

Running head: INTEGRATIVE LEARNING AT EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Integrative Learning at Eastern Illinois University: Developing a Campus-Wide
Framework

Landon Clark, Conrad Lucas, and Beth Stewart
Vanderbilt University

Index

3.....Executive Summary

4.....Contextual Analysis
Definition of Problem
Study Questions

5.....Data Analysis

9.....Baseline Data

25.....Study Question One

33.....Study Question Two

39.....Study Question Three

43.....Study Question Four

48.....Recommendations

58.....Conclusion

60.....Appendices

86.....References

Executive Summary

Eastern Illinois University recognizes the need for better collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Services and for an assessment plan for integrative learning. Qualitative surveys reveal that time constraints, lack of vision and knowledge, communication issues, and institutional politics are barriers to collaboration. Existing and new initiatives such as faculty fellows and new student programs; co-curricular learning outcomes; and developing a campus-wide task force, technology workshops, and coursework in leadership development can improve collaboration. Measurable outcomes for IL will help establish an assessment plan that can fulfill accreditation, VSA, and IL requirements. The Collegiate Learning Assessment and VALUE Rubrics are key to collecting data. A redesigned IL webpage will communicate what integrative learning is and track its success.

Contextual Analysis, Definition of Issue, and Project Questions

Eastern Illinois University (EIU), located in Charleston Illinois, has a 115-year history of serving students. Eastern Illinois State Normal School, founded by the Illinois General Assembly in 1895, became Eastern Illinois State Teachers College in 1921. In 1957, the college became a university. Today, EIU has an enrollment of over 10,000 undergraduate students and approximately 2,000 graduate students (Pearson, 2009). EIU is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (EIU at a Glance, 2009).

The 2009 freshmen class has an enrollment of 1,705; seventy percent of freshmen are white, 17% are black and three percent are Hispanic. Other identified ethnicities include Asian, international, and Native American. The freshmen class is 60% female (Freshmen Profile, 2009). Students came from 16 states across the nation.

EIU freshmen have an average of a 22 ACT composite score. Forty-three students graduated in the top 10% of their high school class while 234 students graduated in the top 30% of their high school class (Freshmen Profile, 2009). EIU has 44 undergraduate majors and 25 graduate programs (EIU at a Glance, 2009). The Bachelors of Science in Biological Sciences and the Bachelors of Science in Education in Elementary Education are the top two programs chosen by the 2009 freshmen class. Undeclared freshmen make up 27% of the class (Freshmen Profile, 2009).

Undergraduates at EIU enjoy a 15:1 student-faculty ratio. During their time at EIU, students have the opportunity to participate in 150 student organizations, 27 fraternities and sororities, and 39 intramural sports. A variety of intercollegiate athletic programs exist including baseball and softball, soccer, track and field, women's rugby, and NCAA Division I FBS (Football Bowl Subdivision) football. Students may also participate in study abroad programs, honors programs, and a variety of internships. Sixty-one percent of undergraduates persist to graduation (EIU at a Glance, 2009).

In 2007, Dr. William Perry became EIU's tenth president. With him, he brought a vision for the University; EIU will become the national leader in integrative learning. Integrative learning, according to the Carnegie Foundation (Huber, Brown, Hutchings, Gale, Miller, & Breen, 2007, Spring), is "developing the ability to make, recognize, and evaluate connections among disparate concepts, fields, or contexts."

In 2009, EIU identified the need to further develop integrative learning at the University. As such, a team from Vanderbilt University's Peabody College was asked to fulfill the following requests:

1. Construct a literature-based management framework outlining recommendations for effective collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs regarding Integrative Learning.
2. Address the need for baseline data by identifying pertinent data, devising a methodology for data collection, and

determining the most effective manner of presenting data.

Four study questions were formulated from the above two requests.

1. What are the barriers and opportunities that exist between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs collaboration?
2. What existing collaborative practices between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs should be kept and what practices are needed for more effective collaborations?
3. Is there an assessment plan that is adequate for integrative learning?
4. What assessment tools already exist that can be used to measure integrative learning?

This report on integrative learning at Eastern Illinois University will first define integrative learning and describe best practices among the ten Carnegie Integrative Learning Initiative schools. Second, the report will explain data collection and will provide a data analysis. Third, the report will address the four study questions. Finally, recommendations to improve integrative learning will be offered to EIU.

