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TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Dear Dr. Cuevas:

As President of Texas Tech University, I am very proud to submit our innovative Quality Enhancement Plan for your review. Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society is the result of two years of university-wide planning and development that reflects our long-term commitment to improve student learning and faculty development. It is our goal to prepare students for the challenges and rewards of thriving in an increasingly interconnected world, and our QEP supports this point and, indeed reinforces our commitment “to student success by preparing learners to be ethical leaders for a diverse and globally competitive workplace,” as our mission statement establishes.

Enriching the multicultural environment of Texas Tech University is a key element of our institutional Strategic Plan. Indeed, international student recruitment and enhanced student Study Abroad opportunities have become top priorities for the university at large and within many schools and colleges. We are also deeply committed to increasing student communication skills and welcome the enrichment of our Writing Intensive course requirement with an expansion to include other vital forms of communication. With a focus on curriculum and faculty development, this QEP provides TTU with the opportunity to engage in a rigorous five-year plan helping undergraduates develop the communication skills to engage dynamically in our global society. We are eager to begin the process of refining the strategies necessary to sustain high-quality student learning over the long-term.

The Office of the President and the Office of the Provost of Texas Tech University will ensure that QEP resources are consistently made available, that assessments are conducted and analyzed, and that our campus is informed of the QEP’s process on a regular basis. We are confident Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society will have a major impact on our students, our faculty, and the local community.

Thank you very much for the attention you are giving to the Texas Tech University reaffirmation of accreditation process. I look forward to your on-site visit and engaging in a probing discussion of our QEP and its promise.

Sincerely,

M. Duane Nellis
President, Texas Tech University
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Executive Summary:

*Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society* is a five-year Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) designed to improve the communication skills and global awareness of Texas Tech University (TTU) undergraduate students.

The result of a broad-based, campus-wide effort, this QEP represents the collective voice of Texas Tech University faculty, staff, students, and stakeholders, all of whom joined in the process of collecting or contributing to the decision-making process. Also included in the process was the review of assessment report data, internal program review reports, and national and in-house surveys (Chapter 1). The result of this effort allowed the campus to reach a consensus that TTU undergraduates need more instruction on ways to improve their communication skills as well as more instruction and training to understand their place in an increasingly interrelated world. Given that our current instruction at the upper division only requires writing, there is understandably more discussion given to that particular form of communication. However, it is our intent to ensure that our students receive instruction in additional forms of communication in their major. To that end, this QEP has identified two specific goals:

1) TTU students will *develop* communication skills in a variety of media that are appropriate to their disciplines and *focus* on developing them within a global context.

2) TTU students will successfully *apply* these communication skills in a range of situations with audiences, both local and global.

The QEP goals also align with the new Texas Core Curriculum objectives that include attainment of communication skills as part of every core course. The SLOs that have been developed to meet these goals demonstrate our understanding that acquiring and honing skills in both communication practices and global awareness takes a longitudinal effort by both students and faculty.

**SLO1:** Students will create works (which may be written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal) that demonstrate essential communication skills.

**SLO2:** Students will demonstrate global awareness and knowledge through the written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal communication warranted by individual disciplines.

**SLO3:** Students will produce work that communicates in a culturally informed and appropriate manner, using multiple lenses and perspectives with diverse groups and individuals about timely global issues.

The Learning Activities (Chapter 3) have been designed to support the SLOs and are embedded in two specific TTU undergraduate requirements:

- The three-hour Multicultural Course requirement
- The six-hour Writing Intensive Course (WI) requirement, currently being changed to include other forms of communication and renamed the Communication Intensive Course (CI) requirement, effective Fall 2015
Executive Summary continued...

Through a series of development opportunities, selected faculty will participate in a guided process of integrating a communication component into a majority of the diverse courses comprising the Multicultural Course curriculum, while others will increase their understanding of and strategies for increasing the amount of writing and assignments involving other forms of communication into their Communication Intensive courses. Faculty members who teach one of the Multicultural Courses will apply to become Global Communication Fellows (GCFs). Likewise, faculty who are interested in teaching a Communication Intensive course will apply to attend CI Course Revision Workshops or CI Course Development Workshops.

To coordinate the curricular changes, training opportunities, and assessment activities of the QEP, the university is establishing the Center for Global Communication (CGC). The Center will be staffed by a full-time Program Director, a full-time Associate Director with a split FTE of 0.50 faculty and 0.50 staff, a full-time Administrative Assistant, and one part-time graduate student. CGC staff will report to the Associate Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs and work closely with the Office of Planning and Assessment and subject matter experts on campus to develop and implement the most meaningful tools for measuring QEP student learning outcomes (Chapter 4 details all assessment plans).

To create more instructional support for these curricular revisions, the university is also establishing the Communication Tutoring Center (CTC). It will be housed in the College of Media and Communication and staffed by a full-time Director, a Unit Coordinator and three part-time graduate students. The CTC will complement the TTU Writing Center by providing tutoring sessions for students who wish to receive supplemental instruction in their oral presentations and visual and multimedia projects.

Texas Tech University has made a substantial financial commitment to this QEP (Chapter 5). An average of approximately $700,000 will be devoted annually in support of this project for faculty development stipends, workshop developers and facilitators, graduate student assistants, and support staff. Moreover, it will fund the important work of the Center Global Communication Director, who will be charged with the coordination of this project. Finally, it will fund the Director of the new Communication Tutoring Center and its tutors and staff.

In summary, Texas Tech University has developed *Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society* as a Quality Enhancement Plan that demonstrates institutional capability for initiating, implementing, completing, and assessing this enriched learning opportunity. Through a broad-based involvement of university constituencies, we have identified clear goals and a plan for assessing achievement of these goals. We are confident we will improve undergraduate communication skills and global awareness through these revisions to essential course requirements. We are also confident that this initiative will reverberate far beyond the QEP to become a dynamic part of the campus community.
Introduction:
The Mission Statement of Texas Tech University is a succinct declaration that sums up the charge of our university, and it is the belief of all of those who have contributed to this proposal that the second sentence of this statement explains the focus of this Quality Enhancement Plan—Bear our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society.

Known as the “Hub City,” Lubbock, Texas, at a population of approximately 240,000, is the 11th most populous city in Texas. Located in West Texas in an area known as the Llano Estacado, Lubbock serves as the regional hub of government, economy, health care, and education. But even as the hub, Lubbock is isolated, located 338 miles from the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex and 318 miles from Albuquerque, New Mexico. Despite its geographic isolation, one of Lubbock’s primary purposes has been to connect, whether it’s connecting cotton growers with other growers, buyers, and researchers around the world or exploring and harnessing the potential of alternative green energies through the activities of Texas Tech University’s National Wind Institute.

This QEP fulfills our charge from Core Requirement 2.12, to identify “key issues emerging from institutional assessment” and to focus on “learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution.” While teaching students essential communication skills is a commonly accepted, if sometimes unspoken, obligation of any institution of higher education, we well understand that our responsibility has expanded due to the QEP topic TTU has selected. Because students will be part of an increasingly complex web of global interactions, our graduates need to be able to communicate effectively. Furthermore, to be effective leaders and workers—whether in government, health care, industry, information services, education, or anything else—our graduates need to be globally aware. By global, we speak metaphorically in that no matter the geographical locale of any human, they are always already interconnected. Thus, “global” for the purposes of our QEP refers to communication and interaction among different groups, including those identified by culture, gender, religion, or other distinguishing characteristic. “Communicating” refers to the development, transmission, and understanding of information in any mode—written, digital, oral, visual or aural. As either the author or audience, it is important for our students to produce, read, understand, and evaluate ideas and knowledge for any situation. Our plan, which combines the goals of growing students’ communication skills and preparing students to participate thoughtfully and effectively in a global workforce, is admittedly ambitious, but one that we feel well-prepared to enact in this QEP. It is with these urgent needs in mind that we offer the following Quality Enhancement Plan for Texas Tech University (2016-2020).
Chapter 1:
Topic Identification and Development

Reaffirmation Team Six
Texas Tech University began the process of developing its second QEP in December of 2012. At that time, the Office of the Provost appointed a special team of faculty members and staff to serve as Reaffirmation Team Six. Their charge was to establish a process for organizing the development of Texas Tech University’s new Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). To ensure a broad-based investigative unit, Reaffirmation Team Six was composed of representatives from a wide variety of university disciplines, and included the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Campus Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casadonte</td>
<td>Dominick</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td>Wes</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Judi</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>OPA Staff Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louder</td>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Ethics Center (Team Leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Theatre and Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsoneault</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>College of Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Reaffirmation Team Six Members

The leader of Team Six, Justin Louder, led the campus Ethics Center, which was established as part of the university’s first and very successful QEP Do the Right Thing: A Campus Conversation on Ethics (2005-2010). By choosing Louder as the Team Six leader, the Office of the Provost sought to establish a pattern of continuity with a deliberate membership overlap from one team to the next throughout the QEP selection and development process. The Office of the Provost also sought to ensure that QEP development reached out to the broad university community for fresh minds and eyes by expanding representation from various campus constituencies at each stage of the QEP process.

Following the official Reaffirmation Kick-Off in March of 2013 and the SACSCOC Reaffirmation Orientation in June of 2013, Reaffirmation Team Six made official recommendations for organizing the QEP selection and development process that included establishing the Topic Selection Committee (TSC). The TSC was charged with reviewing institutional data and other salient information and recommending the QEP topic for improving student learning outcomes (SLOs).
**QEP Topic Selection Committee**

The Topic Selection Committee rooted its investigations solidly in the 2010-2012 Texas Tech University Strategic Plan to: 1) Increase Enrollment and Promote Student Success, 2) Strengthen Academic Quality and Reputation, 3) Expand and Enhance Research and Creative Scholarship, 4) Further Outreach and Engagement, and 5) Increase and Maximize Resources. The TSC was also guided throughout its investigations by the mission statement of the university:

As a public research university, Texas Tech advances knowledge through innovative and creative teaching, research and scholarship. The university is dedicated to student success by preparing learners to be ethical leaders for a diverse and globally competitive workforce. The university is committed to enhancing the cultural and economic development of the state, nation and world.

The Office of the Provost expanded campus representation to the Topic Selection Committee by adding members from student organizations, nine out of the ten colleges, two schools, the Library, and academic support offices, while maintaining some members from the Reaffirmation Team Six for continuity. Members were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>College Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bard</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Teaching Academy (CHAIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burris</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>College of Agricultural Sciences &amp; Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casadonte</td>
<td>Dominick</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedden</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariani-Smith</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>College of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale</td>
<td>Mitzi</td>
<td>College of Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphry</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>College of Media and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borst</td>
<td>Stefanie</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinaldo</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Rawls College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purinton</td>
<td>Marjean</td>
<td>Honors College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Peyton</td>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnello</td>
<td>Mary Frances</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huff</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Staff Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killough</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Office of the Provost (Ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsoneault</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Office of the Provost (Ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Assessment (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louder</td>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>TTU Ethics Center (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Topic Selection Committee Members
In July of 2013, three representatives of the newly constructed Topic Selection Committee attended the SACSCOC Summer Institute and returned to share information they gathered from presentations regarding QEP development. Their first opportunity to share that information occurred on August 15, 2013. From those conversations, the TSC determined that the new QEP should focus on undergraduate enhanced learning goals and the topic should serve as a beacon for enrichment of courses throughout the undergraduate curriculum.

The TSC was able to accomplish its task of choosing a topic for the second QEP in a three-month period. During this time, TSC members reviewed years of learning assessment and other data concerning student achievement at Texas Tech. The TSC also disseminated surveys, convened discussion groups, and solicited individual feedback from faculty, staff, students, and shareholders throughout the university community concerning the enhancement of student learning. In a concerted effort to establish transparency in the development process, the TSC posted its activities on the QEP Development webpage (www.depts.ttu.edu/provost/qep), making summaries of data and information available to the entire campus community and those at extended teaching sites. The Topic Selection Committee met formally four times, recommending a topic at its final meeting on October 10, 2013.

**Topic Identification**

Using the data and feedback from around the campus, the TSC was able to narrow down a rather long list of possible topics to three during the official meeting on Thursday, September 12, 2013. The three topics that emerged and seemed to garner the most support via both data and expressed concern around the campus were: **Writing, Globalization, and Diversity**. TSC members then took these three choices back to their colleges, schools, and other campus constituencies for review and feedback.

Prior to the committee’s third meeting, which took place on September 26, 2013, TSC members reviewed written responses from a broad range of the campus community, including the College of Human Sciences, the College of Arts & Sciences, the College of Media & Communication, the College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources, the College of Engineering, the School of Law, as well as the University Career Center, the Division of Undergraduate Education & Student Affairs, and Academic Advising. The responses helped refine the topics under consideration. For example, many suggested that, while writing was important, the larger issue of communication, including writing, speaking, seeing, and listening, would be more germane to student needs. At the same time, the topic of globalization was mentioned at a rate close to if not equal to writing/communication. Finally, several responses suggested combining communication with globalization as the optimal way to enhance the student learning environment at Texas Tech University. (See Appendix A for full text of the written responses to suggested QEP topics.)

By the end of the third official meeting of the Topic Selection Committee, the members had reached a strong consensus. The committee decided to combine communication with globalization for the Texas Tech University Quality Enhancement Plan. Following another round of queries and comments from university constituencies, at their fourth meeting, members of the TSC unanimously selected the topic: Communication in a Global Society for the Texas Tech University second QEP.

**Realizing the Academic Necessity for this Project**

Texas Tech leads the statewide cohort of eight universities identified by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board as potential “Tier One” institutions, one of only two of those universities that has met all the criteria to receive special funding from the National Research University Fund (NRUF) monies set aside to cultivate those institutions. During the past four years, the university has raised its aspirations to become “more AAU-like,” including increasing expectations for student achievement. But recent results from the administration of the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) tests in Math, Science, and Writing show that, while
TTU undergraduate students perform slightly above the national norms in Science and Math, they remain at the national norms in Writing. National norms are no longer an adequate benchmark for an institution poised to join Texas’ three existing research universities: The University of Texas at Austin, Texas A&M University, and Rice University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>TTU Sample Mean</th>
<th>SD2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>61.56</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62.18</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-1.395</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: 2013 CAAP Writing Scores

TTU has administered the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) since 2007, with annual administration for three years. Beginning in 2009-2010, the CLA has been administered every other year. As TTU has gained experience in administering the CLA (CLA+ beginning in 2013), the way in which students are selected for participation has changed; in turn, this change may have led to a difference in how results accumulate, as well as how conclusions are drawn about the relative “value added” gain students experience during their college careers. For example, the 2013-2014 CLA+ results reveal that Texas Tech students are “proficient,” and that results are “near” the national expectation – showing that, while TTU students are currently holding their own nationally, there is certainly room for improvement. Generally, the CLA and CLA+ indicate that TTU students perform at or near the national norms, but – as with the CAAP results – “average” is not part of the aspirational goal-setting for Texas Tech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2013-2014*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Near Expected</td>
<td>Near Expected</td>
<td>Near Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Near Expected</td>
<td>Near Expected</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Recent CLA & CLA+ Scores

TTU uses the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to measure student attitudes concerning their level of engagement in their college experience. The NSSE has been administered locally every odd-numbered year since 2005. Generally, the mean for TTU student responses tends to fall at or just below the means for other Southwest public institutions, others in the TTU Carnegie class, and all NSSE responses for a given year, but there are some notable exceptions in recent years.

