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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dana Gioia, Chair of the National Endowment for the Arts recently observed, “Whatever the benefits of newer electronic media, they provide no measurable substitute for the intellectual and personal development initiated and sustained by frequent reading.” (To Read or Not to Read, 2007) With so much information available from a multitude of sources, increasing attention is given to equipping students with the critical skills necessary for college success. Accessing, analyzing and using information is intrinsically linked to being an active and engaged reader. Analysis of data, however, suggests that most college students, including those at Troy University, are not reading in the kind of engaged and active ways that promote successful learning.

In response to this information explosion, supported by institutional and external data, and with the active involvement of the institution’s major stakeholders, Troy University has focused its Quality Enhancement Plan on Creating a Culture of Reading. The University’s QEP is built upon three major initiatives: a Common Reading Initiative for first year students; a College Reading Initiative in which each college will select a book for its students to read and discuss; and a Faculty Development Initiative that will assist faculty as they, in turn, help their students become more engaged and active readers.

The University’s QEP is closely linked to the institution’s mission and strategic objectives and grew out of the dynamic learning environment created by Vision 2010, the institution’s strategic plan of 2005-2010. It is fully anticipated that the QEP will be a part of the University’s forthcoming 2010-2015 strategic plan as well. Troy University has committed almost three million dollars in new and in-kind resources in support of the QEP.

Under the leadership of the Director of the QEP and the Implementation Team, a set of clearly identified student learning outcomes, as well as outcomes for the three QEP
initiatives and the overall goal of the QEP (to create a culture of reading) will be assessed regularly to measure the progress, and ultimately, the success of the QEP.

The University’s initial QEP was reviewed by the SACS On-Site Review Committee that noted its general support of the project but that also noted a number of specific concerns, leading to a formal recommendation to revise the Plan. In response to the Committee’s concerns and formal recommendation, the following pages detail Troy University’s revised QEP. In particular, the University has organized this QEP to respond to the Committee’s desire for institutional development in five areas, documenting that Troy University

1. has engaged in a broad-based process, based on institutional assessment, that led to the emergence of key issues, including the need for an enhancement of student learning through greater reading skills;

2. has focused its proposed plan on measurable student learning outcomes that, individually and collectively, support the mission of the University;

3. demonstrates and documents that it has the institutional capacity for initiating, implementing and completing this plan, including the assignment of budget resources;

4. documents the broad-based involvement of University constituencies and stakeholders in the development and proposed implementation of the plan; and

5. has identified specific goals, with measurable outcomes and specific direct and indirect measurements to assess the plan.

These points constitute the five major sections of the following Plan. All SACS-required materials for an institutional QEP are included in these sections and the accompanying Appendix.

It is the strong belief of the University that the creation of a culture of reading will result in student success that can be measured while students pursue their studies at the University and that will be immeasurable in the years after their graduation.
SECTION ONE: DOCUMENTATION OF THE BROAD BASED UNIVERSITY PROCESS USED FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF KEY ISSUES AND SELECTION OF THE QEP TOPIC

The reading of all good books is indeed like a conversation with the noblest men of past centuries who were the authors of them, nay a carefully studied conversation, in which they reveal to us none but the best of their thoughts - Rene Descartes

Troy University intends to create, enhance, and maintain an institutional culture of reading as its Quality Enhancement Plan. Such an effort will require extensive University resources—human, fiscal, and physical—to be successful. The detailed elements of this proposed Plan are described in the five major sections of this report. The QEP has three sets of outcomes that will be assessed during the Plan period:

- **Student Learning Outcomes** that will focus on specific accrual and application of student learning relative to reading activities. These student learning outcomes are:
  1. Student reading activities will result in greater reading for enjoyment, appreciation and information
  2. Student reading activities will result in enhanced perspectives and broader viewpoints.
  3. Student reading activities will result in greater engagement with others and greater understanding of others’ positions
  4. Student reading activities will result in greater discernment and critical/analytical judgment
  5. Student reading activities will result in enhanced writing skills
  6. Student reading activities will result in greater understanding of the connections among and between reading materials

- **Initiative Outcomes** that will focus on the three QEP components of the Common Reading Initiative (CRI), the College Reading Initiative (COLRI) and the Faculty Development Initiative (FDI). Details on initiative outcomes are in Section Five.

- **General Program Outcomes** that will focus, in a global fashion, on the University’s efforts to enhance its culture of reading through the specific elements of the QEP and through collateral elements inspired by, and supportive of, a reading culture:
1. Students at Troy University will read more
2. Faculty at Troy University will assign more reading materials to their students
3. Troy University will develop, implement and assign more reading-intensive courses into the general studies and disciplinary curricula
4. More students will engage in peer engagement over common reading materials
5. More students will engage in student-faculty engagement over common reading materials
6. More academic departments/units will initiate common reading experiences for their specific groups of students
7. There will be more manifestations of a reading culture at the University

The University’s QEP efforts will be guided by these outcomes and the review of their regular assessment.

At Troy University, reading and especially the reading of books, is considered an integral part of student learning. The QEP focus on Creating a Culture of Reading is built upon institutional data, stakeholder input and widespread support across the University. The sections that follow address:

- A brief history and mission of Troy University and the ways in which its selection of Creating a Culture of Reading is consistent with, and actively supports, the institutional mission
- A brief discussion and definition of the key terms reading and culture and their integration into the QEP topic, including a review of best practices and ideas regarding reading
- The institutional processes that led to the selection of the QEP topic.

**The History and Mission of Troy University: Strategic Ties to the QEP**

The mission of Troy University is to educate its students so that these learners, traditional and non-traditional, can be successful throughout their lives. The University takes seriously its mission to link the course-based knowledge of its students with their development as life-long learners. As the University Mission Statement states:

*Troy University is a public institution comprised of a network of campuses throughout Alabama and worldwide. International in scope, Troy University provides a variety of educational programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels for a diverse student body*
Troy University was founded as the Troy Normal School in 1887 with the specific mission of training teachers in south Alabama. In the twelve decades since then, Troy University has grown into a world-wide institution of almost 30,000 students with four campuses in Alabama: the historic campus of origin in Troy with its traditional students, residence halls, and athletic programs and three campuses principally serving working adult learners in Dothan, Montgomery, and Phenix City. Through its Global Campus, Troy University reaches well beyond the state of Alabama with teaching sites throughout the United States and around the world. With its eCampus, students are no longer bound to physical locations and can choose from among almost two dozen online degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. Troy University is a major deliverer of higher education instruction to men and women in the U.S. military and traces its partnership with the armed forces across five decades.

In brief, Troy University’s history and mission are grounded in the development of student learners, both traditional and non-traditional, in physical and electronic learning environments. The selection of a QEP topic focused on reading is entirely consistent with the University’s mission “to promote discovery and exploration of knowledge and its application to life-long success” for its students.

Additionally, Troy University’s QEP selection is consistent with the institution’s 2005-2010 strategic plan, the time period out of which the QEP emerged and was developed into its current configuration. The 2010 strategic plan, entitled “Vision 2010,” sounds a clear call to strong academic activities:

**Strategic Initiative Two: Quality Academic Programs**

*Academic programs engage students in a teaching and learning covenant of knowledge and values derived from the mission and goals of the institution and tenets of different fields of*
study. Faculty dedication to this philosophy qualifies them as members of the Troy University corps of instruction. The hallmark of this corps is teaching excellence. Troy University and its faculty are focused on continuous quality improvement of each program and academic support service. Over the next five years, attention will be paid to enhancing teaching effectiveness, strengthening current programs, and building new programs to meet the need of a diverse and growing student population.

While Strategic Initiative Two did not specifically mention “reading” as one of its focal points, it was the commitment to academics and to innovative academic thinking, as well as clear procedures for assessing academic activities, that served as the incubator for what would become the University’s QEP topic. It was an institutional commitment to the development and implementation of this strategic initiative, as well as a continued commitment to the fulfillment of its mission, that provided a field upon which the QEP topic could be sown.

It is also important to note that the QEP, while developed in the 2005-2010 strategic plans of the University, is expected to be included in the University’s 2010-2015 strategic plan currently under final development. This inclusion will institutionalize the QEP activities, further incorporating them into the daily life of Troy University.

Finally, the proposed selection and implementation of the QEP topic represents the University’s 2005 transformation from a system of accredited campuses to a one accredited University. In 1982, the Troy State University System was formed, as the campuses in Dothan and Montgomery were granted independent accreditation status. In August 2005, all Troy University campuses were again unified under one accreditation. This unification process, commonly referred to as “the merger,” resulted in a common undergraduate and graduate curriculum for the University as well as standardized faculty and staff handbooks, common catalogs, common administrative procedures for students and unified faculty-led governance groups, such as the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils and the Faculty Senate. The merger of three separately accredited campuses into a single organizational whole was more than the creation of common documents. The creation of a single Troy University was a lesson in cultural change. The former culture, that of a Troy State
University System, has been replaced by an evolving Troy University culture. The selection of the QEP topic, featuring the creation of a culture of reading across all locations of Troy University, is an important part of this continued cultural evolution. In many ways, the selection and proposed implementation of the QEP reflect the kinds of activities and challenges that the University faced, and occasionally continues to face, as it moves beyond the post-merger period. The proposal of a Quality Enhancement Plan reaching out to all Troy University campuses and locations and including common outcomes of student learning across the entire University extends, in microcosm, the vision of a unified university. Troy University's QEP topic is consistent with, and supportive of, its history, its mission, its strategic plans and its most recent merger.

**The Significance of Reading: A Review of Literature and Best Ideas**

Being a discerning reader is critical to success in higher education as well as life. Becoming an engaged reader is essential in a world where the rate of new information is currently doubling every four years and will soon double every two years, requiring each individual to analyze, synthesize, sift and determine the legitimacy, as well as the value, of the various pieces of information.

Defining what it means to be a liberally educated person, William Cronon, in “Only Connect . . . : The Goals of a Liberal Education” in *The American Scholar*, recognizes 10 characteristics of people whom he sees as embodying the values of a liberal education. One of these characteristics is the habit of reading:

*They read and they understand.* This too is ridiculously simple to say but very difficult to achieve because there are so many ways of reading in our world. Educated people can appreciate not only the front page of *The New York Times* but also the arts section, the sports section, the business section, the science section, and the editorials. They can gain insight from not only *The American Scholar* and the *Review of Books* but also from *Scientific America*, the *Economist*, the *National Enquirer*, *Vogue*, and *Reader's Digest*. They can enjoy John Milton and John Grisham (p. 76).
Troy University’s focus on creating a culture of reading addresses a growing concern among educators. Stotsky (2006) points out that not only have the reading skills of American adults declined from 1992 to 2003, but literacy skills among college graduates have also declined. As Kurland (2000) noted, “A non-critical reader might read a history book to learn the facts of the situation or to discover an accepted interpretation of those events. A critical reader might read the same work to appreciate how a particular perspective on the events and a particular selection of facts can lead to particular understanding.”

Laufgraben (2006) and Twiton (2007) acknowledge that the research on common reading initiatives is not extensive, but characteristics of effective programs can be gleaned from the limited extant research. Cushman (2007) suggests that the confidence and academic support that accompany a campus-wide reading initiative can enhance persistence and completion. Empirical evidence from related projects supports Bandura’s (1986) notion that learning is a social practice that relies on “constant interaction between the person, the environment, and behavior” (Casazza & Silverman, 1996). The activities supporting the reading activities of the QEP have been designed with this social interaction clearly in mind. Such social interaction is not limited to face-to-face encounters, but can also be achieved for online students through the University’s eCampus technology.

Exposure to a variety of reading materials has been found to be a sign of reading maturity, according to Smith (1996). Implementation of the QEP at Troy University will depend upon the collaborative nature of social learning, as instructors incorporate the discussion of books into their coursework. Research indicates that a social, collaborative approach to reading is essential in developing independent readers. The purpose of integrated learning, according to Leavitt (2006), is “to push students to achieve higher levels of synthesis and integration in their study of new material” (p. 2). Through the selection and use of common books, instructors will be better able to concentrate on a single topic for
investigation from a variety of perspectives. Such an endeavor holds the potential to enhance learning and engagement.

The reading demands at the college level are different from those in the high school classroom. Historically, approaches to addressing this issue have taken a circuitous path. Ryan and Glenn (2007) describe the route as beginning with the acknowledgement of needing to help entering freshmen make the transition from reading for information to reading for appreciation and synthesis. As part of the QEP, first year students will focus on a common reading initiative in the TROY 1101 Orientation course.

The complexities of reading at the college level demand more than an overview of process. Content areas have different expectations and varying approaches to text; mathematics generally relies upon what Rosenblatt (1978) identifies as the efferent stance, literature an aesthetic one. An important element of the QEP is the Faculty Development Initiative designed to assist University faculty as they use the books chosen for discussion and inclusion in their classes. The transactional reading theory of Rosenblatt postulates that when a reader meets a text, background knowledge, attitudes, and ability levels all combine to make the transaction different for every reader. The QEP will address the needs of student readers through specific reading initiatives and through targeted, sequential and ongoing professional development.

Longitudinal data collected and analyzed by Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) reflect increases in colleges’ first year studies initiatives and persistence rates among their participants. Troxel and Cutright (2008) encourage greater emphasis on connecting retention initiatives to challenging social and academic pursuits. Troy University anticipates that its efforts to create a culture of reading will enable both first year and returning undergraduate students to realize “a broadening of horizons, an awareness of a larger, more significant world of trends, events, and subjects of interest to an educated person.”
Contemporary writers have done much to define the assessment methodologies that are relevant to this Quality Enhancement Plan. The National Research Council (2001) has clearly established the need for the use of multiple types of measures for the effective assessment of student learning, stating that “[N]o single test score can be considered a definitive measure of a student’s competence. Multiple measures enhance the validity and fairness of the inferences drawn by giving students various ways and opportunities to demonstrate their competence” (253). Assessment experts in higher education have likewise advised researchers to “build an array of assessment measures” in order to more fully understand student learning outcomes (Walvoord, 2004).

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (2003) classifies assessment as occurring at three levels within the higher educational institution. Assessment of academic success related to student learning outcomes can occur at the individual course level, the academic program level, and the overall institutional level. Assessment methods are likewise divided into two categories. Direct measures are those that “prompt students to represent or demonstrate their learning or produce work so that observers can assess how well student’s texts or responses fit institutional or program-level expectations.” Indirect measures “capture students’ perceptions of their learning and the educational environment that supports that learning, such as access to and the quality of services, programs, or educational offerings that support their learning” (Maki, 2004, p. 88). Maki (2004) further notes that “historically, standardized instruments, such as objective tests, have served as the primary direct method to assess student learning. Content or disciplinary experts identify the standard content, knowledge, and tasks that students should know and be able to perform” (p. 114).

Walvoord (2004) observes that “a national standardized exam is a direct measure that places the goals, performance, criteria, and evaluation with an external source, not the instructor.” “The advantage,” according to Walvoord, “is that you have a national standard
against which to measure your own students.” Troy University’s QEP also will make use of what Walvoord describes as “course-embedded assignments and tests” that individual faculty members will implement in their specific courses as an additional approach to direct measurement of student learning.

Indirect measures, such as data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), will be used to capture students’ perceptions regarding their learning activities that relate to reading. Questions from the NSSE will examine activities related to reading among the “clusters of effective educational practice” identified in the research upon which the NSSE is based (Kuh, 2005).

In sum, there is a national concern that the activity of engaged reading by college students has lost its former place of prominence in university settings. Troy University’s Quality Enhancement Plan is intended to address this concern by focusing its attention on the creation, and enhancement, of a culture of reading by its students and through faculty development in support of these reading activities.

