. With regard to institutional data, there was ample evidence of student weakness for reading and its related theme information literacy. There was limited evidence for weaknesses in students’ ability to apply knowledge, although NSSE data showed that many students do not take advantage of opportunities that are readily available. We kept application on the short list for three reasons: student perception of need, opportunities for improved data collection on student performance, and the potential for this theme to build on recent institutional emphasis on application of critical thinking skills.

The topic of quantitative literacy was not ranked in most respondents’ top three choices despite institutional evidence of student weakness in this area; therefore, we sought additional
information by interviewing faculty and staff. Results of our interviews suggested that advising and support staff perceive quantitative literacy as a student need because of the large numbers of students with low ACT Math scores, and the advising and tutoring services needed to assist these students. Faculty, on the other hand, were less supportive of a potential QEP theme of quantitative literacy because they do not perceive quantitative skills to be universally necessary for student success and because many of them did not feel that they have the skills to improve students’ quantitative literacy; thus, quantitative literacy is less likely to garner broad faculty support and excitement about the QEP.

Faculty support for a QEP is essential, and reading, information literacy, and application of knowledge had strong faculty support and convincing institutional evidence of need. All three themes lent themselves to implementation plans that could realistically include all faculty so that the QEP might have broad impact. Therefore, the three potential themes chosen for the short list were reading, application of knowledge, and information literacy.

The short list, next steps in QEP development, and a timeline for processes were shared with the University community in February 2015 via the QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 2 (Appendix B). In addition, results were discussed with academic chairs, program directors, and deans who suggested slight changes to the theme labels to better reflect their faculty members’ concerns. Preliminary definitions were also added before additional input was solicited.

Program Level Evidence for Top Three QEP Themes Survey #3 (February–March 2015)
The goals of survey #3 were to:

- Determine faculty perceptions of the extent to which students in their specific academic programs evidenced weaknesses in each of the three areas
- Determine faculty ratings of the three themes with regard to potential to improve student success in the specific academic program
- Determine the evidence faculty were using to support their ratings

Chairs and program directors were asked to discuss the survey questions with their programs’ faculty and staff and come to some agreement about the responses and to complete one survey per academic program. Responses were received for approximately 1/3 of the academic programs (n = 49). Quantitative data showed that critical reading was rated by faculty as the area in which students in their specific programs evidenced the most weakness. Faculty perceived that students were weaker in both general reading skills and discipline-specific reading skills than they were in either information literacy or application of knowledge. There
were no discernable differences among the themes with regard to the type of evidence faculty used to rate student weakness. Faculty based their ratings on personal observation, evaluation of student work, standardized/professional exams, employers'/supervisors’ ratings, and students’ own perceptions. Qualitative data from Survey #3 aligned with the quantitative rankings and provided a rich source of additional information for further consideration of the top three themes.

In early 2015, a QEP Topic Selection Team, composed of faculty and staff in all key academic units, was appointed by QEP Co-Leaders, with input from unit Deans and Chairs (Appendix C). All topic review data were provided to the QEP Topic Selection Team members, who were instructed to further discuss the top three themes with their constituents. Based on quantitative and qualitative data from Survey #3 and additional conversations team members had with students and faculty, the Team chose critical reading for independent learning as EKU’s QEP topic.

- Critical reading subsumes reading comprehension.
- EKU’s General Education reform in 2006 and QEP-2007 focused on critical thinking, and faculty-developed rubrics for course and program-level assessment of student learning are based on critical thinking terminology. A QEP topic of critical reading builds on the foundation of terminology, professional development, and assessment already established at EKU.
- Another topic on the short list, information literacy, further strengthened the argument for critical reading. Specifically, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are components of information literacy that overlap with critical reading. Thus, by choosing critical reading as the QEP topic, some elements of information literacy could be addressed as well.

Independent learning was added as a component of the QEP topic because common and persistent concerns noted in the EKU Implementation Team meetings, strategic planning sessions, focus groups, surveys, and faculty conversations focused on students’ lack of self-confidence in their ability to learn, lack of persistence in the face of difficult learning situations, and over-dependence on faculty. These concerns suggested that the need for students to improve in academic skills, such as reading, are not the ultimate goal of education. Rather, improving academic skills should serve the purpose of developing personal characteristics necessary for students to become independent, lifelong learners. The Topic Selection Team was mindful that including the construct “independent learner” expanded the QEP topic beyond skills to a personal characteristic.
### Table 5 QEP TOPIC SELECTION TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2014</td>
<td>• Institutional needs identified</td>
<td>• EKU’s Implementation Team identified obstacles to student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic planning groups suggested QEP topics</td>
<td>• Research on similar institutions’ QEP themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic planning groups suggested QEP topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research on similar institutions’ QEP themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>• Campus updated</td>
<td>• Campus updated by Provost &amp; encouraged to participate in topic selection processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student needs ranked</td>
<td>• Survey #1 &amp; focus groups narrowed potential topics to primary areas of concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• QEP leadership identified</td>
<td>• Co-leaders for QEP planning selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>• Campus updated</td>
<td>• QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 1 informed campus of QEP process, six potential themes, and next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional data analyzed</td>
<td>• Institutional data for six potential themes analyzed for evidence of student strengths/weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perceptions of themes’ impact gathered</td>
<td>• On Survey #2 administrators, faculty, staff, &amp; students ranked six themes based on potential for greatest positive impact on student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short list of themes selected</td>
<td>• Three themes chosen for short list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February - March 2015</td>
<td>• Campus updated</td>
<td>• QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 2 informed campus of QEP process, three short-list themes, and next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program-level evidence of student performance gathered</td>
<td>• On Survey #3 faculty rated three themes on potential for greatest impact on their programs’ student success, and identified evidence used for ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• QEP Topic-Selection Team identified</td>
<td>• Topic-Selection Team members selected from all key academic units on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - May 2015</td>
<td>• QEP Topic selected</td>
<td>• QEP topic selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus updated</td>
<td>• QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 3 informed campus of QEP topic, provided working definitions of constructs, and identified next steps in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>• Focus statement developed</td>
<td>• Focus statement developed based on selected topic, institutional mission, and recent professional-development focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus updated</td>
<td>• QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 4 informed campus of QEP focus statement, next steps, and solicited nominations for QEP Design Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• QEP Design Team nominations sought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The QEP topic, next steps in QEP development, and timeline for processes were shared with students, faculty, and staff in May 2015 via QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 3 (Appendix D). The Topic Selection Team then developed the QEP Focus Statement. This initial focus statement included metacognition as the primary pedagogical strategy: The purpose of the QEP is to develop independent learners by improving critical reading skills through the use of metacognitive strategies.

The inclusion of metacognition in the focus statement was an intentional plan to focus professional development on a specific set of strategies designed to improve reading skills. Metacognition was a top choice for QEP themes in survey #1, and metacognitive strategies have been used effectively to improve reading skills and were already being used in EKU’s English Department for developmental and General Education first-year writing courses. Additionally, EKU began to focus professional development efforts on metacognition in 2015, bringing Dr. Saundra McGuire to campus for student and faculty development workshops. Expanding professional development to metacognitive strategies specific to the improvement of reading will build on existing faculty interest and efforts to incorporate metacognitive awareness and use into pedagogy.

In August 2015, the focus statement, next steps in the QEP process, and timelines were shared with students, faculty, and staff via QEP-2017 Newsletter Vol. 4 (Appendix E). Additionally, faculty were invited to self-nominate for the QEP Design Team. The Provost, deans, and chairs were also asked for recommendations for the Design Team. Table 5 summarizes the topic selection process and timeline.

**QEP-2017 Implementation Planning Process**

The QEP Design Team (Appendix F), which met throughout the academic year 2015/2016, was charged with reviewing other institutions’ reading-focused QEP implementation plans, beginning a review of literature and best practices related to critical reading and metacognition, identifying some options for implementation strategies that were realistic for EKU, and outlining a general implementation plan by Spring 2016.

By early Spring 2016, it became clear that we had been too ambitious by including independent learning in the focus statement. A review of the literature showed that independent learning is a rich and important construct that could have been its own QEP. Focusing on both critical reading and independent learning would dilute the time and resources for each, and would endanger our ability to improve either. Therefore, we narrowed
the focus statement to the essential, original student learning goal of critical reading and narrowed the focus statement to:

**The purpose of the QEP is to develop critical readers through the use of metacognitive strategies.**

The QEP Design Team defined critical reading as an active, reflective process of engaging in dialogue with texts of all modes. Critical readers purposefully analyze, synthesize, and evaluate texts based on disciplinary ways of constructing knowledge (Elder & Paul, 2004; Moje, Stockdill, Kim, & Kim, 2011). The Design Team defined *metacognitive strategies* as deliberate practices used by readers to help them think about and monitor their thinking and learning (Flavell, 1978; Mokhtar and Reichard, 2002).

The Design Team then considered areas of the University to best focus efforts. Comments from faculty during the QEP pre-planning phase indicated that instructors from developmental courses, from first-year courses, and from major and pre-professional level courses shared concerns about students' need to improve critical reading. Therefore, the QEP Design Team began to craft a plan designed to impact students across levels of learning and across disciplines by working to improve students' critical reading in each of the areas described below.

**Developmental Education (ENG 095R and ENG 101R)**

As a school of opportunity, EKU has a historic and state-mandated commitment to provide access to higher education to students with varying levels of preparedness and has long provided developmental coursework in reading, writing, and mathematics for these underprepared students. In 2014, in response to student learning data, state mandates, and national trends, EKU redesigned developmental education and began to offer integrated, accelerated, and co-requisite reading/writing courses: ENG 095R: Introduction to Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric and ENG 101R: Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric (Supported). In 2015, 24% of first-year students enrolled in these courses, which are supported by Course Embedded Consultants (CECs), undergraduate student leaders trained to counsel students on reading, writing, and metacognitive practices.

**First Year Writing (ENG 101 and ENG 102)**

All first-year students are required to take ENG 101: Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric and ENG 102: Research, Writing, and Rhetoric as part of EKU's General Education requirement. In 2013, recognizing that students in first-year composition courses often struggled with critically reading
and integrating sources into their writing, EKU’s Department of English and Theatre redesigned ENG 101 and ENG 102 to more explicitly promote instruction in critical reading, and its integration with writing, in these courses.

**Foundations of Learning Course (GSD 101)**
GSD 101: Foundations of Learning was developed as one of the major university-wide program initiatives of EKU’s previous Quality Enhancement Plan. It is the required orientation seminar for students who have not declared a major, for students with a declared major of Psychology or Associate of General Studies, and for athletes (approximately 35% of first-year students). GSD 101 provides foundational knowledge and skills in critical and creative thinking and increases student success and persistence. GSD leaders have identified a need for critical reading instruction to help students meet the objectives of the course.

**General Education Courses in Elements 3A (Arts), 3B (Humanities) and 5A (Historical Perspectives)**
Approximately 100 sections of these reading intensive General Education courses are offered each year. Faculty members who teach these courses have expressed concern about some students’ inattention to reading assignments, surface level approaches to course reading, and difficulty in identifying and critically analyzing scholarly articles. The QEP will focus on students in these courses in years one through three of *Read with Purpose* and add natural and social sciences and mathematics courses in the General Education Program in years four and five.

**Upper-level courses across disciplines**
The QEP will impact students in upper-level courses through faculty identified needs and projects. Faculty members from across the University have expressed interest in critical reading pedagogy, including instructors in anthropology, biology, chemistry, communication, criminal justice, education, family and consumer sciences, history, mathematics, nursing, occupational therapy, and sociology. Interested faculty across disciplines can choose to participate in QEP sponsored programs that prepare them to adjust their pedagogical strategies in ways that improve student critical reading.
DESIZED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
Based on faculty surveys in the selection of the QEP topic, the QEP Design Team crafted the following student learning outcomes (SLOs) and institutional learning outcome, which guided the development of the implementation plan:

**QEP Student Learning Outcomes**

- Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.
- Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.
- Students will express confidence in their abilities as critical readers.

**QEP Institutional Learning Outcomes**

Faculty, staff, and student leaders will use and teach metacognitive strategies to develop students as critical readers.

As noted, these outcomes build on EKU's prior QEP, which focused on critical thinking and communication, and are consistent with EKU’s Strategic Plan, which includes a commitment to “maintaining and enhancing critical and creative thinking and communication skills initiatives” and “providing a strong liberal arts core through the general education curriculum.”

The QEP SLOs also align with EKU’s General Education program mission, which “helps students to become informed, independent thinkers by developing competencies in communication, quantitative analysis, and critical thinking and by helping them understand and appreciate the diversity of culture, individuals, the natural environment, and the global society.” Critical reading undergirds each of EKUs General Education goals, and it applies directly to Goal 1: that students will "communicate effectively by applying skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening and through appropriate use of information technology."

The SLOs, key definitions, and implementation plan were also informed by a review of research related to critical reading and metacognition.
LITERATURE REVIEW AND BEST PRACTICES
Necessary Reading Skills for College and Career Success

Critical reading is essential for developing the critical thinking skills needed for success in higher education, yet many first-year college students arrive with only surface level approaches to reading that are inadequate for engaging with complex texts (Elder & Paul, 2004; Jolliffe, 2007; Pugh, Pawan, & Antommarchi, 2000; Tierney & McGinley, 1987). For academic success, students must be active, strategic readers who push beyond basic understanding of texts to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate textual content and structure within disciplinary contexts (Horning, 2007; Moje et al., 2011). Developing critical readings skills is even more important as students negotiate the vast terrain of digital media: students must build on foundational reading skills to develop the new literacies required by multimodal texts (Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, Cstek, & Henry, 2013; Hartman & Morsink, 2015).

Critical reading ability also impacts writing ability. Recent studies have indicated that a shallow understanding of sources hinders students’ writing and contributes to the likelihood of plagiarism (Haller, 2010; Howard, Serviss, & Rodrigue, 2010; Jamieson & Howard, 2013). Students transitioning to college often need explicit instruction in learning to construct meaning from texts and in using those texts to develop and express their own arguments (Bugdal & Holtz, 2014; Carillo, 2015; Haas & Flower, 1988; Horning & Kraemer, 2013).