The 2011 mean comparisons, for example, show that, when viewed within the contexts of those three larger cohort groups, TTU students rated significantly below the mean in writing clearly and effectively, speaking clearly and effectively, thinking critically and analytically, understanding yourself, understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds, and contributing to the welfare of your community. TTU students were below the three cohort means on such activities as the number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings completed, number of books read on your own (not assigned), and number of written papers or reports (all three categories depending on paper length). Seniors tended to vote less frequently in local, state, or national elections than others in the three larger cohorts. Both first-year students and seniors tended to devote less time to preparing for class and using computers in academic work than their peers in the three comparison groups. In 2011, they studied less, read less, wrote less, did less homework, did less lab work, analyzed less data, rehearsed less, and were just simply less engaged in academic activities than their peers in the three larger cohort groups.
In 2013, Texas Tech first-year students were slightly above the mean when compared with the three NSSE cohort groups (Southwest public, Carnegie class, and all NSSE 2013) when engaging in “discussions with diverse others,” while TTU seniors were at about the mean for the three cohort groups in the 2013 NSSE sample. This represents a loss, as first-year students ranked at or above the mean in all three categories for the same set of items. Both first-year students and seniors at TTU in 2013 were less likely to have included diverse perspectives in their learning, and did not perceive that they had learned something that changed the way they understood an issue or concept as frequently as any of their peer groups. They were less likely to have examined the strengths and weaknesses of their own views on a topic or issue or to have tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from a different perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First Year Student/ Senior</th>
<th>TTU</th>
<th>Southwest Inst.</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>NSSE Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c. Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48**</td>
<td>49**</td>
<td>51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52**</td>
<td>51**</td>
<td>56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. Had discussions with people from a race or ethnicity other than your own.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73--</td>
<td>70--</td>
<td>70--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76**</td>
<td>72--</td>
<td>72--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72--</td>
<td>73--</td>
<td>73--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76**</td>
<td>75--</td>
<td>74--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c. Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68--</td>
<td>68--</td>
<td>68--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72**</td>
<td>69--</td>
<td>70--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d. Had Discussions with people with political view other than your own.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71--</td>
<td>70--</td>
<td>70--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73**</td>
<td>72--</td>
<td>72--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: 2013 NSSE Scores and Comparisons to Peer Institutions

* Higher than comparison group
** Lower than comparison group
-- No difference with comparison group

In addition to administering nationally-normed assessment instruments, Texas Tech uses a number of local assessments. One of these, the Online Senior Assessment (OSA) (http://www.depts ttu edu/opa/assessment/osa_landing.php), is used to assess outcomes in the general education curriculum, and specifically, in the state-mandated core curriculum. The OSA includes seven items related to the multicultural course that is a required part of the TTU general education curriculum but is not actually a part of the statewide mandated core. The other additional general education requirement at TTU, the completion of two upper-level Writing Intensive (WI) courses within the major, is not assessed as part of the OSA.
The two most recent administrations of the Online Senior Assessment took place in 2010 and 2013. Results of items pertaining to the multicultural course requirement showed that, in 2010, about three quarters of TTU students completed their multicultural course at TTU, while about one fourth of students transferred credit for the course or were awarded credit through dual credit or examination. By 2013, the number of students taking the multicultural requirement while in residence at TTU decreased slightly, to a little more than 70 percent. Approximately 20 percent fulfilled the requirement through transfer credit or examination. In 2010, approximately three percent of TTU seniors were uncertain how their multicultural credit had been earned, but this number rose to around eight percent in 2013.

Overall, among the 2010 cohort of seniors, those who had completed their multicultural course at TTU answered all seven questions correctly at a considerably higher rate than students who had brought their multicultural credit with them from somewhere else. Otherwise, results for those two groups were fairly similar. In 2013, female students, older students, students with higher SAT/ACT scores, and students with higher GPAs tended to score better on the multicultural section of the Online Senior Assessment, but no other results were notable. Ultimately, both academic assessment data and NSSE information show that TTU students generally meet but seldom exceed means or norms among peer institutions in most areas assessed.

A review of these periodic university assessment tools adds to the evidence that TTU students could profit from increasing their proficiency in writing and multicultural awareness. While Texas Tech does not administer any specific local assessment of communication skills, it has begun to develop such tools in response to the recent statewide changes to the required core curriculum.

**A Confluence of Events in Support of the Topic**

In addition to the results described above, other timely factors have recently converged to support the TSC in the selection of the QEP topic. Newly appointed Texas Tech University President, M. Duane Nellis, challenged the university to think of ways that would enhance global engagement and expand outreach through the TTU Worldwide eLearning initiative. On a similar timetable, revisions to the Texas Core Curriculum were prepared for implementation in the Fall semester of 2014. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board implemented a revised 42-semester credit hour (SCH) Texas Core Curriculum, with six new core objectives that include attainment of Communication Skills as part of every core course.

Yet another event that occurred in this same 2014 semester was that the TTU Department of Political Science gained approval for a new Bachelor of Arts in Global Studies, a degree program that will be implemented during the next year. Likewise, both the College of Architecture and the College of Engineering added initiatives combining improved student learning in communication skills within the context of an ever-growing global society. Undergraduates in these Colleges must fulfill an international requirement, either through study abroad or projects that increase global awareness. Given this confluence of events, which include data-collection, campus-wide discussions and written responses, a synergistic set of circumstances formed to support the Texas Tech University QEP topic selection.
QEP Topic Development Committee

After the Topic Selection Committee reached a consensus that Communication in a Global Society would be the topic for Texas Tech University’s second QEP, the Topic Development Committee (TDC) was formed. To maintain continuity, some members from the TSC remained to serve on the TDC, and membership was expanded to include a stronger student voice and more faculty members with an expertise in writing, communication, and global initiatives. TDC members were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>College Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnello</td>
<td>Mary Frances</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borst</td>
<td>Stefanie</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>College of Media and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillis</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>University Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>TTU Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justyna</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Center for Active Learning and Undergraduate Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>College of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Jobi</td>
<td>Cross Cultural Academic Advancement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyers</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>College of Agricultural Sciences &amp; Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramirez</td>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roach</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>College of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>College of Architecture (CHAIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurgeon</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Honors College and Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valle</td>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>Aliza</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbow</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Honors College (Ex Officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsoneault</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Office of the Provost (Ex Officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Jennifer S</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Assessment (Ex Officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Assessment (Ex Officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Assessment (Ex Officio)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>College Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cliatt</td>
<td>Regine</td>
<td>College of Media and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmann</td>
<td>Paige</td>
<td>Rawls College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhung</td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Topic Development Committee Members
On November 21, 2013, the QEP Topic Development Committee met for the first time with the charge to create a viable plan that would culminate in a draft of the QEP proposal. After a second meeting of the entire group on February 6, 2014, members of the TDC were divided into “Task Forces” on March 5, 2014, to begin close consideration of the elements of the proposal. The five task forces were 1) Rationale for the Topic, 2) Literature Review, 3) Identification of TTU Resources, 4) Constituent Identification, and 5) Student Learning Outcomes. Each of these groups met virtually or face-to-face one or more times in March and April. Deliverables from these groups included an early draft of the proposal’s literature review, a list of TTU resources that could be leveraged in support of the QEP, a list of constituents to survey regarding aspects of the QEP topic, and a preliminary list of SLOs/Project Goals. The task forces ended their formal work at the beginning of the summer although individual members continued working on aspects of the proposal. Throughout the spring 2014 semester, the TDC examined historical data from recent administrations of standard assessment instruments, sponsored a series of broad-based surveys and collected undergraduate curricular and program data to help gain a greater understanding of the needs and current resources available in communication and global awareness at Texas Tech University.

Student Attitude Assessment: Customizing the CAAP
In early 2014, the TDC realized the need to better understand how our students perceived themselves as global citizens. We also wanted to understand how they perceived their own preparedness. To that end, the TDC administered a series of targeted questions as part of the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) tests. Students answered queries concerning their confidence levels as members of a global workforce and as communicators

![Student Attitude Assessment: Customizing the CAAP](image)

Figure 1: TTU Student Confidence as Global Citizens
in a global society. A total of 1,023 responses represent an approximate 4 percent stratified sampling of Texas Tech University students by college. Notably, confidence levels were high. Over 80 percent of the students who responded, regardless of classification, reported feeling moderately to completely confident in their ability to communicate in a global society, while between 72 percent (freshmen) and 83 percent (seniors) felt moderately to completely prepared for the global workforce.

The question concerning a student’s sense of place yielded a more problematic response. When asked, “With what group do you feel the most connected,” 80 percent of freshmen identified their home state or a smaller region. Seniors also identified with the same regions at 73 percent. Of these students, during their freshmen through junior years, an average of 16 percent focused on their university; that number rose to 24 percent their senior year, while the rest either identified their hometown, region of the state, or the state. Very few felt most connected to the nation or to other countries, a result that is not that surprising but does indicate an opportunity for student learning enhancements in developing an interest and sensitivity to different ways of doing things.
Almost 60 percent of the entire undergraduate student population in 2013 came from within 300 miles of Texas Tech, from within Texas, a state that has a strong and abiding sense of style and identity that can sometimes lead to cultural myopia and professional limitations. The more TTU undergraduates can be encouraged to recognize, respect, and celebrate cultural variations inside and outside the United States, the better prepared they will be to embrace the challenges of the global marketplace. The Topic Development Committee noted the results of this survey in its ongoing efforts to define student learning outcomes (SLOs).

In terms of demographics, TTU’s Fall 2013 Online Fact Book shows that approximately 66 percent of freshman applicants were admitted and approximately 37 percent of all admitted freshmen actually enrolled. Among those freshmen who did enroll, about 22 percent were among the top ten percent of their high school graduating class and therefore admissible by law into any Texas public institution of higher education. Sixty-three percent of the 2013 freshman class was white; about 21 percent was Hispanic, and 7 percent was Black non-Hispanic. Undergraduates are overwhelmingly Texan. Only 1 percent of undergraduates came from farther than 500 miles away from Lubbock. The vast majority of undergraduate students are traditional college age. In the fall of 2013, almost 90 percent of undergraduates were between the ages of 18 and 24.

**Internal and External Priority Assessments**

In the Spring of 2014, the Development Committee also sponsored two broadly distributed surveys to internal and external shareholders to help evaluate a set of priorities for enhancing student communication skills and global understanding. The surveys asked participants to rank a variety of potential learning activities as “very, some, or not very” important. The TDC customized these surveys to gain perspective from two broad audiences. One was addressed to students, faculty, and staff at TTU. The other was addressed to a wider group, including alumni, employers, parents, caregivers, spouses or other close relatives of TTU students, and persons with an interest in TTU or Texas higher education.
The results of both the internal and external surveys yielded the same emphasis from the list of educational priorities for success in the workplace: Priority #1, Writing and Speaking effectively (98%); Priority #2, Listening skills (95%); Priority #3, Ability to work and communicate with others of varied cultural backgrounds (80%), Priority #4, Ability to create, use, and understand visual communication (73%).

**Priorities from External Constituencies**

(3608 total respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responses indicating Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing &amp; Speaking Effectively</td>
<td>3538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Skills</td>
<td>3434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Work and Communicate with People from varied backgrounds</td>
<td>2885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create, use and understand visual communication</td>
<td>2622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Student Learning Priorities from External Stakeholders

**Priorities from Internal Constituencies**

(1996 total respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Moderate Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop Communication Skills in the Classroom</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise Visibility of Importance of Communication in and out of the classroom</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augment opportunities for students to have meaningful int’l experiences</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer faculty development opportunities to improve communications/global awareness instruction</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Student Learning Priorities from TTU Students, Faculty, and Staff
To obtain additional information from administrators around campus, Associate Vice-Provost Catherine Parsoneault and Chair Gary Smith attended the April 1, 2014 President’s Breakfast for Progress. This is a series of breakfasts held several times each semester by the President to discuss various issues with College and Department Administrators as well as representatives from the President’s office and the Provost’s office. Chair Smith presented the attendees with a list of four questions for each table to discuss and provide ideas and comments.

1. To what extent is there a need for Texas Tech University to emphasize the improvement of student learning regarding communication through implementation of a Quality Enhancement Plan?

2. To what extent is there a need for Texas Tech University to emphasize the improvement of student learning regarding global competence through implementation of a QEP?

3. The QEP Committee is trying to identify curricular and co-curricular resources at TTU that may be useful as the project is developed. What programs or resources can you identify that already exist at Texas Tech University to support a QEP emphasizing communication in a global society?

4. To what extent might this QEP theme contribute to equipping our students to become leaders in a globally competitive workforce, which is a goal emphasized in the TTU mission statement?

The collected responses overwhelmingly supported the selected Topic. (See Appendix B for full text of responses)

Getting the Word Out and Refining Our Understanding of Student and Faculty Practices

To continue our information campaign, in Summer 2014, we introduced a Twitter campaign, with the hash tag #bearourbanners, to all entering students during their Red Raider Orientation visits to the campus. The phrase “bear our banners” comes from the Texas Tech Matador Song, composed by Texas Tech band director, Harry Lemaire, with lyrics by R.C. Marshall, the editor of the Texas Tech yearbook La Ventana. All Study Abroad students and faculty members were also invited to participate. Many students and faculty tweeted photos of themselves wherever they found themselves in the world as the summer continued.

At the New Student Convocation on September 9, 2014, we distributed lapel buttons featuring the letters “QEP” and made additional efforts to inform the campus throughout the semester, culminating with the first annual Autumn Festival where TDC members were joined at our booth by students from the Honors College and the College of Arts and Sciences to help spread the word about the QEP. We distributed information cards and T-shirts imprinted with the QEP logo as we gathered survey data from undergraduates to determine how well informed they perceive themselves to be regarding awareness and understanding of international events. These paper surveys were also distributed to students at the Student Union Free Speech Area, the Library, and traversing Memorial Circle. The paper survey was also administered to a large Geography course section. Online surveys were offered through the following organizations: The Student Government Association, President Select Students, and the Greek Organization Leadership Council, plus faculty members from Civil Engineering, College of Business, College of Media and Communication, Honors College, College of Human Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, and College of Education. Over 1,200 Texas Tech students completed our World Events Survey, with Freshmen most highly represented (402) and Juniors least represented (253).
In response to the question “How informed do you believe you are about global events,” 34 percent of TTU undergraduate students participating consider themselves “Generally Informed,” while 16 percent consider themselves “Well Informed, and 6 percent consider themselves “Very Well Informed,” giving the TDC an encouraging indication that over half of the students participating in the survey are making a concerted effort to have an awareness of global events.

In response to the question: “Where do you primarily obtain your information about these events,” results indicate that the majority of students receive their information from online sources, with Facebook in the lead and Twitter coming in a close second. Television and radio are still in the running but only with a half and a fourth of the audience, respectively, that is dedicated to Facebook.
Given the influence of Facebook and Twitter in the recent people’s movements in Iran, Arab countries, and Hong Kong, the survey data did not come as a surprise. Indeed, access to the Internet over the past two decades is the germinating seed of the information revolution and globalization, and TTU undergraduate responses substantiate this shift. For example, in the November 16, 2014 issue of The Week, the Editors offered the following statistics with the headline “The Connectivity Boom”:

**Worldwide Internet Users**: 1994: 25 million; 2004: 910 million; 2014: 2.9 billion

**2014 Percentage of Region’s Population Using the Internet**: North America: 84.9%; South America: 49.3%; Europe: 68.6%; Middle East: 44.9%; Africa: 21.3% (grown more than 50-fold since 2000); Asia: 31.7%; Australia: 67.5%

**Emails Sent Every Minute**: 204 million

**Videos Uploaded to YouTube Every Minute**: 100 hours

The article ends with the following two statistics on the state of the world: “62% of people grab their phones immediately after waking up,” and “a typical person checks his smartphone 150 times throughout the day.”

**Current Curriculum Findings on Communication and Global Awareness**

In giving voice to the concerns of our campus faculty, staff, and students we found ourselves moving in what felt like a purposeful direction. At the same time, we knew that we needed to gauge the present curricular offerings on communication and global issues. To do so, the TDC conducted a survey of academic department and college leadership and received 55 responses representing all of the undergraduate colleges. The results indicated that communication and global awareness are already issues that have been integrated into the curriculum of each college but with significant opportunities for enhancement. For example, in response to the question, “Does curriculum in your college or department assist students in getting more globally ‘connected,’” 47 percent answered “Yes, in some courses,” with 27 percent answering “Yes, in most.”

![Figure 8: Faculty on Current Global Connectivity in Curriculum](image-url)
In response to the question, “Does curriculum in your college/department prepare students for communicating in an increasingly global society,” 36 percent answered, “Yes, in some courses,” with 34 percent answering, “Yes in most.”

In response to the final question, “How well does your college or department prepare students to participate in a global workforce,” 40 percent answered, “Yes, in some courses,” with 32 percent answering, “Yes, in most.” Only from 9 percent to 13 percent in all three questions answered “Yes, in all courses.” From these survey results, the TDC was able to refine goals for supporting existing courses and enhancing SLOs throughout the institution.
Review of Current University Programs

Besides survey assessments, the TDC conducted a series of investigations of Texas Tech University programs dedicated to international studies. Texas Tech University is an institution of over 35,000 students with a strong Classical and Modern Languages and Literature Department, offering BA degrees in classical languages, French, Spanish, German, and Russian. The department also offers courses in Arabic, Italian, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese and provides a culture of internationalism in every area of departmental endeavor.

The College of Arts and Sciences, however, is the only college at Texas Tech University to require a second year of a foreign language to satisfy graduation requirements.¹ Two newer colleges spun off from Arts and Sciences have reduced the requirement or provided other options. Specifically, Visual and Performing Arts still requires a second year of foreign language for voice majors in the School of Music but does not require it of other students. Media and Communication now allows students to complete two years of foreign language or to substitute 12 SCH of courses in Media and Communication that focus on “global, international, or intercultural affairs and or study abroad.”

Besides the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Media and Communication, Architecture, and Engineering, which seek to ensure that every undergraduate student fulfills an international study requirement, the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources supports the International Center for Agricultural Competitiveness and offers opportunities for students to study abroad in Ethiopia. The Rawls College of Business Administration recognizes the importance of an international experience through the Center for Global Engagement and joins with the College of Engineering in supporting scholarships for study in Norway and the possibility of receiving the Certificate of International Entrepreneurship. Students also have the opportunity to receive The Global Scholar Certificate by participating in a study abroad program and continuing their cross-cultural learning experience when they return. Even with these programs in place and others across the campus offering students opportunities for study abroad, as of the Fall of 2013, only 3 percent of TTU students (1,048) participated in a university study abroad program.