**Troy University’s Culture of Reading: A Definition**

Culture is a central concept to the University’s QEP. Eminent anthropologist Clifford Geertz offered that “culture” is a kind of “ethnographic algorithm, which, if followed, would make it possible . . . to pass for a native.” (p.11) Geertz also suggested that culture is “an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited concepts expressed in symbolic forms by means of which [people] communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and their attitudes toward life.” (p.89) From such a description of “culture” as a set of shared symbolic experiences, Geertz further defines the term as a collection of “symbol systems, created [by people], shared, conventional, ordered and indeed learned, [which] provide human beings with a meaningful framework for orienting themselves to one another, to the world around them and to themselves.” (p.250)
For Troy University’s QEP, *culture* embodies shared activities and experiences that lead to the kind of understanding of self and the larger world described by Geertz. *A culture of reading* that the University is attempting to create and enhance through its QEP is a culture of common identities, identifications and definitions for the University and its faculty and students. Within this culture there are both overt and implied common values: that reading is important, that engaged reading is essential to collegiate and life-long success, and that Troy University has determined it will be an institution of higher learning where reading is valued and valuable. Similarly, this culture of reading is also a place where common experiences will occur:

- All entering students are expected to read a common book, discuss that book in a common class (TROY 1101) and further engage in group discussions that will allow for analysis and idea-sharing.
- Each college will select a book for similar use and discussion by its particular majors.
- All faculty members will be offered development opportunities to assist their students in engaged reading.

Through the QEP, the University hopes to build an institution-wide appreciation for reading by creating a culture that allocates resources, energies and efforts in support of the engaged reader. Within the first year student community as well as within the communities for each college’s majors, there also exists the potential for creating cultures devoted to reading. Similarly, through the faculty development program, there is the opportunity to generate a culture of instructors linked together by the common interest of helping students engage in reading. At Troy University, *a culture of reading* is the collective symbolic expression captured by the institution in its QEP slogan “We Read at Troy University.” All that follows from that shared set of expressions is what will constitute the University’s culture of reading through the five years of the Quality Enhancement Plan.
Troy University’s Process of QEP Topic Selection

Troy University has an on-going concern assisting students in their efforts to become better learners. Similarly, the University, through its own recent history, is acutely aware of the significance of cultural change and the need for institutionalization of activities devoted to student learning. The following sections document the University’s topic selection:

- The development of a First Year Studies program at Troy University and Common Reading Initiative activities on the Troy Campus in 2007 and 2008
- University and national data concerning reading activities of college students
- Focus groups’ input regarding the QEP topic
- The evolution of the University’s QEP topic, based on comments by SACS

The Development of the University’s First Year Studies Program and the Common Reading Initiative Activities on the Troy Campus in 2007 and 2008

The First Year Task Force, the forerunner of the current University First Year Advisory Board, was established in September 2003 by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Services. The First Year Task Force was comprised of twelve University individuals: six were full-time faculty members; seven were academic administrators who held formal faculty rank and were long-time and award-winning professors; and eight were professional staff members who were formally certified by the University with faculty credentials, following SACS guidelines, and who taught regularly (see Appendix A for this group).

The First Year Task Force had as its primary focus the improvement of first year learning and student engagement that would lead to persistence and retention on the Troy Campus. Among several goals accomplished by the task force was the piloting of a Common Reading Initiative, requiring all entering students to read a selected book prior to their arrival on the Troy campus. A common book was discussed by the First Year Task Force as early as its September 15, 2005 meeting (Appendix B). In a memo, on February 7, 2006, one of the major proposed actions recommended to assist with retention was to “Implement a reading initiative that requires all entering . . . students to read an assigned
book prior to campus entry....”  The Common Reading Initiative was inaugurated on the Troy Campus in the Fall Semester 2007. The common book was selected by a committee of faculty, staff and administrators, with input from students. The first Common Reading Initiative was introduced to the Troy Campus with Cormac McCarthy’s *The Road*.

The Common Reading Initiative for 2007 was supported by 40 discussion groups, attended by 328 students and facilitated by over 30 faculty and staff members over the two days prior to the start of fall classes on the Troy Campus. Twenty-nine individuals participated in a development session in advance of using the book, led by an English professor. The book was included by the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences in the introductory course, BIO 1100, resulting in a conference presentation by faculty members (Appendix C). Other General Studies curriculum courses that included *The Road* in the Fall Semester 2007 were English Composition and U.S. History. Faculty submitted recommendations for the 2007 book and student focus groups were used to review finalists for the book selections. The Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies coordinated the assessment and review activities of the 2007 Initiative, based on discussions with faculty members and recommended to the First Year Advisory Board the continued use of a selected book for entering students.

A similar process was used to select the Common Reading Initiative book for 2008: *A Lesson Before Dying* by Ernest Gaines. Faculty submitted recommendations for the 2008 book and student focus groups were used to review the finalists for the book selections. The use of this book by entering students was supported by 46 discussion groups, attended by 477 students and led by 28 faculty and staff and 7 upper level students. Fifty-five sections of TROY 1101 (including several online sections) discussed the CRI book and student involvement with the book was assessed (Appendix D). Thirty-five faculty and staff took part in a faculty development session on the book led by an English professor. The book was also read in General Studies English classes. Following a review of the CRI
activities for 2008, the Dean of First Year Studies and the First Year Advisory Board agreed to continue the CRI program.

In Fall Semester 2009, the Common Reading Initiative was expanded to all campuses and locations throughout the University, including those in eCampus. The selected book, *Ecology of a Cracker Childhood* by Janisse Ray will be used in face-to-face and electronic discussion groups and incorporated into all TROY 1101 classes regardless of location. Over fifty recommendations for the 2009 CRI book were received and the finalists for the CRI book were discussed with student focus groups. The TROY 1101 classes used a standardized syllabus and standardized examination on the CRI book. Fifty discussion groups were scheduled on the Troy Campus and 584 students participated, led by thirty-four faculty and staff. Sixty faculty and staff participated in pre-discussion development led by professors of English, History and Biology. Fifty-five sections of TROY 1101 were to be delivered in the Fall Semester 2009 where the CRI book will be discussed and student involvement with the book will be assessed.

The 2007 and 2008 CRI provided important information, suggesting that student learning might be enhanced by the further development of reading projects at the University.

**From First Year Task Force to First Year Studies Program**

Upon recommendation of the First Year Task Force, the Chancellor created a Dean of First Year Studies position in June 2006, and the position was filled in August 2007. The Dean of First Year Studies reports directly to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, the Chief Academic Officer for the University. Because the University leadership in 2007 perceived that the purposes of the First Year Studies Program would be linked to the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan, the First Year Task Force transitioned into the First Year Advisory Board to support the Dean of First Year Studies. The First Year Advisory Board was comprised of thirteen members: three were full-time faculty members; eight were academic administrators who held formal faculty rank and were long-time and award-
winning professors; and ten were professional staff members who were formally certified by the University with faculty credentials, following SACS guidelines, and who taught regularly (See Appendix A for this group).

Under the leadership of the Dean and with the assistance of the Advisory Board, the QEP topic was selected and recommended.

**University and National Data Regarding Reading**

As the Common Reading Initiatives were piloted and assessed annually, and in anticipation of the selection process, the Dean and First Year Advisory Board also reviewed relevant institutional data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness:

- Troy University students' mean scores were just below the national mean score in reading and critical thinking in 2007 data based on the College Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAPP).

- Fifty-three percent of Troy University’s first year students reported spending less than 10 hours per week engaged in academic activities, including reading, according to the 2007 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

- Among first year students in the Fall Semester 2007 NSSE survey, on the question of level of engagement in discussion of ideas from readings with faculty members outside of class, forty-eight percent of Troy University students gave positive responses compared to fifty-nine percent nationally. Among seniors in the same survey, fifty-five percent of Troy University students gave positive responses compared to seventy-two percent nationally.

- Among first year students in the Fall Semester 2007 NSSE survey, on the question of level of engagement in discussion of ideas from readings with others outside of class, eighty-four percent of Troy University students gave positive responses compared to ninety-two percent nationally. Among seniors in the same survey, ninety-three percent of Troy University students gave positive responses compared to ninety-five percent nationally.

- Among first year students in the Fall Semester 2007 NSSE survey, on the question of number of books read (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment, twenty-nine percent of Troy University students indicated reading five or more additional books compared to the national average of eighteen percent at this level. Among seniors in the same survey, twenty-five percent of Troy University students reported reading at this level of activity, the same percentage reported nationally.
• According to data from the 2007 Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) reading, beyond classroom assignments, is at the bottom of the list of activities for incoming college freshmen in the United States.

• According to that same CIRP report from 2007, the majority of incoming freshmen are not in the habit of evaluating the quality and reliability of the information they receive.

These results confirmed what the Common Reading Initiative activities suggested and what faculty had been informally reporting for some period of time: Troy University students were not regular, active and engaged readers. Even when NSSE data suggested that Troy University might be slightly ahead of the national average, the actual percentage of students reading for enrichment or information was less than thirty percent. Clearly, the internal data did not suggest a strong culture of reading at the University. At Troy University, creating a culture of reading was about being more than average and certainly more than at the mid-point of national, standardized assessment measures. Stotsky’s 2008 study noted a general national decline in reading as well as a decline in literacy among college graduates nationally in the decade from 1992 to 2003. While Troy University’s QEP does not focus on the technical skill of literacy, clearly an institutional culture that promotes engaged reading is a strategic plan moving against national indicators for all elements of reading.

Another important piece of institutional data noted in the topic selection process was that sixty-two percent of Troy University students are from families in which the parents either never attended or never completed college. As college entrance requirements become more egalitarian, the issues surrounding persistence and successful completion become more complicated. High-risk populations, including first-generation students, are ushered into higher education under the same expectations as those for whom college success is statistically more likely. Any student’s opportunity for success depends heavily upon being able to maneuver the intricacies of life away from home; if the student is unprepared, either academically or socially, the chances for success can be diminished.
Troy University believes that a culture of engaged readers offers opportunities for success to these first-generation college students.

**The Role of Focus Groups in the Topic Selection**

In February 2008, the First Year Advisory Board, with its strong academic focus, conducted a series of focus group sessions on the Troy Campus to request QEP ideas:

- **Faculty Sessions** 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. February 11, 2008
- **Professional Staff** 4:00 p.m. February 12, 2008
- **Students** 4:00 p.m. February 13, 2008
- **Deans** 4:00 p.m. February 14, 2008

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness conducted the meetings, organized by the Dean of First Year Studies. The ideas generated by faculty, staff and administrators tended to be broad in concept and centered on student learning, while student ideas focused on changes that would impact a specific class or a specific perceived campus need (i.e., registration procedures and residence halls). In their review of the focus group materials, members of the First Year Advisory Board noticed that one idea emerged relative to many of the topics recommended: the role of reading as an institutional activity.

The faculty group identified the possibility of embracing reading as a way to help students develop a global perspective. Similar ideas about the role of reading at Troy University emerged from staff and administrator focus groups as well. The groups’ ideas included:

**Faculty Input**

- Reading - a way to develop a global perspective
- Civic engagement/informed reading
- Improve reading/writing skills
- Reading program
- Improve reading ability/vocabulary
- Skills: reading, writing, critical thinking, and math
- Build on first year reading experience
- Reactivate the reading center
- Involve international students in reading
- Enhance learning of basic information
- What do we expect in terms of being global citizens
- Measure change in worldview
- Geographic literacy/knowledge
• Listening, civility - understanding arguments
• Shift teaching environment to learning environment
• Attributes of a university scholar
• Skill building in terms of improving employability
• Provide course support on research
• Clarify what we want students to learn
• Identify a group of faculty to redesign teaching
• More substantial signal for the starting of college

Staff Input
• Improve reading/writing skills
• Train faculty/staff working with first year students
• Measure change in world view of students
• Reading program
• Look at skill building in terms of improving employability
• Students’ technology skills
• Provide courses/support on research

Administrator Input
• Improve reading ability/vocabulary
• Writing ability
• Reading skills
• Build on first year reading experience
• Reactivate the reading center
• Involve international students in reading

In addition, the Dean of First Year Studies used the institution’s email technology to send a communication to all University faculty requesting possible QEP topics. During the process of focus groups, faculty input and Advisory Board meetings, the concept of developing a culture of readers at the University began to take shape. Group members agreed the initiative had significant potential to enhance student learning, and Creating a Culture of Reading emerged as the proposed theme for Troy University’s QEP. The focus group information, supported by University and national data, suggested a cultural decline in engaged readers at Troy University.

The focus groups helped generate broad input on the topic selection process. Further discussion of the involvement and support of University stakeholders for the QEP, including their review of the proposed topic, is detailed in Section Four of this Plan.
SACS On-Site Review and Final Refinement of the QEP

The final refinements of the QEP are based on suggestions offered by the SACS On-Site Review Committee. The current QEP was revised in accordance with the University’s response to concerns noted by the SACS On-Site Review Committee. Among the refinements suggested by the SACS On-Site Review Committee that the University has incorporated into this revised version of the QEP are:

- A reduction in QEP initiatives from six to three
- A revision of the QEP Implementation Team to be more broadly inclusive, especially in the area of faculty and student representation
- A clarification of information, especially with regard to the input of the focus groups and the widespread support of institutional stakeholders
- A sharper delineation of student learning outcomes and programmatic outcomes, the measures by which these will be assessed and the review process that will determine needed improvements
- Specific strategies for achieving the overall QEP goal of creating a culture of reading, especially with regard to the University-wide implementation of the Plan
- A clarity of organization strongly demonstrating that the required five major QEP sections identified by SACS had been addressed

Conclusion

Troy University selected and refined its Quality Enhancement Plan topic through a deliberative process involving a careful review of existing programs, the analysis of institutional and national data, the generation of ideas and input from the University community and the suggestions of SACS officials and committee members.

A book is the most effective weapon against intolerance and ignorance - Lyndon B. Johnson

At the recommendation of the SACS On-Site Review Committee, Troy University sharpened its focal elements of the QEP by reducing the number of initiatives from six to three. These three initiatives strongly support the University’s overall QEP goal of enhancing the culture of reading. These initiatives support the QEP student learning outcomes. The three initiatives are at the heart of planned activities that Troy University envisions will take it from its current state to a more enhanced culture of reading. In brief, the three initiatives will serve as the “tipping points” (Gladwell 2002) for the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan.

The three initiatives support the QEP’s student learning outcomes (below) as well as provide opportunities for the assessment of these learning outcomes:

1. **Student reading activities will result in greater reading for enjoyment, appreciation and information**
2. **Student reading activities will result in enhanced perspectives and broader viewpoints.**
3. **Student reading activities will result in greater engagement with others and greater understanding of others’ positions**
4. **Student reading activities will result in greater discernment and critical/analytical judgment**
5. **Student reading activities will result in enhanced writing skills**
6. **Student reading activities will result in greater understanding of the connections among and between reading materials**
The Common Reading Initiative (CRI)

This initiative builds upon two years of a pilot conducted on the Troy Campus in 2007 and 2008. This initiative also builds upon an expansion of the pilot that extended the CRI to all campuses and sites (including eCampus) in the Fall Semester 2009. The proposed Common Reading Initiative will emulate the successful process from the two years of pilot study.

The objective of the CRI is to introduce first year students, at all University locations (including the eCampus) to a common reading experience. The CRI is a transformational activity, reminding first year students that they have entered a University setting where reading, in all of its manifestations, is a valued activity. The CRI also provides structured opportunities for first year students to engage in peer-to-peer discussion activities centered on a common reading experience as well as student-to-faculty engagement about reading. The CRI provides students with opportunities to translate their reading activities into written work and to begin the important process of connecting the various texts from their reading efforts. The Common Reading Initiative also provides faculty with opportunities for development as course instructors and discussion leaders.