Critical reading skills are also sought by employers. In many sectors, the increasingly complex global economy requires employees who can access, evaluate and organize information from a variety of sources, yet, according to a recent study by The Association of American Colleges and Universities, only 29% of employers reported that college graduates were prepared for these types of critical reading tasks (Hart Research Associates, 2015).

Academic success in college requires foundational critical reading skills, especially in the early post-secondary years when students are grappling with multiple disciplinary contexts in their general education program. The Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education’s 2012 General Education Transfer Policy and Implementation Guidelines lists Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the general education curriculum, which are aligned with the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ Liberal Education for America’s Promise Essential Learning Outcomes and are seen as national benchmarks for 21st century college learning (Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, 2012). While all of these SLOs depend on a base of critical reading abilities, several SLOs address critical reading ability directly; for example, in the Written and Oral communication section, students must be able to

- Find, analyze, evaluate, and cite pertinent primary and secondary sources, including academic databases, to prepare speeches and written texts.
Identify, analyze, and evaluate statements, assumptions, and conclusions representing diverse points of view; and construct informed, sustained, and ethical arguments in response.

Under Quantitative Reasoning, students must be able to “interpret information presented in mathematical and/or statistical forms.” And under the Arts and Humanities heading, students must be able to “distinguish between various kinds of evidence by identifying reliable sources and valid arguments.”

The foundational nature of critical reading skills is also reflected in the Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile—Defining Degrees (2014). In the Intellectual Skills section, one of five categories for learning, the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) lays out SLOs that “transcend the boundaries of particular fields of study. They overlap, interact with and enable the other major areas of learning described in the DQP” (p. 18). Under the heading Analytical Inquiry, the student

- Identifies and frames a problem or question in selected areas of study and distinguishes among elements of ideas, concepts, theories or practical approaches to the problem or question.
- Differentiates and evaluates theories and approaches to selected complex problems within the chosen field of study and at least one other field.

And, under the heading of Use of Information Resources, the student

- Identifies, categorizes, evaluates and cites multiple information resources so as to create projects, papers or performances in either a specialized field of study or with respect to a general theme within the arts and sciences.
- Locates, evaluates, incorporates, and properly cites multiple information resources in different media or different languages in projects, papers or performances.
- Generates information through independent or collaborative inquiry and uses that information in a project, paper or performance.

Both Analytical Inquiry and Use of Information Resources, which rest on critical reading ability, are considered foundational intellectual skills necessary for all other academic learning. These skills go beyond reading comprehension and demand analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of complex texts of all modes. There is substantial evidence, however, that students need explicit instruction to transition to these deeper critical reading practices (Manarin, Carey, Rathburn, & Ryland, 2015).
Although college students may be reading more than ever, inundated as they are with texts of all modes, national studies continue to highlight the group’s poor academic reading skills (Horning & Kraemer, 2013). For example, the college testing service ACT reports that a reading score of 22 predicts success in college, yet only 46% of test-takers met that benchmark in 2015 (ACT, 2015). Among minority groups, academic reading achievement is much lower: only 31% of Latinos and 19% of African Americans tested as college ready in reading (ACT, 2015). A Pew Charitable Trust study (2006) found that fewer than half of graduating college seniors scored at the proficient level on a test of prose and document literacy. Arum and Roksa’s (2011) four-year investigation of more than 2000 students at 24 postsecondary institutions indicated that almost half of undergraduates did not improve literacy skills after two years of college.

In 2014, EKU students entered the University with an average ACT reading score of 22.9. Yet, 27% of freshmen entered EKU that year with an ACT reading score below 20, Kentucky’s benchmark score for full admission. The percentage of minority students not meeting the benchmark ranged from 31% to 64%. EKU students who do not meet the ACT benchmark, or additional college placement exam benchmarks, are required to take developmental courses that extend their time and financial cost toward a degree. Higher reading ability, as indicated by higher ACT admission scores at EKU, correlates positively with higher retention and graduation rates (see page 14). This correlation is supported by evidence that campus cultures that value rigorous and extensive reading across disciplines have high student engagement and graduation rates (Kuh et al., 2005).

The Nature of Disciplinary Reading

A substantial body of research over the past decade, primarily by scholars of middle and secondary school literacy, supports the need for explicit instruction in disciplinary reading (Shanahan, Shanahan, & Misischia, 2011). Research on teaching disciplinary reading in postsecondary classrooms supports this need as well (Braunger, 2011; Pugh & Honeyford, 2009; Shiorring, 2010). College instructors may have developed disciplinary ways of constructing knowledge intuitively, but many college students need explicit instruction in the core principles and rhetorical approaches of disciplinary texts, which require specialized reading strategies. As Shanahan et al. (2011) wrote, “each discipline possesses specialized genre, vocabulary, traditions of communication, and standards of quality and precision, and each requires specific kinds of reading and writing” (p. 395). Shanahan et al. claim that teachers must foster “disciplinary sensitivity and practice” to help students construct knowledge in disciplines, which have different epistemologies (p. 396).
For example, Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) conducted focus groups and think-aloud protocols with disciplinary experts (where a reader makes her thinking processes visible by thinking aloud) and found that historians valued the source, context, and corroboration with their own views while reading, and that they maintained a critical stance in their reading even while reading materials about which they knew little. Historians especially looked for bias and valued multiple interpretations of events in both the narrative and argumentative structure of texts.

Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) observed that chemists, on the other hand, were concerned with methodological and technical precision in science texts. They read less linearly than historians, recursively moving back and forth from tables, charts and graphs to ascertain what information was relevant to their purpose. Mathematicians were not interested in textual sources or context, but rather on solving problems through logical and accurate application of standard concepts. Bazerman (1985) interviewed and observed physicists about their reading and found the scientists had a clear purpose for their reading and relied on a schema when searching literature. They did not read articles sequentially and detailed mathematics were often skipped.

Expert readers in disciplines have distinct purposes and use distinct strategies to construct knowledge. If students are able to apply various critical reading methods to the different disciplines they are learning, they are much more likely to learn at a deep level. Yet, many college students, because they are novices in higher education, struggle with the demands of academic reading in the disciplines and fall into the trap of using a “one-size-fits-all” approach to reading, engaging only in surface-level reading for memorization purposes (DeJong & Ferguson-Hessler, 1996; Linderholm, 2006). As other researchers have pointed out, many college students do not understand the different demands of their courses, texts, or tasks and may still be expecting the teacher to provide all the information they need (Harklau, 2001; Orlando, Caverly, Swetnam, & Flippo, 1989; Simpson & Nist, 2002).

In their book *Critical Reading in Higher Education*, Manarin, Carey, Rathburn & Ryland (2015), faculty members in English, political science, biology, and history respectively, described their collaborative, cross-disciplinary inquiry into how their students read. They examined over 700 written artifacts from 72 students enrolled in their courses, including reading logs, assignments related to a research paper, and student research papers, for evidence of critical reading. They found that instructors need to emphasize the “intellectual processes of reading” and the genres and purposes for reading particular to their discipline (p. 64). As Manarin et al. point out, “college instructors often speak about how students read or don’t read as if it were a single skill employed for a single purpose” (p. 9).
Effective college readers critically engage these discipline-based intellectual processes through their use of strategies. Strategic readers use prior knowledge to connect with texts, deliberately plan and use strategies flexibly based on their purpose for reading, monitor their understanding, and use fix-up methods to reorient when understanding breaks down (Paris & Myers, 1978). College instructors can help students transition to the demands of critical, disciplinary reading by providing explicit instruction in both general and disciplinary reading strategies.

**Strategic Reading and Metacognition**

Research supports explicit teaching of reading strategies across the disciplines, from elementary through college contexts (Holschuh & Aultman, 2009; Pressley, 1990). When college students are explicitly taught reading strategies, they are more productive, focused, and critical readers (Falk-Ross, 2001). Introducing and modeling strategies, providing guided practice and independent practice with instructor feedback, help students develop critical reading skills (Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2009). As Manarin et al. (2015) explain, students need guidance to transition from a passive, transmission model of reading, where the text contains the meaning, to a transactional model of reading, where the reader actively constructs meaning with the text (p. 31).

Strategy use implies purpose and necessitates deliberate choice from a repertoire of strategies; in other words, strategy use involves a metacognitive component (Paris, Lipson, & Wixson, 1983). Metacognitive awareness and skill promote control and monitoring of the thinking processes and are considered essential elements of reading and learning from texts (Flavell, 1978; Garner, 1987). According to Maitland (2000), reading skills are hindered when students lack metacognitive skills, leading to the failure to use different approaches for reading in different contexts. Many students are poor self-monitors who lack the ability to understand when a particular reading strategy is ineffective. Those students who possess the ability to self-monitor their reading strategies can pinpoint positive reading strategies whereas poor self-monitors fail to realize their strategy is not effective. As a result, poor self-monitors have lower reading comprehension abilities compared to high self-monitors (Paris and Myers, 1978).

Metacognitive strategy use is one of the most research-recommended approaches for improving college students’ engagement with texts (Bauer & Theado, 2014). Pacello (2014), for example, designed an integrated reading and writing course to assist students in connecting the class material to other college courses by emphasizing metacognitive strategies. Students were required to write metacognitive blogs in which they discussed the reading strategies used during three different reading assignments. Pacello (2014) suggests that reflective metacognitive assignments may help students connect literacy instruction with academic tasks in other courses.
In another study, Dolly (2004) described a developmental reading course based on metacognitive reading theory. Through a think-aloud protocol, the instructor encouraged students to respond verbally to text by articulating the purpose for reading, previewing the text and making predictions, monitoring comprehension by pausing to acknowledge lack of understanding, pausing to summarize a statement made in the text, evaluating major and minor points discussed within the text, commenting on how an expressed idea compares with other materials, and demonstrating analysis of the text by asking questions relating to how concepts in the reading fit together. Dolly found that readers who engaged in these types of metacognitive strategies worked to make meaningful connections when they read.

Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) designed the Metacognitive Assessment of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) to examine the metacognitive practices of strong readers. The MARSI was designed around 15 research-based strategies that were identified and described by Pressley and Afflerbach (1995) as general practices used by skilled readers. These included previewing, having a purpose in mind while reading, taking notes to understand reading, checking understanding when encountering conflicting information, underlining and/or circling text, asking questions about the text itself, summarizing ideas in text, paying closer attention to more difficult text, and pausing from time to time in order to think about what is being read. A number of studies that used the MARSI, including one by Poole (2014), who taught metacognitive strategies in a freshman composition course, revealed that successful readers used these strategies more than students who were less successful.

Metacognitive strategies often recommended by the research base include previewing, annotating, generating questions, and summarizing text: these practices help readers construct meaning and move toward in-depth analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of texts. Previewing text helps readers activate their schema, or the framework of what they know about a particular subject, and guides expectations and predictions of written text (Anderson & Pearson, 1984). It also helps the reader establish purpose for the reading task. For example, Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001) surveyed undergraduates on metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and support strategies and found that students with high reading ability reported previewing the text before reading more often than did students with low reading ability. Barton’s (1997) research suggested that instructors use pre-reading activities, such as examining headings, in order to prime the brain for content within the text.

Numerous studies support direct instruction of annotation in college classes. Frazier (1993) examined the impact of teaching annotation in a college reading course and concluded that
instructors must motivate students to use reading strategies such as annotation by explicit explanation of their value and through explicit instruction in the various components of the strategy. She also recommended that instruction be carried out over more than one semester. Simpson and Nist’s (1990) intervention study with students in four class sections of developmental reading found that students who received direct instruction in annotation performed better in course tasks and assessments than those who did not receive the treatment. Annotation helps students interact physically and metacognitively with text and can provide the basis for analyzing not just what a text says but what it does; for example, it can encourage a reader to examine a writer’s rhetorical strategies, assumptions, or biases.

Reciprocal teaching, a research-based classroom activity that teaches students to generate their own questions as they read, was recommended by Doolittle et al. (2006) as a means of more deeply processing texts. Simpson and Nist (2002) reviewed several studies that indicated that by generating their own questions from text, students read actively and monitored their comprehension as they read. Questioning can help students isolate important information in a text and aids in summarization of key points. Text summarization requires that students distill textual content into its most essential elements. Simpson and Nist’s (2002) review of summarization research suggests that this strategy helps students improve comprehension and monitor their understanding. Summarization also forms the basis of more critical analysis and is necessary for students to elaborate on ideas in text, to generate, for example, connections among texts that allow them to synthesize ideas within and among texts and to evaluate the relevance or credibility of a text (Simpson & Nist, 2002).

These and many other studies suggest that students who use metacognitive strategies such as previewing text, annotating, generating questions, and summarizing have stronger reading comprehension ability, the foundation of critical reading. Students’ ability to use metacognitive strategies also increases their confidence as readers and leads to a greater motivation to achieve academic goals (Paris and Winograd, 1990). Engagement in text-based learning is tied to learners’ self-efficacy, or beliefs about their ability to use reading and writing effectively in meaningful ways (Bandura, 1977; Cantrell et al., 2013; McCarthey & Moje, 2002; Paulson & Theado, 2015). Increasing students’ confidence in their ability to read challenging texts, and motivating students to want to read complex texts, requires attention to the social and personal domains of learning as well as the cognitive and metacognitive domains.

QEP professional development will build on the substantial research base that links metacognitive strategy use to student engagement and self-efficacy. The theoretical and practical foundation of
our professional development efforts will be Reading Apprenticeship, a literacy development framework that promotes strategy use, builds on students’ strengths, and enhances students’ confidence in their critical reading ability.

**Reading Apprenticeship**

The Reading Apprenticeship approach, created in 1995 by WestEd, a nationally recognized, non-profit professional development organization, has been widely used by middle and high schools and community colleges throughout the country, and increasingly by faculty at four year colleges. In an early study of the Reading Apprenticeship approach, Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, and Mueller (2001) reported on results of a study of 216 ninth grade students enrolled in a mandatory, Reading Apprenticeship designed, academic literacy course in a San Francisco, CA, high school. The researchers collected data from student interviews, focus groups, and case studies. These data indicated that students grew in their ability to use strategies to construct meaning from text, monitor their comprehension, and develop a vocabulary for thinking about their own cognitive processes related to reading. The researchers argued that this led to students “participating in the ways of thinking that characterize the academic disciplines” (p. 109) as well as “intellectual and ethical engagement and personal agency” (110). Greenleaf et al. (2001) also collected standardized test scores (n=216) from the norm and criterion referenced Degree of Reading Power test, which demonstrated a two year gain in reading scores within one academic year of instruction.