Other curricular and co-curricular resources, including the Cross-Cultural Academic Advancement Center (CCAAC); the Teaching, Learning, and Professional Development Center (TLPDC); and the International Cultural Center (ICC), present substantial opportunities for advancing global competency among students on the campus, but, as with programs within the colleges, they lack visibility and require much more campus-wide coordination to reach the TTU student population.

In another review, the TDC examined all Spring 2014 TTU undergraduate syllabi for the presence of the terms from the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U) Global Learning VALUE rubric. Out of 1,279 undergraduate syllabi analyzed, 80 contained the word “global,” 170 contained the term “[taking] perspective,” and 102 contained the term “multicultural.” The terms “cultural diversity,” “global learning,” and “global systems” appeared in fewer than a dozen syllabi. Additionally, members of the TDC collected and analyzed syllabi from 149 Writing Intensive (WI) courses. Content analysis of those revealed that only 26 percent mentioned that the course was Writing Intensive. Only 47 percent listed one or more SLOs that

¹Some departments reported that they reduced the foreign language requirement in order to be able to retain curricular content in the discipline while staying within the 120 credit hour limit for BA degrees prescribed by the THECB.
related overtly to writing. At least one writing assignment was listed on 73 percent of the syllabi inspected, although the quality of the descriptions varied widely. Finally, discussions of what instructors termed “process” were more aptly labeled “formatting and style guidelines.”

From the results of this series of assessments, the TDC was able to confirm a broad institutional consensus for shaping the student learning outcomes in our new QEP and proceeded with the curricular structure for enhancing our graduates’ ability to communicate in an increasingly complex web of international interactions and becoming effective participants in the global workforce.

Members of the TDC also determined that the title of the QEP should reflect a strong course of action and chose to adopt the line from the Texas Tech *Matador Song,* “bear our banners far and wide” as the title of the QEP. Texas Tech band director, Harry Lemaire, composed the song in 1930 with lyrics by R.C. Marshall, the editor of the Texas Tech yearbook *La Ventana.* To this evocative university touchstone, the TDC determined that the subtitle should also be a call to action and selected the verb “Communicating” over the noun “Communication” to complete the title, *Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society.* With the revised title in place and assessments completed, the TDC proceeded with its mission of shaping the QEP into a university plan where written, oral/aural, and visual communication combined with global awareness will permeate the curriculum, de-compartmentalizing these issues and making them a vital part of campus life.

Drafting of proposal components continued during the summer, building on the task forces’ work. A preliminary draft was given to the President and Provost in early September. At the October 9, 2014 TDC meeting, following a review of that same draft that was also sent to external consultants in September, members of the TDC were divided into subcommittees. They were charged with drafting or revising components of the manuscript that would be discussed in face-to-face meetings with consultants at the end of the month. The subcommittees were charged with drafting the following areas (particular needs or points of emphasis in the subheadings):

A. Rationale
   a. Show need and provide evidence
   b. Process

B. SLOs
   a. Directly related to need

C. Learning Activities
   a. Tie to SLOs, Center moved to another chapter

D. Literature Review
   a. Add multi-cultural and international

E. Assessment
   a. Of learning activities and Center activities

F. Center for Global Communication
   a. Staffing, organizational structure, activities synergizing (curricular and extra-curricular)

G. Budget and Resources
   a. Faculty Development
   b. TTU Centers and Offices

H. Implementation and Timeline
The revised manuscript was sent to the consultants on October 25, 2014, and two days of meetings were scheduled for October 30 and 31. Following these meetings, at the consultants’ suggestion, a smaller writing group was formed to unify the draft and prepare it for final editing and production.
Chapter 2:
Literature Review

A significant amount of literature focuses on the need for college graduates to have acquired
more extensive communication skills; likewise, an increasing body of literature examines the
idea that students need to develop their multicultural awareness as they prepare to participate
in a more global society. That both concerns—communication skills and global literacy should
come together in our QEP is no accident. Given their shared dependence, that is, without
communication skills, global competency cannot be learned or practiced and without global
competency, effective communication cannot occur, both find themselves front and center of this
project and this literature review.

This literature review explores:

- The need to increase students communication skills
- Revisions to the Texas Core Curriculum
- Challenges/Best Practices for teaching communication skills
- The need to increase students’ global awareness
- Education and the global marketplace

Increasing Students’ Communication Skills
Numerous publications call for college graduates to have polished communication skills,
particularly in writing. A 2010 report from Hart Research Associates notes that of over 300
prospective employers interviewed, 89 percent said that colleges and universities needed to
place greater emphasis on students’ ability to communicate effectively (p. 3). Likewise, Kirsch
et al., in a 2007 ETS report note that shifting demographics, the information age economy, and
growth in college-related jobs that depend on communication, literacy, and numeracy are three
forces converging in the United States at this time. Those workers who possess top quintile
reading, writing, and math skills are most employable. Of those in the bottom one-fifth quintile,
only twenty percent can find work. Most recently, a 2013 Gallup/Lumina Poll noted that the top
two items that graduates needed to prepare themselves for the workforce were 1) Internships and
2) Communication/Writing skills.

Revisions to the Core Curriculum in Texas
In Texas, this message has hardly been ignored. The same concerns regarding workplace
preparedness that appear in national polls of business leaders have gained the attention of the
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). In its 2009 report, the Board called for a
reevaluation of the core curriculum because it found that “while students are generally achieving
good levels of learning in their undergraduate major discipline, their more fundamental skills –

---

2 Moran (2010) defines communication as “the sharing of information between and among humans and the systems they construct
by means of agreed-upon conventional signs, symbols, and structures” (9). All human communication systems can be defined as
media and the medium is anything in the middle such as language, writing, printing, and visuals.
including writing, reading, and critical thinking – often leave much to be desired. Many graduates
are not prepared to apply their specialized learning in the workplace or to handle tasks requiring
higher-order thinking skills” (p. 12), including writing and speaking.

That call in 2009 yielded considerable revision of the core. In 2011, the Board’s revision of
rules for the state-mandated core curriculum recognized the need to integrate context-driven
communication practice throughout the core. These revisions to the statewide core offered
new opportunities for students to establish a foundation for building their communication skills,
but honing those skills in preparation for a chosen profession will require additional study and
practice. Indeed, mastery of different types of communication may be compared to Kellogg’s
explanation of how humans gain mastery in writing. As Kellogg explains, learning to write and
to write well is not accomplished in a matter of weeks or months. Instead, it is comparable to
“becoming an expert in other complex cognitive domains” such as we might see in what he terms
“the best violinist” who has spent upwards of 10,000 hours in solitary practice to achieve that level
of expertise (p. 2).

The Challenge of Teaching Communication Skills
While the writing skills of today’s college graduates do not have to mirror that of a professional
writer, they do have to reach the third stage of expertise, wherein they engage in “knowledge-
crafting,” which means possessing the ability to coordinate the relationship between the
author, the text, and the reader, allowing them to “spontaneously engage in deep conceptual
revisions as well as surface revisions to a text to try to make certain that readers see matters
the way the author does” (p. 9). Unfortunately, as Beaufort found, college students are rarely
given the opportunity to write frequently enough to engage in “the practice of mindfulness, or
metacognition” about writing (p. 152). This is also true of oral communication. The skill to “think
on your feet” requires consistent practice to master.

Instead, students often view writing, and other types of professional communication,
a-contextually. Beaufort’s results are echoed in the 2011 AAC&U report that states, “Even
effective writing takes different forms in different fields and settings. Because competence is
always related to context, students need to work on the liberal education outcomes in their
major field(s) as well as their pre-collegiate and general studies” (p. 24). Context, then, is critical,
regardless of the genre, media, audience, or purpose of any communicative artifact.

Context, however, becomes increasingly difficult to teach, learn, and work within when we
consider how advancements in electronic media and new online communication technologies
have dramatically increased the speed and expanded the scope of creating and sharing
information. That ever-expanding scope is what we now term global, a term that in all of its
manifestations, including globalization, globalizing, globalism and so forth, is difficult to define.
No doubt this difficulty is due, in part, to the fact that each time we invoke it, our context and its
meaning shift ever so slightly. The fact that we now use terms such as “global village” to describe
how emerging media have helped people worldwide become connected in a more traditional
sense, heightens the function of context, because it now means that concepts such as religion,
trade, and migration must also be considered (Hurn & Tomalin, 2013).

Appropriate and effective consideration of these concepts, of course, depends on “the willingness
by individuals and groups to integrate acceptable cultural norms and values in a meaningful
and respectful way into their everyday lives” (Patel, F., Li, M., & Sooknanan, P., 2011, p. 6).
Indeed, it is precisely because of this ability to integrate that people from different cultural and
geographical areas can engage with each other through shared problems and values, overcome differences, and investigate solutions that context becomes such an important consideration in any communiqué (Constantinou, Richmond, & Watson, 2008). It is these conditions that bring urgency and substance to this QEP.

Texas Tech is certainly not the first university to recognize the need to prepare college students to work in a global society with a variety of media. California State University-Fullerton (2011) identified the need to train “global communicators” in establishing a global leadership certificate. The SLOs for this certification are centered on intercultural communication skills, meaning “some form of culture and some form of communication has [sic] interacted or intersected in a particular space, time and context” (Patel et al., 2011, p. 15). Achieving learning outcomes such as those identified at California State University-Fullerton requires careful planning, and part of that planning means finding effective ways to allow students to begin to understand who they are. For example, Patel et al. (2011) suggest that in addition to completing a personal self-assessment and learning how to consider setting and context, students should also practice what they term “supportive communication.” They must also develop language competencies and an appreciation toward diversity. Integrating “supportive communication” (Patel et al., 2011) will require TTU faculty to rethink, programmatically, how their curriculum does or does not enable this type of instruction and learning to take place.

Increasing Student Global Awareness

The need for global competency in the United States is well recognized. Numerous organizations have sought to increase our understanding of global interconnections, collaborations, and dialogue, as well as augment recognition of the importance of awareness, fluency, and knowledge of other cultures, other systems, and other frameworks.

As part of the Higher Education Act (HEA)–Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs, Engaging the World, U.S. Global Competency in the 21st Century serves as a stellar example of efforts to engage the U.S. public in the challenges of the modern world. Each year, it organizes a global symposium that focuses on the critical issues facing the world and the role of U.S educators, business professionals, engineers, artists, technicians, and other professionals in global dynamics. This symposium, as well as many other public forums, seeks to develop the ability of U.S citizens to move and communicate comfortably in many different global contexts. To succeed, university and college graduates today must nurture a curiosity and engagement with wider world events, and the Texas Tech University QEP seeks to offer students a variety of meaningful ways to develop a rich and constructive global awareness.

Writers in both the scholarly and popular presses have addressed the need for global literacy in an increasingly interconnected world. Academicians, professionals, state leaders, and others have emphasized the urgency of providing the skills necessary to participate in a global society and the need to understand the foundational knowledge of cultures, languages, traditions, rituals, and habits. Our planet is quickly growing into a network of interconnected cultures and connected individuals, and our teaching and learning structures must acknowledge and reflect this reality.

By developing a QEP that includes communication within a global society as curricular and co-curricular agendas, Texas Tech University will inspire students, faculty, and staff to more fully recognize the importance of global events, shared environments, developing technologies, patterns of human migration and demographic trends, epidemics and cures, as well as educational and professional opportunities and responsibilities. Bear Our Banners also
recognizes that, in the modern world, local and global may well be synonymous. This QEP focuses on offering our students the tools necessary to be truly global citizens, not just in name but in action, regardless of where they might live.

**Individual Talent in an Interconnected World**
Friedman explores the critical connection between global and local in his narrative about the discrete stages of globalization in *The World is Flat*. Among the keys to success is the ability of individuals to make themselves “indispensable” by ensuring they have learned how to remain both specialized and adaptable. Friedman quotes Vashistha, CEO of an outsourcing firm, who explains, “when your job environment is changing a lot, being adaptable is the number one thing. The people who are losing out are those with solid technical skills who have not grown those skills. You have to be skillfully adaptable and socially adaptable” (p. 239).

Andrews et al. (2014) reinforce Friedman’s claims as they discuss how this empowering of individuals to “go global” requires the development of skills necessary to function in global organizations that employ “virtual teamwork among geographically distributed workgroups” (p. 21). Such development points to the importance of being skillfully and socially adaptable. A critical consequence of Friedman’s discussion for academia is that programs in the United States must retool to assume that most, if not all, professional communication will be international. Institutions of higher learning must develop curricula to immerse and engage students in global communication throughout their academic careers and beyond (Andrews et al., p. 22).

A 2010 NEA Policy Brief, “Global Competence Is a 21st Century Imperative,” likewise notes that just as students come to college unprepared for many of the writing, oral, and visual challenges they will face, many also come ill-prepared to grow their global competence—which is now recognized as a necessity in “our increasingly interconnected and interdependent global society” (1). This brief cites several areas for improvement: international awareness, appreciation for cultural diversity, and foreign language(s) proficiency. Along with these areas, students should strive to improve their critical, creative, and innovative thinking skills to more fully participate in a global society.

As well, Gacel-Avila (2005) adds dimension to the global imperative by addressing the paradigm of globalized and globalizer, power and privilege structures that inform the ways in which we have defined, studied, and narrated discourses on global competency. She argues that, “To achieve this, however, we must reform our way of thinking: a reform that is paradigmatic and not programmatic. The development of a new consciousness—a global consciousness—among people is a key aspect of this reform, however, it requires a change in mentality, and therefore a change in educative paradigms. Educational strategies in the 21st century must begin with a common foundation, which would include the search for a standard of teaching competitive on an international level but adapted to local conditions” (p. 123).

Further complicating any discussion of the term “global preparedness” are phrases that have become mainstream, such as “global competence,” “globalization,” or “global society.” For example, Hunter, White, and Godbey (2006) surveyed over 133 representatives of colleges and universities to better understand what comprised “global competence.” Their survey indicated that one of the most significant contributors to becoming globally competent was for individuals to have “a keen understanding of his/her own cultural norms and expectations: a person should attempt to understand his/her own cultural box before stepping into someone else’s” (p. 18). They conclude that “Global competence as a concept is important because it informs the ways in which
we encourage and train people to interact with, and open themselves to, other cultures and to build the relationship capital that makes the exercise of sharp power less likely” (p. 269).

Global competence has also been defined in more active terms such as the one offered by Knight (2008) who defines globalization as “the process that is increasing the flow of people, culture, ideas, values, knowledge, technology, and economy across borders, resulting in a more interconnected and interdependent world” (p. X). Whether “global” is part of a concept, a process, or some other dimension, these definitions do have a common element: a clear connection with communication. Learning advanced communication skills will be necessary for students to successfully acquire “the knowledge, skills, and attitudes…that enable them to understand world cultures and events; analyze global systems; appreciate cultural differences; and apply this knowledge and appreciation to their lives as citizens and workers” (Olson, Green, and Hill, 2006, p. V).

Education and the Global Marketplace

Business leaders would second the notion that global awareness has not been adequately taught in college for over two decades. Zakaria (2000) examines the issue of cross-cultural training and intercultural communication competence and discusses both the need for and success of such programs. She explains that a “comprehensive literature review by Black and Mendenhall (1990) found strong evidence for a positive relationship between cross-cultural training and adjustment. In addition, a survey by Hogan and Goodson (1990) revealed that 86 percent of Japanese multinationals report a failure rate of less than 10 percent for their expatriates who have received training” (as cited in Zakaria, p. 493). This link between culture and communication is hardly new; Zakaria notes Hall’s 1959 statement that “culture is communication and communication is culture” (p. 496). More recently, according to Hovland in 2009, an AAC&U survey reported that, “[b]usiness leaders thought that colleges were underemphasizing ‘Global Issues,’ with 72% urging greater attention” to this area. As Zakaria asserts, “the issue of cross-cultural training in developing intercultural communication competence can no longer be neglected. People who are sent abroad must develop such competence in order to be successful” (p. 493).

A 2004 publication from Zakaria, Amelinckx and Wilemon further underscores the need to combine instruction in communication and global competence. They discuss this need in the context of the development of “global virtual teams.” They explain that “computer-facilitated communication technologies are only as effective as those using them. Even though information and communication technologies impact knowledge sharing, team coherence and performance, it is the human component in the virtual environment and the interactive relational bonds that facilitate or hinder the development of a shared knowledge culture and organizational learning” (p. 15). Underlying their discussion of these teams is the fact that “[t]he process of communicating is dynamic, multifaceted and complex,” (p. 17) and that cross-cultural communication adds additional layers of complexity to the process. But those skills are essential, since “[t]he preparation of global team members, individually and collectively, to effectively communicate cross-culturally is a prerequisite to successful collaboration and is as important as the team’s technological competency and skill” (pp. 23 – 4).