The Common Reading Initiative will have seven major components:

1. **Annual Selection**: Each spring, the CRI book will be selected by a committee comprised of faculty and staff representing all five University campuses. Student input will be solicited via the committee. The committee, through the Director of the QEP, will invite broad-based faculty and staff participation (Appendix E). The committee will recommend to the Director of the QEP a final choice, based on a number of variables including readability and applicability to a broad group of first year learners (including traditional, non-traditional, face-to-face and electronic students). The final choice will be presented by the Dean of First Year Studies to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and the Chancellor for final approval. Following final approval, faculty, staff and students
at all University campuses and locations will be notified. All entering first year students will be informed that they must have completed their reading of the CRI book prior to the beginning of fall classes. For the Troy Campus, information about the CRI book will be included in all IMPACT (new student) orientation sessions. At other University locations, information about the CRI book will be included in all pre-registration materials. Students will be directed by the Director of the QEP, via letters and emails, to the QEP webpage for additional information.

2. **Use of TROY 1101**: The CRI selection will be discussed in TROY 1101, the University Orientation course. This discussion of the CRI text will occur in all TROY 1101 courses, at all University locations, including those delivered via eCampus. The Director of the QEP will work through the QEP campus subcommittees (see Sections Three and Four of this Plan) to ensure that TROY 1101 faculty receive instructional materials regarding the CRI text. The TROY 1101 mid-term exam tests student knowledge about the CRI book. TROY 1101 also serves as a survey point for faculty and students on the impact of the CRI.

3. **Faculty Use of the Common Reading Initiative in General Studies Courses**: In addition to TROY 1101, the Common Reading Initiative book will be used in selected General Studies courses, at the recommendation of the University faculty and their department/unit chairs, and with the approval of the college deans. Selected General Studies courses using the CRI book will vary annually based on the themes and topics of the book. In the pilot study, the Department of Biology and Environmental Sciences on the Troy Campus incorporated the 2007 selection (*The Road*) into the introductory biology course (Appendix C). The Department of English and Department of History used the 2007 selection in General Studies courses. The Department of English also made use of the 2008 selection in their General Studies courses. The projected use of
these General Studies courses serves as a feedback point for faculty and student surveys and for information regarding student reading activities.

4. **All Campuses, All Locations**: The CRI book will be discussed at the four Alabama campuses as well as at all Global Campus locations and through eCampus course offerings, beginning in Fall Semester 2009. The QEP campus subcommittees, in collaboration with the campus vice chancellors, Director of eCampus and Director of the QEP, will be the principle groups to ensure consistency of CRI activities across the various locations.

5. **CRI Discussion Groups**: Each fall, discussion groups will be held at University campus and site locations where first year students are taught. Discussion groups will be led by University faculty and staff. For eCampus first year students, these discussions will be held via the University’s Blackboard platform. The QEP campus subcommittees will serve as the principle operational groups to ensure that these discussions are held. The Director of the QEP will solicit feedback and other data (including the number of participants) from all discussion group leaders. The purpose of these groups is to provide first year students with opportunities to engage in critical thinking by exploring the topics and themes of the CRI book in support of its use in TROY 1101 and selected General Studies classes. Materials for group discussion facilitators will be generated by the Director of the QEP and will be transmitted to them through the campus subcommittees.

6. **Enrichment Activities**: Each fall and spring semester, various enrichment activities associated with the Common Reading Initiative will be scheduled at the University’s campuses and locations to reinforce the impact of the CRI on the University’s culture. During the 2007 pilot phase, these activities included a campus-wide panel discussion of the themes and issues raised by *The Road* and attended by over 300 students. In 2008, the Department of Theatre and Dance produced a theatrical presentation of *A Lesson*
Before Dying to extend the campus-wide discussions of that CRI selection. Anticipated activities include bringing CRI authors to University locations as well as bringing in other speakers to speak on issues related to the CRI selection. The QEP budget has set aside specific resources for these cultural activities, which will be initiated and coordinated by the Director of the QEP with the assistance of the Implementation Team, campus subcommittees, faculty and academic leadership.

7. Outcomes, Assessment and Review: The Common Reading Initiative has specific outcomes detailed in Section Five of this report. These outcomes will be assessed through specific measurements, feedback, and other data collections. The University has a specific review process in place to determine if the Common Reading Initiative is meeting its outcomes; if not, there are in place specific steps for the recommendation of improvement plans. (See Section Five for this information)

The Common Reading Initiative is intended to link all first year students into a common reading experience and to provide opportunities for these students to engage with peers and faculty in discussions about a common book. It is anticipated that such discussions that initially are focused on the CRI selection will expand, over the course of the semester and academic year, into additional discussions about other reading materials. The CRI is intended to serve as a demonstrative indicator to students that they have entered a new context, that of a university and there are new expectations about reading, thinking and learning which are markedly different from the expectations of high school.

The College Reading Initiative

The College Reading Initiative (COLRI) extends the idea of a common reading experience to each of the University’s five academic colleges. At the suggestion of the SACS On-Site Review Committee, the center of the COLRI initiative has been refocused. Every undergraduate student in each college will be expected to read a selected book, discuss it in various group settings throughout the academic year, and analyze it as part of
class requirements in selected major courses. The COLRI provides students with opportunities to translate their reading activities into written work in selected major courses and to further understand the important process of connecting the various materials they are reading. As with the CRI, faculty development activities for the College Reading Initiative provide opportunities for improvement as course instructors and discussion leaders. The College Reading Initiative, like the CRI, supports each of the six QEP student learning outcomes as well as the QEP program outcomes of enhancing the culture of reading at Troy University.

In the Fall Semester 2009, the College of Communication and Fine Arts is piloting the COLRI prior to the COLRI pilots for the other four University colleges in Year Two of the QEP. Information about the CCFA pilot is contained in Appendix F.

The **College Reading Initiative** will have six major components:

1. **Annual Selection**: Each spring, faculty members from each academic college will select a college-specific common book to be read by all students within their respective colleges during the forthcoming academic year. Each selection committee will be constituted by, and report to, their respective college dean. Each committee, through their college deans, will invite broad-based faculty and student participation. The CCFA pilot in 2009 had two representatives from each discipline area within the College serve on its COLRI selection committee; the committee was chaired by a CCFA faculty member as well. Each committee will recommend to their dean a final choice for approval, based on a number of variables including readability and applicability to student majors within the specific college (including traditional, non-traditional, face-to-face and electronic students). Following final approval, faculty and students from each college will be notified and students will be reminded that they must have completed the reading of their college’s COLRI selection prior to the beginning of fall classes. Students will be directed by their college deans, via letters and emails, to the QEP webpage for
additional information about each college’s COLRI selection, forthcoming discussion groups, classes that will use the COLRI selection and other related materials.

An additional advantage of the COLRI is that it provides engagement of reading opportunities for students who transfer to Troy University and are not a part of the CRI activities (designed for first year students).

2. **Selected Classes**: The COLRI book will be discussed and student knowledge about the book will be assessed in pre-determined major courses in each college. Each COLRI Selection Committee will recommend specific courses for inclusion to their college dean, who will approve the final course selections following consultation with his/her associate deans, department chairs, and faculty. Each college dean will work through his/her campus associate deans and other academic leadership to ensure that college faculty members receive instructional materials regarding the COLRI text. In classes that are reading the COLRI book, assessment of student reading activities will be conducted by the faculty teaching the class. These assessments will be summarized by the faculty and forwarded to the college dean for review and follow-up with the Director of the QEP. These major courses, in each college, will also serve as survey points for both faculty and students regarding the impact of the College Reading Initiative.

3. **All Campuses, All Locations**: The COLRI book will be discussed at all University campuses and locations where the selected major courses (selected for COLRI use) are taught. These locations include, as appropriate, the four Alabama campuses as well as all Global Campus locations and eCampus course offerings. The college deans and their campus associate deans, in collaboration with the campus vice chancellors, Director of eCampus and Director of the QEP, will be the principle groups to ensure consistency of COLRI activities across the various locations.
4. **COLRI Discussion Groups**: Planned group activities, focused on discussions of the specific COLRI books in each college, will be scheduled with the approval the dean of each college to occur throughout the academic year. These discussion groups will be led by University faculty from each college. For eCampus students, these discussions will be held via the University’s Blackboard platform. The campus associate deans and campus vice chancellors, will serve as the principle operational groups to ensure that these discussions are held. The dean of each college will solicit feedback and other data (including the number of participants) from all discussion group leaders in his/her college. This information will be reviewed by the dean and provided to the Director of the QEP. The purpose of these COLRI discussion groups is to provide each college’s students with opportunities to explore the topics and themes of the COLRI book in support of its use in selected classes. Materials for group discussion leaders will be generated by invited faculty through each dean and associate deans to discussion leaders.

5. **Enrichment Activities**: Each year, various enrichment activities associated with the each college’s COLRI will be scheduled at the University’s campuses and locations to reinforce the impact of the COLRI on the University’s culture. During the College of Communication and Fine Arts pilot study in 2009, these activities will include over fifty artistic presentations followed by discussions of themes and issues raised in the CCFA selection (Twyla Tharp, *The Creative Habit*). Activities include bringing the various COLRI authors as well as other selected individuals to one or more Troy University campuses/locations to speak on issues associated with the COLRI selections. The QEP budget has set aside specific resources for these cultural activities, in partnership with resources provided by college deans. These COLRI activities will be initiated and coordinated by each dean in collaboration with their faculty, the Director of the QEP and their respective advisory staffs and organizations.
6. **Outcomes, Assessment and Review**: The College Reading Initiative has specific outcomes that are detailed in Section Five of this report. In the pilot, CCFA is tracking student attendance and participation, faculty feedback, interactive blogs and hits on the CCFA COLRI web pages as part of their assessment activities. These outcomes will be assessed through specific measurements, feedback, and other data collections. The University has a specific review process in place to determine if a College Reading Initiative is meeting its outcomes; if not, there are in place specific steps for the recommendation of improvement plans. (See Section Five for additional information).

**Faculty Development Initiative**

Faculty development activities are specifically defined and resources, human and fiscal, are allocated to their achievement (see the proposed budget in Section Three). In fact, the greatest percentage of the proposed budget (40%) is intended to support the faculty development initiative (FDI) activities of the QEP. FDI activities support the QEP student learning outcomes and support the QEP program outcomes associated with changing the culture of reading at the University.

The FDI is a strategic and concerted set of activities designed to assist faculty as they promote an enhanced culture of reading at Troy University and as they help students become more immersed in all types of reading, including reading for enjoyment, appreciation, and information.

The **Faculty Development Initiative** will have nine major components:

1. **Faculty Development Facilitator**: The University has made a significant in-kind commitment toward the success of the FDI (and the entire QEP) by reassigning a portion of load for a full-time faculty member from the College of Education to serve as the QEP Faculty Development Facilitator. This Facilitator will serve a variety of roles, including collaborating with the University faculty, Director of the QEP, Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE, the external reviewer and other academic leadership members to
develop a baseline assessment of the culture of reading at Troy University. Along with the Faculty Development sub-committee of the Implementation Team, this Facilitator will assess faculty needs in regard to specific development activities to support the QEP goals and will help create appropriate activities to address identified needs. The Facilitator will work closely with the four faculty development teams (described below) and will review outcomes assessment data as part of the QEP leadership team.

2. **Faculty Development Teams**: At the heart of the Faculty Development Initiative are four faculty development teams. These teams will be constituted by the Director of the QEP with the assistance of the college deans, University faculty, Faculty Development Facilitator, and other QEP-responsible University officials. Each team will be comprised of 8-12 individuals with full-time faculty (representing all campuses) constituting the majority of the members (other individuals might include professional staff, administrators, and/or students at the discretion of the Director of the QEP and the deans). These four teams will focus their attention on one of four topic areas: 1) **The College Reading Initiative**; 2) **The Traditional Student Learner-Reader**; 3) **The Adult Student Learner-Reader**; and 4) **The Online Student Learner-Reader**.

3. **Best Practices and Development Materials**: Each of the four teams will use an action research model to develop best practices and developmental materials in support of their specific assigned topic areas. These practices and materials will come from the teams’ research efforts as well as their own collective experiences as instructors. In this sense, these faculty-led teams will be informed by their activities in teaching students over time and as such, the best practice models and the development materials will originate from collective faculty-student interactions. The strength of the Faculty Development Initiative is a faculty-student model of continuous encounters, exchanges, and interactions that have been summarized, synthesized and shared with other faculty. This process is consistent with the reflective practice model used to promote critical
thinking and professional growth (Mezirow 1990). These “other faculty” primarily will be those individuals involved with the discussion groups and classes associated with the CRI and COLRI books. However, any faculty can choose to use the information generated by these four teams, making use of the models and materials in their classes. In this fashion, more faculty members have the opportunity to enhance the reading activities and abilities of their students, even if their particular classes are not selected for CRI and COLRI use. These best practices models and development materials will be distributed in face to face as well as electronic formats, ensuring a wide availability of information for faculty, especially those teaching in the University’s Global Campus and eCampus.

4. **Workshops and Panels**: The faculty development teams, in collaboration with the Faculty Development Facilitator will create and lead specific workshops and panels to discuss these best practices and reading-related materials. These workshops and panels will be digitally recorded by the University’s Broadcast and Digital Network department and will be made available, via real-time and web-based streaming, to faculty at other University locations beyond the specific campus/site of origin. Further, these panels and workshops will be saved on the QEP website so that over time, they become an evolving repository of ideas and practices about how to increase student learning by enhancing a culture of reading. Topics likely to be developed include:

- The incorporation of reading materials into classes
- The types of reading materials
- Kinds of reading (for enjoyment, appreciation, information, etc)
- The relationship between reading and writing
- Reading activities for the University disciplines
- The Library as resource center for reading
- Assessing the outcomes of the Quality Enhancement Plan
• Creating a culture of reading
• “Why Reading Matters”

5. **Writing Exercises:** The Faculty Development Teams, in collaboration with the Faculty Development Facilitator and the Director of the QEP, will develop writing exercises for use by CRI and COLRI faculty in the classes where these books will be discussed.

6. **Electronic Resource Center:** The Faculty Development Teams, in collaboration with the Faculty Development Facilitator, the Director of the QEP, and the University’s department of Information Technology and Broadcast/Digital Network will create, implement, evaluate and update an electronic resource center for use by faculty. The Faculty Development Facilitator, in collaboration with the Director of the QEP and the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies will manage the content of this Center. This Center will be linked to the QEP web page and will include materials related to faculty development in support of all QEP activities. The Center will function as a virtual reading center for faculty. The Center will be updated regularly with information, upcoming events, development and assessment materials. The Center will be linked to the main QEP website and to related websites (CRI, FYS, colleges) so that users encounter a seamless environment of information and assistance about the QEP and reading.

7. **Assessment of the Reading Culture:** The Faculty Development Teams, in collaboration with other individuals/group responsible for the QEP, will assist in the selection of and interaction with external reviewers in Years One, Three and Five of the QEP. These reviewers will be retained for the purpose of rendering an assessment of the baseline (and subsequent) culture of reading as it exists at the University. Concurrent with the external reviewers’ assessments, the Director of the QEP will compile an internal review of the culture for comparative purposes. This internal review will include the input of the Faculty Development Teams.
8. **Culture of Reading Conferences:** The Faculty Development Teams, in collaboration with the Faculty Development Facilitator, the Director of the QEP and other members of the University’s academic leadership, will plan annual conferences focused on building a culture of reading at the University beginning in Year One. These internal conferences will be designed to broaden the discussion of QEP activities and to further promote the culture of reading at the University. In Years Four and Five, the teams will expand this activity to a national/international conference with open calls for presentations, a keynote speaker, and related workshops.