Since that earlier study, three federally funded, randomized controlled studies of the Reading Apprenticeship approach have demonstrated statistically significant gains in student reading (Schoenfield, Greenleaf, & Murphy, 2012). Other studies suggest that Reading Apprenticeship classroom practices improve college students’ reading achievement, grades and course success rates (Shiorring 2010; Braunger 2011).

The Reading Apprenticeship framework approaches reading as a purposeful, strategic, problem-solving process by building on the key cognitive and knowledge-building practices that skilled readers use. These include teaching students to articulate their thinking processes as they read, to identify the reading strategies that skilled readers use, such as previewing, questioning and summarizing, and to practice these through annotating, or “talking to the text.” It also recognizes that knowledge is fundamentally socially constructed; thus, classroom routines acknowledge readers’ personal strengths and the importance of learning through text-based discussions. Reading Apprenticeship promotes literacy development through these four dimensions—cognitive, knowledge-building, personal and social—and cultivates them through extensive
reading and metacognitive conversations (Schoenfield, Greenleaf & Murphy, 2012, p. 25). (See Figure 1).

Since 2013, EKU faculty members have used Reading Apprenticeship as a guide in redesigning developmental reading and writing courses. The QEP will integrate Reading Apprenticeship classroom activities into all professional development through a set of common classroom practices that promote explicit reading instruction based in disciplinary contexts. As content experts, faculty members are often not aware of the cognitive and metacognitive processes they use to construct meaning from texts in their disciplines. They often assume that college students should be able to read without considering students’ lack of experience with the types of lengthy, complex texts they assign. And they do not generally think it is their job to teach their students to read (Horning, 2007; Manarin et al., 2015).

QEP professional development activities will guide instructors in identifying and articulating the literacy tasks and mental processes they use so that they can more deliberately apprentice students to their discipline’s ways of reading. Instructors are not expected to teach reading, an area they might view as outside of their area of expertise, but to teach students how to read as historians, physicists, biologists, mathematicians, etc. Reading Apprenticeship practices help instructors make their reading processes visible by helping them decode and model the literacy processes unique to their discipline. This modeling helps students critically analyze, synthesize, and evaluate textual content within disciplinary contexts.

Reading Apprenticeship routines are built around active, collaborative learning activities that encourage metacognitive discussions about what texts mean and how we know what they mean. As students gain understanding of the role of reading in their learning and the expectations that they will actively participate in critically reading course texts, they will be better prepared for class discussion, debates, application exercises, and writing projects in the classroom (Schoenbach & Greenleaf, 2009). EKU’s QEP implementation plan is informed by Reading Apprenticeship and the research base that supports critical reading development through metacognitive strategies.
THE READING APPRENTICESHIP® FRAMEWORK

SOCIAL DIMENSION
- Creating safety
- Investigating the relationship between literacy and power
- Sharing text talk
- Sharing reading processes, problems, and solutions
- Noticing and appropriating others' ways of reading

COGNITIVE DIMENSION
- Getting the big picture
- Breaking it down
- Monitoring comprehension
- Using problem-solving strategies to assist and restore comprehension
- Setting reading purposes and adjusting reading processes

PERSONAL DIMENSION
- Developing reader identity
- Developing metacognition
- Developing reader fluency and stamina
- Developing reader confidence and range

KNOWLEDGE-BUILDING DIMENSION
- Surfacing, building, and refining schema
- Building knowledge of content and the world
- Building knowledge of texts
- Building knowledge of language
- Building knowledge of disciplinary discourse and practices

Figure 1.
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
In the spring semester of 2016, Dr. Lisa Bosley and Dr. Jill Parrott, who served on the Design Team, were selected as Co-Directors of the QEP. (Brief vitae for Drs. Bosley and Parrott can be viewed in Appendices G & H). In summer 2016, due to university reorganization, Dr. Sherry Robinson, Vice Provost, replaced Dr. Perrine and Dr. Henning as administrative leaders of the QEP effort and formed the QEP Executive Leadership Team (Appendix I) to continue to steer development of the implementation plan. The Executive Leadership Team invited faculty, staff, and students representing a broad swath of university interests and areas to convene as the QEP Implementation Team, which began meeting in summer 2016, to further refine the implementation plan (see Appendix J). The plan aims to achieve QEP student learning outcomes through professional development of faculty, staff, and student leaders.

**Strategies to Develop Critical Readers**

**Strategy I. Professional Development of Faculty and Staff:**

EKU has a strong commitment to professional development of faculty and staff. The EKU Strategic Plan states that “academic excellence, the cornerstone of the University’s mission, begins with the faculty” and will be achieved by “promoting innovative pedagogy and by investing in our faculty and our academic programs.” This objective is supported by the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education’s (2016) commitment to promoting “relevant, rigorous, and engaging” instruction through professional development to ensure “the most effective pedagogical practices” (p. 12). Both of these objectives have student success as their end goal.

EKU also has a well-developed infrastructure to support professional development of faculty and staff. EKU’s Teaching and Learning Center (TLC), housed in the Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, offers an array of services, from a Teaching and Learning Innovations series of workshops led by Faculty Innovators, to Professional Learning Communities (semester long, collaborative, cross-disciplinary learning experiences) to a Faculty Consultation Program for one-on-one mentoring. The TLC also offers faculty the opportunity to earn recognition for in-depth study and leadership in topics such as metacognition and the scholarship of teaching and learning through a four-level professional development system called Developing Excellence in Eastern’s Professors (DEEP).

In addition, the Office of the Provost offers a Professional Development Speaker Series, which brings in notable scholars such as Dr. Saundra McGuire, who delivered student and faculty presentations on metacognition in Fall 2015. EKU’s highly regarded Chautauqua
Lecture Series brings in an average of fifteen distinguished scholars annually to address a variety of scholarly topics.

The QEP Co-Directors will work with TLC and campus leaders to embed QEP professional development within these well-established frameworks. Additionally, the QEP Co-Directors will build on departmental faculty development efforts; for example, the Department of English and Theatre and the Office of First Year Courses have strong professional development structures that the QEP will work to enhance.

QEP Co-Directors for Implementation, Dr. Lisa Bosley and Dr. Jill Parrott, are faculty in EKU’s Department of English and Theatre, with expertise in critical reading, composition, and facilitation of professional development. They will lead QEP professional development efforts for
the entire campus, providing training and/or coordinating training by others. Dr. Bosley has used Reading Apprenticeship approaches in her classes for several years and she participated in Reading Apprenticeship 101 training Spring 2016 and is currently enrolled in Reading Apprenticeship’s train-the-trainer course. Dr. Parrott participated in *Reading Apprenticeship 101* in Fall 2016, as will three student leader directors/coordinators in 2017.

Faculty Innovators are full-time faculty members and teaching experts who work with EKU’s Teaching and Learning Center to facilitate workshops and professional learning communities (PLCs) on a variety of topics, many of which currently focus on critical thinking and metacognition. Faculty Innovators will be provided multiple professional development opportunities to gain expertise in best-practices pedagogy for critical reading so that they can integrate instructional practices for critical reading into many of their workshops and PLCs. They will also be recruited to lead some of the professional development activities described below.

There will be two concentrations for professional development of faculty and staff. One, Course Specific Critical Reading, will be anchored in the Department of English and Theatre and the Office of First Year Courses. The second concentration, Critical Reading across the Disciplines, will be anchored in EKU’s Teaching and Learning Center.

The Reading Apprenticeship approach will inform all QEP professional development activities, providing a broad framework of common classroom practices and language to reinforce critical reading across the disciplines. In addition, over the QEP project timespan, QEP Co-Directors will create an online repository for critical reading resources.

**Concentration I: Course Specific Critical Reading:**

Concentration I will focus on instructors who teach courses that have a broad impact on first-year students. These include the developmental reading and writing courses ENG 095R: Introduction to Reading, Writing and Rhetoric and ENG 101R: Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric (Supported); the first-year writing courses ENG 101: Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric and ENG 102: Research, Writing, and Rhetoric; and GSD 101: Foundations of Learning, the orientation course for exploratory students, Psychology students, and student athletes.

Professional development for faculty and staff teaching these courses will focus on strengthening existing structures in the Department of English and Theatre and the Office of First Year Courses that promote critical reading and the integration of reading and writing instruction.
Developmental Reading and Writing Faculty: Professional development for these instructors will build on efforts already in place since the 2014 redesign of developmental education, which resulted in the accelerated, integrated reading and writing course ENG 095R and the co-requisite, credit-bearing developmental reading and writing course ENG 101R. The Reading Apprenticeship approach has provided the framework for the redesign of these courses. The QEP will reinforce and extend this work with one day-long workshop each summer specifically designed for developmental reading and writing faculty and one day-long workshop for all first-year writing instructors. These workshops will focus on program assessment and curriculum development.

First-Year Writing Faculty: The QEP will build on efforts to more fully integrate reading and writing in ENG 101 and ENG 102 by offering workshops specifically geared for first-year writing instructors. Critical reading workshops will be incorporated into the annual Fall Professional Day for first-year faculty and into two additional professional development sessions offered each semester. In addition, first-year writing instructors will be encouraged to attend a day-long summer workshop focused on program assessment and curriculum development.

GSD 101: The Office of First Year Courses (FYC) houses the orientation courses known as Student Success Seminars (SSS). All new students with less than 30 hours of transfer credit are required to take either the 3-credit hour GSD 101 (for Psychology majors and Exploratory and Bridge students) or the 1-credit hour college seminar offered for their major. FYC provides extensive training for instructors of GSD 101. FYC leaders offer a full day of professional development for all SSS instructors prior to the beginning of each fall semester and they require GSD 101 instructors to attend two of their “Take Five” series of in-house workshops per year. They also require GSD instructors to select and attend four more hours of professional development per year from the diverse opportunities provided by the Teaching and Learning Center and other university departments.

QEPCo-Directors will work with First Year Course leaders to design critical reading workshops specifically for GSD 101 instructors and will integrate these workshops into the existing professional development structure. QEP Co-Directors will facilitate a critical reading session at the annual Fall GSD 101 SSS instructor professional development day. They will also design and facilitate at least one “Take Five” workshop per year. Additionally, GSD 101 instructors will be able to meet their other required professional development hours by attending the introductory critical reading workshops offered as part of the Teaching and Learning Innovation series (described in Concentration II).
All other first-year orientation SSS instructors, those who offer orientation courses for the various majors, will be encouraged to attend critical reading workshops offered as part of the Teaching and Learning Innovation series. QEP related workshop topics for Concentration I faculty will be customized to align with course curriculum and will include:

- Teaching Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies
- The Reading Process and Active Reading Strategies
- Integrating Reading, Writing, and Rhetoric
- Critical Reading and Multimodal Texts
- Information Literacy
- Increasing Student Motivation to Read Course Materials

In addition to these departmental efforts, developmental and first-year faculty and staff will be encouraged to participate in the Concentration II activities described below.

**Concentration II: Critical Reading across the Disciplines:**

Concentration II will focus on faculty from the General Education program and from upper-level disciplinary courses who want to improve students’ critical reading skills. Recognizing that disciplines have unique ways of constructing meaning from texts, QEP professional development will help instructors decode the reading requirements and practices of their discipline and teach students disciplinary ways of critically approaching texts.

A four-level course, Critical Reading across the Disciplines, will be housed within the Teaching and Learning Center’s DEEP system beginning in Fall 2017. DEEP (Developing Excellence in Eastern’s Professors) courses are organized by modules that follow a template building on four levels of development, moving from “Learner” to “Practitioner” to “Advocate” and, finally, to “Scholar,” following the movement of Bloom’s taxonomy and ensuring that all topics follow a consistent style, length, approach, and structure. The DEEP system allows participants to meet goals that build toward a badge credential upon reaching the Scholar level. Once a badge is complete, the faculty member will receive university recognition.

All faculty will be encouraged to participate in the QEP professional development course, and while all participants might not achieve “Scholar” badges, participants will have the opportunity to progress at their own pace according to their own interest. The Critical Reading across the Disciplines course will provide the following opportunities:

*Level 1 Learner:* Learner level participants focus on remembering, understanding, and applying knowledge. Learner level participants will have two avenues for gaining knowledge of critical
reading scholarship and pedagogy: an online module or an in-person workshop on Teaching Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies.

1. Online Module participants will:
   - Read and/or view curated materials on critical reading scholarship and pedagogy
   - Complete a self-assessment on concepts learned
   - Plan ways to apply concepts into course curriculum through a brief, written plan

The online module will provide a convenient and accessible forum for faculty looking for basic information for incorporating a new reading activity or approach in their classrooms. QEP Co-Directors will provide online feedback to participants and will also meet with them in-person to encourage them to continue learning through subsequent modules of the Critical Reading across the Disciplines course.

2. In-Person workshop participants will attend the introductory workshop, Teaching Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies, which will be offered three times each semester. This workshop will cover the same material as the online module, with hands-on activities built into the experience. The workshop was piloted in October 2016 with 20 participants from varied disciplines, and the post-workshop survey comments were very positive, indicating strong interest in learning more. This same pilot workshop will be offered twice in Spring 2017, allowing revisions to its structure resulting from faculty feedback.

All Learner level participants will be encouraged to attend other QEP related workshops; at least two other workshop topics will be offered each semester. These workshop topics will vary, but will include:
   - Integrating Reading and Writing
   - Apprenticing Readers to a Discipline
   - Textbook Reading Strategies
   - Information Literacy
   - Increasing Student Motivation to Read Course Materials
   - Developing Critical Readers in Online Courses
   - Navigating the Changing Nature of Literacy with Students
   - Assessing Students’ Critical Reading
   - Customized Departmental Session (per request)

Workshops on Textbook Reading Strategies and Increasing Student Motivation to Read Course Materials will be offered as pilots in Spring 2017.
Other workshop topics will emerge in response to faculty interests and inquiries and through formative assessments of professional development, such as post-workshop surveys to gauge faculty perceptions of their learning and through formative assessments of students’ progress toward QEP student learning outcomes.