Meloncon (2014) echoes this difficulty. Programs such as technical communication must balance those items long considered core knowledge (rhetorical and communication theories, critical thinking, reading, writing in myriad genres) with evolving technical proficiencies (p. 186). And Jose (2014) reminds us that any addition of the global to communication curricula must be thoughtful. He writes “if globalization enacts pragmatic responses to shape programs that provide students with the skills to successfully transition into a more diverse workplace, it is also
a catalyst for spurring productive debates and reflections that involve the very core and meaning of technical communication’s practices” (p. 128). Globalization must be explored deeply and critically. Schuerholz-Lehr (2007) pushes this query even further by questioning the preparedness of our instructors in taking on this teaching mission of encouraging global literacy and the types of pedagogical training, personal experiences, and methodological approaches that must be made available to educators in order to provide a more balanced, nuanced, and complex path toward global literacy (p. 182).

Yet, productively designing and implementing an effective program that enables critical “global learning,” in all its complexity, is no easier than creating a program that enables the teaching of communication skills. In 2009, Hovland noted the following “Lessons Learned” that any institution should consider:

1) Global learning cannot be achieved at one time or in one place.
2) Global learning must take into account the developmental state of the student.
3) Global learning must be built sequentially in developmentally appropriate ways.
4) Colleges and universities need help in developing assessment tools to track the multiple expectations of global learning and to help determine the best teaching strategies for each.

Finally, Green (2013) examines how institutions implement the above lessons in *Improving and Assessing Global Learning*. She reminds readers that “[i]mproving student learning is an institutional commitment, requiring wide participation, time, and resources. Although individual faculty members and staff can be very intentional and effective in improving student learning within their particular courses or initiatives, it requires a concerted effort of many players to actually know the effectiveness of a program or activity (e.g. education abroad, general education, or the major), or judge outcomes beyond those of individual courses” (p. 6). She further explains that “[r]egardless of size or mission, the cornerstones of any academic initiative are faculty leadership, participation, and buy-in. Global learning is no exception. Faculty involvement from the outset is crucial; they must be the central architect of any academic initiative” (p. 12).

This review of the literature in both communication studies and global learning reveals a critical convergence reflected in the Texas Tech University QEP, *Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society*. Students need increased learning opportunities in both communication and global awareness, and faculty require the time and support to create the structure for successful and sustainable initiatives in both areas.
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Chapter 3:
QEP Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, and Implementation Plan

Goals
From the topic development process, we have confirmed a strong consensus throughout the university community for increasing student learning in both communication and global awareness. We have launched our QEP action plan guided by CR 2.12 requiring “a broad-based institutional process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment,” with a focus on “…learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution.” It is our commitment that Texas Tech University graduates will be able to communicate effectively within a global context, interacting with people from different cultures and responding knowledgeably to the complexities of a global society. We have established the following formal goals for QEP implementation:

QEP Goal 1: TTU students will develop communication skills in a variety of media that are appropriate to their disciplines and focus on developing them within a global context.

QEP Goal 2: TTU students will successfully apply these communication skills in a range of situations with audiences, both local and global.

QEP Student Learning Outcomes
To reach these goals, we have developed the following Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The SLOs will be applied within the two components of undergraduate general education at TTU that stand outside the state-mandated, lower-division core curriculum: the Multicultural Course requirement and the two Writing Intensive courses. Through our five-year QEP, we will enhance and expand the Writing Intensive (WI) requirement to become the Communication Intensive (CI) requirement, adding opportunities for developing oral/aural, visual, and nonverbal communication skills to the writing component in fulfilling the two-course requirement. We will also coordinate and refine the objectives of the Multicultural Course requirement to include a communication component that will reinforce the goals of our QEP to teach students the complex skills of communicating in a global society. By targeting these two requirements, we will reach all of those undergraduates who receive their bachelor’s degrees from Texas Tech.

SLO 1: Students will create works (which may be written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal) that demonstrate essential communication skills (skills and knowledge).

• We recognize the need to assess communication skills since many of our first-year students do not enter the university with the reading, writing, and thinking skills that they will need to succeed in their coursework, despite being deemed “college-ready” by other means.

• The primary stated goal of our WI Courses is to improve students’ abilities to communicate in their disciplines, but the reality of the situation is that for the 60%+ of students who do not take first-year writing at this university, the WI Courses may well be the first place where substantial writing is required of them at TTU.

• Our first outcome sets a foundation for our assessment (we have multiple rubrics to assess communication skills) and responds to that first word in our QEP—“Communicating.” Once we find that our students are demonstrating essential rhetorical skills (and rhetorical can cover ALL forms of communication), then we can assess whether they are demonstrating the knowledge/skills/behaviors needed as globally aware humans.
SLO 2: Students demonstrate global awareness and knowledge through the written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal communication warranted by individual disciplines (skills and knowledge).

- This outcome clearly focuses on the context of our QEP, “in a global society,” and can be assessed clearly via the identification of attributes of global awareness using two AAC&U VALUE rubrics that speak to this, as well as the Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (GCAA).

SLO 3: Students produce work that communicates in a culturally informed and appropriate manner, using multiple lenses and perspectives with diverse groups and individuals about timely global issues (behaviors and values/attitudes).

- This is our capstone outcome and represents what we ultimately seek in our students. They need to be competent in communication and global knowledge before they can put it together in any meaningful way. We expect to leverage a variety of the components of the AAC&U VALUE rubrics and other direct and indirect assessments as discussed in that section.

These outcomes are intended to move students from acquisition of information and skills to the integrated application of them. As either the author or audience, it is important for our students to produce, read, understand, and evaluate ideas and knowledge for any situation. Our outcomes set in motion the goals of growing students’ communication skills and preparing them to participate thoughtfully and effectively in a global workforce as our mission statement promises. Examples of these kinds of artifacts include, but are not limited to publication of writing, oral presentations to members of the university or other communities, the presentation of information in a multimedia format, or communication through dance, theatre, or music.

Our QEP will better utilize resources, including learning spaces already in existence, because of our two general education requirements: the Multicultural Course and the two Writing Intensive (WI) Courses. However, for these requirements to truly enable students to apply those skills to communicating with people of different cultures and/or lifestyles from theirs, we must place additional emphasis on both communication and awareness. Through the enactment of our learning activities, we intend that our SLOs make clear our understanding of what Kellogg, Hovland, and Green, among others, mean when they state that communication skills and global awareness take time and must be built sequentially.

TTU Writing Intensive Requirement (WI)
Each TTU degree program includes six hours of upper-division writing intensive coursework in the degree area of study. Faculty teaching courses designated as “Writing Intensive” are to:

- use writing to reinforce learning in the course
- devote class time to writing activities
- ensure a rhythm of writing assignments throughout the semester
- offer essay as well as objective exams
- personally evaluate formal writing assignments

The university commitment to the Writing Intensive requirement is an institutional acknowledgement of the importance of skillful writing in every area of personal and professional life; moreover, the courses that fulfill this requirement in each degree program must be taken in residence at Texas Tech University, including TTU distance and online courses. Exceptions to that requirement must be submitted to and approved by the Communication Advisory Committee.
By dedicating the institutional resources to teaching students to learn to write for their intended major, Texas Tech University seeks to send graduates out into the world with the writing abilities to formulate ideas, raise questions, express considered opinions, and communicate meaning to readers with clarity and fluency.

**TTU Multicultural Course Requirement**

In addition to the core requirements, TTU students must complete a three-hour designated Multicultural Course that focuses on U.S. subcultures or the cultures of other societies. Students can fulfill the Multicultural Course requirement by selecting a course from 53 options that span the undergraduate curriculum from “Introduction to Agricultural Education” to “World Dance Forms” to “Cultural Aspects of Food” to “World of Egypt and the Near East.” They can also fulfill the requirement by completing an approved Study Abroad Program, with assessments by the TTU Study Abroad Office.

Beginning in the fall of 2013, TTU changed the objectives of the Multicultural Course requirement to respond to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board core curriculum objective of social responsibility, “to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.” The objectives for the TTU Multicultural Course are:

- Students will demonstrate intercultural awareness, knowledge, and skills in written, verbal, and behavioral activities.
- Students will exhibit the ability to engage constructively with individuals and groups across diverse social contexts.
- Students will appraise privilege relations at different levels – from interpersonal, to local, to regional, to national, to international – and explain how these relationships affect the socio-cultural status of individuals and groups.

The activities that will enable students to become more globally aware and thus better achieve the above outcomes are outlined in the following section.

**Learning Activity One (LA1): Integrate Communication Activities into the Multicultural Course Requirement**

Integrating communication activities into the 53 courses that comprise the Multicultural Course curriculum will require a strong organizational structure. These courses are dispersed throughout the curriculum, as well as taught through TTU Worldwide eLearning. Further complicating implementation of LA1 is the fact that many of these 53 courses are large enrollment, high impact courses with multiple sections taught or assisted by graduate students or part-time instructors.

**LA1: Year 0 (2015)**

1) **Multicultural Course Resource Library.** As a result of the new course objectives establishing Multicultural Course requirements in 2013, the Multicultural Subcommittee of the Core Curriculum reviewed all the syllabi for courses being considered in the revised curriculum. During Year 0 (2015), the Multicultural Subcommittee will return to the issue and collect and review teaching materials and student artifacts from all Multicultural Courses, along with any syllabi that were modified to satisfy new course objectives. Teaching materials, students artifacts, and course syllabi that the Multicultural Subcommittee find exceptionally well crafted will be included, with instructor consent, in a library of materials made available to Multicultural Course teachers.
LA1: Year 1 (2016)

1) **2016 Global Communication Fellows.** We will select the first 15 instructors to be part of the QEP as Global Communication Fellows (GCFs). The cohort will include up to three instructors teaching in the TTU Worldwide eLearning Program, plus, if possible, a selection of instructors who are teaching at least one section of large enrollment/high impact courses, such as “Introduction to Sociology,” with 8 classroom sections; Multicultural America,” with 2 classroom sections and 2 distance sections; and “Art Appreciation,” with 2 classroom sections and 2 distance sections. Fellows will receive a $2,500 stipend for participating in the Global Communication Training Program (GCTP) prior to or during the semester they are teaching a Multicultural Course.

2) **Global Communication Training Program.** We will implement the GCTP through the Teaching, Learning, and Professional Development Center (TLPDC). As part of the QEP, the TLPDC will provide periodic training sessions to help the cohort of Global Communication Fellows develop instructional materials for incorporating communication components into their Multicultural Courses.

3) **2017 Global Communication Fellows (GCFs).** In the fall of Year 1 (2016), we will select a second group of 15 Fellows to participate in the GCTP during Year 2. Once again the cohort will include up to three GCFs who are teaching in the TTU Worldwide eLearning Program and some instructors who are teaching large enrollment courses.

LA1: Year 2 (2017)

1) **GCF Mentors.** The 2016 class of Global Communication Fellows will become Mentors to the 2017 class of Global Communication Fellows. Each Mentor will be paired with a new Fellow to enrich the training process and help expand awareness of the communication objectives in Multicultural Courses.

2) **Global Communication Training Program (GCTP).** The TLDPC will conduct periodic training sessions for the second cohort of GCFs and assist them in developing instructional materials for incorporating communication components into their Multicultural Courses, administering assessments of QEP Student Learning Outcomes, and serving as GCF Mentors.

3) **2018 Global Communication Fellows (GCFs).** In the fall of Year 2 (2017), we will select a third cohort of 15 Fellows to participate in the GCTP. Once again the cohort will include up to three GCFs who are teaching in the TTU Worldwide eLearning Program and some instructors who are teaching large enrollment courses.

LA1: Year 3 (2018)

1) **GCF Mentors.** The 2017 Global Communication Fellows assume the responsibility of becoming GCF Mentors to the 2018 class of Global Communication Fellows.

2) **Global Communication Training Program (GCTP).** Coordinated by the Center for Global Communication, staff from the TLPDC will conduct periodic training sessions for the third cohort of Global Communication Fellows and assist them with instructional materials for incorporating communication components into their Multicultural Courses.

3) **2019 Global Communication Fellows (GCFs).** In the fall of Year 3 (2018), we will select a fourth cohort of 15 Fellows to participate in the Training Program during Year 4. Once again, the cohort will include up to three GCFs who are teaching in the TTU Worldwide eLearning Program and some instructors who are teaching large enrollment courses.
LA1: Year 4 (2019) and Year 5 (2020)
All characteristics of Learning Activity 1 developed from 2016 through 2018 will continue during 2019 and 2020. At the conclusion of the QEP, we will have engaged 75 faculty in the process of integrating and evaluating communication assignments into their Multicultural Courses. We anticipate the success of the QEP will nurture the development of additional Multicultural Courses in the curriculum.

Learning Activity Two (LA2): Develop a Communication Intensive Curricular Component
The TTU Writing Intensive (WI) requirement, which consists of 6 SCH of coursework within students’ majors, is intended to provide undergraduates with the opportunity to grow their written communication skills in a way that is appropriate for their majors. However, a review of WI syllabi in the spring of 2014 revealed that fewer than half of the syllabi list one or more SLOs that relate overtly to writing. In addition, the university has offered little to no infrastructure for WI courses beyond a brief catalog statement and a single sheet of 10 general guidelines since the requirement was put in place. While efforts are underway to add oversight, professional development and assessment to WI courses, the university’s commitment to increasing students’ communication skills will be further bolstered by Learning Activity Two (LA2) of this QEP. Specifically, LA2 focuses on faculty development with the end goal of improving student learning in terms of both global awareness and communication skills. We believe this strategy will contribute to effecting change in the culture and attitudes toward writing and other communicative acts at the university. Such change is very important to our campus given that students can gain credit for first-year writing in at least five ways other than taking the courses at TTU and fewer than 40 percent of freshmen each year take those courses here. While we will reach that 40 percent early by integrating readings into those courses that emphasize the connections between rhetoric and global awareness, and from the fall of 2014 onward, by careful attention to the incorporation of Communication Skills as a required objective in all core curriculum courses, we can reach all undergraduates through the WI requirement, as it must be completed at TTU. We anticipate that for many of our students, especially our transfer students, that their WI courses may be one of the first times at Texas Tech University that they are required to demonstrate any form of writing proficiency. Given the complex task of teaching writing or communication in any form, additional faculty development and support is necessary; when we also ask faculty to add elements of global awareness into appropriate assignments, faculty development becomes even more critical.

Learning Activity Two entails changing the WI requirement to a Communication Intensive Requirement (CI). In 2006, the Writing Advisory Committee (WAC) was formed in the College of Arts and Sciences. Although the committee has offered workshops and has discussed best practices in writing instruction to advance understanding of these practices among some of the faculty, without broader support from the university the committee could not enact any widespread reform. As the QEP topic selection and development process occurred, though, it became clear that we have an opportunity to create the synergy needed to improve the learning experience of

---

3 Each degree program will include six hours of writing intensive coursework in the specific area of study. The fundamental objective of a writing intensive course is for students to write often and receive critical review from the course instructor. Students should be required to rewrite, based on the instructor’s critique.

The writing intensive course emphasizes the process as well as the products of writing. Faculty use writing to reinforce student learning. Students’ writing should formulate ideas, raise questions, and express considered opinions. Students’ written work should analyze, integrate, and synthesize as well as communicate (TTU Catalog, 2014-15).
our students in these courses in significant ways and to impact nearly all undergraduates. To that end, we have started a process of revitalizing and expanding the WI courses into a more comprehensive Communication Intensive (CI) requirement. Doing so will assist in implementing SLOs 1 and 3. It will also provide the flexibility for faculty to emphasize different modes of communication that may be important to their discipline. For example, the ability to communicate orally face-to-face with clients or patients may be a vital skill for students in health or counseling professions while business majors may need to learn the writing, organizational, and public speaking skills necessary for strong and effective oral presentations.

Efforts are already underway for this transition. The WAC met twice in October 2014 to develop a list of requirements that focus on writing for WI courses that will replace the old set of guidelines. In addition, invitations have been sent to selected faculty across the university to join the committee, which is being reconstituted as the Communication Advisory Committee (CAC). Members will consist of faculty from each of the university’s ten undergraduate colleges who have a commitment to instruction in all forms of communication. This committee will continue the work of the WAC by examining other CI programs at peer institutions and developing new requirements for CI courses.

LA2 provides students with an opportunity to improve their overall communication skills across a set of three required courses generally completed at TTU and to be able to apply those skills when communicating with people who have different cultures and/or lifestyles from theirs. While we will require written communication in all Communication Intensive Courses, the CI Course requirement must also contain at least one other mode of communication. For example, while the course requirements must involve written communication with instructor review and revision by the student, they also might include oral reports with appropriate feedback from the instructor to students, listening exercises, or instruction and practice in various modes of visual communication. Peer review could also be useful, as students develop critical facility through observing each other in communication-rich classes or co-curricular activities. In many cases, communication modes will be combined to take full advantage of visual technology resources now ubiquitous on the TTU campus.