Integrative Learning Defined

“You should graduate college as a person, not a student.”

- Senior English Major

The above quote illustrates what EIU hopes to achieve with integrative learning. Students should leave EIU with the ability to integrate their education in their everyday lives, or as the Carnegie definition states, “the ability to make, recognize, and evaluate connections

among disparate concepts, fields, or contexts” (Huber, et al., 2007, Spring). EIU has based their expanded definition of integrative learning on the joint Statement on Integrative Learning by the American Association of Colleges and Universities:

Integrative learning [includes] connecting skills and knowledge from multiple sources and experiences; applying theory to practice in various settings; utilizing diverse and even contradictory points of view; and, understanding issues and positions contextually. Significant knowledge within individual disciplines serves as the foundation, but integrative learning goes beyond academic boundaries. Indeed, integrative experiences often occur as learners address real-world problems, unscripted and sufficiently broad to require multiple areas of knowledge and multiple modes of inquiry, offering multiple solutions and benefiting from multiple perspectives.

From this definition, EIU has developed six characteristics of integrative learning: intentionality, reflection, metacognition, problem solving, collaboration, and engagement. From the available information, it is unclear who developed these characteristics and the level of involvement by the administration and the faculty.

Data Analysis

Interview Protocol

In order to fully unlock the answers to each of the study questions, designing an effective interview protocol was essential. The first two project questions regarding barriers that exist on campus as well as successful practices can only be answered fully through the gathering of qualitative data in the form of in-person interviews and a review of applicable literature. From the information provided and the initial client interviews, it became apparent that the administration felt some level of integrative learning was taking place on campus. The questions of “how” and “what” and “to what degree” needed to be answered thus a multi step process was designed to arrive at the interview protocol. The first step was to identify existing literature that provided a foundation and would support the validity of the study, followed by informal interviews of faculty members and, finally, finalizing a survey to answer the study questions.

The literature surrounding integrative learning is extensive, but in terms of assisting institutions in the assessment process, an effective model is provided by Braskamp, Trautvetter and Ward (2008), who posed the question, “How can higher education faculty, staff and administrators create campus environments that guide students in their development within chosen disciplines and careers as well as in ways that contribute to a common good?” Providing such an environment is the very basis of the integrative learning approach that Eastern Illinois would like to develop. Braskamp, et al. notes, “Cultivating this complex and expansive form of learning requires that educators intentionally structure campus

environments to help students integrate multiple dimensions of self”. Quite succinctly, it is stated, “It takes a whole campus of whole persons to develop whole students”.

The Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2008) study focused on religious institutions that were struggling to identify ways to achieve holistic development of the student. The Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward study ultimately produced the “4 C framework” of culture, curriculum, co-curriculum and community from which to analyze an institution’s approach to holistic development. Ultimately, this study served as the primary basis for developing the interview protocol to assess integrative learning at Eastern Illinois.

In the study by Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2008), “culture” was determined to be the ethos and social norms that exist on campus including the basics of day-to-day life. Researchers believed that the design and implementation of “curriculum” is the very cornerstone of student development. For curriculum, “What content is taught and how it is taught – the pedagogy – is the essence of the curriculum.” In assessing curriculum at institutions that utilize integrative learning, Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward described the classroom techniques as, “Usually these experiences encourage students to integrate knowledge and understanding, delineate the practice of particular worldviews, engage in reflection, and apply knowledge to their personal life.” Further, “co-curriculum” is viewed as activities that support curricular endeavors and can take place anywhere

outside the classroom. Further, the integration of co-curriculum and curriculum helps students integrate their public and private lives thus institutions should develop an intentional co-curriculum to support their efforts. “Community” refers to relationships that exist and are developed both within the confines of the academic community and with the external surrounding community. By understanding the “4 C’s” as they exist currently at EIU, the institution can understand its current situation before moving forward.

Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2008) provide a series of questions from which to begin developing an interview protocol which should be adapted to individual institutions:

- What are the mission and vision of your institution? How do they influence the culture of your institution?
- Who at your institution do you consider to be champions or leaders in guiding students in their search for meaning and purpose?
- How are faculty at your institution expected to guide students intellectually, socially, civically, physically, religiously, spiritually, and morally?
- How do your institution’s mission and vision influence curricular and co-curricular priorities?
- What are the key issues – challenges, barriers, or opportunities – that your institution needs to address in order to create a campus and a set of programs that foster holistic development?
- How do you encourage and prepare faculty to work with students in the

co-curricular context at your institution?