9. **Outcomes, Assessment, and Review:** The Faculty Development Initiative has specific outcomes that are detailed in Section Five of this report. Outcomes will be assessed through specific measurements, feedback, and other data collections. The University has a specific review process in place to determine if the Faculty Development Initiative is meeting its outcomes; if not, there are in place specific steps for the recommendation of improvement plans. (See Section Five for additional information)

In conclusion, Troy University’s QEP is built upon three major initiatives: a Common Reading Initiative for first year students, a College Reading Initiative for each college and its majors, and a Faculty Development Initiative designed to support both the CRI and COLRI efforts through specific faculty-generated materials. These three initiatives are closely linked to specific student learning outcomes and to the overall program goals of the QEP.
SECTION THREE: INSTITUTIONAL DEMONSTRATION OF CAPABILITY FOR THE INITIATION, IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPLETION OF THE QEP

Books are the quietest and most constant of friends; they are the most accessible and wisest of counselors, and the most patient of teachers - Charles W. Eliot

Introduction

Troy University is committed to the implementation of its proposed Quality Enhancement Plan. This section discusses the University’s capability of supporting the Plan through a variety of resources, including human, physical and fiscal.

Troy University already has demonstrated its institutional commitment to the Quality Enhancement Plan in a variety of ways:

- The University has supported two years of a pilot program for the Common Reading Initiative (CRI) in 2007 and 2008 through the institutional resources of the First Year Studies Program, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and E, and the Office of the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies.
- The University is supporting the pilot expansion of the Common Reading Initiative in the Fall 2009 through these same offices as well as the campus resources from the Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City and Global Campus (including eCampus) locations.
- The University is supporting the pilot College Reading Initiative (COLRI) in the College of Communication and Fine Arts on the Troy Campus in 2009-2010.
- The University has supported institutional development for its faculty and staff who conducted the discussion sessions on the Troy Campus for the CRI in 2007-2008-2009.
- The University has committed new budget dollars toward the QEP as part of its budget planning process for the next five years, beginning with 2009-2010.
- The University has funded and staffed a position of Faculty Development Facilitator in the Fall Semester 2009.
Institutional Capability and Commitment: Three Major Institutional Areas

The following sections detail the three major areas of institutional capability and commitment:

1. The identification of University personnel and the assignment of responsibilities to these personnel in support of the QEP

2. The delineation of specific strategies, tactics and tasks for the achievement of the QEP goals and outcomes, including the development of a timeline for the creation, implementation and assessment of QEP activities

3. A budget of allocated new monies as well as University in-kind reallocated resources to support the QEP

1. Identification of individuals responsible for the implementation of the QEP

The commitment of a number of University individuals will be necessary for the QEP to succeed. Support staff for these individuals, units, campuses, and locations will be critical to the success of the QEP as well. These individuals and groups include:

- University Faculty

The success of the QEP ultimately will depend upon the advocacy and support of the University faculty who will use the books of the CRI and COLRI, who will make use of the faculty development opportunities to help their students become better readers, and who will participate in the various groups that select the books and lead the discussions. In each element of the QEP, the faculty have a central active role, including:

- Selection of the annual Common Reading Initiative book
- Use of the annual CRI book in TROY 1101 classes, general studies courses and selected undergraduate courses
- Leadership in the CRI student discussion groups
- Selection and use of the College Reading Initiative book annually
- Leadership in the COLRI student discussion groups
Leadership in faculty development activities through the four Faculty Development Teams and the Faculty Development Subcommittee of the QEP Implementation Team
- Support for, and participation in, reading enhancement activities
- Active engagement in the assessment of QEP activities

University Students

The QEP is directed toward student reading and the global goal of enhancing the University’s reading culture so that student learning is improved. Specifically, students will have the following kinds of responsibilities:
- Readers of the CRI and COLRI book selections annually
- Participants in the CRI and COLRI classes and discussion groups
- Respondents to assessment measures
- Participants on the QEP Implementation Team and QEP campus subcommittees

The Director of the QEP

The Director of the QEP oversees all elements of the QEP and is ultimately responsible for its implementation, continued operation, and evaluation. This individual ensures that all strategic and operational activities related to the QEP are enacted and that the outcomes projected for the three major initiatives (CRI, COLRI, and FDI) are monitored, assessed and achieved. The Director of the QEP is also responsible for assessing the University’s culture of reading and suggesting additional ways in which this culture might be enhanced. This individual is the budget officer for the QEP and reports directly to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost on all matters related to the QEP. The Director of the QEP will coordinate annual reports on the QEP, including an assessment of the QEP and will provide these regular reports to the EVC/Provost, who may, in turn, request their presentation to other University governance groups such as the Academic Steering Committee, the Chancellor’s Cabinet and the Board of Trustees.
• **QEP Implementation Team**

  This group of individuals served to guide the development of the University's initial QEP and represented all major constituents of the Plan: faculty, staff, administrators, students, alumni, and the community. With the proposed revisions to the QEP, at the recommendation of the SACS On-Site Review Committee, the Implementation Team has also been revised, reflecting a greater representation of faculty and students (see Section Four of the Plan for the revised membership of the QEP Implementation Team). The Implementation Team will provide guidance, support, and advocacy of the QEP and will serve as the Director of the QEP’s chief advisory group. The internal structure of the Implementation Team will include: 1) campus subcommittees; 2) Testing and Assessment Subcommittee; 3) Faculty Development Subcommittee; and 4) Marketing and Publicity Subcommittee

• **Chairs and Members, QEP campus subcommittees**

  In an effort to achieve better communication, additional advocacy, and enhanced support for the QEP, campus subcommittees have been developed for the Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City, and Global Campus/eCampus. For the rosters of these subcommittees, see Section Four of this Plan. The chairs of these subcommittees serve as members of the QEP Implementation Team, providing enhanced information as well as feedback to and from the major group out to each of the other campuses of the University beyond the Troy Campus. The chairs of the campus subcommittees have specific responsibilities for the Common Reading Initiative as it is implemented on each of the campuses.

• **Faculty Development Facilitator**

  A full-time senior faculty member has been reassigned into a new role that includes facilitating faculty development activities in support of the QEP. This individual reports to the Associate Vice Chancellor/IRPE, will coordinate faculty development activities and
will have specific assignments with regard to the selection of the external evaluators who will assess the University’s culture of reading at the One, Three and Five year periods.

The Facilitator will provide an overall assessment of faculty development needs for the QEP, facilitate the four faculty development teams and will lead the Faculty Development Subcommittee of the QEP Implementation Team.

- **First Year Studies Staff and CRI Book Selection Committee**
  Support for the CRI will be provided by the staff of the First Year Studies (FYS) program, where the TROY 1101 course is administratively housed. The CRI Book Selection Committee has annually selected the CRI book used in the pilot phase.

- **Deans of the Five Colleges**
  Deans of each University college will play major roles in the implementation, assessment, and achievement of the QEP. The five deans will provide leadership, resources and guidance to each major initiative within the QEP:

- **Dean of University Libraries**
  The Dean of University Libraries will provide expertise and technical support to the Director of the QEP and the deans of the five colleges for each of the three major initiatives of the QEP. The Dean of University Libraries is a member of the QEP Implementation Team.

- **Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness**
  The Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE is the University’s chief assessment officer and will help coordinate all QEP assessment activities. This individual is on the Implementation Team.

- **The Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies**
  This individual is on the Implementation Team and will provide support to all QEP activities, including implementation and assessment of the three major initiatives.
• **University Department Chairs, Professional Staff, and Clerical Staff**

Support for the QEP at all University locations also will be provided by academic department chairs as well as academic professional and clerical staff. These chairs will have specific roles in assisting their faculty, at an operational level, as the faculty incorporate the CRI and COLRI books into their courses.

• **QEP Support Individuals**

There also are a number of University officials who will play pivotal roles in the success of the QEP. These individuals will provide operational and technical support as well as advocacy and leadership for the QEP throughout the University’s various campuses and sites, including Global Campus and eCampus. These individuals include:

- Associate deans for each of the five colleges
- Vice chancellors for Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City and Global Campuses
- Director of the University’s eCampus
- Regional directors and academic officials in the University’s Global Campus
- Dean of Enrollment Management
- Director of Information Technology
- Department of Broadcast and Digital Network
- Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost
- Chancellor of the University

2. **Identification of strategies and tasks and the creation of a timeline for the implementation of the QEP**

Specific strategies, tactics and tasks related to the QEP will fall along a continuum ranging from initiation and development to implementation and ultimately assessment.

- The Director of the QEP, with the guidance of the Implementation Team, and the support of the deans, campus vice chancellors, and Global Campus officials and with the
advocacy and assistance of the University faculty, will implement all activities related to
the three initiatives of the QEP.

- The Director of the QEP, with the guidance of the Implementation Team, the Associate
Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, and the
Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies, will annually expend budgeted
University monies and in-kind resources in support of the QEP and its three initiatives.

- The Faculty Development Teams, with the Faculty Development Facilitator, will assess
faculty development needs and develop best practices and related development
materials to support all faculty development activities. These Teams and this Facilitator
will create faculty development programs, including annual conferences focused on
reading.

- The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, in collaboration with the
Director of the QEP, the Implementation Team, the deans, campus vice chancellors,
Global Campus officials, the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies and
University faculty, will annually and cumulatively assess student learning outcomes and
outcomes of the QEP’s three initiatives. The overall program outcome of an enhanced
University culture of reading will be annually and cumulatively assessed. Upon review of
the assessment of the student learning outcomes and the outcomes for the three
initiatives, the Director of the QEP, in consultation with the Implementation Team, the
University faculty and the University’s academic leadership will recommend plans for
improvement.

- At the direction of the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor/ Provost, the Director of
the QEP will report the QEP’s progress to the University’s various governance groups.

- The Director of the QEP, with the guidance of the Implementation Team, the Office of
Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, the Associate Provost/Dean of
Undergraduate Studies, the University’s academic leadership and the University faculty, will assess student learning outcomes, initiative outcomes and program outcomes and offer plans for improvement, in advance of the preparation and transmission of the QEP Five Year Report.

A detailed timeline of activities, with specific tasks, for Years One through Five of the QEP is presented as Implementation Timeline in Appendix G. Highlights include:

**Year One**
- Expand pilot of Common Reading Initiative (CRI) to all Troy University campuses, including Global Campus sites and eCampus. This expansion will be achieved through a University-wide use of TROY 1101 for discussion and assessment of CRI book. The expansion will also make use of the resources of campus subcommittees that will plan face-to-face and electronic discussions of the CRI book. The CRI text will also be used in selective General Studies classes
- Pilot the College Reading Initiative (COLRI) in the College of Communication and Fine Arts on the Troy Campus. This pilot will include selection of a book to be read by all CCFA majors, selection of CCFA courses where the book will be discussed and assessed, and the creation of faculty-led discussion groups with CCFA students throughout the academic year.
- Selection and use of an external evaluator to provide a baseline determination of the University’s reading culture
- Creation of four faculty-led development teams to develop best practices in support of the QEP outcomes and the delivery of materials based on the work of these teams, in face-to-face and electronic environments
- Development of cultural enhancement activities, including invited speakers and authors, to University campuses and sites throughout the academic year. These activities will be a collaborative effort between the University’s faculty, college deans, campus vice chancellors (including the Director of eCampus) and the Director of the QEP and the QEP Implementation Team.
- Assessment of QEP Year One Activities, including assessment of student learning, initiative and program outcomes. Based on these assessments, the Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the University’s academic leadership will prepare an annual report for presentation to various University governance groups. Included in this report will be
recommendations for plans for improvement as necessitated by an analysis of the outcomes assessment.

**Years Two-Five**

- Inclusion of all activities noted in Year One above
- Retain use of external evaluation of University's reading culture in Years Three and Five
- Continued assessment of all outcomes at all levels
- Development and implementation of annual plans for improvement based on an annual assessment of outcomes
- Pilot the COLRI in each of the five colleges at all University campuses and sites, including Global Campus locations and eCampus courses in Year Two with full development and implementation beginning in Year Three
- Continued creation and implementation of faculty support/development activities through the four faculty development teams
- Development of an annual University conference on “enhancing the culture of reading” beginning in Year Two
- Development of a University-sponsored regional conference on reading for Year Four
- Formal assessment of the five years of the QEP with specific focus on its impact on the enhancement of the University's overall culture of reading
- Development of the QEP five-year report for transmission to SACS in Year Five

3. **Identification of budgeted resources necessary for the implementation of the QEP**

   Troy University has committed new monies in a separate budget line for the QEP, beginning with FY 09-10 as noted in the chart below. These allocations are directly tied to the goals, activities, outcomes, and assessment of the QEP. For confirmation of the University’s commitment to the budgeted resources below, see Appendix H.
New University Funding for Quality Enhancement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty Development</th>
<th>Consultation and Assessment</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Enrichment</th>
<th>Marketing and Communication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$10,250</td>
<td>$138,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$159,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$160,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$4000</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$32,250</td>
<td>$780,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Funding Budget Details

Faculty Development

Approximately forty percent (40%) of the five year proposed budget of new resources is committed to professional development for the University’s faculty in order to promote a culture of reading, assist students in the achievement of student learning outcomes and ultimately, enable the University to meet its QEP goals.

- Workshops to focus on the development of faculty as teachers of critical reading. These workshops will be led by external in-field experts as well as University personnel.
- Workshops to focus on the development of faculty, staff, and students serving in tutorial roles during the project. These workshops will be led by external in-field experts as well as University personnel.
- Faculty development in the content of the CRI and COLRIs each year. This experience will be conducted by external and internal individuals who have appropriate expertise.
- Travel costs in support of professional development of QEP campus officials serving as workshop leaders in content areas and skills areas (critical reading, thinking, discussion).


Consultation and Assessment

- To bring to the University national experts to assess the institution’s culture of reading. These macro-assessments are scheduled for Years One (baseline), Three and Five.
- To regularly send the Director of the QEP and Implementation Team members to the University’s locations to conduct internal assessments about the institution’s response to QEP activities enhancing the reading culture.
- To support the administration and analysis of surveys, focus groups and other measurements used to assess the reading culture across the University.
- To purchase appropriate national measurement instruments that will be used for assessment activities. These instruments include the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) as well as those instruments suggested by external consultants.

Staffing

- Resources are budgeted to provide additional clerical staff support for the Director of the QEP.

Enrichment

- Opportunities to meet, and hear, CRI authors.
- Opportunities to meet, and hear, COLRI authors.
- These authors’ visits will be coordinated by the Director of the QEP with the support of the college deans and campus vice chancellors.

Marketing and Communication

- Formal communication materials to announce the initiation of the approved QEP.
- Announcements of the annual CRI selection.
- Resources available for use by college deans to promote their annual COLRI selections.
- On-going information communicated to the University faculty, staff, and students in support of reading and the various QEP activities.
In-Kind Funding

Troy University will also support the QEP through institutional in-kind resources:

- Fiscal and human resources by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness. This support will include on-going assessment activities used to review the macroscopic status of the University’s culture of reading. Specifically, the Office of IRPE will support QEP assessment through the administration and analysis of the First Year Student Survey and Graduating Senior Survey. These assessment activities, among others by the IRPE will total in excess of $100,000 annually.

- The reallocation of responsibilities of a University faculty member from the College of Education to support faculty development activities described in the role of Faculty Development Facilitator. This support will total approximately $50,000 annually.

- Commitment of time and human resources by the staff of the Dean of First Year Studies in support of the QEP. These staff resources include contributions to the three major initiatives of the QEP. Additionally, these staff members will support the general assessment, cultural enrichment and marketing/communication activities of the QEP. These in-kind resources will total approximately $100,000 annually.

- The University will support the QEP through the physical resources of Eldridge Hall, providing office space, supplies and technology to the QEP through the budgets of the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and the Dean of First Year Studies. These in-kind resources will total approximately $100,000 annually.

- The COLRI portion of the QEP will be supported annually, in part, through the budgets of the college deans. These monies will support campus speakers, assessment, and marketing and communication activities, in partnership with the Director of the QEP’s annual budget. These in-kind resources, totaled across all colleges, approximately $50,000 annually.

- The institutional units of Information Technology, Broadcast and Digital Network, and Admissions will support the QEP through in-kind contributions of time and money. Specifically, Information Technology will contribute resources toward the development, maintenance and enhancement of an interactive web page devoted to the QEP. The Broadcast and Digital Network will provide technical support for the recording and internal transmission of authors’ presentation on campuses and sites as well as general marketing/communication activities. The Office of Admissions will continue to play a significant role in the communication and advocacy of the CRI within its IMPACT
sessions each summer. These units will provide in-kind contributions of approximately $50,000 annually in support of the QEP.