Instructors of CI Courses also will be required to include content on global communication as appropriate for the discipline in their Communication Intensive Courses. Students should understand that “communication” is more than conveying information in written or spoken form; it also includes a wide array of other modes, such as body-language, dance and other performing arts, as well as the visual arts. Students might be introduced to issues that resonate positively or negatively with members of cultural, gender, religious, or political groups; or they may come to understand how habitual behaviors in one milieu may be interpreted differently in another. In some disciplines, they may learn the benefits of foreign language competence, while in all disciplines see the connections between culture and language. Finally, they will gain knowledge of behaviors that might be offensive to members of subcultures worldwide. CI Courses might also engage students in discussion of the implications of instant communication around the world and possible negative responses in some cultures to certain communication conventions in social media in the United States, including media yet to be developed or marketed.

Texas Tech University currently offers 106 academic programs leading to a bachelor’s degree. Each of these programs is required to designate at least two courses as Writing Intensive. This means that the minimum number of Communication Intensive Courses that will replace the current WI course inventory is 212. Many programs now offer more than two writing intensive courses, and we can anticipate that the situation with communication intensive courses will be similar. These courses are far more than we will be able to work with directly, so our plan
is to begin with a small number in key programs, and then broaden them to achieve complete
coverage by year four of the QEP. As with Learning Activity One, Learning Activity Two is
structured to be implemented incrementally.

LA2: Year 0 (2015)
1. Make formal the transition from a WI requirement to CI requirement. A proposal for
changing WI to CI was presented to the university’s Academic Council for consideration
in October 2014 and implementation in Spring 2015.
2. In Spring 2015, new and detailed guidelines will be developed by the Communication
Advisory Committee (CAC) and circulated for comment. Final guidelines will be drafted in
response to the comments and passed through the normal academic program approval
process before being implemented.
3. The Writing Advisory Committee will also change its title to the Communication
Advisory Committee.
4. Establish the current Writing Intensive/Communication Intensive course list prior to
publication of the 2016 course catalog. Courses currently identified as WI courses will need
to submit syllabi for approval during the transition period. These syllabi will be reviewed by
the CAC committee.

LA2: Year 1 (2016)
1. The Communication Advisory Committee will continue its review of syllabi. We will begin
the outreach process to identify faculty who have an interest in being an early adopter of
the CI requirement.
2. In the second semester of Year 1, these early adopters will participate in professional
development workshops organized and facilitated by the Teaching, Learning, and
Professional Development Center (TLPDC) and Communication Advisory Committee.
   a. Faculty who attend one of the two-day CI course revision workshops will receive
      a $300.00 stipend.
   b. Faculty who participate in week-long course development initiative during May
      Intersession will receive a $1000.00 stipend. A follow-up workshop will occur during
      the following long semester.

In Year 1, there may be up to eighteen participants in the revision workshops and as many as
twelve participants in the course development workshops. Faculty who are teaching in TTU’s
Worldwide eLearning program will have up to three spaces reserved in each annual cohort. If we
maintain this rate over the course of the five-year QEP, we anticipate that 10% or 150 faculty will
have participated in this professional development opportunity.

LA2: Year 2 (2017)
1. Instructors who participated in Year One workshops will be asked to serve as mentors for
the new class of Communication Intensive instructors accepted into the program.
2. At the same time, we will review the drafted CI requirements and complete the
Communication Intensive course review process by the end of QEP Year 2.
3. Training of faculty in Year 2 and thereafter will be coordinated by the Center for Global Communication and conducted by the TLPDC in collaboration with the Cross Cultural Academic Advancement Center (CCAAC) and the University Writing Center. Thus the initial training purview expands as various parts of the QEP are implemented.

LA2: Years 3-5 (2018-2020)

1. In addition to continuing with the process of developing and approving CI Courses, we will also begin to identify programs that are interested in further integrating communication skills into their overall curriculum, based on the needs of their students and their subject matter.

2. All activities associated with LA 2 will be assessed annually to allow for mid-course corrections and during the fifth year of the QEP for overall effectiveness of the program goals.

Communication Tutoring Center
TTU has a well-established University Writing Center that serves as a dynamic support for writing instruction across campus at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. To support students in learning other types of communication skills, TTU will establish the Communication Tutoring Center (CTC) in the College of Media and Communication. The mission of the CTC will be to provide tutoring services for students who require assistance in developing their oral communication skills or their visual communication skills. The CTC will accommodate students and their tutors to work effectively one-to-one either in person or on-screen and online, depending on the oral or visual communication challenge at hand.

Organizational Resources
Texas Tech University has committed the financial, human, and physical resources necessary to effectively develop, implement, and sustain Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society. The QEP leadership team has submitted the 5-year budget for the QEP. It has been reviewed by the CFO and approved by the SACSCOC Leadership Team, including the TTU President and Provost.

We will establish the Global Communication Center to coordinate curricular enhancements, faculty development opportunities, an assessment structure for evaluating the QEP, and an ongoing information campaign to keep the broader university community engaged in the goals of the QEP. With this strong university-wide organizational and financial investment in the QEP, we are confident we are laying the cornerstone to sustain a long-term university commitment to instruction in communication and global awareness.

Center for Global Communication
Texas Tech University will establish the Center for Global Communication (CGC) in the fall of 2015 with the full support of the University President, Provost, and CFO. The overarching mission of the CGC will be to implement and coordinate support activities for the TTU Quality Enhancement Plan. The CGC will serve as the robust administrative component necessary to achieve our Student Learning Outcomes. Once the CGC staff is in place, the CGC Director will collaborate with existing programs and offices, including the TLPDC, the Multicultural Course Transformation Project, the Institute for Inclusive Excellence, the Division of Undergraduate Education, the ICC, the Core Curriculum Committee, (including the Multicultural Core Committee), the CCAAC, and the Office of the Provost, to marshal these existing resources in support of the QEP. A key component of our Information Campaign will be to raise campus-wide awareness of both fledgling and established programs that will strengthen student learning, faculty development, and, by extension, the QEP.
The university will provide the CGC adequate office space. The CGC will report to the Associate Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs who also directs activities of the Multicultural Course requirement and the Writing Intensive two-course requirement, soon to become the Communication Intensive requirement. While the QEP is primarily faculty-driven, due to its focus on curricular enhancement, the CGC will serve as the fulcrum for coordinating curriculum and training activities, providing crucial information services, and organizing assessment support. The CGC staff gathered to take on this broad organizational mission will include a full-time Director, a full-time Associate Director with a split FTE of 0.50 faculty and 0.50 staff, an Administrative Assistant, and one graduate student.

The Director of the Center for Global Communication will be hired as a tenured TTU faculty member with departmental or college administrative experience in this full-time position.

CGC Director Responsibilities:
- Coordinate and, potentially, facilitate curriculum development and faculty training sessions
- Collaborate with the QEP Topic Development Committee to maintain realistic schedules for implementing QEP projects
- Direct an ongoing Information Campaign to ensure widespread campus involvement and broad-based awareness of QEP activities
- Collaborate with the Office of Planning and Assessment to guide the QEP assessment process
- Coordinate program development with the Teaching, Learning, and Professional Development Center
- Coordinate program development with the Writing Center and the Communication Tutoring Center
- Serve as the liaison with university programs that can expand the reach of QEP activities, including the Study Abroad Program, student cultural clubs, international events, and other activities that can enrich the QEP experience
- Manage the CGC budget

The Associate Director of the Center for Global Communication will be hired as a tenured TTU faculty member with administrative experience, potentially in organizing and implementing information campaigns.

CGC Associate Director Responsibilities:
- Support the Director in his or her responsibilities
- Develop and maintain a university-wide QEP global communication events calendar in collaboration with other university departments and programs
- Coordinate with IT to maintain the QEP website and CGC website to ensure all information pertinent to the QEP is current and available
- Work with the Office of Planning and Assessment to administer QEP assessments and prepare assessment reports
- Coordinate the Information Campaign with TTU Office of Communications and Marketing
• Coordinate travel opportunities for Global Communication Fellows and CI Early Adopters
• Supervise the CGC Administrative Assistant and CGC Graduate Assistants

The CGC Administrative Assistant

CGC Administrative Assistant Responsibilities:
• Provide administrative support to the CGC Director and Associate Director
• Prepare and process faculty incentive funds
• Prepare travel agenda and arrangements
• Maintain Graduate Assistant work schedules
• Maintain office functionality

The CGC Graduate Assistant will be selected each academic year to assist the Center in coordinating QEP programming.

A critical task for the CGC staff will be to assume the ongoing responsibility of coordinating and expanding the QEP Information Campaign, and the groundwork for this charge has already been put in place by the Topic Development Committee and staff from the Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA).

Once hired, CGC staff members will continue with this information campaign. Potential activities include the distribution of table tents across campus at residential and commercial food venues and scheduling articles for periodic release to the campus newspaper, the Daily Toreador. They will place information in the prime-location display cases inside the Student Union Building and invest in bus wraps, yard signs, banners, and radio ads with the campus public broadcasting station and commercial stations.

CGC staff will also be expected to expand our Twitter campaign to include Instagram and Snapchat and make informational visits to classes and campus groups, as well as give presentations to local Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, and the Lubbock Chamber of Commerce. The CGC staff will take on the challenge of informing the campus and the surrounding community about the TTU curricular innovations being developed to increase student learning through our Quality Enhancement Plan.
Chapter 4:
Assessment Plan

In this chapter, we discuss the Texas Tech University comprehensive plan to assess the goals of the QEP and the achievement of QEP-related student learning outcomes (SLOs). We will use both direct and indirect means, resulting in both formative and summative assessments of the QEP throughout the five years of its duration. We have designed a comprehensive assessment plan in compliance with CS 3.3.2 to identify “… goals and a plan to assess their achievement.”

Assessment of Student Learning

The primary purpose of Texas Tech’s proposed QEP, *Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society*, is to improve our students’ ability to communicate with others in a global context. This section begins by listing our SLOs, followed by a table correlating assessment methods with each SLO. Following the table comes a more detailed explanation of SLO and overall project assessment.

This QEP will use the following Student Learning Outcomes:

**SLO 1:** Students will create works (which may be written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal) that demonstrate essential communication skills (skills and knowledge).

This student learning outcome recognizes that students must be able to demonstrate essential communication skills prior to applying them within a particular context. It builds on previous college-level course work that students may have completed as part of their fully-transferable, lower-division core curriculum requirement, which may or may not have been completed through courses at TTU. The required core curriculum is organized into eight content-specific Foundational Component Areas (plus one additional area that may combine characteristics of component areas if desired), but that requires six specific, skills-related objectives to permeate the curriculum, regardless of content area. The statewide core curriculum requires that every course, regardless of the content, must include the cultivation of Communication Skills. Assessments for this SLO will focus on student communication skills.

**SLO 2:** Students demonstrate global awareness and knowledge through the written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal communication warranted by individual disciplines (skills and knowledge).

This student learning outcome allows the global context that shapes the QEP to be addressed in specific assignments. Assessments for this SLO will combine direct assessment of students, including both communication skills and global awareness/competence, with indirect assessments of students’ attitudes, values, and beliefs regarding global society concepts in discipline-specific, communication-related contexts.

**SLO 3:** Students will produce work that communicates in a culturally informed and appropriate manner, using multiple lenses and perspectives with diverse groups and individuals about timely global issues (behaviors and values/attitudes).

This student learning outcome is the culminating outcome for the QEP. Assessments for this SLO will combine direct assessment of students, including both communication skills and global awareness/competence, with indirect assessments of students’ attitudes, values, and beliefs regarding global society concepts in discipline-specific, communication-related contexts. The GCAA will also be used to assess this SLO.
The following table summarizes the assessments that will be used to evaluate each SLO. Overlap exists because each SLO builds upon those coming before. A more detailed explanation of how each assessment method will be used follows the initial table.

| SLO 1: Students will create works (which may be written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal) that demonstrate essential communication skills (skills and knowledge). |
| SLO 2: Students will demonstrate global awareness and knowledge through the written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal communication warranted by individual disciplines (skills and knowledge). |

| SLO 1: Students will create works (which may be written, oral/aural, visual, and non-verbal) that demonstrate essential communication skills (skills and knowledge). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments (to be selected from these options as appropriate to the course and student cohort)</th>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress (CAAP)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form (National Communication Association)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Written Communication rubric-derived assessment</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Oral Communication rubric-derived assessment*</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) items regarding communication in class and in co-curricular activities</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (GCAA)</td>
<td>Direct and Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress (CAAP) Essay Module</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form (National Communication Association)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Global Learning rubric-derived assessment</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Intercultural Competence and Knowledge rubric-derived assessment</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) items regarding communication and diversity in class and in co-curricular activities</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The VALUE rubrics will be used at two levels; by individual instructors to assess student assignments, and by oversight committees (Communication Advisory Committee and Multicultural Subcommittee) to independently assess a random sample of student assignments from across sections. Each rubric is listed under the SLO (either 1 or 2) it primarily assesses and then again where elements of the rubric will be used to assess SLO 3.
### QEP SLO’s TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments (to be selected from these options as appropriate to the course and student cohort)</th>
<th>Assessment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (GCAA)</td>
<td>Direct and Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress (CAAP) Essay Module</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form (National Communication Association)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Written Communication rubric-derived assessment</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Oral Communication rubric-derived assessment</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Global Learning rubric-derived assessment</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Intercultural Competence and Knowledge rubric-derived assessment</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) items regarding communication and diversity in class and in co-curricular activities</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-developed Multicultural Course Rubrics</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-developed Communication Intensive Course SLO assessments</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTU Online Senior Assessment</td>
<td>Direct and Indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLO 3: Students will produce work that communicates in a culturally informed and appropriate manner, using multiple lenses and perspectives with diverse groups and individuals about timely global issues (behaviors and values/attitudes).

Table 7: SLO Assessment Instruments
Assessment Phases
Assessment will take place in four phases. Phases 1 and 2 will involve assessment of current practices and student skill levels, while Phases 3 and 4 will involve the assessment of new strategies and practices (Phase 3) and further revisions of those in light of the findings (Phase 4).

- **Phase 1 (planning)** will involve the assessment of current practices and student skill levels. In this phase, appropriate committees (CAC for the Writing Intensive/Communication Intensive courses and Multicultural Subcommittee of the Core Curriculum Committee for Multicultural) will examine syllabi and assignments for their respective courses and evaluate them for communication and global awareness content. Phase 1 should be completed during Year 0 (2015) and Year 1 (2016).

- **Phase 2 (planning)** will involve the assessment of specific course assignments and student work artifacts from those courses to determine the percentage of assignments that currently address the QEP SLOs and the extent to which students attain the SLOs (baseline assessments). Phase 2 should be completed during Year 0 (2015) and Year 1 (2016).

The results of this review will establish a foundational picture of current activities relative to the QEP SLOs and will provide direction for enacting revisions in content and specific course assignment artifacts. Results will also help personnel design training sessions for faculty as well as additional instructional materials for these courses.

- **Phase 3 (pilot assessment of new materials/approaches)** will begin during the second year (2017) of QEP implementation, following the first year of faculty development and course modifications in CI and Multicultural courses. The Multicultural courses whose instructors have been GCFs and the Communication Intensive courses whose instructors have attended course development or course revision workshops will undergo full assessment to be led by the CAC and the Multicultural Subcommittee of the Core Curriculum Committee. Phase 3 will continue through the duration of the QEP.

- **Phase 4 (implementation and ongoing review)** will consist of continued assessment in all courses that have undergone directed revision via the faculty development programs and implementation of any changes suggested by the Phase 3 assessment of those courses.

Thus the QEP will implement a communication-enhanced curriculum and address global competency in students through a phased implementation in both CI and Multicultural courses. We will compare student performance in the newly-modified Multicultural and Communication Intensive courses with the performance of students in similar courses that have not been modified. This information will be crucial to improving and refining ongoing faculty development as the QEP implementation proceeds. Phases 3 and 4 will continue through the duration of the QEP, expanding to include more courses as more faculty cycle through development opportunities. We will use both direct and indirect assessment in all phases.

Formative Evaluation: Direct Assessment of QEP Goals and Student Learning Outcomes
At the oversight committee level (CAC and Multicultural Subcommittee), a sample of course syllabi and assignments will be analyzed annually, beginning with year 0 (2015), by using text mining and content analysis techniques to determine the extent to which the QEP goals and outcomes have been integrated into the course content.

Assessment of student artifacts spans Phases 2, 3, and 4. Throughout those phases, instructors will assess student artifacts produced in both the Multicultural Courses and CI Courses by using specified rubrics, such as the AAC&U VALUE rubrics (potentially including Global Learning, Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, Oral Communication, and Written Communication).
In the case of oral communication, the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form from the National Communication Association and similar instruments for the evaluation of visual/graphic communication may also be used.\(^5\) (Appendix D)

As the VALUE rubrics will be critical to norming our assessment practices across campus, a closer examination of their use is appropriate here. As noted in the introduction to each rubric, they “are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading.” During our faculty development activities for both Multicultural and CI courses, the rubrics will help faculty from across the university develop a common understanding and terminology to use in their assignment descriptions and classroom conversations with students.