QEP critical reading workshops will be available for all EKU faculty, not just those who enroll in the DEEP Critical Reading across the Disciplines course, and will be promoted for all faculty through the Teaching and Learning Center. Critical reading workshops will work as recruitment platforms for encouraging faculty to participate in the Critical Reading across the Disciplines course and to advance through all four levels.

*Level 2 Practitioner:* Level 2 participants will focus on applying knowledge gained in the Learner level by participating in a Critical Reading Professional Learning Community (PLC). Beginning Spring 2018, the QEP Co-Directors will offer a Critical Reading Professional Learning Community (PLC) through the Teaching and Learning Center each semester. The PLC, which will meet throughout the semester, will follow a model of the scholarship of teaching and learning to help participants deepen their knowledge and practice of critical reading pedagogy. The QEP Assessment Liaison will work with PLC members to develop a critical reading assignment and assessment with the EKU Critical Reading Rubric. Assessment will be aligned with the University’s assessment practices and tools. PLC members will present their projects and findings at the end of the semester and submit data to the QEP Assistant Director for Assessment.

Membership in the Critical Reading PLC will be dependent on completing Learner Level 1. PLC participants will be encouraged to move to the next level of the Critical Reading across the Disciplines course to develop research ideas into advocacy and scholarly projects, which will be eligible for QEP Leadership Grants to develop and share QEP projects among EKU faculty and staff. QEP Leadership Grant funded projects are expected to bring scholarly work, research, pedagogical strategies, or other QEP-relevant work to the campus community (Appendix K).

Based on faculty participating in professional development sessions offered at EKU in the past two years, we anticipate high participation rates for these opportunities. For example, over 300 faculty participated in workshops on metacognition offered by Dr. Saundra McGuire in Fall 2015, and 95 faculty participated in professional learning communities during 2015-16. The QEP Co-Directors are working with faculty members in Occupational Sciences to pilot the critical reading PLC in their department Spring 2017.
Level 3 Advocate: Advocate level participants in the critical reading course will promote increased knowledge in the topic with their colleagues. In consultation with QEP Co-Directors, Advocate level participants will design a critical reading project that could include one or more of the following:

- Share their critical reading project in departmental or QEP organized professional development forums
- Lead roundtable discussions or workshops on critical reading in departmental, college or QEP/TLC organized forums
- Develop a research project with other faculty members to redesign an assignment or course
- Facilitate other campus activities focused on critical reading

Advocate Level learners will extend the reach of the QEP by sharing their projects with the University community. Their efforts will assist in recruiting new participants for levels one and two of the Critical Reading across the Disciplines course.

Level 4 Scholar: Level 4 participants in the Critical Reading across the Disciplines course who wish to complete their badges and receive recognition for distinguishing themselves in critical reading pedagogy will focus on creating new knowledge in this area. Participants in the scholar level will:

- Lead or co-lead a PLC on critical reading
- Create scholarly contributions such as conference presentations, peer-reviewed publications, literature reviews, qualitative and quantitative research, and grant proposals.

Through these types of scholarly activities, faculty can develop their interest in critical reading pedagogy into the types of scholarly products valued by their field, department, and the University. These projects will provide further assessment of QEP supported student and faculty learning and will make the results available to broader audiences.

The flexible nature of the DEEP modules in the Advocate and Scholar levels will attract faculty who desire to follow their unique interests within the broader critical reading topic. Working through departmental and Teaching and Learning Center structures already in place, QEP professional development will be coordinated with and enhanced by university-wide initiatives such as an emphasis in the past two years on metacognition and the scholarship of teaching and learning.
Online Repository: In addition to the activities in the two concentrations, QEP Co-Directors will identify, compile, and archive critical reading resources and make these available through EKU’s Teaching and Learning Center website. This will be an ongoing process throughout the QEP period. Materials will include a bibliography of critical reading research and pedagogical articles as well as teaching toolkits, workshop handouts, and classroom materials and activities.

The faculty development strategy ties directly to student learning as the pedagogical strategies chosen by instructors directly impact students at the point of contact in the classroom. The QEP’s student learning outcomes of developing critical reading skills, increasing awareness of metacognitive reading strategies, and improving reading confidence are inextricable from faculty best practices in the classroom, curriculum and assignment design, and a culture of students being held accountable for their reading. Through these efforts, EKU faculty will be well prepared to provide instruction to students as they work to develop critical reading skills through metacognitive strategies.

Strategy II. Professional Development of Student Leaders:
Professional development of student leaders will also build on structures already in place, with intensive efforts to promote metacognitive strategy use to improve students’ critical reading.

EKU has an extensive and effective system of peer tutoring and support for students across the University that includes the Student Success Center, the Office of First Year Courses, the NOVA (federal TRIO) program, the Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, the Bratzke Student-Athlete Academic Success Center, the EKU Guru program, the Center for Student Accessibility, the Office of Housing residential tutoring program, and various academic departments’ tutoring services. Student leaders who work for these programs are upper-level students who are recruited for their strong academic, interpersonal and leadership skills. These programs reap the additional benefit of providing career development skills for student leaders.

EKU’s Office of Academic Readiness oversees tutor professional development through the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) Tutor Training Program Certification. CRLA Level I tutors receive ten hours of training; Level II tutors receive 20 hours of training. QEP Co-Directors will work with the Office of Academic Readiness to offer a general critical reading workshop, Supporting Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies, as part of their CRLA fall and spring tutor training conference. Additionally, each of the tutoring and mentoring programs mentioned above offers workshops throughout the semester to support tutors and
mentors. The QEP will work with each of these groups to help coordinate, at minimum, one customized workshop per semester. Workshop topics will include:

- How to Recognize a Reading Issue as a Learning Issue
- Improving Student Writing through Critical Reading
- Textbook Reading Strategies
- Critical Reading in Sciences
- Critical Reading in Mathematics
- Working with International Students to Improve Critical Reading Skills

Additionally, FirstYear Leaders, who are peer mentors and guides to first-year students in GSD 101, Foundations of Learning, enroll in a 3-credit course (GST 300, Principles of Peer Mentoring/Tutoring) in which they are provided the training needed to guide their peers. The Coordinator of First Year Courses and NOVA program staff will provide instruction in this course in recognizing reading difficulties and accessing critical-reading resources with guidance from the QEP Co-Directors.

The QEP will also intensify critical reading training efforts in place at EKU’s Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, which supports students through peer consultation services. Noel Studio Consultants (NSCs) are upper-division students who work with students at all levels and from all disciplines on reading, writing, and oral communication projects and products. The Noel Studio has an extensive consultant training program. As part of this effort, faculty from EKU’s Department of English and Theatre have provided training in critical reading consultations for the past several years. The QEP will build on and reinforce these professional development initiatives by offering two workshops per semester, one, Supporting Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies, and the second with a particular emphasis on helping students improve critical reading to improve their writing and oral communication projects.

Course Embedded Consultants (CECs) are also based in the Noel Studio. These upper-division students serve as academic mentors to students in ENG 095R, the accelerated, integrated, developmental reading and writing course, and ENG 101R, the co-requisite developmental reading and writing course in which students also earn General Education credit for ENG 101. CECs attend ENG 095R and ENG 101R classes and form strong relationships with the students in their assigned class. They support classroom learning through one-on-one consultations with students outside of class. CECs participate in the Noel Studio’s training program to assist peers with critical reading and writing tasks. The QEP will build upon and reinforce these structures by offering two critical reading workshops per semester specifically focused on supporting critical reading and writing for students with developmental requirements.
The QEP will also focus resources on expanding the number of hours CECs are available for students with developmental requirements to help increase course completion and retention rates. Program assessment shows a correlation between the number of hours a student meets with a CEC and successful grades in the courses.

Reading Apprenticeship will also form the foundation for professional development of student leaders. The QEP will fund three EKU Student Success support services staff leaders to participate in the Reading Apprenticeship 101 online course. These include the Assistant Director of the Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, the Coordinator of First Year Courses, and the Director of the Student Success Center. Two EKU NOVA program staff will also participate in Reading Apprenticeship 101 online course through separate funding.

The following QEP Implementation Timeline outlines the ways professional development of faculty and of student leaders will help EKU achieve and assess the QEP’s Student Learning Outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Summer '17</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Summer 18</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
<th>Summer 19</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
<th>Summer 2020</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Summer 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Spring 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: FACULTY CONCENTRATION I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, Coordinate &amp; Facilitate Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Facilitate Intensive Summer Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: FACULTY CONCENTRATION II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Revise DEEP Course &amp; Online Sources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor DEEP Course</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Facilitate Workshops through TLI Series</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Facilitate Sessions for Departments as Requested</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Facilitate Professional Learning Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Leadership Grants at Scholars Week</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: STUDENT LEADERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Revise CRLA Workshops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate CRLA Workshops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Facilitate Customized Workshops for Student Leader Groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Summer '17</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Summer '18</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
<th>Summer '19</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
<th>Summer 2020</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Summer 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refine &amp; Finalize Sampling Strategies &amp; Implements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess SLO 1 via Critical Reading Rubric for PLC Participants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess SLO 1 via Critical Reading Rubric for General Education Elements 3A, 3B, &amp; 5A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess SLO 1 via General Education Element 1A/B Rubric</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess SLO 2 via MARSI in ENG 095, 101, 101R &amp; GSD 101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess SLO 3 via Confidence Scale Administered through Graduation Processes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess Institutional Learning Outcome via Formative Assessments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Summer '17</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Summer '18</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
<th>Summer '19</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
<th>Summer 2020</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Spring 2021</th>
<th>Summer 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Faculty &amp; Staff Complete Reading Apprenticeship Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Data Management &amp; Reporting Systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect and Manage Assessment Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze Assessment Data and Adjust QEP as Needed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Reports for Executive Leadership Team and Implementation Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with Implementation Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Leadership Grant Applications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote QEP through Media &amp; Events</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer &amp; Monitor the QEP Budget</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicize QEP Accomplishments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare SACSCOC Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
The responsibilities of those implementing the QEP are summarized below.

**President Dr. Michael Benson**
- Inform the EKU Board of Regents and the University community about the QEP’s alignment with EKU’s mission and strategic goals
- Approve and ensure funding for the QEP budget

**Vice Provost Dr. Sherry Robinson**
- Supervise QEP Co-Directors
- Chair the QEP Executive Leadership Team
- Ensure that the QEP meets SACSCOC compliance criteria
- Provide oversight of QEP budget

**QEP Co-Directors Dr. Lisa Bosley and Dr. Jill Parrott**
- Lead Implementation Team in development and refinement of QEP
- Facilitate work groups of Implementation Team including professional development, marketing, and assessment
- Oversee production of QEP document
- Develop on campus presentation for SACSCOC visit in February 2017
- Promote the QEP across the University
- Work with Department of English and Theatre and Office of First Year Courses to develop, market, facilitate, and track participation in professional development Concentration I
- Work with the Teaching and Learning Center to develop, market, facilitate, and track participation in professional development Concentration II
- Work with student leader program directors to develop and facilitate professional development for student leaders
- Coordinate and guide other faculty in developing and facilitating professional development
- Identify and host external experts to facilitate professional development in collaboration with the Provost’s Speaker Series and Chautauqua Lecture Series
- Develop an online resource repository of critical reading materials
- Keep abreast of innovative critical reading pedagogy and professional development design through conference attendance, including the SACSCOC annual meeting
- Work with Assistant Director of Assessment and QEP Assessment Liaison to integrate professional development and assessment of student learning outcomes and to manage data collection and analysis
- Manage the QEP budget
- Report QEP activities to QEP Executive Leadership Team and QEP Implementation Team
- Track all QEP related activities and prepare QEP reports for the University and SACSCOC

**QEP Faculty Assessment Liaison Dr. Jennifer Wies**
- Serve on the QEP Executive Leadership Team and Implementation Team to support coordination of QEP efforts with assessment
- Work with faculty to develop QEP assessment instruments and pilot instruments during pre-implementation
- Provide professional development focusing on assurance of learning and assessment related to the QEP
- Assist with the preparation of QEP assessment reports to the University and SACSCOC

**Assistant Director of Assessment (Office of Institutional Effectiveness)**
- Coordinate distribution of QEP assessment instruments
- Assist with QEP data collection and management
- Assist with the preparation of QEP reports to the University and SACSCOC
- Support QEP survey operations in Qualtrics

**QEP Executive Leadership Team (see Appendix I)**
- Provide guidance for QEP Co-Directors
- Provide final approval of the QEP narrative document
- Prepare for the February visit from SACSCOC

**QEP Implementation Team (see Appendix J)**
- Represent demographics from across the University in QEP implementation plans
- Share information about the QEP’s focus, learning outcomes, and definitions with colleagues and students
- Serve on at least one work team to help develop plans for QEP implementation
- Review various drafts of the QEP narrative and provide input and guidance toward finalizing the document
- Promote QEP-related activities among colleagues and students
Literature Review Work Team (see Appendix L)
- Review and revise the literature review section of the QEP narrative
- Agree on best practices for professional development of faculty, staff, and student leaders

Professional Development Work Team (see Appendix M)
- Refine the professional development plan for faculty, staff, and student leaders
- Provide guidance in development of materials for professional development.
- Review and approve QEP Leadership Grant applications

Marketing Work Team (see Appendix N)
- Work with graphic designers, video producers, printers, and vendors to develop a QEP logo, advertisements, posters, giveaways, and other elements of marketing
- Collaborate with various entities on campus to identify opportunities to introduce administrators, faculty, staff, and students to the QEP.

Assessment Work Team (see Appendix O)
- Develop metrics and instruments for assessment of QEP student learning outcomes
- Align assessment tools and processes with plans for professional development of faculty, staff, and student leaders
- Pilot QEP specific assessments
- Monitor and revise assessment processes as needed during implementation of the QEP
RESOURCES
The QEP budget provides the financial and human resources necessary for achievement of the plan’s Student Learning Outcomes in the following areas.