In sum, the University will devote approximately $450,000 annually out of existing human, fiscal, and physical resources. Over the five year period, the University will commit over $2 million to the QEP with these contributions. Coupled with the University’s annual QEP budget of new monies (totaling over $780,000 for the five year period), the institution is committing almost $3 million to the QEP during its initial five years.

The University expects to place the QEP within its strategic plan for 2010-2015; with such identification comes continued resources for the QEP as well as the likelihood of additional resources for reading-related activities. Troy University is committed and capable of enacting its proposed Quality Enhancement Plan.
Section One of this report documented Troy University’s process for identifying and selecting its QEP topic. Within that Section were a number of references to the broad-based participation by University stakeholders in the topic selection process. Specifically, this broad-based participation included:

- University faculty, staff and administrators who served on the First Year Task Force and its later manifestation as the First Year Advisory Board
- The inter-divisional nature of the origins of the Common Reading Initiatives that blended the work of the University’s divisions of Academics and Student Services
- University faculty, staff, administrators, and students in the focus groups whose ideas ultimately coalesced into a desire to enhance the University’s culture of reading
- University faculty, staff and students in the discussion groups and classes that examined the Common Reading Initiatives in 2007 and 2008
- The QEP Implementation Team of University faculty, staff, administrators and students that guided the development of the original version of the Plan
- University faculty, staff, administrators and students at each of the University’s Alabama campuses as well as locations within the Global Campus and eCampus who participated in the SACS on-site review and provided information to the On-Site Review Committee.

**Quality Enhancement Plan Implementation Team and Campus Subcommittees**

Clearly, the University’s identification of a QEP topic was inclusive, deliberative and encompassing of the institution’s internal stakeholders. Chief among these groups is the QEP Implementation Team with its campus subcommittees (discussed in Section Three). At the suggestion of the SACS On-Site Review Committee, the QEP Implementation Team was revised as follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Annette</td>
<td>Professor and Chair of Sociology, Montgomery Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Pam</td>
<td>Professor of Art, Troy Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty, Fred</td>
<td>Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Montgomery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belsches, Alan</td>
<td>Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Dothan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchannon, Lindley</td>
<td>Officer, Panhellenic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckner, Tim</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History and Faculty Senate Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellon, Jonathan</td>
<td>Coordinator of Learning Activities/First Year Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran, Maryjo</td>
<td>Dean, College of Communications and Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Davis</td>
<td>President, Student Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dew, John</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor/Institutional Research and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dye, Judy</td>
<td>Professor of Reading Emeritus, College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, Michael</td>
<td>Web Architect, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fretwell, Cherie</td>
<td>Professor and Chair of Business, Phenix City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulmer, Hal</td>
<td>Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gearhart, Deb</td>
<td>Director, Troy University eCampus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington, Jonathan</td>
<td>Assoc Professor of Internatl Relations, Global Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Jessica</td>
<td>President, Sigma Tau Delta English Honors Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard-Shaughness, Candice</td>
<td>Interim Chair/Assistant Professor, KHP, Troy Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshi, Achal</td>
<td>Member, International Student Cultural Organizations (ISCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Eleanor</td>
<td>Dean of First Year Studies and Director of the QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means Floreda</td>
<td>Officer, National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Wayne</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Biology, Troy Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlofsky, Mike</td>
<td>Professor of English, Troy Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Marian</td>
<td>Director, Instructional Support Services and former Professor with tenure, College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Troy University Freshman Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Zac</td>
<td>Officer, Interfraternity Council (IFC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltiel, Iris</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Education, Phenix City Campus and Faculty Development Facilitator for QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starling, Buddy</td>
<td>Dean, Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmurr-Stewart, Darlene</td>
<td>Dean, International Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, Henry</td>
<td>Dean, University Libraries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the QEP Implementation Team, four campus subcommittees were developed to respond to suggestions by the SACS On-Site Review Committee. These subcommittees represent the University’s Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City and Global Campuses (including eCampus). The chairs of these subcommittees sit on the QEP Implementation Team to provide clear channels of communication between the main QEP governance group and the University’s various stakeholders throughout its widespread campus and site locations.

Dothan Campus Subcommittee:
- Dr. Alan Belsches, Subcommittee Chair and Associate Dean, Arts and Sciences
- Dr. Gary Manfready, Assistant Professor of Biology
- Dr. Robin Bynum, Associate Professor and Associate Dean, Education
- Mr. Chris Shaffer, Director, Library Services
- Mr. Jerry Taylor, Dothan Student Government Association President
- Dr. Don Jeffrey, Campus Vice Chancellor

Montgomery Campus Subcommittee:
- Dr. Fred Beatty, Subcommittee Chair and Associate Dean, Arts and Sciences
- Dr. Kirk Curnutt, Professor and Chair, English
- Dr. Anthony Rhee, Professor and Associate Dean, Business
- Mr. Kent Snowden, Director, Library
- Mr. Dan Tennimon, Coordinator, Institutional Effectiveness
- Dr. Annette Allen, Associate Professor and Chair, Sociology
- Dr. Dennis Self, Associate Professor, Business
- Dr. Lynn Boyd, Assistant Professor, Education
- Ms. Ashanta Young, undergraduate Business major
- Ms. Monique Hill, undergraduate Education major
- Ms. Ashley Hicks, undergraduate History/Political Science major
- Mr. Ray White, Campus Vice Chancellor

Phenix City Campus Subcommittee:
- Dr. Cherie Fretwell, Subcommittee Chair and Professor and Chair/Business
- Dr. Iris Saltiel, Associate Professor of Education
- Dr. Isabelle Warren, Assistant Professor and Chair, Education
- Dr. Jack Miller, Director of Distance Learning
- Ms. Sherry Alifarhani, Director of Information Technology
- Ms. Cecelia Spivey, Coordinator of Academic Support
- Dr. Curtis Pitts, Campus Vice Chancellor
Global Campus/eCampus Subcommittee:

- Dr. Deb Gearhart, Subcommittee Chair and Director of eCampus
- Dr. Jay Hurwitz, Lecturer
- Dr. Paige Paquette, Lecturer
- Dr. Jonthan Harrington, Associate Professor
- Dr. Andrew Heller, Assistant Professor
- Dr. Mike Fieldler, Assistant Professor
- Dr. Tammy Esteves, Assistant Professor
- Ms. Deanna Koepke, Site Director, Western Region
- Mr. Stan Small, undergraduate major
- Dr. Christine Burge, Director/Atlantic Region
- Dr. Philip Gray, Director/Pacific Region
- Dr. David White, Director/Southeast Region
- Dr. Earl Ingram, Vice Chancellor of Global Campus

Broad-Based University Involvement in Selection of QEP Topic

Following the preliminary selection of the QEP topic, the Dean of First Year Studies presented the proposal to a wide array of University stakeholders. In most instances, stakeholder presentations were completed as part of the final deliberative process regarding the topic selection and formal drafting of the original QEP. In other instances, stakeholder presentations were made as part of the University’s decision to inform and involve as many individuals as possible prior to the final approval of the Plan by SACS. Based on the responses by these groups to the presentations listed below, there is a clear pattern of stakeholder support for the QEP topic.

Academic Steering Committee: March 18, 2008

- This committee serves the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost with a membership of all major academic officials at the University, including college deans, associate provosts, Dean of University Libraries, Dean of First Year Studies, University Registrar, and campus vice chancellors for Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City and Global Campus. Additionally, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE well as the Dean of Enrollment Management regularly attend and participate in ASC meetings.
The Chancellor of Troy University and His Cabinet: April 2008

- The Chancellor of the University is responsible for all aspects and activities of the University. The Chancellor reports to the Board of Trustees, the governing body of the University. The Chancellor’s Cabinet is the chief advisory council for the Chancellor. Its members consist of the four Senior Vice Chancellors (Academics, Student Services/Administration, Business/Financial Services, and Advancement/External Relations) as well as the Director of Athletics and other University officials. The Dean of First Year Studies presented the proposed QEP topic to the Chancellor on April 1, 2008. On April 23, 2008, the Chancellor briefed his Cabinet about the proposed topic that was endorsed by the Cabinet and recommended for Board of Trustees’ approval.

Faculty Council: April 29, 2008

- This group, now known as the Faculty Senate, represents the entire University faculty. Elected faculty representing all colleges and campuses serve on the Senate (Appendix I).

Troy University Board of Trustees: May 1, 2008 and July 25, 2008

- The Board of Trustees governs the University in all matters external and internal in accordance with prescribed and appropriate policies for such governance. In May 2008, the Dean presented the QEP topic proposal which was endorsed by the Board. In July, the Dean presented specific information regarding the Common Reading Initiative for the upcoming year; this presentation was also enthusiastically received by the Board (Appendix K).

Troy University Leadership Conference: May 22-23, 2008

- This conference, which is held annually, brings together upwards of 200 University leaders from its faculty, staff and administrator ranks. These individuals represent all University campuses and locations, including those in Global Campus and eCampus.
Student Government Association: April 7, 2009

- This organization represents, via elected members, the students at Troy University. In response to the Dean’s presentation on the QEP topic, the SGA passed a resolution of support (Appendix J).

College of Arts and Sciences; Sorrell College of Business; College of Communication and Fine Arts; and College of Health and Human Services: March 27-April 20, 2009

- These four colleges, along with the College of Education, are the organizational structure for the University’s faculty and undergraduate/graduate curricula. Faculty in these colleges deliver the undergraduate curriculum. Faculty representing the colleges serve on all University standing committees. University faculty, representing the five colleges, will also serve as members of the four Faculty Development Teams.

In summary, Troy University had broad-based stakeholder involvement and support in the development of its QEP topic. The QEP implementation will be guided by an Implementation Team, representing faculty, staff, students and administrators from the University’s Troy, Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City, and Global Campuses.
In this section of the Plan, the institution describes its three sets of outcomes, the specific measures that will be used to assess these outcomes and the process to be used for institutional review and follow-up once that assessment has been completed.

The QEP has three sets of outcomes that will be assessed during the Plan period:

- **Student Learning Outcomes** which focus on specific accrual and application of student learning relative to reading activities;
- **Initiative Outcomes** which focus on the three QEP components of the Common Reading Initiative, the College Reading Initiative and the Faculty Development Initiative; and
- **General Program Outcomes** which focus, in a global fashion, on the University’s efforts to enhance its culture of reading through the specific elements of the QEP and through collateral elements which may be inspired by, and supportive of, a reading culture.

Each of these outcomes will be discussed in detail in the following section. A discussion of specific assessments and measures is included with each outcome.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

At the recommendation of the SACS On-Site Review Committee, the student learning outcomes for the QEP have been redefined to include the six outcomes discussed below. The QEP promotes the creation and enhancement of a culture of reading at Troy University. As such, the QEP posits that the specific initiatives of the Common Reading Initiative and the College Reading Initiative as well as the collaborative efforts associated with the Faculty Development Initiative will enhance student reading efforts. All six student learning outcomes are linked to the overall QEP goal of enhancing the University’s culture of reading. All six outcomes are articulated, supported and assessed through the two QEP
initiatives which involve book reading: the CRI and the COLRI. The Faculty Development Initiative supports these six outcomes by assessing faculty development needs, generating best practices models and creating materials (face to face and electronic) for faculty.

**Learning Outcome:**

1. **Student reading activities will result in greater reading for enjoyment, appreciation and information**

**Assessment:**

- Specific questions related to types and frequency of reading done by students will be included in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) administered to Troy University students (see Appendix L for the selected questions)
- Surveys administered to students in all CRI and COLRI classes (Appendix M). Surveys will be administered by faculty at the direction of their deans and Director of the QEP
- New Student Surveys and Graduating Senior Surveys will be administered by Office of IRPE to all new and graduating students (see Appendix L for questions to be used)

**Review and Follow-Up:**

- A baseline of student reading activities, as identified on these instruments and as directed toward the three types of reading (enjoyment, appreciation, and information) will be determined in Year One by the Director of the QEP, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE and the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the QEP Implementation Team and college deans
- A review led by the Director of the QEP in collaboration with the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership will determine if this outcome annually exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or fails to meet expectations. Specific plans for improvement will be recommended by the Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the University faculty, Faculty Development
Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership, should this outcome fail to meet expectations.

**Learning Outcome:**

2. **Student reading activities will result in enhanced perspectives and broader viewpoints.**

**Assessment:**

- Specific questions related to students’ self-reported changes in perspectives and viewpoints due to reading will be included in the NSSE administered to Troy University students (Appendix L).

- Surveys will be administered to students in all CRI and COLRI classes (Appendix M). Surveys will be administered by faculty at the direction of the Office of IRPE.

- Senior Student Survey administered by Office of IRPE to all graduating students will address perceived changes in perspectives and viewpoints due to reading activities (Appendix L). Feedback from faculty participating in Faculty Development Teams will address faculty perception of the impact of reading on students’ perspectives and worldviews.

**Review and Follow-Up:**

- A baseline of student viewpoints, as identified on these instruments will be determined in Year One by the Director of the QEP, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE and the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the Implementation Team and college deans.

- A review led by the Director of the QEP in collaboration with the QEP Implementation Team and its subcommittee on Assessment, University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership will determine if this outcome annually exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or fails to meet expectations. Expectations are that an enhanced culture of reading will also broaden student perspectives and
worldviews. Specific plans for improvement will be recommended by the Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership, should this outcome fail to meet expectations.

**Learning Outcome:**

3. Student reading activities will result in greater engagement with others and greater understanding of others’ positions

**Assessment:**

- Specific questions related to students’ self-reported awareness of their/ others’ positions (politically, socially, etc) will be included in the Senior Student Survey administered by the Office of IRPE to all graduating Troy University students (Appendix L).

- Total number of student participants in CRI and COLRI book discussion groups. The Director of the QEP will solicit and summarize the student participation data based on faculty-staff (discussion leader) reports. (See Appendix N for example of this reporting form).

- Surveys will be administered to students in all CRI and COLRI classes (Appendix M). Surveys will be administered by faculty at the direction of the Office of IRPE.

- Faculty analysis of student writing assignments in classes where CRI and COLRI books are discussed. The Director of the QEP will solicit summarized information from faculty regarding writing assignments.

**Review and Follow-Up:**

- A baseline of student engagement and student awareness of others’ positions (socially, politically, culturally), as identified on these instruments will be determined in Year One by the Director of the QEP, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE and Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the QEP Implementation Team and college deans.
• A review led by the Director of the QEP in collaboration with the QEP Implementation Team and its subcommittee on Assessment, the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership will determine if this outcome annually exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or fails to meet expectations. Expectations are that an enhanced culture of reading will generate more student engagement with others and increase student sensitivity to others’ positions. Specific plans for improvement will be recommended by the Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership, should this outcome fail to meet expectations.

Learning Outcome:

4. Student reading activities will result in greater discernment and critical/analytical judgment

Assessment:

• Specific questions related to students’ self-reported awareness of their critical thinking judgment will be included in the NSSE administered to Troy University students (Appendix L).

• Student response forms with specific questions related to CRI and COLRI books (Appendix M). These forms will be administered by the faculty in classes where the CRI and COLRI books are specifically discussed. The response forms will be sent to the Director of the QEP.

Review and Follow-Up:

• A baseline of student discernment and critical judgment, as a result of reading activities, and as identified on these instruments will be determined in Year One by the Director of the QEP, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE and the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the QEP Implementation Team and college deans.
• A review led by the Director of the QEP in collaboration with the QEP Implementation Team and its subcommittee on Assessment, the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership will determine if this outcome annually exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or fails to meet expectations. Expectations are that an enhanced culture of reading will result in increased student discernment and critical judgment. Specific plans for improvement will be recommended by the Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership, should this outcome not meet expectations.