For example, faculty using the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence rubric may focus on the following four out of the six elements of the rubric:

- Knowledge (Cultural self-awareness)
- Knowledge (Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks)
- Skills (Verbal and nonverbal communication)
- Attitudes (Openness)

Key to faculty conversation will be determining what percentage of their courses and assignments already address these elements of the rubric, as well as examining student artifacts from their courses to understand if students are at the benchmark, low or high milestones, or capstone level.

Likewise, beginning in Phase 2, samples of these student artifacts will be assessed by the CAC and Multicultural Subcommittee using the VALUE rubrics in order to determine whether students are already, in fact, achieving any or all of the QEP outcomes in the Multicultural or current WI courses. As we move into Phase 3 assessment, student artifacts from revised/redeveloped courses will be sampled and assessed by the CAC and Multicultural Subcommittee to continue assessment of student learning in these courses. These groups will discuss results with the TLPDC and the CGC to inform the professional development programs for the following year, as well as follow-up with the faculty to suggest any revisions or refinements of their syllabi and assignments. During Phase 4, artifacts from both courses that have undergone directed revision as well as those that have not will be assessed to help determine the specific impact of QEP learning activities.

In addition to ongoing evaluation of syllabi and student artifacts by oversight committees, a number of other direct assessment instruments currently in use at Texas Tech can help determine the effectiveness of the QEP. In the appropriate years (currently odd-numbered years), we will continue to assess writing skills by administering the Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+) to freshman and senior students, whose performance is compared to develop a “value added” score that reflects the level of improvement between the freshmen and seniors in the sample.

\(^5\) Existing rubrics for writing competence may be expanded or combined to create a TTU-specific Communication rubric that addresses global society as the context for attainment of skills. Any assessment based on the application of a set of rubrics for examining the attainment of knowledge and skills would be adopted based on a consensus process through which the two oversight committees would seek input from the GCF fellows as part of the Year Zero and Year One activities.
The Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress (CAAP) offers a range of modules that provide direct assessment for different academic knowledge and skills. Texas Tech University uses the Mathematics, Writing Skills, and Science modules in a rotation; to assist in assessing the QEP, we would add the Writing Essay module to the Writing Skills Module already in use and to administer those two modules annually during the QEP. The CAAP tests are administered during a class meeting in those courses whose instructors have agreed to participate; CAAP writing-related modules would become part of the routine assessment of QEP-related Multicultural and Communication Intensive courses where writing is a key component. As the CAAP writing skills module is also administered in other courses, the results will provide an opportunity to compare the achievement of students in the redeveloped courses with students in courses outside the Multicultural and CI curriculum.

**Formative Evaluation: Indirect Assessment of QEP Goals and Student Learning Outcomes**

The NSSE will be a core component of our indirect assessment. Throughout the QEP, we will examine the results of appropriate NSSE questions and compare student responses to those from earlier years to monitor overall gains in attitude and valuing of both communication and global awareness/competence. We will also review two other measures of global awareness that include both direct and indirect measures, the Global Competence Aptitude Assessment instrument (GCAA) and the TTU Online Senior Assessment. The Online Senior Assessment (OSA) is a TTU faculty-developed core curriculum and general education assessment instrument that was first administered in 2008. Beginning in Spring 2015 the Core Curriculum Committee is expected to modify the OSA as part of its initiative to assess the new core curriculum learning objectives that became effective in fall 2014. The modified instrument will also address the new student learning objectives that were established for the university multicultural requirement in 2013. Assessments will be added to this instrument to assist in evaluating the QEP learning outcomes.

**Assessment of the Institutional QEP Partners**

The effectiveness of the QEP will be determined based on the assessment of cumulative changes in student learning that have been outlined above. But in addition to assessing the results of our QEP at the individual course level and Learning Activity level, QEP leadership will evaluate the work of the university units that contribute to the implementation of the QEP, such as the TLPDC, the CCAAC, and the new CTC. The CGC will also be evaluated. This assessment will primarily be indirect and formative, carried out through interviews with key personnel from these entities. The various contributing offices mentioned above, working through the Center for Global Communication, will also use client surveys following each QEP activity. The TLPDC and, presumably, the CCAAC have such forms in regular use, and the new CTC will create client surveys based on established protocols used by the University Writing Center for ongoing feedback. Each unit will report its activities annually to the QEP leadership via the CGC. Both the TLPDC and CCAAC will collect evaluations and suggestions for improvement from each faculty development program/workshop they hold.

The CGC will submit an annual report of all activities, curricular and co-curricular, to the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. This report will also be distributed to institution-level strategic planners and advisory groups as the mission and strategic goals for the university undergo periodic review.
Summative Evaluation of the Goals for the QEP

Throughout our QEP, we will gather data for use in our final assessment and evaluation, which will summarize trends emerging from the five years of the project’s active existence. In addition to the data collection described above, we will also track data on conference presentations and articles published by TTU faculty, staff, and students as a result of their work with the WI/CI and multicultural courses.

Essentially, we will aim to answer the following three questions in our final report:

• What did we do?
• Did the QEP increase student learning in the areas of communication and global awareness?
• Did the QEP result in improvements, including increases in student learning, that helped to accomplish the mission of the university?

The following section includes our timeline for the project.

QEP Proposed Assessment Timeline by Year

Year 0 (2015)

• Multicultural Subcommittee reviews existing syllabi for Multicultural Courses (content, assignments)
• CAC reviews existing syllabi for WI courses (content, assignments)
• Administer CLA+ and CAAP on normal schedules to assess student writing
• Administer Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (GCAA) in a sample of Multicultural and WI/CI Courses to establish baseline data
• Examine NSSE items specific to communication and global awareness
• Modify Online Senior Assessment Instrument to address QEP project

Year 1 (2016)

• Continue to assess student artifacts (as described above) in both Multicultural courses and WI/CI Courses assessed using elements of the VALUE rubrics
• Administer Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (GCAA) to a sample of students across the university (those enrolled in Multicultural and WI/CI as well as those who are not)
• Administer the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Instrument in Multicultural courses and CI Courses as applicable
• Administer CLA+ and CAAP on normal schedules to assess student writing
• Pilot test the modified Online Senior Assessment Instrument
• Assess QEP project implementation and make adjustments as necessary
• QEP Director generates Annual Report for OPA, Provost’s Office, and President’s Office

Year 2 (2017)

• Continue to assess student artifacts (as described above) in both Multicultural courses and CI Courses assessed using elements of the VALUE rubrics
• Administer Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (GCAA) to a sample of students across the university (those enrolled in Multicultural and WI/CI as well as those who are not)
• Administer the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Instrument in Multicultural courses and CI courses as applicable
• Administer CLA+ and CAAP on normal schedules to assess student writing
• Administer modified Online Senior Assessment
• Examine NSSE items specific to communication and global awareness
• Assess QEP project implementation make adjustments as necessary
• QEP Director generates Annual Report for OPA, Provost’s Office, and President’s Office

Year 3 (2018)
• Continue to assess student artifacts (as described above) in both Multicultural courses and CI Courses assessed using elements of the VALUE rubrics
• Administer Global Competence Aptitude Assessment (GCAA) to a sample of students across the university (those enrolled in Multicultural and WI/CI as well as those who are not)
• Administer the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Instrument in Multicultural courses and CI courses as applicable
• Administer CLA+ and CAAP on normal schedules to assess student writing
• Administer modified Online Senior Assessment
• Assess QEP project implementation make adjustments as necessary
• QEP Director generates Annual Report for OPA, Provost’s Office, and President’s Office

Year 4 (2019)
• Continue to assess student artifacts (as described above) in both Multicultural courses and CI Courses assessed using elements of the VALUE rubrics
• Administer Global Competence Aptitude Assessment to a sample of students across the university (those enrolled in Multicultural and WI/CI as well as those who are not)
• Administer the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Instrument in Multicultural courses and CI courses as applicable
• Administer CLA and CAAP on normal schedules to assess student writing
• Administer modified Online Senior Assessment
• Assess QEP project implementation make adjustments as necessary
• QEP Director generates Annual Report for OPA, Provost’s Office, and President’s Office

Year 5 (2020)
• Continue to assess student artifacts (as described above) in both Multicultural courses and CI Courses assessed using elements of the VALUE rubrics
• Administer Global Competence Aptitude Assessment to a sample of students across the university (those enrolled in Multicultural and WI/CI as well as those who are not)
• Administer the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Instrument in Multicultural courses and CI courses as applicable
• Administer CLA+ and CAAP on normal schedules to assess student writing
• Administer modified Online Senior Assessment
• Final QEP project implementation and results assessment. Total budget and costs reviewed. QEP Director generates Summative Report for OPA, Provost’s Office, and President’s Office. Plans for sustainability included in report.

Conclusion
Just as our first QEP was coming to a close in 2010, the mission statement for Texas Tech was modified with the following three-sentences that prioritize the preparation of student “learners to be ethical leaders for a diverse and globally competitive workforce.” Our second QEP addresses the need for students to be learners for a diverse and globally competitive workforce, again harkening back to a sentence in our mission statement. It is our hope that Texas Tech’s second QEP, *Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society*, will offer as profound a set of opportunities for institutional change as those that have resulted from the first QEP, and that the mission of the university will be forever strengthened by the deliberate investment of resources over time to sustain projects so fundamental to the purpose of the institution.
Chapter 5:
Quality Enhancement Plan Budget

This chapter describes detailed budgets in terms of annual and total expenditures for the five-year implementation cycle of *Bear Our Banners Far and Wide: Communicating in a Global Society*.

**Faculty and Staff Development**

**Faculty**: For the five-year implementation cycle, the proposed budget includes a $2,500 stipend for each of 15 Global Communication Fellows selected annually, plus $10,000 in annual travel incentives dispersed through grant appeals each year. The proposed budget also includes annual faculty incentives for participating in CI Workshops. Faculty members who attend two-day CI Revision Workshops will receive a $300 stipend, and faculty members who attend annual week-long CI Development Workshops will receive $1,000.

**TLPDC Staff**: The proposed budget includes funds for two full-time educational consultants in the TLPDC, with starting salaries of approximately $60,000. These consultants will provide instructional design support in organizing and facilitating GCF training sessions and CI workshops during the first three years of the QEP.

**CTC Director and Unit Coordinator**: The proposed budget includes hiring a full-time Director of the Communication Tutoring Center (CTC) at a starting annual salary of $70,000 and a CTC Unit Coordinator to help facilitate tutoring activities at an annual starting salary of $35,000. The CTC will also hire two graduate student tutors at an annual starting salary of $20,000 each. These are all new university positions.

**CGC Managing Director and Associate Director**: For the five-year implementation cycle, the proposed budget includes a twelve-month annual salary starting at $100,000 for the CGC Managing Director. This is a new full-time faculty position dedicated to the implementation of the QEP. The proposed budget also includes a twelve-month annual salary, starting at $65,000, for the CGC Associate Director with a split FTE of 0.50 faculty and 0.50 staff. This is also a new full-time position. Together, the CGC Director and Associate Director will coordinate QEP training and assessment, maintain a dynamic information campaign, and fulfill all managerial requirements for developing, achieving, and assessing SLOs.

**Other CGC Personnel**: The proposed budget includes funds for hiring an Administrative Assistant to provide full-time office management to the Center for Global Communication with a starting annual salary of $28,000. For the QEP implementation cycle, the CGC will also hire one graduate student on an annual basis at a starting salary of $20,000. These new positions will provide the clerical and programming infrastructure for the efficient and effective management of all QEP activities.

**Assessment**

This proposed budget includes a total of $117,500 for assessment services over a six-year period. These funds will support crucial assistance from the TTU Office of Planning and Assessment, support the purchase of GCAA Software, and fund instrument testing, processing, and printing. With these funds, we will ensure that our sampling of students during QEP implementation will provide adequate data for analysis, refinement of programs, and measures of long-term possibilities.
Facilities and Equipment
The CGC will be allotted 1,000 square feet of university office space to administer the multifarious activities of the QEP. In addition to personnel, the proposed budget includes approximately $123,000 in annual funding for CGC equipment, furniture, office supplies, and travel.

The Communication Tutoring Center will be housed in the College of Media and Communication and receive an annual budget of approximately $237,000 for staff, programming and operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Year 0 2015</th>
<th>Year 1 2016</th>
<th>Year 2 2017</th>
<th>Year 3 2018</th>
<th>Year 4 2019</th>
<th>Year 5 2020</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Incentives for Faculty Participants</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for GC Fellows (15)</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$187,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* $2500/stipend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for CI Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based on 18/yr-CI rev and 12/yr workshop)</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* $300/stipend for two-day CI revision, $1000/stipend for week-long CI Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLPDC Instructional Design Support</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$558,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 2 educational consultants, including fringes, operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>$202,900</td>
<td>$244,900</td>
<td>$274,900</td>
<td>$79,900</td>
<td>$79,900</td>
<td>$882,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Costs

| Assessment Costs                        |             |             |             |             |             |             |          |
| Indirect Costs - OPA Services           | $5,900      |             |             |             |             |             |          |
| GCAA Software                           | $15,500     | $15,500     | $15,500     | $15,500     | $15,500     | $77,500     |          |
| Instrumentation-testing, processing, and printing | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $40,000 | | |
| ASSESSMENT COSTS                        | $5,900      | $15,500     | $25,500     | $25,500     | $25,500     | $117,500    |          |

QEP Final Report Preparation and Printing

| QEP Final Report Preparation and Printing |             |             |             |             |             |             |          |
| QEP Technical Editor for Approved Document | $9,999     |             |             |             |             |             |          |
| QEP Report Printing for TTU Provost & President’s Staff and Deans | $2,000 | | | | | | |
| QEP REPORT COSTS                        | $11,999     |             |             |             |             |             |          |

PROGRAMMING/OPERATIONS

| PROGRAMMING/OPERATIONS                  | $30,000     |             |             |             |             |             |          |

PROJECT TOTAL

| PROJECT TOTAL                           | $47,899     | $218,400    | $270,400    | $300,400    | $105,400    | $105,400    | $1,000,000 |

Table 8: Budget for all but Centers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 2016</th>
<th>Year 2 2017</th>
<th>Year 3 2018</th>
<th>Year 4 2019</th>
<th>Year 5 2020</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CGC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$104,040</td>
<td>$106,121</td>
<td>$108,243</td>
<td>$520,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$33,150</td>
<td>$33,813</td>
<td>$34,489</td>
<td>$35,179</td>
<td>$169,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$28,560</td>
<td>$29,131</td>
<td>$29,714</td>
<td>$30,308</td>
<td>$145,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (30%)</td>
<td>$48,150</td>
<td>$49,113</td>
<td>$50,095</td>
<td>$51,097</td>
<td>$52,119</td>
<td>$250,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment - Staff Computing</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture - Staff Offices</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel - GCC Staff</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CGC</td>
<td>$290,650</td>
<td>$276,823</td>
<td>$277,079</td>
<td>$277,421</td>
<td>$282,849</td>
<td>$1,404,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |             |             |             |             |             |            |
| CTC (part of College of Media and Communication) |             |             |             |             |             |            |
| Director             | $70,000     | $71,400     | $72,828     | $74,285     | $75,770     | $364,283   |
| Unit Coordinator     | $35,000     | $35,700     | $36,414     | $37,142     | $37,885     | $182,141   |
| Fringe (30%)         | $31,500     | $32,130     | $32,773     | $33,428     | $34,097     | $163,927   |
| Graduate Assistant (1) | $20,000   | $21,000     | $22,000     | $23,000     | $24,000     | $110,000   |
| Graduate Assistant (2) | $20,000   | $21,000     | $22,000     | $23,000     | $24,000     | $110,000   |
| Operating/Programming | $37,000   | $35,000     | $30,000     | $25,000     | $20,000     | $147,000   |
| TOTAL CTC            | $213,500    | $216,230    | $216,015    | $215,855    | $215,752    | $1,077,351 |

|                      |             |             |             |             |             |            |
| GRAND TOTAL FOR CGC AND CTC | $504,150 | $494,053    | $493,094    | $493,276    | $498,601    | $2,482,174 |