**Leadership Training**

The QEP relies on existing faculty and staff expertise to promote and instruct colleagues and student leaders across the university in critical reading pedagogy and support. The budget reflects investment in these campus leaders by funding their participation in Reading Apprenticeship training, which provides the foundation for QEP professional development of staff, faculty, and student leaders. The Leadership Training line of the budget includes costs for Co-Directors Dr. Lisa Bosley and Dr. Jill Parrott to each complete two courses through Reading Apprenticeship. Dr. Bosley completed Reading Apprenticeship’s *Faculty 101* online course in Spring 2016 and is currently enrolled in Reading Apprenticeship’s *Leadership Community of Practice* eight-month course. The course included a four day summer institute and subsequent online modules; it prepares participants to lead reading across the curriculum initiatives at their institutions. Dr. Parrott completed Reading Apprenticeship’s Faculty 101 online course in Fall 2016 and will enroll in Reading Apprenticeship’s Leadership Community of Practice course summer 2017.

Dr. Bosley and Dr. Parrott will use this training to design and facilitate the professional development activities described in the implementation plan and to develop other QEP leaders who will plan and facilitate the QEP advocacy and scholarly projects described in the implementation plan. The budget also includes funding for professional development each year for Dr. Bosley and Dr. Parrott so that they may continue to refresh and update the design and facilitation of critical reading pedagogy and professional development. The Co-Directors will also attend the SACSCOC annual meeting to learn from colleagues who are also managing QEP programs.

The QEP budget also supports the development of key staff who have responsibility for developing student leaders in tutoring, mentoring, and consultation. Dr. Clint Stivers, Assistant Director of EKU’s Noel Studio, Ms. Lara Vance, the Director of EKU’s Student Success Center, and Ms. Leslie Valley, the Coordinator of First Year Courses, will all complete Reading Apprenticeship’s *Faculty 101* online course by Fall 2017. These staff will have primary responsibility for coordinating and facilitating professional development of student leaders to achieve QEP student learning outcomes.
**Faculty and Staff Support**
All faculty and staff will be encouraged to participate in QEP professional development activities, but two areas will include extra incentives. Instructors for first-year reading and writing courses, ENG 095R, ENG 101R, ENG 101, and ENG 102, will receive a stipend to attend intensive, day-long workshops each summer (when they are not on contract). ENG 095R and ENG 101R instructors will attend two days of summer workshops, while ENG 101 and 102 instructors will attend one day. Because instructors in these courses provide foundational skills that lead to student success across the curriculum, this professional development will ensure that instructors are well prepared to teach critical reading through metacognitive strategies and will help to develop additional leaders for ongoing professional development. The summer professional development will provide time for curriculum development and assessment that is difficult to achieve during the regular academic year. The workshop days will be in addition to the required professional development day for first-year writing instructors held each August, which will also support critical reading and its integration with writing instruction.

Additionally, all faculty and staff will be encouraged to participate in the Concentration II DEEP course, Teaching Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies, and will be eligible to apply for a QEP Leadership Grant to bring scholarly work, research, pedagogical strategies or other QEP-relevant work to the campus community through the design and facilitation of a Professional Learning Community or other professional development experience for their colleagues. (See Appendix K for the application process and list of possible activities)

**Direct Student Support**
The QEP budget will fund salaries of student leaders designated as Course Embedded Consultants (CECs), who provide direct support to students enrolled in the developmental reading and writing courses ENG 095R and ENG 101R (approximately 20% of first-year students per year). These upper-division students, based in EKU’s Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, serve as academic mentors to EKU’s most at-risk students. Pass rates for these integrated, accelerated courses, offered as pilot courses since Fall 2013 (ENG 101R) and Fall 2015 (ENG 095R), have been comparable to the pass rates in the formerly separate developmental courses. Instructors of these courses consider CECs essential to the course design: preliminary studies of a two-year pilot suggest a link between contact hours with a CEC and student success in these courses.
Administrative Support

Primary responsibility for administration of the QEP implementation plan resides with three faculty positions and one staff position. QEP Co-Directors will each receive 50% reassigned time each semester for the QEP period, as well as a 25% salary stipend during the summer months. The Faculty Assessment Liaison will receive 12.5% reassigned time per year. The Assistant Director of Assessment, based in the Office of Institutional Research, is assigned to the QEP at 40% distribution of effort for a 12-month contract. Additional administrative expenses include operating expenses for books and materials for professional development, printing, copying, and supplies to support the implementation plan.

Marketing

Promoting the QEP across the university is essential to ensuring widespread participation in professional development and achieving student learning outcomes. Marketing activities and expenses, heavier during the first years of the QEP, include purchasing QEP branded items such as banners, posters, t-shirts, bookmarks, and other student giveaways. They will also include two promotional video productions: one shows students and faculty engaged in critical reading activities in different campus contexts; the other shows students and faculty speaking about their critical reading experiences.

The university is committed to providing sufficient funds for the QEP. The QEP 2017-2022 budget maintains allocated funds from the previous QEP budget and has been approved by EKU administration and the Board of Regents. Table 6 summarizes expected QEP budget expenditures.
Table 6  QEP Budget Summary by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PRE IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>YEAR 1 2017-18</th>
<th>YEAR 2 2018-19</th>
<th>YEAR 3 2019-20</th>
<th>YEAR 4 2020-21</th>
<th>YEAR 5 2021-22</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>QEP Co-Directors</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>25,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD Noel Studio</td>
<td>750 (S17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD First-Year Courses</td>
<td>750 (F16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD Student Success</td>
<td>750 (S17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Support</td>
<td>Faculty Leadership Grants</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration I Faculty Dev.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Student Support</td>
<td>Course Embedded Consultant</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>306,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Director of Assessment</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Assess Liaison Reassigned Time</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>20,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEARLY TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>97,431</td>
<td>186,831</td>
<td>188,581</td>
<td>187,081</td>
<td>181,581</td>
<td>176,581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,019,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# QEP Budget Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>EXPLANATION / CALCULATION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEADERSHIP TRAINING (TOTAL $27,500)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Co-Directors Reading Apprenticeship Leadership Training</td>
<td>Lisa Bosley 2016; Jill Parrott 2016-17</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Co-Directors Ongoing Professional Development</td>
<td>$1,000 per year exclusive of RA Leader Training Year Lisa Bosley 2017-2022 (5 yrs); Jill Parrott 2018-2022 (4 years)</td>
<td>2017-2022</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director Noel Studio Reading Apprenticeship Training</td>
<td>Training for Supervision of Course Embedded Consultants Faculty 101 Reading Apprenticeship online course</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director First-Year Courses Reading Apprenticeship Training</td>
<td>Training for Leading First-Year Courses Instructors Faculty 101 Reading Apprenticeship online course</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director Student Success Reading Apprenticeship Training</td>
<td>Training for Supervision of Student Tutors Faculty 101 Reading Apprenticeship online course</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY SUPPORT (TOTAL $54,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Support Leadership Grants</td>
<td>Competitive faculty awards for faculty initiatives to support QEP student learning outcomes</td>
<td>2017-2022</td>
<td>2000-10000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration I Faculty Development Workshops</td>
<td>Stipends for intensive summer faculty workshops &amp; training $3000 in Summer 2016; Dev Ed. 6@150=900; FYW 20@150=3000; Food=$300 (5 years)</td>
<td>2016-2022</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT SUPPORT (TOTAL $306,000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Embedded Consultants Salary</td>
<td>15 CECs @ 2,040 each per semester (10 semesters)</td>
<td>2017-2022</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>306,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE (TOTAL $607,086)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Directors: Summer Stipends</td>
<td>$4,500 + 45% = $6,525 x 2 Directors (6 yrs)</td>
<td>2016-2022</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>78,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Directors: Reassigned Time</td>
<td>Reassigned time: $3,200 + 8.1% = $3,459 x 4</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>13,836</td>
<td>13,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 reassigned time $6,400 + 8.1% = $6,918 x 2 Directors (11 semesters)</td>
<td>Sp 2017 - Sp 2022</td>
<td>13,836</td>
<td>152,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Assessment</td>
<td>Inclusive of fringe benefits (5.5 years)</td>
<td>2017-2022</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Assessment Liaison: Reassigned Time</td>
<td>.25 reassigned time: $3,200 + 8.1% (5.5 years)</td>
<td>2017-2022</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>20,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$2,000 Pre-implementation; $3,000 5 years</td>
<td>2016-2022</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARKETING (TOTAL $19,500)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Marketing</td>
<td>Pre-implementation</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020-2022</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT OF QEP OUTCOMES
Assessment of QEP student learning outcomes will be integrated with existing University assessment practices that take place primarily at the course level, but will feed into the University’s programmatic assessment through its Assurance of Learning process. Summative assessments will measure achievement of Student Learning Outcomes while formative assessments will inform ongoing adjustments to the QEP strategies to ensure student learning. Summative assessment tools include an EKU developed Critical Reading Rubric and Critical Reading Confidence Scale and the widely-used Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI). The data generated from the use of these tools will be used formatively as well. Formative assessments also include professional development participant surveys; EKU’s student course evaluation instrument, eXplorance Blue; and analysis of student reflection essays.

Summative Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

- SLO 1: Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.  
  (Direct measure of student learning with EKU developed Critical Reading Rubric)
- SLO 2. Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.  
  (Indirect measure of student learning with MARSI)
- SLO 3. Students will express confidence in their abilities as critical readers.  
  (Indirect measure of student perception through EKU developed Confidence Scale)

Summative Assessment Measures

Critical Reading Rubric: The QEP Assessment Work Team designed the EKU Critical Reading Rubric based on the definition of critical reading that was developed by the QEP Design and Implementation Teams. The Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AACU) VALUE Reading Rubric provided a national standard to guide rubric development, as did specific ideas and terminology that have been the focus of assessment of EKU’s General Education Program. In order to capitalize on faculty members’ existing knowledge, the EKU Critical Reading Rubric was based on language in EKU’s General Education Rubrics, which have been used to assess course-level student-learning competencies since 2006. The EKU Critical Reading Rubric incorporates language from Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning (Krathwohl, 2002) and the Elder and Paul (2004) Model of Critical Thinking, which has been the basis for much professional development at Eastern Kentucky University since 2007 as part of the previous QEP.

The EKU Critical Reading Rubric (Appendix P) will be used to evaluate students’ critical reading performance at the course level. The Rubric language is general enough to adapt to any
discipline’s reading task or assignment, yet specific enough to separate areas of student strengths and weaknesses. The Rubric will be used by faculty to evaluate student work products based on a faculty selected text relevant to the course. The student work product will be an assignment developed by faculty in consultation with the QEP Assessment Faculty Liaison and, when appropriate, in collaboration with other faculty members in the department.

Using the Rubric, faculty will categorize student performance as “Beginning,” “Developing,” “Competent,” or “Accomplished.” These categories are used in the current General Education Rubrics, and program-level assessment rubrics for critical thinking and communication. In addition to language within the rubrics guiding faculty judgments, the following definitions are provided for the category labels:

This rubric was piloted Fall 2016 by Dr. Jennifer Wies in her Introduction to Cultural Anthropology course; the pilot will inform further refinement of the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Fails to meet the expectation for the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Incomplete in meeting the expectations for the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Meets the expectations for the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>Exceeds the expectations for the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory:**

Awareness of metacognitive strategies will be measured with the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI; Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). The MARSI was developed to assess readers’ metacognitive awareness and perceived use of reading strategies. The scale can be used as both a summative and formative assessment instrument.

Students rate themselves on the MARSI items on a 5-point scale from 1 (I never or almost never do this) to 5 (I always or almost always do this). The University modified some of the MARSI items for the sake of brevity and clarity, and to arrange the items chronologically according to strategies students might use before, during, and after reading. (The modified scale can be viewed in Appendix Q).
Critical Reading Confidence Scale: Students’ confidence in their abilities as critical readers will be measured with the Critical Reading Confidence Scale, an instrument created by the QEP Assessment Work Team in collaboration with the QEP Implementation Team (See Appendix R). The instrument is based on research on self-efficacy among students in K-12 and higher education environments (Bandura, 2006; Cantrell, et. al., 2013; Hampton, 1998; and Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler 2005). The items ask students to rate their confidence in using metacognitive reading strategies, their confidence in their abilities to understand and evaluate texts, and their confidence in succeeding in college and in college-level courses. The scale contains 9 items rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (not at all confident) to 4 (very confident).

Summative Assessment Processes

SLO 1: Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.
Students’ critical reading will be assessed at the course level in targeted General Education courses in the arts, humanities, historical perspectives, and in the culminating first-year writing course, ENG 102. Students’ critical reading skills will also be assessed in other General Education and upper-level courses across disciplines based on faculty interest and self selection. The University will institutionalize assessment of critical reading into all General Education courses by 2020.

Course-level assessment data guides instructors in knowing what they can change in their courses to improve student performance. Faculty can create assignments and corresponding assessments that are directly connected to the course content; thus faculty can readily understand how student strengths and weaknesses connect directly to what happens in the classroom. Additionally, course-level assessments provide faculty with data that highlights instructional successes: instructors can share an effective assignment or pedagogical technique with other faculty members. In this way, early adopters of critical reading pedagogies become disseminators of the information.

Through QEP professional development, projects focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning will help spread information about what strategies could be used, how to implement those strategies, how assignments could be structured to encourage students to read material, how assessment could be structured to get useful information about student strengths and weaknesses, and how changing pedagogical approaches lead to improved student learning. Professional development and assessment pathways encourage and support faculty development of these scholarly projects focused on classroom assignments and assessment.
**SLO 1 Measurement 1.**

**Direct Assessment of Student Work in General Education Courses**

**Performance Target:** At least 85% of students will score competent or accomplished on a critical reading task for courses in General Education.

Since 2006, EKU has used a performance target of 85% for assessment of General Education courses. Faculty developed this target and continue to support its use.

Beginning Fall 2018, students in each General Education course in Elements 3A (Arts), 3B (Humanities), and 5A (Historical Perspectives) will be evaluated on critical reading. This will include approximately 100 course sections and 2,400 student work products. These will not be 2,400 unique students since many students complete multiple General Education Elements concurrently, but the work products from each course will be unique.

Since 2006, General Education courses have been evaluated using rubrics that contain the higher-order thinking skills included in the definition of critical reading, i.e., analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Therefore, integrating QEP and GE assessment is an extension of existing assessment processes. However, the assessment assignments and instruments will be newly created and/or revised specifically for the purpose of evaluating critical reading using the EKU Critical Reading Rubric.