Learning Outcome:

5. Student reading activities will result in enhanced writing skills

Assessment:

• Specific questions related to students' self-reported quality of their writing skills will be included in the NSSE administered to Troy University students (Appendix L).

• The Faculty Development Teams will generate and communicate suggestions to all University faculty regarding the use of reading-based writing assignments.

• Selected University faculty who use the CRI selection and who use the COLRI selection will provide summative feedback to the Director of the QEP about their analysis of the impact of these two selections on student writing skills.

Review and Follow-Up:

• A baseline of student perceptions regarding writing skills, as identified on the NSSE will be determined in Year One by the Director of the QEP, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE and the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the QEP Implementation Team and college deans

• Expectations are that enhanced reading activities will result in improved student writing skills, as observed by faculty and as self-reported by students, especially over time. A
review led by the Director of the QEP in collaboration with the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership will determine if this outcome annually exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or fails to meet expectations.

Specific plans for improvement will be recommended by the Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the QEP Implementation Team and its subcommittee on Assessment, the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership, should this outcome fail to meet expectations.

Learning Outcome:

6. Student reading activities will result in greater understanding of the connections among and between reading materials

Assessment:

- Specific questions related to students’ self-reported awareness of their ability to understand connections among their reading materials will included in the annual Senior Student Survey administered by the Office of IRPE to graduating Troy University students (Appendix L).

- Surveys will be administered to students in all CRI and COLRI classes (Appendix M). Surveys will be administered by faculty at the direction of the Office of IRPE.

Review and Follow-Up:

- A baseline of student ability to understand connections between their various reading materials, as identified in the Senior Survey, will be determined in Year One by the Director of the QEP, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE and Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies in consultation with the QEP Implementation Team and college deans.

- Expectations are that enhanced reading activities will result in improved student ability to understand connections among and between their reading materials, especially over time. A review led by the Director of the QEP in collaboration with the University faculty,
Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership will determine if this outcome annually exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or fails to meet expectations. Specific plans for improvement will be recommended by the Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the University faculty, Faculty Development Teams/Facilitator and academic leadership, should this outcome fail to meet expectations.

**QEP Initiative Outcomes**

The QEP advances the belief that the specific initiatives of the Common Reading Initiative and the College Reading Initiative as well as the collaborative efforts associated with the Faculty Development Initiative will enhance student reading efforts. Each of these initiatives also has specific individualized outcomes and corresponding assessments and measures. These three initiatives support the overall QEP goal of enhancing the University’s culture of reading.

**Common Reading Initiative**

**Outcomes:**

1. First year students will read the CRI book selected annually
2. First year students will participate in discussion groups (face to face and electronic) regarding the CRI selection
3. Faculty and staff will participate as group leaders for the discussion groups regarding the CRI selection
4. Faculty and staff will report satisfaction or satisfaction-plus with their involvement as group leaders in the discussion groups regarding the CRI selection
5. Faculty will choose to use the CRI selection in courses other than TROY 1101, especially General Studies courses
6. Faculty and student will participate annually in CRI-related activities beyond the discussion groups and academic classes (such as TROY 1101)
7. The Common Reading Initiative will support the six QEP learning outcomes
Assessments:

- Students will complete a feedback form in TROY 1101 classes and other classes making use of the CRI book. A sample of this form can be found in Appendix D and will be provided to the faculty in these classes by the Director of the QEP.

- The number of students who participate in discussion groups will be totaled annually by the Director of the QEP based on faculty report forms.

- The total number of faculty-staff, the number of unique faculty-staff members and the diversity of faculty-staff (by rank, college, gender, ethnicity, and campus location) will be determined annually by the Director of the QEP based on discussion group matrix forms (see Appendix N for a sample).

- The Director of the QEP, with the assistance of the Office of the IRPE, will annually secure satisfaction feedback and critical reflections from faculty-staff discussion leaders.

- The Director of the QEP will annually monitor the number of non-returning faculty-staff participants for discussion groups.

- The Director of the QEP will solicit information from the University faculty, with the assistance of the college deans, regarding the faculty use of the CRI selection in courses other than TROY 1101.

- The Director of the QEP, with the assistance of the University faculty, the college deans, and the campus vice chancellors (including the Director of eCampus) will annually compile a report detailing faculty and student participation in the following:
  - enhancement/reading events (such as authors’ presentations)
  - book discussion clubs (beyond the CRI discussion groups)
  - presentation of CRI-related activities at professional conferences
  - publication of CRI-related activities in professional journals
  - other activities that suggest a clear relationship to the CRI selection
• The effectiveness of the CRI in supporting the six student learning outcomes will be assessed in the manner and methods described in the Student Learning Outcomes section above

Review and Follow-Up:

• The Director of the QEP, the Implementation Team and the college deans, with the advice and counsel of the University faculty, campus vice chancellors, the Director of eCampus, the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research and Planning, will annually assess the Common Reading Initiative on a three-part continuum: meets expectations, exceeds expectations, does not meet expectations. The Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the group identified above, will recommend annual plans for improvement for if the CRI initiative does not meet expectations.

College Reading Initiative

Outcomes:

1. Student majors in each college will read the COLRI book selected annually
2. Student majors in each college will participate in discussion groups (face to face and electronic) regarding the COLRI selection
3. Faculty will participate as group leaders for the discussion groups regarding the COLRI selection
4. Faculty will report satisfaction or satisfaction-plus with their involvement as group leaders in the discussion groups regarding the COLRI selection
5. Faculty will choose to use the COLRI selection in their classes even if their classes were not initially identified for COLRI use
6. Faculty and student will participate annually in COLRI-related activities beyond the discussion groups and academic classes
7. The College Reading Initiative will support the six QEP learning outcomes
**Assessments:**

- Students will complete a feedback form in classes using the college-specific COLRI book. A sample of this form, modeled on the CRI, can be found in Appendix D and will be provided to the faculty in these classes by the Director of the QEP.
- The number of students who participate in discussion groups will be totaled annually by the Director of the QEP based on faculty report forms.
- The total number of faculty, the number of unique faculty members and the diversity of faculty (by rank, college, gender, ethnicity, and campus location) will be determined annually by the Director of the QEP based on discussion group matrix forms, modeled on the ones used for the CRI (see Appendix N for the template).
- The Director of the QEP, with the assistance of the Office of the IRPE, will annually secure satisfaction feedback and critical reflections from faculty discussion leaders.
- The Director of the QEP will annually monitor the number of non-returning faculty participants for discussion groups.
- The Director of the QEP will solicit information from the University faculty, with the assistance of the college deans, regarding the faculty use of the COLRI selection in these additional courses.
- The Director of the QEP, with the assistance of the University faculty, the college deans, and the campus vice chancellors (including the Director of eCampus) will annually compile a report detailing faculty and student participation in the following:
  - enhancement/reading events (such as authors’ presentations)
  - book discussion clubs (beyond the COLRI discussion groups)
  - presentation of COLRI-related activities at professional conferences
  - publication of COLRI-related activities in professional journals
  - other activities that suggest a clear relationship to the COLRI selection.
• The effectiveness of the COLRI in supporting the six student learning outcomes will be assessed in the manner and methods described in the *Student Learning Outcomes* section above

**Review and Follow-Up:**

• The Director of the QEP, the Implementation Team and the college deans, with the advice and counsel of the University faculty, campus vice chancellors, the Director of eCampus, the Associate Provost/ Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research and Planning, will annually assess the College Reading Initiative on a three-part continuum: *meets expectations, exceeds expectations, does not meet expectations.* The Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the group identified above, will recommend annual plans for improvement for those colleges whose COLRI initiative does not meet expectations.

**Faculty Development Initiative**

**Outcomes:**

1. Plan and implement faculty development activities to ensure successful completion of the QEP student learning outcomes and the outcomes for the Common Reading Initiative and College Reading Initiative
2. Implement a continuous cycle of learning opportunities for faculty
3. Communicate current information regarding best practices for student reading instruction to faculty
4. Ensure optimal use of faculty development resources by coordinating college and university-wide faculty development offerings as these apply to the QEP
5. Promote faculty participation in faculty development activities
6. Promote professional development of faculty and staff as instructors and mentors
7. Coordinate the development of electronic resources to support faculty development activities as these activities and materials support the QEP
8. Faculty will participate in planned programs where they read and discuss their own books and other publications
Assessments:

- At the request of the Director of the QEP, and with the assistance of the college deans, campus vice chancellors, eCampus Director, Faculty Development Facilitator and Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies, four faculty development teams, comprised of, and led by faculty, will be created in Year One with the following foci: 1) The College Reading Initiative 2) The Traditional Student Learner-Readers; 3) Adult Learners-Readers; and 4) Online Learners-Readers.

- These four teams will generate best practices for their focus areas through research, peer interaction and student input. The teams will communicate these best practices to the University faculty through face to face, print, and electronic means.

- The teams will hold regular workshops and panel discussions for faculty throughout the University, via face to face and electronic means. These panels will be recorded with the assistance of the Department of Broadcast and Digital Network for streaming on the QEP web page.

- The teams, with the assistance of the Faculty Development Facilitator, will plan an annual University conference focused “Enhancing the Culture of Reading at Troy University”.

- The teams, with the assistance of the Faculty Development Facilitator, the Director of the QEP and the University’s academic leadership, will plan a University-sponsored national/international conference on reading for Years Four and Five of the Plan.

- The teams will provide regular and specific suggestions for assignments and related course materials as part of supporting the QEP’s six student learning outcomes.

- The teams will generate regular materials to enhance faculty involvement with the CRI and COLRI initiatives.
• The Faculty Development Facilitator will encourage and coordinate regular faculty readings of their own published materials and will provide an annual report of these activities to the Director of the QEP

• The teams, in collaboration with the Department of Information Technology and QEP officials, will develop a web-based resource center for faculty in support of the QEP goals, activities and outcomes

• Faculty Development achievements will be measured by the achievement of the six student learning outcomes noted in the Student Learning Outcomes section above.

**Review and Follow-Up:**

• The Director of the QEP, the Implementation Team and the college deans, with the advice and counsel of the University faculty, campus vice chancellors, the Director of eCampus, the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research and Planning, will annually assess the Faculty Development Initiative on a three-part continuum: **meets expectations, exceeds expectations, does not meet expectations.** The Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the group identified above, will recommend annual plans for improvement if this initiative does not meet expectations.

**QEP Program Outcomes: Enhancing the Culture of Reading at Troy University**

In addition to assessing student learning and initiative outcomes, the entire QEP program must undergo regular and recurring assessment. With regard to an assessment of the entire QEP program, the central question is “Has the reading culture at Troy University undergone positive changes as a result of the Quality Enhancement Plan?” Related questions that must be answered include specific ways in which the culture of reading at the University has shifted from its baseline condition in Year One to its condition in Year Five.
QEP Program Outcomes:

1. Students at Troy University will read more
2. Faculty at Troy University will assign more reading materials to their students
3. Troy University will develop, implement and assign more reading-intensive courses into the general studies and disciplinary curricula
4. More students will engage in peer discussions about common reading materials
5. More students will engage in student-faculty engagement over common reading materials
6. More academic departments/units will initiate common reading experiences for their specific groups of students
7. There will be more manifestations of a reading culture at the University

Assessments:

- In Year One, an external reviewer, recommended by the Director of the QEP in consultation with the QEP Implementation Team, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, the college deans, campus vice chancellors, Director of eCampus, the Faculty Development Teams, Faculty Development Facilitator and Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies, will be retained by the University to provide a baseline assessment of the University’s culture of reading. In addition, the University officials/groups noted above will prepare a University report independent of the external reviewer’s assessment that will address the same general question. The Director of the QEP will coordinate the compilation of the University’s baseline assessment report.

- In Years Three and Five, an external reviewer, selected through the process described above, will render an assessment of the University’s reading culture. The Director of the QEP and University officials/groups, in the process described above, will prepare their own assessment of the University’s reading culture for comparative purposes with the external report.
• The Office of IRPE annually will administer to a stratified sample of University students the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) with attention to the following questions (See Appendix L):
  • Number of non-required books read, as reported by students
  • Level of engagement in discussion of ideas from readings with other students outside of class
  • Level of engagement in discussion of ideas from reading with faculty or others (non-students) outside of class
  • Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length materials as course requirements
  • Time spent preparing for classes (including time spent reading)
  • Writing clearly and effectively
  • Thinking critically and reflectively
• The Office of IRPE, with the assistance of the college deans, annually will report the number of non-textbook readings required by faculty in their classes. This data will be collected using the Reading Utilization Survey found in Appendix O. This data will be summarized by college and level of course and will be retained for year-over-year analysis.
• The Faculty Development Teams in collaboration with the Faculty Development Facilitator and the college deans will determine a baseline number of existing University courses that are operationally defined as “reading intensive”. The teams and individuals will determine this operational definition with the assistance of the Director of the QEP, the Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE and the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies.
• The Office of IRPE, with the assistance of the college deans, annually will survey each college to determine the number of reading-intensive courses by college, department and level of course. This data will be retained for year-over-year analysis.
• In the baseline of Year One, each academic department/unit will be surveyed by the Director of the QEP, with the assistance of the college deans, to determine how many
departments/units currently have a common reading experience for their majors. This survey will be repeated annually for year-over-year comparisons.

- The Director of the QEP, with the Implementation Team and the University faculty and academic leadership, annually will assess the number and type of collateral University activities that promote reading but which are outside of the three specific initiatives comprising the QEP.

- The Director of the QEP in consultation with the QEP Implementation Team, University faculty and University academic leadership, will assess the annual and end state of institutionalization for the CRI, COLRI and FDI. In a year-over-year analysis, the Director of the QEP will offer a current state of the specific ways that these initiatives, their outcomes, assessment and impact, have become internalized by the University as part of the normal, regular, recurring activities of the University.

**Review and Follow-Up:**

- The Director of the QEP, the Implementation Team and the college deans, the University faculty, campus vice chancellors, the Director of eCampus, the Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research and Planning, will annually provide an overall assessment of the QEP Program Outcomes on a three-part continuum: meets expectations, exceeds expectations, does not meet expectations. The Director of the QEP, in collaboration with the group identified above, will recommend annual plans for improvement if this initiative does not meet expectations.

- On the basis of all assessments, across all outcomes and across the five year period of the Plan, the Director of the QEP, in consultation with the individuals and groups identified above, will prepare a Five Year Report according to the SACS guidelines.
Conclusion

Section Five of the QEP detailed the institution’s plan for the recurring assessment of QEP activities and outcomes with planned opportunities for improvement of those activities based on the assessments. The three major sets of outcomes (student learning, initiative and program) are linked to each other through a common goal of creating and enhancing the University’s reading culture. Further, these outcomes support the University’s mission and strategic vision and are consistent with the expectations by SACS that the institution’s QEP maintain a focus on student learning.
The Troy University Quality Enhancement Plan was the product of concentrated strategic thinking about how the institution’s learning environment, and especially the learning of its students, might be enhanced. The University’s decision to adopt a focus of Creating a Culture of Reading was a deliberate choice, reflecting the involvement and input of all major University stakeholders, including faculty, staff, students, administrators, and the Board of Trustees. University governance groups have enthusiastically endorsed the QEP topic, both formally through resolutions such as the one adopted by the Student Government Association, and informally, through the comments and discourse that has surrounded the QEP evolution over the last two years.

The QEP goal is clearly linked to the University’s mission and strategic objectives and is expected to be included in the University’s formal strategic plan of 2010-2015. The specific student learning outcomes of the QEP are also clearly linked to the overall goal and to the University’s mission. Within the Common Reading Initiative, College Reading Initiative and Faculty Development Initiative, faculty and students will be dynamically involved in building an enhanced culture of reading, that will be assessed regularly. Based on these assessments, it is anticipated that the QEP at Troy University will undergo ongoing evolution as reviews are conducted and plans for improvement are implemented.