Table 9: Budget for CGC and CTC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TOTAL</th>
<th>Year 0 2015</th>
<th>Year 1 2016</th>
<th>Year 2 2017</th>
<th>Year 3 2018</th>
<th>Year 4 2019</th>
<th>Year 5 2020</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Project Total</td>
<td>$47,899</td>
<td>$218,400</td>
<td>$270,400</td>
<td>$300,400</td>
<td>$105,400</td>
<td>$105,400</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGC and CTC Total</td>
<td>$504,150</td>
<td>$494,053</td>
<td>$493,094</td>
<td>$493,276</td>
<td>$498,601</td>
<td>$2,482,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL FOR CGC AND CTC</td>
<td>$47,899</td>
<td>$722,550</td>
<td>$763,453</td>
<td>$793,494</td>
<td>$598,676</td>
<td>$604,001</td>
<td>$3,482,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Budget for Total Projects
### Learning Activity One: Multicultural Course Development/Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Year 0 - 2015</th>
<th>Year 1 - 2016</th>
<th>Year 2 - 2017</th>
<th>Year 3 - 2018</th>
<th>Year 4 - 2019</th>
<th>Year 5 - 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect and Review Teaching Materials and Student Artifacts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Instructors for Program (GC Fellows)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Communication Training and Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Learning Activity Two: Communication Intensive Course Development/Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Year 0 - 2015</th>
<th>Year 1 - 2016</th>
<th>Year 2 - 2017</th>
<th>Year 3 - 2018</th>
<th>Year 4 - 2019</th>
<th>Year 5 - 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition from WI to CI Requirement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include CI Requirement in 2016 Catalog</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Existing WI/CI Syllabi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Faculty for Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development CI Course Revision Workshops</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Intersession Course Development Training</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Center for Global Communication (CGC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Year 0 - 2015</th>
<th>Year 1 - 2016</th>
<th>Year 2 - 2017</th>
<th>Year 3 - 2018</th>
<th>Year 4 - 2019</th>
<th>Year 5 - 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish the CGC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise and Hire CGC Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Campaign</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Year 0 - 2015</td>
<td>Year 1 - 2016</td>
<td>Year 2 - 2017</td>
<td>Year 3 - 2018</td>
<td>Year 4 - 2019</td>
<td>Year 5 - 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer CLA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer CAAP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination of NSSE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification of Online Student Assessment OSA Instrument</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer OSA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer Global Competence Aptitude Assessment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer Competent Communicator Speech Evaluation Assessment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Assessment Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate QEP Project Implementation and Make Adjustments as Required</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Annual Report to Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of SLOs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final QEP Assessment of Project and Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Summative Report for Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Project Report for SACCOC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix A: Written Responses to QEP Topic Selection

QEP Topic Selection Committee
Brief Meeting Notes
9/26/13

During the third QEP meeting, consensus arose regarding the topic on which the group should focus. The primary theme that manifested was “Communication in a Globalized Society.” This topic was identified through the growing concern of communicative inadequacies among the student body. Through this process, there was discussion regarding the available resources that would help address said topic such as the Writing Center and the Library. As this topic decision shifts to development, consideration ought to be given to the following:

• Show proof that there is a need
• Develop a clear method of implementation
• Find resources to address this topic
  o Look at the University of Kentucky’s QEP
    • (www.uky.edu/presentationu/)
  o Please refer to page ten for helpful links regarding globalization as a QEP

Attendees
1. Louder, Justin
2. Hughes, Jennifer S
3. Parsoneault, Catherine
4. Stewart, Rob
5. Elbow, Gary
6. Agnello, Maryfrances
7. Bard, Jennifer
8. Borst, Stefanie
9. Burris, Scott
10. Chambers, Todd
11. Hedden, Ronald
12. Huff, Amy
13. Humphrey, Wendy
14. Killough, Jay
15. Lauderdale, Mitzi
16. Justyna, Erin
17. Joe Street
School of Law

Good afternoon, Justin,

I have spoken to a representative number of faculty from the various departments at the law school (e.g., Legal Practice faculty (who teach research & writing), Clinic faculty, Doctrinal faculty, and Career Services).

The ranking of the three possible QEP topics is as follows: (1) Writing, (2) Globalization (which was not far behind Writing), and (3) Diversity.

The law school is uniquely positioned to advance student learning in all of these areas. In regard to writing, the majority of our faculty already engages in some teaching or oversight of legal writing. But, having additional resources to aid our Writing Specialist and to bring in speakers on the topic of writing (e.g., Bryan Garner) would be helpful, among other things. Professors did express the concern that in order to make the most impact, they will have to devote more time to helping students improve their writing skills.

As for Globalization, implementation of this topic at the law school would be somewhat “easy.” Among other things, professors can easily include cases or exercises that focus on global issues, and the law school can host events focusing on practicing law in a global society.

I hope that this information is helpful. I will see you tomorrow at the committee meeting.

Wendy Adele Humphrey
TTU School of Law
Associate Professor of Legal Practice
Justin:

Thank you for volunteering to accept comments on the three topics. Everyone that I discussed it with chose writing of the three proposed. These are two specific responses that I received from my outreach efforts. If it is too late to include I understand, but I figured I would send it your way anyway.

1) Any of the three topics are ones that would benefit TTU. There already seems to be a great deal of momentum on campus for diversity and for globalization – these are exciting topics and more programmatic efforts would be welcomed. The more intractable issue is Writing – I assume you mean improving student writing. This is a more daunting issue, but one that could have great benefits for students. When I think of what would best benefit students in our department where diversity and globalization are already important topics in the curriculum, I would say that Writing is a need.

2) Those 3 topics are so “been around the past 10 years”J. Perhaps “writing” could be expanded to “communication skills” to incorporate both written and verbal communication. That (and critical thinking skills) seem to be what make students most employable.

Thanks,

Mitzi K. Lauderdale, J.D., CFP®
Associate Dean for Students, College of Human Sciences
Associate Professor, Department of Personal Financial Planning
Justin,

I have sought input on the QEP topic from members of the CASNR Administrative Council and CASNR faculty. Below summarizes the input I received:

Globalization
There was a lot of support of this topic. Several faculty members suggested it was the only realistic option of the three. Several others also listed as a viable second option, even though they preferred another. Ideas to advance student learning included more opportunity for student travel and experiences and also for international development of faculty. Possibilities included a diploma designation for students who met criteria for “Globally Educated” and could consist of a combination of designated coursework, travel, study abroad, experiences, etc.
Specifically, financial resources were cited as necessary along with more flexibility with on and off campus expectations (no further elaboration).
I had only one person oppose the topic on the grounds that it was seldom clearly defined.

Writing
This appeared to be the second most favorable topic. Several faculty identified it as the most important skill for graduates, therefore, most important for a QEP topic. I did not receive much input on what these efforts would look like or what resources would be needed.

Diversity
This was the only one of the three which I received opposition. I did not have anyone favorably respond to the topic but many expressed opinions that it should not be the topic.

I hope this helps, SB
Scott Burris, Ph.D. Associate Professor Agricultural Education Texas Tech University
College of Media and Communication

Good Morning Justin!

Here are some thoughts that were sent to me about QEP from a Media & Communication perspective:

All 3 areas garnered positive feedback. In fact, many of our college leaders believed we hit on all three of these areas: writing, globalism, and diversity.

Writing
From an assessment perspective, writing is definitely evaluated across the board – all of our departments have writing courses and our national board definitely brings this topic up at the annual meeting (need to maintain quality writing standards).

Globalism
From a ‘globalism/globalization’ perspective our college has been aggressively pursuing different strategies to get our students thinking globally. From coursework in all departments related to global communication to diverse study abroad opportunities, our curriculum provides students with multiple global touches. In addition, we have the Thomas Jay Harris Institute for Hispanic and International Communication which provides students, faculty and staff with opportunities to study issues related to international communication. Also, the College has hosted the Global Lens Film Initiative for the campus community for the past five years and will continue to do so. This international film series brings together members of the campus community (from departments across campus) to talk about independent films from across the world.

Diversity
Like other units, the College is committed to diversity – curriculum, staff and institutes. Like the global communication perspective, the Thomas Jay Harris Institute for Hispanic and International Communication brings together faculty, staff and students to host and partner with other campus units for different projects related to multiculturalism and diversity. In spring 2013, IHIC sponsored a ‘Reaching Audiences’ conference here at TTU devoted to bringing in academics and professionals for panel discussions about research in both areas — all related to multicultural audiences.

The College would support any of these initiatives and we feel we could help out however we needed to.

Thanks for your leadership on this. Todd

Todd Chambers, Ph.D.
Associate Professor & Chair
Department of Journalism & Electronic Media
College of Media & Communication
Texas Tech University
806.834.5712
Dear Justin,

I am the representative on the QEP Topic Selection Committee for the College of Engineering. Here are our responses regarding the questions Jennifer Bard raised in her recent email.

**We discussed three possible QEP topics, Diversity, Writing and Globalization**

The College of Engineering would most prefer to pursue Globalization or Writing. While Diversity is certainly a critical educational issue, we feel that it is presently being addressed through the Strategic Plan and through additional programs on campus, whereas there is more room for improvement in the areas of Writing and Globalization.

**We decided to take these back to our constituencies to ask them:**

1. **If they thought these were topics that meet our needs and would advance student learning sufficiently for the university to devote resources over the next five years**

Two critical needs of our College are to satisfy or exceed accreditation standards of ABET and SACS, and to prepare our graduates for the job market. Both Writing and Globalization are critical components of our educational mission that are worthy of additional University resources. In areas like Writing or Global Awareness, incoming students may have deficiencies stemming from inadequate K-12 preparation. However, Texas Tech is nonetheless charged with presenting evidence that graduates are adequately prepared for the workforce. A QEP on either topic would thus be helpful in guiding our efforts as we continually seek re-accreditation from ABET and SACS.

It is worth noting that the College of Engineering has already committed a considerable amount of resources to Globalization through the International Experience requirement now in effect for all entering freshmen. The following excerpt from the College of Engineering website summarizes the newly implemented International Experience requirements in our College.

**International Experience Requirement.**

Effective fall 2013, all incoming freshmen must complete an international experience as a component of their graduation requirements. The international experience requirement may be satisfied by any of the following:

- Receiving course credit (minimum 3 hours) during a study abroad experience (Faculty Led Programs, traditional reciprocal exchange agreements, or third-party programs).
- Participating in an international experience during a co-op or summer internship.
- Participating in international service activities (such as but not limited to Engineers Without Borders).
- Completing an international ROTC experience.
- Completing an international experience at a junior or community college.
- Completing another experience approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies.
2. What they would want to do to advance student learning based on these topics.

We feel that consistent evaluation and assessment of student learning across all colleges should be a priority. Student learning should be guided by a consistent rubric, replacing uneven standards across campus. To advance student learning in the area of Global Awareness, we feel that the College of Engineering is presently taking the right steps, but a University-wide plan could have greater impact. In the area of Writing, we would like to see a new rubric of educational objectives that can be met by modifying existing writing-intensive courses without changing degree plans.

3. What resources they would need to engage in activities that would “move the needle forward” in student learning outcomes based on these topics.

The general feeling is that the Writing Center will need significantly more personnel and resources to have a measurable impact on student learning, should Writing be chosen as the QEP topic. Additional University resources may have to be devoted locally (e.g., lecturer positions) to ensure that improved student learning objectives can be implemented without unreasonably increasing the workload of faculty in our College, as Writing is arguably among the most labor-intensive subjects to teach. With respect to Globalization, University resources could be devoted to Study Abroad scholarships and fellowships and additional staff could be added to the Study Abroad office.

Sincerely, Ron Hedden
College of Engineering
Student Affairs
Good morning Professor Bard,

Thank you for running our QEP meeting this morning. In regard to our three potential topics, writing is where I’d like to focus my input. (Oddly enough, I find myself critiquing this email over and over to make sure it is grammatically correct). In this email, I’ve attached statistics from the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). You may want to start on page 29 where statistics are shown that 74.7% of employers surveyed seek communication skills (specifically written) on a candidate’s resume. Furthermore, on page 31, employers give new graduate recruits a “B” grade for written communication skills.

Based on information shared from other QEP’s, the ability to write is not the sole responsibility of the English department. Professional writing and correspondence spans majors across the University. If we look at Strategic Priority 1: Promoting Student Success, and Strategic Priority 2: Strengthening Academic Quality and Reputation, professional writing and communication potentially play into these priorities.

However, one of my questions is in regard to your statement in your meeting materials and agenda document, “…this is not a ‘build it and they will come’ kind of project. It is one where we need to produce a plan based on something that we can document that we are already doing.” Is there valid data we can use for our QEP if we choose writing as the topic?

Thank you so much and I enjoyed our meeting this morning. Best,

Jay

Jay Killough
Director, University Career Center
Certified Strengths-Based Educator
806-742-2210 www.careercenter.ttu.edu
Undergraduate Education

QEP Feedback from Constituents

• I think it is an excellent topic! I used Globalization as the theoretical framework for my dissertation so naturally it greatly intrigues me. I would be very interested in any results it would produce.

• I could be wrong, but I think the focus (and potential niche) would be in the QEP’s focus on Globalism. I think learning to communicate globally would be a large portion of the QEP, but I think it could be much more than that. Recognizing the importance of the effects of Globalization on a student’s higher education experience is a worthy plan that deserves further scrutiny. Perhaps I am reading too much into this topic, though.

• I like the topic of “Communicating in a Global Society”. I think this includes all three topics. I do not see how an individual can successfully communicate in a global society without being aware of, understanding, provide for, and include diversity in their communications.

• I like the combined approach of Communicating in a Global Society. It seems to go along well with TTU’s mission statement and is broad enough that we can take this in several different directions. For that matter, I actually think that diversity is wrapped into this proposed topic as well. I think this has a lot of potential for involving various departments.

• I believe that the Coordinating Board has established Communication, oral, written, and symbolic, as explicit learning objectives of every core curriculum course across all core competencies. So it would seem that a Quality Enhancement topical emphasis on communication needs to be crafted so as to find its value added niche. There may be a role in helping instructors of core curriculum courses enrolling 200, 300, or more students without breakout discussion sections consider using electronic platforms (discussion threads, blogs, video, vine, etc) to satisfy the communication requirement.

• I feel as though the theme of Communicating in a Global Society would be a great one for the QEP; though, I wouldn’t put the focus on only writing rather on all forms and mediums of communication. As our students grow into and become a part of this global world it is going to be extremely important for them to value the diversity of the world, be able to get out of their comfort zones, and to be able to effectively communicate and share messages with the world.

• I feel like there are natural partners for this topic – specifically in your department with research and study abroad opportunities; we could increase our FYE programming to help get our students into the mindset of globalization by bringing back a common reader program that specifically targets global society, and this topic would help give the Core Curriculum some better focus with some integration of global society into the curriculum.

• As each year passes a greater number of our graduating student population fail to grasp the basic concepts of critical writing. They do not understand how to effectively communicate their thoughts into words to their supervisors and colleagues in the workplace once they graduate. They are also lacking in their level of development in how to successfully write reports. The benefits that students will have by gaining this knowledge base will be one which will allow for them to surpass others who are entering the same fields following graduation.
• In regards to globalism which is continually becoming a more important topic as the world has continued to dwindle with the growing international companies, industries, and schools. While there are several courses that offer students a global perspective or will help students to develop this perspective, there are several other manners in which this skill can be hounded. This can be done through either the study abroad program, internships, or service learning. These programs can include ones which display a variety of cultures, customs, and languages.

• A QEP on Globalization & Communication … hmmm …

General Feedback
The issues that I was hoping our new QEP might address are more along the lines of:

1. developing a curriculum that helps students to understand the relevance and benefit of what they’re learning (care/motivation),
2. connecting between/learning across the curriculum of their many required courses (synthesis/meaning-making), or
3. being appropriately invested to doing the work that will earn them the rewards of learning and of education (commitment/effort).

On the other side of the coin, my perception is that:

1. The issues that our government and the public seem most interested in are related to value, relevance, and cost effectiveness of the educational 1) curriculum and 2) delivery system.
2. However, the things that capture their attention are more related to 1) doing good and 2) doing education innovatively.

Because these types of efforts funds our institution and funding tends to be the most influential driver of activity, it seems wise to structure our quality enhancement plan to support innovative educational approaches that are highly effective and efficient. If it has already been decided that the topic of these is communication and/or globalization, great … but I hope you’ll consider the above as outlets for any QEP focus because I think they’ll matter to students and have profound and widespread institutional impact.