Students in these General Education courses will read a faculty-selected text appropriate to the level and type of course, and respond in writing to prompts/questions about the reading. (See Appendix S for Sample Assignment.) The course instructor will evaluate the assignment using the EKU Critical Reading Rubric, use section-level data to evaluate the effectiveness of lesson plans, and submit data to the department’s General Education Assessment Coordinator. Data across all sections of the same course will be aggregated and sent to the Assistant Director of Assessment, who will aggregate data across all courses within an Element for program-level summative data. This is the assessment process currently used for the General Education Program; thus, there will be no changes in process for faculty other than the new assignment/instrument to evaluate critical reading. This is an advantage as it limits the changes to which faculty must adapt and allows them to focus on the most important change, pedagogical strategies for critical reading.

The QEP will initially focus on courses in arts, humanities, and historical perspectives because
current assessment instruments in most courses in these General Education Elements require students to read texts and respond in writing to questions/prompts. The assessment instruments for courses in other General Education Elements are more varied, and many utilize multiple choice tests. Therefore, QEP assessment will begin with courses for which the assessment instruments typically will require only modest revisions, allowing a focus of professional development resources on pedagogical strategies to improve critical reading, rather than on issues related to assessment.

Additionally, every student completing General Education must take at least one course in every Element. Thus, we would not impact additional students by focusing on more Elements. Limiting the focus to just three Elements in the first year will allow time and resources to include non-General Education faculty in professional development and assessment efforts, and impact more students. For example, Professional Learning Communities will include faculty who do not teach courses in General Education and these faculty members will be encouraged to develop assignments and assessments focusing on critical reading. Data from these assignments will contribute to, and broaden the scope of, the overall assessment of EKU students’ critical reading.

Every faculty member who teaches a class in General Education Elements 3A, 3B, or 5A will be encouraged to enroll in the Critical Reading across the Disciplines DEEP course and to complete, at a minimum, the Level 1 Learner module: Teaching Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies. Data for critical reading in General Education courses will be collected Fall 2018 and every two years thereafter.

The rationale for the schedule is that one year is a data-collection year, and the second year is used for faculty to discuss the meaning of the results at both the course and program levels, and implement changes to the curriculum at the course and/or program levels. A two-year cycle is most reasonable in order to provide time for the changes to have an impact on student learning.

**SLO 1 Measurement 2.**

**Direct Assessment of Student Work in ENG 102**

**Performance Target:** At least 85% of students will score competent or accomplished on critical reading competencies in ENG 102.

ENG 102: *Research, Writing and Rhetoric* is the second required first-year writing course in General Education (Element 1B), and focuses on the integration of critical reading and writing. A
sample of students in each ENG 102 course will be assessed—approximately 100 student work products across 30 sections of the course.

In 2015, the Rubric for Element 1A/B: Written Communication in General Education was revised by faculty to intentionally reflect the course emphasis on reading and information literacy. The revised rubric includes two competencies related to critical reading: Information Literacy: Selection and Information Literacy: Critical Reading/Integration.

All English 102 sections use an assessment assignment with a common structure. A team of first-year writing faculty evaluates a sample of student work products using the General Education Rubric. Critical reading data across all sections will be aggregated and sent to the Assistant Director of Assessment. This is the assessment process currently used for the General Education Program; thus, there will be no changes in process for faculty.

The assessment will provide indications of students’ critical reading in ENG 102 and will inform instructional design in the series of developmental and first-year reading/writing courses that students take as prerequisites for ENG 102. Professional development will be required for faculty who teach these courses: ENG 095R: Introduction to Reading, Writing and Rhetoric, ENG 101: Reading, Writing and Rhetoric, ENG 101R: Reading, Writing and Rhetoric (Supported), and ENG 102: Research, Writing, and Rhetoric. A pilot test of the professional development was conducted Summer 2016, and a refined version of the professional development will be delivered every summer beginning 2017. Data for critical reading in ENG 102 will be collected Spring 2019 and every two years thereafter.

SLO 1 Measurement 3.
Direct Assessment of Student Work Across Disciplines

Performance Target: At least 85% of students will score competent or accomplished on the critical reading task for the course.

Instructors who participate in the Critical Reading across the Disciplines course Level 2 Practitioner module will be engaged in a semester-long Professional Learning Community, which will include critical reading assessment design. These faculty will have completed the Level 1 Learner module, Teaching Critical Reading through Metacognitive Strategies, to learn basic strategies and course-design activities to help students read critically.
In the Professional Learning Community, participants will learn additional strategies and pedagogical approaches to help students become better critical readers and, working with the QEP Assessment Liaison, will develop a project focused on improving students' critical reading on a specific assignment in the course. The project will follow an established formula for the scholarship of teaching and learning (Hutchings, 2000) and will require one or two semesters to plan, implement, and yield data. Student work from each project will be evaluated by the instructor using the EKU Critical Reading Rubric, and data will be submitted to the Assistant Director of Assessment. This will provide an additional measure of students’ critical reading.

Participation rates in other EKU professional learning communities for the past two years suggest that approximately 20 faculty will participate in the critical reading professional learning communities. For example in Spring 2016, 24 faculty participated in a professional learning community on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Completion rates for other professional learning communities suggest that 15 faculty will complete assessment projects and submit data. The participants will be a mix of faculty teaching General Education and non-General Education courses. The assessment data generated as a result of the research projects in the Professional Learning Communities will not duplicate data collected for General Education.

**SLO 2. Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.**

*Indirect Assessment of Students’ Awareness of Metacognitive Strategies in ENG 095R, ENG 101R, ENG 101 and GSD 101*

**Performance Target:** At least 85% of students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.

Students’ metacognitive awareness will also be assessed at the course-level. Students in the developmental reading/writing courses ENG 095R and ENG101R; in the first of the two course first-year writing sequence ENG 101; and in the orientation course GSD 101, will take the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) to assess their awareness of metacognitive strategies. These courses are typically completed in the first semester and provide students with essential foundational knowledge for success in college. Instructors of these courses attend annual professional development, which will include best practice approaches to teaching critical reading through metacognitive strategies. Assessing students at
the end of these courses will provide the most useful data for faculty teaching these courses and for QEP leaders to plan future professional development that is informed by the MARSI data. Thus, the MARSI data will provide summative information about student knowledge of metacognitive strategies and also provide formative information to guide curriculum revisions and future professional development of faculty to better teach these metacognitive strategies.

The approximate number of students in each course in fall semesters are ENG 095R (200), ENG 101R (170), ENG 101 (1800) and GSD 101 (1000). All students will be asked to complete an online (cell phone compatible) version of the MARSI during class time at the end of the semester.

Average scores on the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) can range from 1.0—5.0. The scale developers (Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002) recommend an average score of 3.5 or higher for the “high” category, meaning that the student frequently uses the reading strategies. We have set the criteria for achievement of SLO 2 at 3.5 or higher on the MARSI scale. Students will complete the MARSI each fall semester, beginning 2017.

SLO 3. Students will express confidence in their abilities as critical readers.

Indirect Assessment of students’ confidence in their abilities as critical readers.

Performance Target: At least 85% of students will report confidence in their abilities as critical readers.

Graduating seniors will complete the Critical Reading Confidence Scale online as part of the graduation application process. On the Critical Reading Confidence Scale average scores can range from 1.0—4.0. We have set the criterion for achievement of SLO 3 at 3.0 or higher (somewhat confident or higher). We expect to see increases in confidence levels over time based on comparisons of cohort data.

Formative Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

- SLO 1: Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.
  (Direct measure of student learning with EKU developed Critical Reading Rubric)
- SLO 2. Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.
  (Indirect measure of student learning with MARSI)

Formative Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes: Formative assessment data will be used to monitor processes and intermediate outcomes, and adjust implementation strategies.
Formative data about student learning will be discussed among faculty in order to better understand students’ strengths, weaknesses, and perceptions, and to revise pedagogy to address those needs. Formative data about faculty will be used by QEP Directors to better understand faculty professional development needs and to plan professional development accordingly. Additionally, data that could be useful to other constituents will be shared with others. For example, faculty will be interested in outcomes related to students’ use of metacognitive reading strategies and confidence, and this information can be shared.

**SLO 1.** Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.
Data collected for summative assessment in General Education Elements 3A, 3B, and 5A, ENG 102, and courses across the disciplines will also be used formatively. Section-level data will be used by faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of course lesson plans and refine course content, pedagogy, and assignments as necessary. Course-level data aggregated across sections will be used by program faculty to evaluate student learning in key courses and revise program curricula as needed, and by QEP Co-Directors to inform professional development.

**SLO 2.** Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.
Data collected for the summative assessment in ENG 095R, ENG 101R, ENG 101, and GSD 101 will also be used formatively. Section-level, item-specific MARSI scores will be used by faculty to evaluate the performance of their students and the effectiveness of their course lesson plans. For example, faculty may focus on a few of the metacognitive strategies and item-level data will provide information about whether their students are more aware of those strategies compared to strategies on which the faculty member did not focus.

Data aggregated across sections and courses will be used by QEP Co-Directors to guide professional-development. Faculty teaching ENG 095R, ENG 101R, ENG 101, ENG 102, and GSD 101 will be specifically targeted for this formative information; however, these data also will be useful in developing professional development for faculty and for student leaders.

**Formative Assessment of Institutional Learning Outcome:** Faculty, staff, and student leaders will use and teach metacognitive strategies to develop students as critical readers.

- Faculty will learn critical-reading pedagogical strategies
  (*Post Professional Development Survey*)
- Faculty will use critical-reading pedagogical strategies in teaching.
  (*Student course evaluation instrument eXplorance Blue*)

---

Formative data about student learning will be discussed among faculty in order to better understand students’ strengths, weaknesses, and perceptions, and to revise pedagogy to address those needs. Formative data about faculty will be used by QEP Directors to better understand faculty professional development needs and to plan professional development accordingly. Additionally, data that could be useful to other constituents will be shared with others. For example, faculty will be interested in outcomes related to students’ use of metacognitive reading strategies and confidence, and this information can be shared.

**SLO 1.** Students will demonstrate critical reading of academic texts and materials.
Data collected for summative assessment in General Education Elements 3A, 3B, and 5A, ENG 102, and courses across the disciplines will also be used formatively. Section-level data will be used by faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of course lesson plans and refine course content, pedagogy, and assignments as necessary. Course-level data aggregated across sections will be used by program faculty to evaluate student learning in key courses and revise program curricula as needed, and by QEP Co-Directors to inform professional development.

**SLO 2.** Students will report awareness of metacognitive reading strategies.
Data collected for the summative assessment in ENG 095R, ENG 101R, ENG 101, and GSD 101 will also be used formatively. Section-level, item-specific MARSI scores will be used by faculty to evaluate the performance of their students and the effectiveness of their course lesson plans. For example, faculty may focus on a few of the metacognitive strategies and item-level data will provide information about whether their students are more aware of those strategies compared to strategies on which the faculty member did not focus.

Data aggregated across sections and courses will be used by QEP Co-Directors to guide professional-development. Faculty teaching ENG 095R, ENG 101R, ENG 101, ENG 102, and GSD 101 will be specifically targeted for this formative information; however, these data also will be useful in developing professional development for faculty and for student leaders.

**Formative Assessment of Institutional Learning Outcome:** Faculty, staff, and student leaders will use and teach metacognitive strategies to develop students as critical readers.

- Faculty will learn critical-reading pedagogical strategies
  (*Post Professional Development Survey*)
- Faculty will use critical-reading pedagogical strategies in teaching.
  (*Student course evaluation instrument eXplorance Blue*)

---

---
Student leaders will learn critical-reading pedagogical strategies.

(Post Professional Development Survey)

Student leaders will use critical-reading pedagogical strategies in peer-tutoring sessions.

(Student Reflection Essays from ENG 095R and ENG 101R)

Faculty will learn critical-reading pedagogical strategies: After every professional development session, faculty will complete a survey about what they learned about critical reading pedagogy and what they intend to use. (See Appendix T). Faculty will be sent a link to complete the online survey within two days of their participation in the session. These data will be used to evaluate faculty learning and will also inform changes needed for future professional development sessions.

Faculty will use critical-reading pedagogical strategies in teaching: To evaluate faculty use of metacognitive strategies in teaching, students will evaluate instructors and courses via EKU’s institution-wide course feedback instrument, eXplorance Blue. The instrument will include a question about instructors’ teaching of critical reading: My instructor taught strategies to help me critically read academic texts and materials [4-point response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree)]. This course evaluation instrument is sent to every student in every course every semester.

The section-level course-evaluation data will provide student feedback to individual faculty about their teaching, and aggregated data will provide the University with information about the use of metacognitive strategies across courses, and within subgroups of courses. For example, comparisons can be made for General Education and non-General Education courses.

Student leaders will learn critical-reading pedagogical strategies: Student leaders for the QEP are academic tutors across campus, consultants in the Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, and Course-Embedded Consultants in ENG 095R and ENG 101R. Student leaders will receive customized professional development to learn metacognitive critical reading strategies most useful to their role. After every professional development session, they will complete a survey about what they learned and intend to use. (See Appendix T). Students will be sent a link to complete the online survey within two days of participation in the session. These data will be used to evaluate learning and will also inform changes needed for future professional development for student leaders.
Student leaders will use critical-reading pedagogical strategies in peer-consultation sessions: An important group of student leaders is the Course-Embedded Consultants in ENG 095R and ENG 101R, and additional assessment data will be collected about these student leaders' work with students. Students in ENG 095R and ENG 101R complete reflection essays about their own learning. Included in the essay instructions are prompts related to the Course-Embedded Consultants: (a) Describe your work with the CEC: how is he/she helping you improve your work? (b) Explain any ways you think that the CEC could better help you with the work in this class; (c) What do you need to do to make the most of the support offered by the CEC? (d) In what ways did the class CEC help you achieve your goals?

These qualitative data will be analyzed by the course instructors and QEP Co-Directors to glean information about the Course-Embedded Consultants' use of metacognitive strategies to help students with reading and writing.

**Expected Culture Change**

The QEP Co-Directors will write a brief annual report summarizing assessment results and present the report to the QEP Executive Leadership Team and the QEP Implementation Team for review and ongoing planning and adjustment. Making QEP assessment data available to this broadly representative audience will also help to ensure that QEP assessment data is tied into ongoing university assessment plans and practices.