The next five years at Troy University will be ones where a culture of reading will be supported, developed, and enriched.
The more you read, the more you know. The more that you learn, the more places you’ll go.

Dr. Seuss


To read or not to read: A question of national consequence. (2007). National Endowment for the Arts. Washington, DC: NEA.


Resources to improve teaching and learning (Monograph No. 28). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition
How well he’s read, to reason against reading! -William Shakespeare
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First Year Task Force: 2007
Dr. John Schmidt, Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Services, Chair
Dr. William Nathan Alexander, Assistant Professor of History
Ms. Eleanor Lee, Instructor and Director of Instructional Support Services
Dr. Bryant Shaw, Professor of History
Mr. Buddy Starling, Dean of Admissions
Dr. Hal Fulmer, Professor and Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dr. Jean Laliberte, Associate Vice Chancellor for Development
Ms. Donna Schubert, Associate Professor, School of Journalism
Ms. Susan Pierce, Director, Student Development/Counseling
Dr. Lance Tatum, Professor and Acting Dean, College of Health and Human Services
Ms. Barbara Patterson, Director, Student Involvement and Leadership
Ms. Teresa Rodgers, Academic Counselor, Student Development/Counseling

First Year Advisory Board: 2008-09
Ms. Eleanor Lee, Dean, First Year Studies, Chair
Dr. Maryjo Cochran, Professor and Dean, College of Communication and Fine Arts
Dr. John Dew, Associate Vice Chancellor, IRPE
Dr. Hal Fulmer, Professor and Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dr. Ed Pappanastos, Assistant Professor, Business Programs
Dr. Bill Richardson, Professor and Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Ms. Teresa Rodgers, Director, Student Development/Counseling
Ms. Donna Schubert, Associate Professor, School of Journalism
Dr. Bryant Shaw, Professor, History
Mr. Buddy Starling, Dean, Admissions/Enrollment Management
Dr. Lance Tatum, Professor and Dean, College of Education
Ms. Barbara Patterson, Director, Student Involvement and Leadership
Mr. Herbert Reeves, Dean, Student Services
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First Year Student Task Force
September 15, 2005
Executive Conference Room
2:30-4:30 p.m.
Agenda

1. Roll Call
2. First Year Convocation follow up items
3. START Report
4. **Summer Reading Program**
5. Consolidation of Learning Services (Eldridge Hall)
6. Next meeting scheduled for October 20 at 2:30 p.m. in Executive Conference Room
Appendix C

Instructors of English, Biology, History, and Art used *The Road* in their Fall semester 2007 classes. Below is an excerpt from a conference presentation documenting how Biology incorporated *The Road* into its introductory classes.

**Poster Presentation at Conference**

**INTEGRATED LEARNING:**
**FIRST YEAR READING INITIATIVE AND PRINCIPLES OF BIOLOGY**

*Micheal Wayne Morris, Rachael N. Koigi, and Christi Magrath*

*Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences*

*Troy University*

During the Fall Semester 2007, the Troy Campus of Troy University piloted a First Year Reading Initiative to foster integrated learning among entering freshmen. One of the goals of this reading initiative is to promote a variety of perspectives reflecting each discipline involved on a common literary work. This, in turn, is meant to sharpen the analytical skills of first year students at Troy University and to remind them that different college subjects are not to be learned in their own respective vacuums. Seemingly unrelated subjects can be integrated for a holistic approach to learning. To help accomplish this, a faculty committee chose a national bestseller about a post-apocalyptic world, *The Road* by Cormac McCarthy, to incorporate into English, art, history, University orientation, and biology classes.

Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences faculty members teaching Principles of Biology had the challenge of finding life in a “lifeless” world as described by McCarthy and sharing that discovery with their students. Biology faculty drafted questions, some of which required the students to do some research outside of class, related to *The Road* and also related to topics such as ecology, health, and biological chemistry that are traditionally taught in life science courses. Five of these questions were included on final exams after faculty had discussed specific relationships between the “biology of *The Road*” and class topics and also after the students had researched some current environmental problems in the Southeast to see how interconnected the various aspects of our natural surroundings are. One faculty member in biology had an open-ended question addressing three important biologically relevant themes in the book. Experiences of biology faculty and students conducting this exercise were presented.
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Name ________________________________________________________________
Date _________________________________________________________________

Please answer as many of the following questions as you can. Use the back of this sheet if you need additional space for your responses. Because it is very important to get your personal responses to these questions, do not answer these questions with another student, other students, or anyone else.

1. Did you read the book? Yes _____ No_____

2. Who is the author of A Lesson Before Dying?

3. What do you know about the author?

4. Where and when does the story take place?

5. Briefly summarize the plot of the novel.

6. Which character in the book most interested you and why?

7. Which two characters in the book do you believe are most alike or most different each other and why?

8. In your opinion, what is one theme (main idea) of the novel?

9. Which question would you most like to ask the author?

10. What do you believe is the greatest lesson learned in the book?

11. Why do you think this book was selected for Troy's Common Reading Initiative?

Do you have a book to recommend for next year?
Appendix E

Common Reading Initiative
Recommendation Form

The First Year Reading Initiative Common Book Selection Committee has identified several goals for the common reading:

- To engage students in the reading of a book that many will want to read from cover to cover
- To engage students in the reading of a book that many will find interesting, fun, thought provoking, easy to relate to, or better yet—all of the above
- To engage students in the classroom in lively discussions of material
- To engage students outside of the classroom in lively discussions of supplements to the book, such as movies, plays, lectures, and/or activities that stem from having read the book

Considering the above goals, please recommend one book:

1. Title:
2. Author:
3. Brief summary—three to five sentences:
4. Briefly explain how your selection will help meet the common reading goals:
5. Name of individual submitting recommendation:

Thank you.
Please return the completed form to
Eleanor Lee, Dean, First Year Studies/ elee@troy.edu
101 Eldridge Hall
1. CCFA will serve as the first college to pilot a college-wide reading initiative as part of the QEP beginning Fall semester 2009.

2. During the month of May, the dean solicited book titles from the CCFA faculty for consideration. Four books were nominated.
   - Twyla Tharpe: The Creative Habit ~ Learn it and use it for life.
   - The Element, by Ken Robinson, Ph.D.
   - Atlas Shrugged by Ayn Rand
   - The Study of the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance

3. The unit heads selected The Creative Habit and The Element as the two finalists.

4. The dean established a CCFA Common Reading Initiative Committee to select the book.
   - Music Larry Blocher & Carla Gallahan
   - Theatre & Dance Adena Moree & Chris Rich
   - Art & Design Jerry Johnson & Pam Allen (committee chair)
   - Languages Pete Howard & Jim Sherry
   - Journalism/Communication Steve Padgett & Shari Hoppin

5. The dean’s office purchased six copies of The Creative Habit & The Element for review by the committee members.

6. It was agreed that each of the five departments/schools would “host” one event associated with the College Reading Initiative during the course of the academic school year. The event could be a lecture, workshop, performance, exhibit … something that would reflect the uniqueness of each discipline and would add to the overall experience for all CCFA majors.

7. Each department will identify at least one academic class that will require use of the book during the course of the semester. It is important that the faculty involved at this level CHOOSE to incorporate the book rather than feel forced to use it. Faculty “buy-in” is a key ingredient for the success of this project.

8. The CCFA Common Reading Initiative Committee will meet by July 1st to discuss and vote on the 2009-2010 book. At that time, the committee will also discuss strategies for using the book; potential projects and a time-line for implementation. The committee will also discuss assessment of the project.

9. One the final choice has been made, the dean will send both a hard-copy letter and an email to all CCFA majors including any transfer or entering freshmen who have declared fine arts as their major. The letter sent by Dr. Roach to incoming freshman for the 2008 reading initiative will serve as the model.

10. We expect to send out this letter by mid-July so students can purchase the book and read it before the fall semester begins.
# Implementation Timeline

The timeline which follows documents in table form the various QEP activities in Years One through Five. The timeline also notes the key individuals involved in each of the various elements in support of the three major initiatives (CRI, COLRI, FDI).

## Year 1 – 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Persons/Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Common Reading Initiative (CRI) will move from its pilot phase to full implementation. The CRI Book Selection Committee will have selected the book and informed the faculty, staff and student body by April 2009.</td>
<td>QEP Director, Book Selection Committee of CRI, FYS Staff, QEP Implementation Team, Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees (Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City, Global Campus, eCampus), TROY 1101 Faculty, Faculty in selected General Studies courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College Reading Initiative (COLRI) will be piloted in the College of Communication and Fine Arts on the Troy Campus. A faculty committee in the CCFA will select a common book to be read by all CCFA majors and used in CCFA classes and discussion groups.</td>
<td>QEP Director, Dean/College of Communication and Fine Arts, CCFA COLRI Selection Committee, CCFA Chairs and Faculty, QEP Implementation Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An external consultant will be retained to generate a baseline assessment of the culture of reading at Troy University. This consultant will provide a written report and meet with key University officials (including the QEP Implementation Team) as part of his/her assessment activities.</td>
<td>QEP Director, Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research, Planning and Evaluation (IRPE), Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Faculty Member assigned to support QEP faculty development, QEP Implementation Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of four faculty-led teams to develop best practices models and development activities for the Faculty Development Initiative. Initiation of development activities for Year One through work of Faculty Teams and Faculty Development Facilitator. All development activities will include both on-site and electronic resources.</td>
<td>QEP Director, Faculty Development Facilitator, Four Faculty Development Teams, Office of IRPE, QEP Implementation Team, Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees, Director, eCampus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural enhancement activities, including bringing the CRI author to the Troy Campus; discussion roundtables and coordination of CRI book with specific campuses’ activities; use of technology to link other campuses to CRI author. Also, cultural activities linked to discussion groups to examine the CCFA COLRI book.</td>
<td>QEP Director, QEP Implementation Team, QEP Campus Subcommittees, Dean/College of Communication and Fine Arts, Chairs and Faculty/CCFA, Broadcast and Digital Network Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of QEP learning outcomes and objectives; assessment of specific CRI, COLRI, and Faculty Development activities and outcomes; assessment of University reading culture.

- Office of IRPE
- Testing and Assessment Subcommittee of the QEP Implementation Team
- Dean/CCFA
- Chairs and Faculty/CCFA
- TROY 1101 Faculty
- Faculty who used the CRI book
- QEP Director
- Chairs of QEP Campus Subcommittees
- QEP Implementation Team
- Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Annual review of the QEP with report prepared for Academic Steering Committee, Chancellor’s Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Student Government Association, and Board of Trustees.

- QEP Director
- QEP Implementation Team (including Chairs of Campus QEP Subcommittees)
- Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE
- Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
- Dean/College of Communication and Fine Arts
- Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2 – 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The CRI Book Selection Committee will have selected the book and informed the faculty, staff and student body by April 2010. | - QEP Director  
- Book Selection Committee of CRI  
- FYS Staff  
- QEP Implementation Team  
- Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees (Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City, Global Campus, eCampus)  
- TROY 1101 Faculty  
- Faculty in selected General Studies courses |
| The College Reading Initiative (COLRI) will be piloted in all five colleges with a common book selected by each college for its majors, with college specific COLRI activities, and with college specific COLRI assessment. | - QEP Director  
- Deans of the five colleges  
- Associate Deans, Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
- COLRI Faculty Selection Committees for each of the five colleges  
- Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
- QEP Implementation Team |
| Development initiative activities for faculty will be conducted based on recommendations of Faculty Development Teams and assisted by Faculty Development Facilitator. All activities will include both on-site and electronic resources. Initiation of a University conference on “Enhancing A Culture of Reading” for faculty, staff and students. | • QEP Director  
• Faculty Development Facilitator  
• Four Faculty Development Teams  
• Office of IRPE  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• Director, eCampus |
| Cultural enhancement activities, including bringing the CRI author to the Troy Campus; discussion roundtables and coordination of CRI book with specific campuses’ activities; use of technology to link other campuses to CRI author. Bringing COLRI authors to the University’s campuses, via on-site or through technology. Also, cultural activities linked to discussion groups as part of COLRI books. | • QEP Director  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
• Broadcast and Digital Network Dept |
| Assessment of QEP learning outcomes and objectives; assessment of specific CRI, COLRI, and FDI activities and outcomes; assessment of University reading culture. | • Office of IRPE  
• Testing and Assessment Subcommittee of the QEP Implementation Team  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
• TROY 1101 faculty  
• Faculty who will use the CRI book  
• QEP Director  
• Chairs of QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies |
| Annual review of the QEP with report prepared for Academic Steering Committee, Chancellor’s Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Student Government Association, and Board of Trustees. | • QEP Director  
• QEP Implementation Team (including Chairs of Campus QEP Subcommittees)  
• Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Persons/Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The CRI Book Selection Committee will have selected the book and informed the faculty, staff and student body by April 2011. | • QEP Director  
• Book Selection Committee of CRI  
• FYS Staff  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees (Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City, Global Campus, eCampus)  
• TROY 1101 Faculty  
• Faculty in selected General Studies courses |
| The College Reading Initiative (COLRI) will be implemented in all five colleges with a common book selected by each college for its majors, with college specific COLRI activities, and with college specific COLRI assessment. | • QEP Director  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Associate Deans, by campus, of the five colleges  
• Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• COLRI Faculty Selection Committees for each of the five colleges  
• Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
• QEP Implementation Team |
| An external consultant will be retained to assess the University’s culture of reading at the mid-point of the five year QEP timeline. This consultant will provide a written report and meet with key University officials (including the QEP Implementation Team) as part of his/her assessment activities. | • QEP Director  
• Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
• Faculty Member assigned to support QEP faculty development  
• QEP Implementation Team |
| Faculty development initiative activities for faculty will be conducted based on recommendations of Faculty Development Teams and supported by the Faculty Development Facilitator. All activities will include both on-site and electronic resources. Holding of annual University conference on “Enhancing A Culture of Reading” for faculty, staff and students. | • QEP Director  
• Faculty Development Facilitator  
• Four Faculty Development Teams  
• Office of IRPE  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• Director, eCampus |
| Cultural enhancement activities, including bringing the CRI author to the Troy Campus; discussion roundtables and coordination of CRI book with specific campuses’ activities; use of technology to link other campuses to CRI author. Bringing COLRI authors to the University’s campuses, via on-site or through technology. Also, cultural activities linked to discussion groups as part of COLRI books. | • QEP Director  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
• Broadcast and Digital Network Dept |
Assessment of QEP learning outcomes and objectives; assessment of specific CRI, COLRI, and FDI activities and outcomes; assessment of University reading culture.

- Office of IRPE
- Testing and Assessment Subcommittee of the QEP Implementation Team
- Deans of the five colleges
- Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges
- TROY 1101 faculty
- Faculty who will use the CRI book
- QEP Director
- Chairs of QEP Campus Subcommittees
- QEP Implementation Team
- Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Annual review of the QEP with report prepared for Academic Steering Committee, Chancellor’s Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Student Government Association, and Board of Trustees.
In addition, a mid-term report will be prepared and presented to these University’s groups as well.