What I Found
The response above is just my gut reaction/opinion to the QEP process and the selected topics in general, but I recognize that I’m not very knowledgeable on this, so I thought I’d go online for a moment and see what I could find on QEP related to these two topics. My quick search didn’t turn up any qualitative or quantitative Higher Education studies on QEP programs, their topics, or their effects the effects on different types of institutions. I was surprised at this, and to the HiEd folks out there, IMHO it would be a pretty cool (and useful) study for someone in Higher Education. But, the question still intrigued me, so for the last several nights I’ve been exploring. It all got started when I found the 2010 SACS-COC summary page and then a little ADD surfing took over. Anyhow, what follows is a little about some of the resources that have captivated me and kept me out of late night television this weekend… I hope you can make some use of my online adventure.
On globalization as a QEP:

- Penn State:  
  http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.87.5555&rep=rep1&type=pdf

- Florida International University:  
  http://goglobal.fiu.edu/SiteCollectionDocuments/QEP_Report-Final.pdf

- TCU:  

- Duke:  

- A&M Commerce:  
  http://web.tamuc.edu/aboutUs/institutionalEffectiveness/qualityEnhancementPlan/documents/minutes/QEPCSteeringCommitteeMinutes08-09-2012.pdf

- Other Papers on Globalization in Higher Education, not necessarily QEP
  - http://dspaceprod.georgiasouthern.edu:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10518/5082/cornelius_adrian_r_201201_edd.pdf?sequence=1

Other places that have embraced Communication Skills as the SACS-QEP …


- University of Southern Mississippi:  
  http://se.asee.org/proceedings/ASEE2007/RP2007036HOW.pdf

- Dillard University:  

G&C via Academic Advising

I’m thinking that academic advisors might have some role in helping students to understand what globalization is, how to build a curricular plan that will deliberately include global experiences, and for the communications portion, encourage documentary or reflective writing that helps students to communicate about these experiences, their challenges, and their benefits. My online search turned up some folks who, generally speaking, agree:

- A good summary of strategies for advising students for a globalized world:  
  http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/080820mc.htm

- Advising for Globalization and the World of Work:  
  http://www.montana.edu/news/6242/globalization-and-the-world-of-work-implications-for- 
  academic-advising-workshop-set-for-oct-6

- Scholarly seminar to help advisors cultivate a global perspective through understanding globalization, encouraging opportunities, and understanding curricular and pedagogical approaches they will encounter:  
  http://dus.psu.edu/advisers/global_engagement.html

Personally, I would hope that our plan involves some aspects of “Active Learning” …  
http://www.utexas.edu/insyopma/resourcncenter/helptips/ActiveLearningatUTA.pdf
Other
MY FAVORITE finds that that made me think about communication with a big world (or, a Michael Wesch moment):

- 90 minutes in understanding Globalization http://youtu.be/gF2kFPNZChc
- Not globalization, but inter-cultural competence: http://vimeo.com/68388753
- Can Texas Tech hire this guy away from Kansas? http://ksuanth.weebly.com/wesch.html

As a matter of practicality for implementation of any plan, I particularly like the “8 Key Questions” approach used by James Madison University (pg. 19) that sought provide instructors a way that their QEP might be introduced in every classroom … http://www.jmu.edu/files/qep-proposal.pdf

As an aside, I ran across this online and thought you might be curious about the process used by this community college on how to select a QEP and get stakeholder buy-in: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10668920902928978

Human Sciences
Feedback was solicited from executive council (dean and associate deans), department chairs and faculty via both email and in person meetings. Nice discussion ensued in all of the meetings attended.

Of the three proposed, everyone chose writing with the exception of one person. He chose Globalism because of his current efforts on an initiative to create and international scholar program on campus to formalize and refine the current process. One person also suggested a new topic outside of the three which was “civility”.

With regard to written feedback, these are two responses that I received from my outreach efforts:

1) “Any of the three topics are ones that would benefit TTU. There already seems to be a great deal of momentum on campus for diversity and for globalization – these are exciting topics and more programmatic efforts would be welcomed. The more intractable issue is Writing – I assume you mean improving student writing. This is a more daunting issue, but one that could have great benefits for students. When I think of what would best benefit students in our department where diversity and globalization are already important topics in the curriculum, I would say that Writing is a need.”

2) “Those 3 topics are so “been around the past 10 years”J. Perhaps “writing” could be expanded to “communication skills” to incorporate both written and verbal communication. That (and critical thinking skills) seem to be what make students most employable.”

Overall, through discussion with many constituents, it was recommended that we expand writing to be “communication” and include writing in a scholarly form, writing in a business and profession form, communication with regard to email etiquette, as well as oral skills to include presentations, interviews and general communication skills.
Faculty Senate
Three senators responded to my question forwarded from Dr. Bard.

The responses focused on the need for writing and the importance of globalism. One respondent indicated that “diversity” is nebulous, vague, and not clearly defined.

Over all, my sense was that writing is needed, and we are on the track to doing many good things that involve the global perspective.

Staff Senate
Per request, here is what I gathered from my constituents in talking to students:

1.) It was explained that Freshmen English at Tech is hard from a student perspective and should be avoided is the general consensus.

2.) Students explained that they felt underprepared for writing intensive classes because they are not confident in their skills.

3.) Students do not utilize writing center for various reasons.

Suggested implementation:
1. Competition factor for students to submit writing pieces with poems, creative writing, as well as scholarly could be some potential categories.

Library
DIVERSITY (I think we have a good handle on this topic here al TTU.)

1. Writing- I feel this harbors effective communication, which acts as the foundation to working with any person or group no matter if they are a local entity or foreign.

2. Globalization- the exposure to the practices and customs of the global market are key in today’s society and have suitable globalization efforts will take foster diversity naturally.

3. Diversity- While this is important, I feel effective writing and globalization already promote diversity naturally.

Diversity= I recently heard Dr. Nellis speak about the diversity of TTU and I was astounded to hear that 93% of the students at TTU are Texas! And to add to that, only 3% of students are international, making the rest of us (myself included) only 4% of the population. This needs to change. I just can’t believe that a large university with the funds to assist with out-of-state and out-of-country recruitment would have such a low percentage of both.

Globalization- There is diversity in globalization. Recruiting internationally, engaging in international researching.

Writing
I’m writing to report on the feedback that I received from the other music faculty who responded to my queries regarding the QEP. In general, globalization garnered the strongest positive response (or “globalism” as it was amended in the last meeting). While they recognize the importance of having an initiative aimed at writing skill, there was concern as to its implementation, since our musicology faculty members each already teach large classes in which they must grade anywhere from 75-100 full-length undergraduate papers with the help of only two TAs. On the other hand, both our course offerings and our music ensembles (particularly the ensembles within the Vernacular Music Center), already address issues of globalism and cultural literacy. It is my impression that a university-wise initiative such as “Communication within a Global Society,” which was suggested at the last meeting, would be greeted with enthusiasm. I believe it would aid us in the growth and enhancement of programs that are already in place, and help to foster additional activities.
Appendix B: President’s Breakfast for Progress Collected Responses

Breakfast for Progress
April 1, 2014
QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN

1. To what extent is there a need for Texas Tech University to emphasize the improvement of student learning regarding communication through implementation of a Quality Enhancement Plan?

2. To what extent is there a need for Texas Tech University to emphasize the improvement of student learning regarding global competence through implementation of a QEP?

3. The QEP Committee is trying to identify curricular and co-curricular resources at TTU that may be useful as the project is developed. What programs or resources can you identify that already exist at Texas Tech University to support a QEP emphasizing communication in a global society?

4. To what extent might this QEP theme contribute to equipping our students to become leaders in a globally competitive workforce, which is a goal emphasized in the TTU mission statement?

1.

• Need to address students not knowing they have a deficit in communication skills – conflict resolution in particular, multimodal
• NSSE results – weakness global competence, not engaged, interacting with students, classroom discussions lacking
• communicate?, enforce more rules, Engineering – study abroad (interactive experience), competitive situations rather than rules for professors
• concerns about enrollments – programs like with Ethics, if you don’t require how to incentivize?
• student employees – incorporate motivational interview, training
• more structured interviews (staff)
• “dance” – get students to buy into it
• actively engage students even before first day of class
• need campaign
• need to highlight deficits
• worry that there isn’t even a problem
• communicate globally
• international experience
• classes offered at partner institutions, partner together, integrate technology, team project
• global needs to be broader than just international
• skill set; communication becomes the key; written, oral, visual, social
• students, conflict resolution
• old “integrity”
• Counseling Center, most clients dealing with communication deficits
• workshops, Student Resolution Center, RHA, Raider Ready, Law School
• international partners, partner in Mexico/all over
• convocation
• conduct concerns, Parent and Family Relations
• deficit, global competence (NSSE), communicate, conflict resolution
• culture, language, religion, politics, values, study abroad

2.
• NSSE results – weakness about our student population, not engaged with diversity and other cultures, classroom discussion lacking

3.
• Counseling Center, student conflict resolution, workshops, RHA, Raider Ready, Law School, convocation, international partner institutions

3.
• Academy for Leadership in the Legal Profession, advocacy program, legal practice program

• Messaging for the QEP needs to first convince students they have deficiencies in communication/global. Next, it will need to offer support and generate passion for developing better communication in global platforms. Then, current tools, programs, curricula must be leveraged to make progress. Finally, assessment conducted.

• Global communication needs?
• Key is students don’t recognize their deficits in communication – interpersonal, relationships, conflict resolution, writing, persuasion, visuals

• QEP SACSCOC 2016-2010 – broad engagement, institutional support, alignment with strategic plan, communication summit?

• writing intensive, global competence in communication, beyond the core, speaking lab, support – center, themes, capstone courses, transactional writing in and across the disciplines, summit of communication programs
• integrating global competence – languages, modes (speaking, writing, visual), contexts (global, disciplinary, social awareness)
1. • accent, writing, lecture training

3. • Mentor Tech, PEGASUS, writing center, Resolution Center, TLPDC, veterans programs, CALUE, student organizations

4. • further engagement, fight apathy

1. • infrastructure for visiting researchers, professors, include housing, shows a need to think globally
   o clarify insurance, stipend, housing, health insurance
   o still need for enhancing writing skills
   o public speaking
   o languages

2. • important to understand various cultures, know what different customs are, consciousness of other countries’ issues

3. • 42 student organizations with this purpose – study abroad programs, congressional internship programs, Clark Scholar program, writing center, Mentor Tech, Career Center, technology (understand how it can help)
   o capitalize on large non-profits (e.g., Red Cross), connect Center for Undergraduate with international population

4. • out of language of NSF – learning language and understanding cultures, making sure we have information on the other end when we travel to other places

1. • employers report that our students are technically capable, but not skilled at communicating. They need application experience in college.
   • need to work on communication skills
   • need to develop professionalism
   • written and email communication skills are especially needed
2.

- we can help students communicate visually
- it would be useful for them to understand regional heterogeneity in other countries such as India or China
- study abroad programs are especially helpful
- we have some multicultural education, but need much more
- need more exposure to global cultures
- need to develop emotional intelligence
- need to adhere to our global commitment

3.

- lab in basement of Media & Communication
- study abroad
- utilize Career Center, professional communication
- leverage the centers in foreign countries
- Cross-Cultural Academic Advancement Center
- International Cultural Center
- invite more and leverage more international scholars and students visiting Tech
- funding, especially for study abroad
- explain the value of study abroad to academic advisors so they emphasize these opportunities to students
- Snyder Communication Center and Center for Global Engagement in RCOBA

4.

- self-evident
- expand students’ comfort zones
- emphasize that there is a world beyond Texas and that Texas is changing and becoming more global. In other words, encourage our students to explore and learn.

1, 2.

- great extent
- informal vs. professional/business communication
- deep reading/complex writing with synthesis
- foreign language competency
  - more study abroad opportunities
  - more internships abroad
- level of exposure to global perspectives in disciplines
- is multicultural requirement in core a global perspective as well?
- issue discussion groups – access to clean water, education of women
- build global comparative/perspectives into courses – beef production (Southwestern U.S.)
vs. Argentina)
  • using technology to connect to students in other schools

3.
  • International Cultural Center, writing center, study abroad center, Fulbright Scholars
  • develop standards on what it means to be competent in global communication by discipline

4.
  • international/multi-country companies, diverse client bases

1. students need to understand the importance of communication, writing, languages across all majors or departments
   o communication is an ideal in a globalized society and workforce
   o should more majors require study abroad?
   o communication should be across disciplines as well as across cultures

2. we have multicultural and writing intensive open teaching concept and study abroad programs
   o we can scale up and link these already existing programs

• STEM already 85% international
• seek more grants for placement of graduate students internationally
• focus on cultural aspects of communication
• use resident population of international students to teach cultural nuances to other students
• service learning, internships, study abroad, research
• globally active learning – service learning abroad
• students return and must report back
• active learning conference - creates visible outlet
• senior seminar – course requirement, report on globally active experience
• develop attractive name that stands out on resume
• creates points of distinction
• introducing abroad options through the Freshman Seminar (38% students)
• utilize junior and senior students to report experience to the Freshman Seminar
• Freshman Seminar bookended by senior seminar
• "Kalamazoo College requirements study abroad"
• need to benchmark other programs
• stipends and scholarships for international travel for second and third year students
• e-portfolio – general core
• how do we develop an assessment tool?
• possibly use writing as a way to demonstrate global competency
• also look at verbal communication
• advisory board for architecture sent resolution to improve communication
• business would like better verbal and written competence with communication
• global competency awareness and comfort of moving through the globe
• recognition that most companies are multinational
• understanding cultural diversity and learning to be respectful of cultures other than your own
• we have eliminated language yet one learns a lot through language
• we have lots of events that work with international organizations, we need to organize this global calendar
• we should advertise our international events to the Lubbock community
• note: global competence can mean global in the sense of accommodating different cultures at home
• look at social media opportunities to support global awareness

• beyond the core themes, capstones
• support, resources, training, smaller classes, Center for Global Communication
• global languages, modes (writing, speaking, visual), and contexts

• consciousness of global issues
• partnerships with global-reaching non-profits (e.g., Red Cross)
• connecting international students with undergraduates
• CALUE – pushing undergraduate research with international issues

• awareness of values, beliefs, cultures
• study abroad – 250 students

1.
• strong need to improve
• writing center, writing skills enhancement, consciousness of global issues

2.
• how to develop non-profit opportunities
• understand cultures
3.
- 42 registered student organizations
- keeping up with technology
- study abroad exchanges, domestic/international
- science programs, HSC international collaboration

4.
- math/science
- beliefs, worldviews of where you are and where you are going
- languages, learning languages

2.
- assess awareness and competence

3.
- study abroad, cultural exchange

4.
- languages, beliefs, worldview, study abroad, 4-1-1 for graduate students presenting papers abroad
- 42 student organizations
Appendix C: Selected VALUE Rubrics
# Written Communication VALUE Rubric

**Definition**
Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

- Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of and Purpose for Writing</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).</td>
<td>Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience’s perceptions and assumptions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Development</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer’s understanding, and shaping the whole work.</td>
<td>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.</td>
<td>Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices</td>
<td>Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.</td>
<td>Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.</td>
<td>Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

for more information, please contact value@aaau.org
## Oral Communication VALUE Rubric

**Definition**
Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

- Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Material</strong></td>
<td>A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Message</strong></td>
<td>Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)</td>
<td>Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.</td>
<td>Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Global Learning VALUE Rubric

## Definition

Global learning is a critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people's lives and the earth's sustainability. Through global learning, students should 1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, 2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and 3) address the world's most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably.

• **Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Self-Awareness</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectively addresses significant issues in the natural and human world based on articulating one's identity in a global context.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluates the global impact of one's own and others' specific local actions on the natural and human world.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Analyzes ways that human actions influence the natural and human world.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identifies some connections between an individual's personal decision-making and certain local and global issues.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective Taking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluates and applies diverse perspectives to complex subjects within natural and human systems in the face of multiple and even conflicting positions (i.e. cultural, disciplinary, and ethical)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Synthesizes other perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when investigating subjects within natural and human systems.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring subjects within natural and human systems.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identifies multiple perspectives while maintaining a value preference for own positioning (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapts and applies a deep understanding of multiple worldviews, experiences, and power structures while initiating meaningful interaction with other cultures to address significant global problems.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Analyzes substantial connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts, incorporating respectful interactions with other cultures.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explains and connects two or more cultures historically or in contemporary contexts with some acknowledgement of power structures, demonstrating respectful interaction with varied cultures and worldviews.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Describes the experiences of others historically or in contemporary contexts primarily through one cultural perspective, demonstrating some openness to varied cultures and worldviews.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal and Social Responsibility</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takes informed and responsible action to address ethical, social, and environmental challenges in global systems and evaluates the local and broader consequences of individual and collective interventions.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Analyzes the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of global systems and identifies a range of actions informed by one's sense of personal and civic responsibility.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explains the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of local and national decisions on global systems.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identifies basic ethical dimensions of some local or national decisions that have global impact.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding Global Systems</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses deep knowledge of the historic and contemporary role and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems to develop and advocate for informed, appropriate action to solve complex problems in the human and natural worlds.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Analyzes major elements of global systems, including their historic and contemporary interconnections and the differential effects of human organizations and actions, to pose elementary solutions to complex problems in the human and natural worlds.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examines the historical and contemporary roles, interconnections, and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems within the human and the natural worlds.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identifies the basic role of some global and local institutions, ideas, and processes in the human and natural worlds.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applies knowledge and skills to implement sophisticated, appropriate, and workable solutions to address complex global problems using interdisciplinary perspectives independently or with others.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plans and evaluates more complex solutions to global challenges that are appropriate to their contexts using multiple disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formulates practical yet elementary solutions to global challenges that use at least two disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defines global challenges in basic ways, including a limited number of perspectives and solutions.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>