Every educational program at EKU is required to evaluate students programmatically, assuring that students graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values deemed important to faculty in that program. This annual process is called Assurance of Learning and results are documented in TracDat, the University’s database for strategic planning.

In the 2010-15 University Strategic Plan, critical/creative thinking and communication were added as essential learning outcomes for all academic programs. This was in response to EKU’s QEP-2007 and demonstrated the change in institutional culture precipitated by QEP efforts. The current Strategic Plan (2016-2020) includes critical/creative thinking and communication program-level learning objectives as ongoing commitments, and these are evaluated as part of the university’s Assurance of Learning.

The University expects a similar institution-wide impact of QEP-2017, and will seek inclusion of critical reading as an essential learning outcome in the University 2020 Strategic Plan, for which planning will begin in 2018. Additionally, the University will seek to expand assessment of critical reading into every course in EKU's General Education Program by 2020.
CONCLUSION
The QEP planning process has generated campus-wide interest in and excitement about improving student learning through more direct critical reading instruction. Professional development strategies are designed to provide the framework for faculty, staff, and student leaders to learn from experts and from each other and to generate research projects that create new knowledge about the role of critical reading in student learning. Increased attention to critical reading pedagogy and support will better prepare EKU students to read with purpose and help them achieve their academic and professional goals.

As Manarin and her colleagues (2015) discovered in their study,

Teaching students to read in sophisticated ways, to make meaning, is hard going….Critical reading is not something that can be mastered in a single course; it requires an intentional, collaborative approach in which faculty work together based on shared understandings and goals. It requires an approach that is in this sense “across the curriculum” and thus engages faculty who have likely not thought of themselves as being in the business of teaching reading. This in turn takes an institutional commitment and support as well as hard work by individual faculty. (p. ix)

EKU is committed to this vision of intentional, collaborative effort to develop critical readers who Read with Purpose to achieve their academic, personal, and professional goals.

Table 7 summarizes EKU’s adherence to SACSCOC guidelines in developing the QEP.
### TABLE 7
Evidence of SACSCOC CR 2.12 & CS 3.3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CR 2.12 Institutional Process** | · Topic selection began with identification of student learning and institutional concerns from administrators, faculty, staff, students, and community members (p. 12)  
· Short list of topics selected through careful review of institutional data, university mission, and administrator, faculty, staff, and student input (p. 19)  
· Topic Selection Team included representatives from all key academic areas (p. 81).  
· QEP goals are aligned with University’s Mission, Values, and Strategic Plan (p. 9)  
· QEP implementation plans are based on student needs, available personnel and facilities, and budget (p. 57) |
| **CR 2.12 Key Issues** | · Identification of institutional/student needs involved multiple methods and wide range of constituents (p. 12)  
· EKU’s Mission includes being a school of opportunity, and the student population includes underprepared students (p. 17)  
· Research on critical reading and metacognition shows positive impact on academic success (p. 28)  
· Metacognitive strategies to improve critical reading are grounded in best practices (p. 32)  
· Focus on reading in disciplines places assessment of critical reading within the University’s existing Assurance-of-Learning structure with time dedicated to faculty discussions about student learning (p. 73)  
· Professional development for the purpose of improving teaching and learning is the foundation of QEP implementation plans (p. 39) |
| **CR 2.12 Focus on Learning Outcomes** | · SLOs focus directly on critical reading skills and metacognitive reading strategies (p. 26)  
· Formative and summative assessment of students’ critical reading will be measured via direct assessment of student work products (p. 66)  
· Students’ awareness and use of metacognitive reading strategies will be measured indirectly via self-reports (p. 69)  
· Instructors’ pedagogical focus on metacognitive reading strategies will be measured indirectly via self-reports and directly via student reports (p. 71)  
· Formative assessment allows for monitoring and adjustment of implementation strategies over time (p. 71) |
| CR 2.12 Focus on the environment supporting student learning | · QEP topic aligns with EKU’s Mission, Values, and Strategic Plan and was chosen after thorough review of constituents’ perceptions of institutional needs and institutional data (p. 12)  
· Research shows that reading skills are related to academic and life success (p. 28)  
· Research supports the use of metacognitive reading strategies to improve critical reading (p. 32)  
· QEP plans focus on faculty professional development with the goal of improving teaching of critical reading skills (p. 39)  
· Established Faculty Innovator Program will be used to provide professional development (p. 41)  
· Faculty will create discipline-specific assessment tools to evaluate students’ critical reading (with assistance from assessment experts); Assessment of reading will be integrated into programs’ Assurance-of-Learning plans (p. 63)  
· Faculty participating earlier in QEP implementation will help to educate other faculty members (p. 46) |
| -- | -- |
| CR 3.3.2 Capability to initiate the plan | · Detailed budget is provided (p. 60-61)  
· There is institutional commitment of funds (p. 57)  
· QEP roles, job duties, and identified persons are provided (p. 53)  
· Organizational structure is established (p. 53)  
· Established DEEP program will be used to provide professional development (p. 43) |
| Very detailed budget information, institutional commitment of funds clearly indicated. If individuals are not yet identified, detailed job descriptions provided that indicate the specific skills and abilities needed for key personnel. Organizational structure shows clear reporting responsibilities and oversight structures. | |
| CR 3.3.2 Capability to implement and complete the plan | · The five-year plan details year-by-year activities, assessment, and budget (p. 50)  
· Roles have been identified as key to the plans and expert personnel have been identified for these roles (p. 53)  
· QEP Co-Directors are content experts in critical reading, writing, rhetoric and professional development (p. 83-85) |
| Very detailed timetable is provided for year-by-year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures, and assessment processes. Timetable indicates clearly that QEP can be realistically implemented and completed in five years. | |
| CR 3.3.2 Broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development of the plan | • QEP Design Team included representatives from all academic areas across the University (p. 82)  
• Campus was regularly updated on all stages of plan development and input was encouraged (p. 21)  
• Faculty provided information about discipline-specific reading tasks and challenges and contributed ideas for implementation strategies (p. 19)  
• Ongoing faculty input will be used to determine need for specific professional development strategies for discipline-specific reading (p. 71)  
• Faculty Innovators will be involved in planning professional development strategies (p. 41)  
• Faculty will create discipline-specific assessment tools to evaluate students’ critical reading (with assistance from assessment experts); Assessment of reading will be integrated into programs’ Assurance-of-Learning plans (p. 63) |
| --- | --- |
| CR 3.3.2 Broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the proposed implementation of the plan | • Implementation Advisory Board includes representatives from faculty, students, Faculty Innovators (professional development), Institutional Effectiveness, Noel Studio, Student Success Center (Tutoring), and administration (p. 86-87)  
• Advisory Board is led by faculty in the Department of English and Theatre, who have direct responsibilities for professional development (p. 86-87)  
• The assessment plan includes formative feedback from faculty and students (p. 71)  
• All faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development (p. 39)  
• Course-Embedded Consultants and Tutors will receive professional development focused on critical reading (p. 47)  
• QEP Co-Directors will prepare yearly report to keep key constituencies apprised of progress (p. 73) |
| CR 3.3.2 Identified goals for the quality enhancement plan | • Goals are measurable, clearly identified, and can be achieved via the implementation plans (p. 63-73) |
| CR 3.3.2 A plan to assess the achievement of the goals of the quality enhancement plan | • Goals are clearly stated as outcomes (p. 63)  
• Critical reading will be assessed via direct assessment of student work products (p. 65)  
• Students’ awareness and use of metacognitive reading strategies will be measured indirectly via self-reports (p. 70)  
• Instructors’ pedagogical focus on metacognitive reading strategies will be measured indirectly via self-reports and directly via student report (p. 71-72) |
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**Appendix A**

**QEP Newsletter Volume 1**

**QEP-2017 NEWS**

**Volume 1, January 2015**

**PURPOSE OF QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN (QEP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Desired Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Reading Skills</td>
<td>Improved Cross-Discipline Reading Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Grades on Key Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Standardized/Professional Exam Scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QEP Strategies to Improve Student Learning**

- Example
  - Poor Reading Skills  ————>  Improved Cross-Discipline Reading Comprehension
  - Increased Grades on Key Assignments
  - Higher Standardized/Professional Exam Scores

**SACS' EXPECTATIONS for QEP**

- Addresses documented student-learning weakness
- Goals are realistic & measurable student learning outcomes
- Goals can be achieved within 5 years
- Faculty, staff, & student supported
- Sufficient resources to achieve goals

**QUESTIONS?**

Rose Perrine, Assoc Dean University Programs
rose.perrine@eku.edu; (859) 622-6764

**QEP-2017 POTENTIAL FOCUS**

- What Do EKU Students Need?*
  - Reading Skills
  - Information Literacy
  - Application of Concepts
  - Quantitative Literacy
  - Ethics/Values
  - Cultural Sensitivity

*Sources: Implementation Team (2011—2014), Faculty, Staff, & Student Strategic Planning Focus Groups (2013—14), surveys & focus groups (2014)

**What Strategies Should We Use?**

- Metacognition
- Experiential Learning
- Imaginative Teaching
- Collaborative Learning
- Civic Engagement
- Leadership Experiences

**Additional Faculty & Staff Input Will Guide the Topic Selection Process**

**QEP-2017: PROCESS & DEADLINES**

1. Topic selection (sp 2015)
2. QEP focus statement (su 2015)
3. Develop & Write QEP Plan (sp 2016)
4. Present QEP to campus (f 2016)
5. SACS CCC EKU visit (Feb 2017)
6. Implement QEP (f 2017—f 2022)
7. 5 yr report to SACS CCC (sp 2023)

**QEP Topic Selection Team**

- Lisa Bosley (CAS; HUM)
- Garett Yoder (CAS; NS)
- Cathy Clement (CAS: SBS)
- Jennifer Fairchild (CBT)
- Shirley O’Brien (CHS)
- Scotty Dunlap (CRJ)
- Angie Madden (EDU)
- Rose Perrine (UP)
- Lara Vance (Acad Readiness/Tutoring)
- Christine Myers (Grad School)
- Jaime Henning (Grad School)
- Erik Liddell (Honors)
- Betina Gardner (Library)

**QEP Planning Committee: Co-Chairs**

- Rose Perrine, Associate Dean, University Programs
- Jaime Henning, Associate Professor & Coordinator, I/O Graduate Program, Psychology

**How Have We Gathered Information?**

- Strategic Planning Focus Groups (2012-14)
- Implementation Team (2011-14)
- Survey 1: Potential QEP Topics (sp 2014)
- Survey 2: Select Top 3 Topics* (Jul 2014)
- Survey 3: Evidence for Top 3 Topics (Aug 2014)

*Top 3: Reading, Information Literacy, Application of Concepts

**Survey 1 & 2 Details & Results:**

www.eku.edu (A-Z menu: QEP)

**Survey 3: To be analyzed by QEP Topic Selection Team**

**Appendix A**

**QEP Newsletter Volume 1**

**Appendix B**

**QEP Newsletter Volume 2**
Appendix C  QEP Topic Selection Team

### QEP Topic Selection Team Spring 2015-Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bosley</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Clement</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences: Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotty Dunlap</td>
<td>College of Justice and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Fairchild</td>
<td>College of Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betina Gardner</td>
<td>Library, Noel Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Henning (co-chair)</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Liddell</td>
<td>Honors Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Madden</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Myers</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley O’Brien</td>
<td>College of Health Sciences; Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Perrine (co-chair)</td>
<td>Associate Deans; SACS Leadership Team; University Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Vance</td>
<td>Academic Readiness and Testing; Tutoring and Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garett Yoder</td>
<td>General Education; College of Science: Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>Industrial/Organizational PSY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D  QEP Newsletter Volume 3

**Critical Reading & Independent Learning are Essential Skills Beyond College**

- Graduate/professional school entrance exams
- Professional learning exams
- Job analyses: Application materials
- Workplace reading tasks
- Professional development and advancement
- Informed citizenship: personal decision-making

Continued on back...
## Appendix F  
### QEP Design Team Fall 2015 - Spring 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Baggett</td>
<td>College of Criminal Justice; eCampus Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bosley</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences English; Developmental Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Bradley</td>
<td>Administrative Staff; Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Carpenter</td>
<td>Noel Studio; Libraries; Teaching &amp; Learning Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Day</td>
<td>Faculty Innovators; Interdisciplinary Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginni Fair</td>
<td>College of Education; Future-Teacher Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Henning (co-chair)</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences: Social Sciences; Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Hunter</td>
<td>SACSCOC Leadership Team; College of Arts &amp; Sciences: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Jones</td>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Liddell</td>
<td>Honors Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Meiners</td>
<td>Faculty Innovators; College of Business &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnette Noblitt</td>
<td>Chairs Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Dr. Lisa Bosley
Curriculum Vita
Associate Professor, Department of English and Theatre, Eastern Kentucky University

EDUCATION
Ed.D  Instruction and Curriculum, emphasis Adult and College Literacy  University of Kentucky, 2009
M.A.  English  University of Chicago, 1986
B.A.  English  Centre College, 1985

PUBLICATIONS


SELECTED PRESENTATIONS
“Tracking Student Success in a Co-requisite Reading and Writing Course.” Lisa Bosley and S. Alexander, College Reading and Learning Association Conference, Louisville, KY, November 2016.

“Integrating Reading, Writing and Rhetoric in First-Year Composition.” Lisa Bosley, College Reading and Learning Association Conference, Portland, OR, November 2015.


“An Investigation of Ways to Teach Critical Reading in Composition Courses,” Lisa Bosley, College Reading Association Conference, Pittsburgh PA., October, 2006.


SELECTED PROFESSIONAL WORKSHOPS FACILITATED at EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
The Role of Reading in Composition Courses, Department of English and Theatre, 2012-2016.
Improving Student Reading Strategies: Noel Studio for Academic Creativity, 2012-2016.
Integrating Active Reading and Writing through Group Work, Department of English and Theatre, 2014.
Get the Most out of Reading for College Success. Freshman Academy for Diverse Students, 2014.
Improving Student Reading Strategies in the Social Sciences, The Teaching and Learning Center, 2013.
Teaching Reading in the General Education Classroom, The Teaching and Learning Center, 2009.