- QEP Director
- QEP Implementation Team (including Chairs of the Campus QEP Subcommittees)
- Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE
- Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
- Deans of the five colleges
- Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

### Year 4 – 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Persons/Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The CRI Book Selection Committee will have selected the book and informed the faculty, staff and student body by April 2012. | QEP Director  
Book Selection Committee of CRI  
FYS Staff  
QEP Implementation Team  
Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees (Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City, Global Campus, eCampus)  
TROY 1101 Faculty  
Faculty in selected General Studies courses |
| The College Reading Initiative (COLRI) will continue in all five colleges with a common book selected by each college for its majors, with college specific COLRI activities, and with college specific COLRI assessment. | QEP Director  
Deans of the five colleges  
Associate Deans, by campus, of the five colleges  
Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
COLRI Faculty Selection Committees for each of the five colleges  
Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
QEP Implementation Team |
| Faculty development initiative activities for faculty will be conducted based on recommendations of Faculty Development Teams with support of the Faculty Development Facilitator. All development activities will include both on-site and electronic resources. Through leadership of faculty teams, holding of University-sponsored regional conference on reading. | • QEP Director  
• Faculty Development Facilitator  
• Four Faculty Development Teams  
• Office of IRPE  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• Director, eCampus |
| Cultural enhancement activities, including bringing the CRI author to the Troy Campus; discussion roundtables and coordination of CRI book with specific campuses' activities; use of technology to link other campuses to CRI author. Bringing COLRI authors to the University's campuses, via on-site or through technology. Also, cultural activities linked to discussion groups as part of COLRI books. | • QEP Director  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
• Broadcast and Digital Network Dept |
| Assessment of QEP learning outcomes and objectives; assessment of specific CRI, COLRI, and FDI activities and outcomes; assessment of University reading culture. | • Office of IRPE  
• Testing and Assessment Subcommittee of the QEP Implementation Team  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Chairs and Faculty of the five colleges  
• TROY 1101 faculty  
• Faculty who will use the CRI book  
• QEP Director  
• Chairs of QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies |
| Annual review of the QEP with report prepared for Academic Steering Committee, Chancellor's Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Student Government Association, and Board of Trustees. | • QEP Director  
• QEP Implementation Team (including Chairs of the Campus QEP Subcommittees)  
• Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Persons/Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The CRI Book Selection Committee will have selected the book and informed | • QEP Director  
| the faculty, staff and student body by April 2013.                      | • Book Selection Committee of CRI  
|                                                                          | • FYS Staff  
|                                                                          | • QEP Implementation Team  
|                                                                          | • Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees (Dothan, Montgomery, Phenix City, Global Campus, eCampus)  
|                                                                          | • TROY 1101 Faculty  
|                                                                          | • Faculty in selected General Studies courses                                                  |
| The College Reading Initiative (COLRI) will continue in all five colleges | • QEP Director  
| with a common book selected by each college for its majors, with college  | • Deans of the five colleges  
| specific COLRI activities, and with college specific COLRI assessment.     | • COLRI Faculty Selection Committees for each of the five colleges  
|                                                                          | • Associate Deans, by campus, of the five colleges  
|                                                                          | • Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
|                                                                          | • Faculty of the five colleges  
|                                                                          | • QEP Implementation Team                                                                    |
| An external consultant will be retained to assess the University’s culture| • QEP Director  
| of reading at the conclusion of the five year QEP timeline. This consultant | • Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE  
| will provide a written report and meet with key University officials      | • Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
| (including the QEP Implementation Team) as part of his/her assessment     | • Faculty Member assigned to support QEP faculty development  
| activities.                                                              | • QEP Implementation Team                                                                    |
| Faculty development initiative activities for faculty will continue       | • QEP Director  
| through the leadership of the four faculty development teams and the      | • Faculty Development Facilitator  
| support of the Faculty Development Facilitator. All activities will       | • Four Faculty Development Teams  
| include both on-site and electronic resources. Through faculty teams’    | • Office of IRPE  
| leadership, University will hold second annual regional conference on     | • QEP Implementation Team  
| reading.                                                                 | • Chairs, QEP Campus Subcommittees  
|                                                                          | • Director, eCampus                                                                        |
| Cultural enhancement activities, including bringing the CRI author to the  | • QEP Director  
| Troy Campus; discussion roundtables and coordination of CRI book with    | • QEP Implementation Team  
| specific campuses’ activities; use of technology to link other campuses  | • QEP Campus Subcommittees  
| to CRI author. Bringing COLRI authors to the University’s campuses, via  | • Deans of the five colleges  
| on-site or through technology. Also, cultural activities linked to        | • Faculty of the five colleges  
<p>| discussion groups as part of COLRI books.                                | • Broadcast and Digital Network Dept                                                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assessment of QEP learning outcomes and objectives; assessment of specific CRI, COLRI, and FDI activities and outcomes; assessment of University reading culture. | • Office of IRPE  
• Testing and Assessment Subcommittee of the QEP Implementation Team  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• QEP Director  
• Chairs of QEP Campus Subcommittees  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Faculty Development Teams  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies |
| Annual review of the QEP with report prepared for Academic Steering Committee, Chancellor's Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Student Government Association, and Board of Trustees. | • QEP Director  
• QEP Implementation Team  
• Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
• Deans of the five colleges  
• Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost |
| Five year QEP report prepared for SACS.                                                                                                               | • QEP Director  
• Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE  
• Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
• Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost |
MEMORANDUM

To: Eleanor Lee, Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan
From: Ed D. Roach
Date: September 9, 2009
RE: Confirmation of institutional budget for QEP

This memo confirms Troy University’s support for the implementation of its Quality Enhancement Plan to Create a Culture of Reading for the institution. The following annual and cumulative budget has been approved and ready for your use in support of QEP activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>$138,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>$158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>$159,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>$160,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$780,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any specific QEP budget-related questions, please direct them to Dr. Vardaman’s attention. If I can assist with any QEP issues, please let me know.

Best wishes for success as you and your colleagues launch this exciting University initiative.

cc: Dr. Lee Vardaman, Associate Provost for Academic Support
Dr. Hal Fulmer, Associate Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Dr. John Dew, Associate Vice Chancellor for IRPE
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http://stars.troy.edu/troy_websiteafc.html

from the Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting
Wallace Hall-Troy Campus
April 29, 2008
3:02 pm

4. New Business
   a. Dr. Eleanor Lee, Dean of the Office of First Year Studies, explained the new Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The plan is part of the SACS reaffirmation for accreditation and attempts to enhance student learning by providing a carefully designed and focused course of action. The implementation of the Plan will take approximately five years. Chancellor Hawkins placed the QEP within the Office of First Year Studies because he sees the need to begin the learning enhancement from the first day a student enters Troy University. The First Year Advisory Board reviewed many proposals for the QEP. It is currently focused on the topic of “Creating a Culture of Reading.”
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TROY UNIVERSITY
STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN SAID, "ONCE YOU LEARN TO READ, YOU WILL BE POURVREV PORE." (Frederick Douglass), Troy University's Student Body truly understands the importance of reading. We know that to be successful, one must master the skill of reading and understanding; AND

WHEREAS, Troy University's Quality Enhancement Plan, Creating a Culture of Reading, has been thoroughly presented to the student body. We believe that Troy University has the ability and resources to create a culture of reading. From the common reading initiative piloted, to the implementation of this plan from our various academic college faculty members. Now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, THAT WE THE TROY UNIVERSITY STUDENT BODY recognize and understand the importance of our university's Quality Enhancement Plan; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE TROY UNIVERSITY STUDENT BODY SUPPORTS THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN, CREATING A CULTURE OF READING. WE STAND READY TO ACCOMPLISH THE GOALS SET FORTH, AND GIVE THANKS TO THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION FOR PROMISING YEARS AHEAD.

Given Under This Authority of the
Student Government Association of Troy University on the 12th Day of April, 2008

Tim Pars
President
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http://www.troy.edu/boardoftrustees/minutes/Minutes_for_May-01-2008.pdf

From the Minutes
BOARD OF TRUSTEES’ MEETING
May 1, 2008 -- 1:30 p.m.
Trojan Center Ballroom, Troy University Campus
Troy, Alabama

The Troy University Board of Trustees met at 1:30 p.m. on May 1, 2008, in the Trojan Center Ballroom on the Troy University Campus in Troy, Alabama.

Chancellor Hawkins provided highlights of two presentations that will be made at today’s meeting—Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) by Dean Eleanor Lee and the Global Campus presentation by Dr. Earl Ingram.

Dr. Hawkins took this opportunity to share exciting developments in our QEP. He said that the QEP’s main objective is to enhance the quality of education at the university and will focus on reading.

C. Board Committee Reports
   Academic Affairs Committee, Honorable Gerald Dial
Mr. Dial called upon Dean Eleanor Lee to report on the QEP.

   • QEP Presentation
Dean Lee said that the QEP is a component of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation that affirms our commitment to enhancing the quality of higher education and to the proposition that student learning is at the heart of Troy University’s mission. The QEP describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue related to enhancement of student learning. Dean Lee added that the QEP should complement TROY’s ongoing integrated institution-wide planning and evaluation process. She said that SACS expects strong institutional support for the QEP. In development of TROY’s QEP, Dean Lee said that a First Year Advisory Board was tasked with helping develop the QEP topic—Creating a Culture of Reading. Also, town hall-type meetings were conducted with students, faculty, and staff earlier this year. Goals for the Creating a Culture of Reading program include building on the pilot common book experience to make it a cornerstone of the academic experience for all TROY undergraduate students…. Dean Lee addressed how the project will be assessed and talked about the broad support the Quality Enhancement Program has received across the university from the Student Government Association, the Faculty Council, the Academic Steering Committee, and the Chancellor’s Cabinet. Dean Lee advised that a QEP Implementation Team will be established and will develop a full document that will be submitted to SACS in January 2009. She noted that the SACS on-site team will review the plan in April 2009. Dean Lee concluded her presentation by stating that the QEP supports TROY’s Vision 2010 strategic initiative on student centeredness. According to Dean Lee, the university’s expectation is that this program will appeal to perspective freshmen and their parents and will help increase enrollment of full-time students. It is also expected that the program will help further enhance retention of full-time traditional-age students as well as support our intent to provide students from southeast Alabama with a broad international perspective.
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The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The university has data from before the implementation of the QEP that will serve as baseline data for comparison with student responses that will be acquired during the course of the QEP. This provides an indirect measure that is both longitudinal and comparative to other institutions.

Questions in the NSSE relevant to the university’s QEP include:

1. Frequency of coming to class without completing readings and assignments.
2. Discussion of ideas from readings or classes with faculty members outside of class.
3. Discussion of ideas from reading or classes with others outside of class.
4. Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings.
5. Number of books read on the student’s own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment.
6. Time spent preparing for class (including time spent reading).
7. Writing clearly and effectively.
8. Thinking critically and effectively.

New Student Survey and Senior Student Survey

Both the new student survey and the graduating student survey have been modified to ask students the same set of questions regarding their reading.

Students will be queried on:
1. Frequency of reading.
2. Reasons for reading.
3. Reading ability.
4. Types of reading.
5. Volume of reading.
6. Preferred genre of reading.
7. How often reading is discussed with others.

Specifically, students will be asked the following new questions on these surveys for annual and cumulative assessment purposes:

Please indicate your level of involvement in reading using the following scale:

Not at all   In a very limited way   Somewhat   In a noticeable way   Greatly

- My involvement in reading as part of my college experience has enhanced my ability to understand connections between the various materials I read.
- My involvement in reading as a part of my college experience has enhanced my awareness of other people’s political and social viewpoints.
Which statement below do you agree with most?
- I read constantly for my own personal satisfaction, and I love it.
- I don't have much time to read for pleasure, but I like to when I get the chance.
- I only read what I'm supposed to for school.
- I basically don't read books much at all.

Most often, the reason I read is… (Please choose the best answer from this selection).
- Just for the pleasure of it
- Because I have to for school
- Because I get bored and have nothing else to do
- To learn new things on my own
- I don't really read much
- Because my parents encourage me to

How would you rate your reading level?
- Advanced
- Above average
- Average
- Below average
- Poor

Which of the following do you read? Check all that apply.
- Books assigned for class
- Books I read outside of class for pleasure
- Cereal boxes, instructional pamphlets and other product packaging
- Comic books or graphic novels
- Computer manuals or other electronic equipment manuals
- Fashion/Beauty magazines
- Magazines about video games
- Music/Computers/Entertainment magazines
- News magazines
- Newspapers
- Online websites or webzines
- Puzzles/Games/Humor magazines
- Religious literature/books
- School papers or other newsletters
- Self-help literature
- Sports magazines
- None of the above

Not including school assignments, how much do you read?
- Outside of school assignments, I don't read at all
- Under one book per month
- One book per month
- 2-3 books per month
- 3-5 books per month
- 5-10 books per month
- 10-20 books per month
- More than 20 books per month
About how often do you discuss books with others?
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- A few times per year
- Once per year
- Never

Which statement below do you agree with most?
- I read constantly for my own personal satisfaction, and I love it.
- I don't have much time to read for pleasure, but I like to when I get the chance.
- I only read what I'm supposed to for school.
- I basically don't read books much at all.

Most often, the reason I read is... (Please choose the best answer from this selection).
- Just for the pleasure of it
- Because I have to for school
- Because I get bored and have nothing else to do
- To learn new things on my own
- I don't really read much
- Because my parents encourage me to

How would you rate your reading level?
- Advanced
- Above average
- Average
- Below average
- Poor

Which of the following do you read? Check all that apply.
- Books assigned for class
- Books I read outside of class for pleasure
- Cereal boxes, instructional pamphlets and other product packaging
- Comic books or graphic novels
- Computer manuals or other electronic equipment manuals
- Fashion/Beauty magazines
- Magazines about video games
- Music/Computers/Entertainment magazines
- News magazines
- Newspapers
- Online websites or webzines
- Puzzles/Games/Humor magazines
- Religious literature/books
- School papers or other newsletters
- Self-help literature
- Sports magazines
- None of the above
Not including school assignments, how much do you read?
- Outside of school assignments, I don't read at all
- Under one book per month
- One book per month
- 2-3 books per month
- 3-5 books per month
- 5-10 books per month
- 10-20 books per month
- More than 20 books per month

About how often do you discuss books with others?
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- A few times per year
- Once per year
- Never
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For surveying students in classes using CRI and COLRI books

Directions: As part of Troy University’s Quality Enhancement Plan to Create a Culture of Reading, please complete the following questions as they relate to the Common Reading Initiative/College Reading Initiative book which you have read in this class this semester. This is an anonymous survey and all answers will be aggregated for review. If you have questions about this survey, please ask your instructor. There is no penalty for not completing this survey. Thank you for your time and participation.

Current Semester: ________________
Your major: ________________________
Your classification (circle one): Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior
Title of this course: ________________
Campus/Site Location where this course was taught: ________________
CRI/COLRI book read: ___________________________________________  

For each of the following questions, please rank your responses on the following five-point scale:


1. Based on the CRI/COLRI book I have read this semester and the class discussions about this book, I am now reading more than I did before this class

   __________________________

2. Based on the CRI/COLRI book I have read this semester and the class discussions about this book, I believe I have broader viewpoints about people and events

   __________________________

3. Based on the CRI/COLRI book I have read this semester and the class discussions about this book, I am engaging in more conversations about reading with other people

   __________________________

4. Based on the CRI/COLRI book I have read this semester and the class discussions about this book, I believe I have a greater understanding of other people and their beliefs

   __________________________

5. Based on the CRI/COLRI book I have read this semester and the class discussions about this book, I believe I have a greater discernment and critical judgment about other materials I am reading

   __________________________

6. Based on the CRI/COLRI book I have read this semester and the class discussions about this book, I have made conscious connections between this book and other materials I am reading or have read

   __________________________
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Evaluation of Group Discussion
(to be used for CRI and COLRI Group Discussions)

Name of Discussion
Leader:_______________________________________________________

Date and Location of
Discussion:___________________________________________________

Number of
Participants:__________________________________________________________

Were students prepared for the
discussion?__________________________________________________________

How would you rate the success of the discussion?

_____5 (Outstanding)  _____4 (Very Good)  _____3 (good)  _____2 (Fair)  _____1 (Poor)

Please explain your rating.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Additional Comments:
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READING UTILIZATION ASSESSMENT SURVEY

This survey will be completed annually by all University faculty members for each course they teach. The survey will be developed and administered by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness.

Demographic information will include specifics for each course, course level, and delivery origin (campus, site, online) allowing for segmented analysis.

Questions:

- Amount of text book reading assigned
- Amount of online reading assigned
- Number of articles to be read and reviewed
- Number of books to be read
- Number of short papers to be written (< ten pages)
- Number of intermediate papers to be written (10 – 19 pages)
- Number of long papers to be written (20 pages or more)
- Amount of time students spend in class discussing readings in groups