GRANTS AWARDED

Appendix H Dr. Jill Parrott Curriculum Vita
Associate Professor, Department of English and Theatre, Eastern Kentucky University

EDUCATION
The University of Georgia, PhD, English, Specialty in Rhetoric and Composition, December 2010
Auburn University, MA, English, Emphasis in Rhetoric and Composition, May 2005
Carson-Newman College, BA, English and Sociology, Summa Cum Laude with Honors, May 2003

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS
“Form in Elizabeth Madox Roberts’s He Sent Forth a Raven: A Burkian Perspective.” The Explicator 73.2: 2015.

“Power and Discourse: Silence as Rhetorical Choice in Maxine Hong Kingston’s *The Woman Warrior.*” *Rhetorica* 30.4: 2012.

“How Shall We Greet the Sun?: Form and Truth in Gwendolyn Brooks’s *Annie Allen.*” *Style* 46.1: 2012.


“Multigenred Multicultural Multimedia: Materiality and Literacy in the Composition Classroom.” *Computers and Composition Online* Print to Screen Special Section: 2008.

**SELECTED PRESENTATIONS**


“Making the Humanist Connection Through the Screen (Capture).” *Conference of the South Atlantic Modern Language Association*: November 2014.


“Some Rights are Reserved: Creative Commons Copyright in the Classroom.” *Conference on College Composition and Communication*: March 2010.

**SELECTED AWARDS AND GRANTS**

Faculty Development Grant for “Performing Authorial Subjectivity in the Slave Narrative Preface.” Eastern Kentucky University College of Arts and Sciences: Spring 2016.

Faculty Development Grant for “From Cogito to Cogitamus: A Diachronical Look at Authorship Paradigms and Imagination.” Eastern Kentucky University College of Arts and Sciences: Spring 2015.

University Programs Outside Service Award. Eastern Kentucky University: March 2013.

Junior Faculty Summer Research Award. Eastern Kentucky University: Summer 2012.
### Appendix I  
**QEP Executive Leadership Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bosley</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences English; Developmental Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Hunter</td>
<td>SACSCOC Leadership Team;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Parrott</td>
<td>College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences; English;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Perrine (co-chair)</td>
<td>Associate Deans; SACSCOC Leadership Team; University Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Perrine</td>
<td>Associate Deans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Robinson</td>
<td>Administration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wies</td>
<td>College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanlee Wasson</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness &amp; Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garett Yoder</td>
<td>General Education; College of Science: Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix J  
**QEP Implementation Team Summer 2016 - Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bosley</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Bradley</td>
<td>Staff (non-exempt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Carpenter</td>
<td>Faculty (English); Noel Studio and TLC/Faculty Innovators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellie Ellis</td>
<td>Faculty (Communication Disorders); College of Education/Clinical Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Faith</td>
<td>Staff; Housing/Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivonne Gonzalez</td>
<td>Student; NOVA/Rodney Gross Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Grant</td>
<td>Faculty/College of Justice and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Hayden</td>
<td>Faculty (Occupational Therapy); College of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Hunter</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences; SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Jones</td>
<td>Staff; Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie Maples</td>
<td>Student; Student Government; Course Embedded Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Meiners</td>
<td>Faculty (Communication); College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences, Faculty Innovator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Mendenhall</td>
<td>Staff; Housing/Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtnie Morin</td>
<td>Student; Noel Studio, Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnette Noblitt</td>
<td>Faculty (Government); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences; Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Parrott (co-director)</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, First-Year Writing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Porter</td>
<td>Faculty (Clinical Education Preparation); College of Education/Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin Potter</td>
<td>Student; Student Body President, Regent and Student Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Regis</td>
<td>Student; English Education and Greek Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Robinson</td>
<td>Administration; QEP Lead Administrator/Office of the Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Robles</td>
<td>Faculty (Management); College of Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Staddon</td>
<td>Faculty (Biology); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, Faculty Innovator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Stivers</td>
<td>Noel Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Valley</td>
<td>Staff; First-Year Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Vance</td>
<td>Staff; Student Success Center/Gurus/Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Vanover</td>
<td>Faculty (Child and Family Studies); College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Vaught</td>
<td>Student, Noel Studio Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanlee Wasson</td>
<td>Administration; Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wies</td>
<td>Faculty (Anthropology); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, Academic Planning and Assessment Committee Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Williams</td>
<td>Staff; Academic Testing/Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Wilson</td>
<td>Staff; Extended Campuses/Regional Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffen Wilson</td>
<td>Faculty (Psychology); College of Letters Arts and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garett Yoder</td>
<td>Faculty (Physics); College of Science/General Education Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K       QEP Leadership Grant Application

QEP Leadership Grant Application
QEP Leadership Grant funded projects are expected to bring scholarly work, research, pedagogical strategies or other QEP-relevant work to the campus community. All EKU faculty and staff who participate in the QEP DEEP training or equivalent professional development are eligible to apply. Projects will be rewarded for creativity and prioritized for:

1. Developing a professional learning community (PLC) relevant to the QEP
2. Developing a QEP-related program, assignment, or assessment on campus,
3. Developing a workshop for the university community relevant to the QEP, and
4. Funding to attend a conference or institute focused on a QEP-related topic so that QEP-relevant training could be shared with the campus community and used to design critical reading curriculum or assessment.

Applications will be reviewed by the QEP Professional Development Work Team once a semester. Grant amounts are flexible (within a range of $250-1000) and the QEP may be able to partially or fully support projects based on the yearly QEP budget. Priority for funding will depend on degree of relevance to critical reading, contribution to measurable QEP student learning outcomes, and scope of the impact for the campus community. All grant recipients will agree to present progress on or results of their work as part of an annual QEP showcase at EKU Scholarship Week or at the EKU Pedagogicon.

Applications for a project must include the following elements:

- This completed form,
- An updated curriculum vitae for all parties involved,
- A one to two page description of the project, and
- Any supplemental materials to help the review team understand the project.

The project description should address a timeline, a detailed budget with justification for expenditures, and a detailed description of the project, including a brief literature review and your previous experience with the topic. Be certain to address relevance, contribution to SLOs, and scope. Supplemental materials might include official descriptions of institutes or workshops, sample copies of materials requested, or visual representations or projects.
### Appendix L  QEP Literature Review Work Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bosley (Co-director)</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellie Ellis</td>
<td>Faculty (Communication Disorders); College of Education/Clinical Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Parrott (Co-director)</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, First-Year Writing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Porter</td>
<td>Faculty (Clinical Education Preparation); College of Education/Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Vance</td>
<td>Staff; Student Success Center/Gurus/Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Vaught</td>
<td>Student, Noel Studio Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Williams</td>
<td>Staff; Academic Testing/Tutoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix M  QEP Professional Development Work Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bosley (Co-director)</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Carpenter</td>
<td>Faculty (English); Noel Studio and TLC/Faculty Innovators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellie Ellis</td>
<td>Faculty (Communication Disorders); College of Education/Clinical Educator Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Grant</td>
<td>Faculty/College of Justice and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Hayden</td>
<td>Faculty (Occupational Therapy); College of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Hunter</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences; SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Jones</td>
<td>Staff; Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Meiners</td>
<td>Faculty (Communication); College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences, Faculty Innovator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtnie Morin</td>
<td>Student; Noel Studio, Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Parrott (Co-director)</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, First-Year Writing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Porter</td>
<td>Faculty (Clinical Education Preparation); College of Education/Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Robles</td>
<td>Faculty (Management); College of Business and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Valley</td>
<td>Staff; First-Year Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Vance</td>
<td>Staff; Student Success Center/Gurus/Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Vanover</td>
<td>Faculty (Child and Family Studies); College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Williams</td>
<td>Staff; Academic Testing/Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garett Yoder</td>
<td>Faculty (Physics); College of Science/General Education Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix N  QEP Marketing Work Team

**QEP Marketing Work Team Summer 2016 – Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Bradley</td>
<td>Staff (non-exempt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Faith</td>
<td>Staff; Housing/Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivonne Gonzalez</td>
<td>Student; NOVA/Rodney Gross Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Jones</td>
<td>Staff; Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allie Maples</td>
<td>Student; Student Government, Course Embedded Consultant, and Greek Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Mendenhall</td>
<td>Staff; Housing/Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnette Noblitt</td>
<td>Faculty (Government); Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Parrott (Co-Director)</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences and First-Year Writing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin Potter</td>
<td>Student; Student Body President, Regent, and SGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Regis</td>
<td>Student; English Education and Greek Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Vaught</td>
<td>Student; Noel Studio Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Wilson</td>
<td>Staff; Extended Campuses/Regional Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffen Wilson</td>
<td>Faculty (Psychology); College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix O  QEP Assessment Team

**QEP Assessment Summer 2016 – Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bosley (Co-Director)</td>
<td>Faculty (English); College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Perrine</td>
<td>Associate Deans; College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanlee Wasson</td>
<td>Administration; Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wies</td>
<td>Faculty (Anthropology); College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences and Academic Planning and Assessment Committee Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>ACCOMPLISHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds Course Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>Demonstrates accurate, clear, and precise comprehension of significant concepts in the text(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective assessment criterion: Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Provides accurate, relevant, and precise analysis by recognizing the parts or aspects of the text that contribute to understanding the purpose of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTHESIS</td>
<td>Accurately, deeply, and broadly connects and integrates relevant and significant concepts from text(s) to construct and support explanations, conclusions, or arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>Demonstrates the use of methods, models, or perspectives to evaluate the accuracy, relevance, logic, or significance of the text(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Italicized words are Intellectual Standards (Elder & Paul, 2007)
Appendix Q  Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (modified)

Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

Student Name___________________________________ Date ____________________

CRN # _________________________________________________________

Course Instructor ________________________________________________________

Directions: Listed below are statements about what people do when they read academic or school-related materials such as textbooks, essays or articles.

Five numbers follow each statement (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), and each number means the following:
• 1 means “I never or almost never do this.”
• 2 means “I do this only occasionally.”
• 3 means “I sometimes do this” (50% of the time).
• 4 means “I usually do this.”
• 5 means “I always or almost always do this.”

After reading each statement, circle the number (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) that applies to you using the scale provided. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers to the statements in this inventory.

1. I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I have a purpose in mind when I read. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I think about what I know about the topic to help me understand what I read. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it. 1 2 3 4 5
8. When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I adjust my reading speed according to what I'm reading. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I decide what to read closely and what to ignore. 1 2 3 4 5
11. When the text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I’m reading. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I use tables, figures, and pictures in the text to increase my understanding. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I stop from time to time and think about what I’m reading. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I use context clues to help me better understand what I’m reading. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I restate ideas in my own words to better understand what I read. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I try to picture or visualize information to help me remember what I read. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I use typographical aids like boldface and italics to identify key information. 1 2 3 4 5
18. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information. 1 2 3 4 5
20. When the text becomes difficult, I reread to increase my understanding. 1 2 3 4 5
21. I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text. 1 2 3 4 5
22. I try to guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases. 1 2 3 4 5
23. I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text. 1 2 3 4 5
24. I use a dictionary, Google or other references to help me understand what I read. 1 2 3 4 5
25. I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding. 1 2 3 4 5
26. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text. 1 2 3 4 5
27. I check to see whether my guesses about the text are right or wrong. 1 2 3 4 5


Appendix R  Critical Reading Confidence Scale

Critical Reading Confidence Scale
Created by EKU QEP Assessment Team & QEP Implementation Team

Response Scale
1—Not at all confident
2—Not very confident
3—Somewhat confident
4—Very confident

1. I am confident that I can use strategies to help me critically read academic texts and materials. (EKU developed item)

2. I am confident I can identify the main points in college-level readings in my discipline. (Adapted from Hampton, 1998)

3. I am confident I can do well on a test about what I read. (Adapted from Cantrell et. al., 2013)

4. I am confident that I can analyze evidence presented in my discipline. (EKU developed item)

5. I am confident that I can synthesize ideas from several texts to construct my own written or oral argument. (EKU developed item)
6. I am confident I can evaluate the validity of an argument in a research journal. (EKU developed item)

7. I am confident that I can evaluate the validity of an argument in a newspaper editorial. (EKU developed item)

8. I am confident I can be successful in college. (EKU developed item)

9. I am confident I can do even the hardest classwork if I try (Adapted from Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 2005)

Appendix S

Sample Critical Reading Assignment

Sample Assignment: QEP Discipline-Based Critical Reading:
General Education Element 5BA: Anthropology 120: Introduction to Cultural Anthropology

Instructions: Read the piece from the textbook entitled, “Thinking Like an Anthropologist: Genealogical Amnesia in Bali, Indonesia, and the United States.” Carefully and completely answer each of the questions in 1-2 paragraphs.

1. What core anthropology concepts are discussed in this piece? Be specific and identify terms and concepts we have learned in the course. (Instructor Note: General Education and Critical Reading, Comprehension)

2. What happens to people’s knowledge of their common kin ties once their grandparents die? How is this similar to and/or different from your own experiences? (Instructor Note: General Education and Critical Reading, Application and Analysis)

3. How might people be able to identify kin relations more easily if everyone used personal names rather than tekonyms? (Instructor Note: General Education, Integration and Critical Reading, Evaluation)

4. Imagine you are an anthropologist studying kinship traditions in Bali and Indonesia. Identify and describe three ethnographic methods that you would use to learn more. (Instructor Note: General Education, Methods)

5. Now, imagine you are anthropologist studying kinship traditions in the United States. Identify three methods you would use and the corresponding data you would seek to understand genealogical amnesia in the U.S. (Instructor Note: Critical Reading, Synthesis)

Appendix T

Post Professional Development Survey

Online Survey: Post Professional Development Survey (Faculty and Student Leaders)

Pre-populated fields
Date and Name of Professional Development Session
Audience: Student Leader or Faculty
Survey Items
How much did you learn about critical reading in this session? (rating scale from 1(very little) to 4( a great deal))

How useful was the information in helping you develop ways to help students read more critically? (rating scale from 1(not at all useful) to 4(very useful))

Would you recommend this session to other faculty (or student-leaders)? (nominal scale: no, unsure, yes)

What one or two things did you learn that will be most useful to you? (comment box)

What do you want to know more about to improve your instruction of critical reading? (comment box)

Other comments /suggestions for improving these sessions? (comment box)
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