- How is community defined at your institution? What can you and your colleagues do to cultivate an even greater sense of campus community?
- How is your campus addressing the big questions of the ‘good life?’ (32).

These questions support multiple components to this project. First, these questions serve as a starting point to develop EIU specific questions that address the first two student questions as well as support the gathering of baseline data. Second, these questions provide the basis to gather baseline data. As per the client interviews, the administration at EIU first wanted to know what types of integrative learning were already taking place on-campus. The key to understanding what is already happening was to conduct interviews that would unlock this information. These questions served as the basis for developing specific interview protocols for the different groups that were interviewed at EIU. Third, these questions help to address the first two study questions – relating to existing collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs. By tailoring these questions to EIU, the project team was able to find out about the relationship between these two departments. And, as a fourth role, these questions provide an opportunity for the project team to begin to identify any potential opportunities for EIU that could be included as a recommendation.

Using these questions developed by Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2008), a member of the Vanderbilt team met members of EIU’s Integrative Learning team at the AAC&U

Conference on Integrative Learning in Atlanta during October 2009 to identify specific issues related to EIU. Information gained from the initial client interviews, publicly available sources and meetings with the Integrative Learning team revealed important factors to consider when adapting the interview protocol for use at EIU. Input received at all levels indicated that a strong sense of community exists at EIU and that strong relationships exist between faculty members and students. Further, officials at all levels were confident that students enrolled in the Honors College were receiving a full integrative learning experience but were unsure about the experience of non-honors students. Additionally, in honors courses, a presumption exists that integrative learning takes place while there is uncertainty about non-honors level courses. Moreover, the level of collaboration between academicians and the Student Affairs staff is unknown.

As a result, the final interview protocols were developed with EIU specific material in mind and interviews were conducted with honors students, non-honors students, Student Affairs staff, Academic Affairs staff, faculty who teach honors courses and faculty who do not teach honors courses. By interviewing a sample from each of these groups, a cross-section of the EIU community would be available to provide insight into campus life and the overall use of integrative learning, both intentional and coincidental. The selection process, subject recruitment process, and the number of interviewees for each group are indicated below. Appendix A includes a complete listing of the interview protocols for Academic

Affairs/Faculty, Student Affairs, and students.

The interviews of all subjects were conducted individually during the first week of December 2009, on-campus, and during the business day at times that were selected by the interview subjects. The results of the interviews provide the basis for the recommendations and conclusions that are drawn regarding the first two research questions, as well as baseline data regarding faculty and student perceptions of integrative learning.

Honors Faculty

To recruit faculty who taught honors level classes, the Dean of the Honors College sent an email to all faculty involved in the honors program that asked those interested in participating to contact the principal investigator. In total, all six faculty members who responded were interviewed. These faculty members represented a variety of disciplines.

Non-Honors Faculty

Emails were sent by the Deans of the various colleges to members of their faculty and were asked to contact the principal investigator to schedule an interview. All five faculty who responded to the request participated in the interviews.

Staff

An email request for interviews of director-level staff was sent out to the entire Student Affairs staff listing via the staff assistant for the Vice President of Student Affairs. Participation was

voluntary, and interested Student Affairs directors responded to an email address set up by the Vanderbilt study team. In all, 10 director-level or higher professionals within Student Affairs were interviewed. The areas within Student Affairs represented through the interviews were Health Services, Residence Life, Career Services, Greek Life, Community Service, New Student Programs, Student Activities, Student Standards, and Assessment. Additionally, all staff members in the Academic Affairs department were interviewed. Staff interviews will be discussed in detail in the first research question.

Honors Students

For honors students, an email was sent by the Dean of the Honors College at EIU to all honors students. Those interested were asked to contact the principal investigator directly and not the Dean in order to preserve anonymity. In total, eleven honors students, representing a variety of backgrounds were interviewed. The recruitment process for interviews of honors students was coordinated by the Dean, thus the exact response rate is unknown.

Non-Honors Students

For non-honors students, the investigators utilized the resources of the Student Affairs department in an effort to draw from a cross-section of the campus. The project team examined the campus demographics and types of student activities/organizations that existed and targeted specific groups that would yield responses from a broad picture of students that reflected the student body at EIU. The Division of

Student Affairs sent emails to each of the following groups: student athletes, fraternity/sorority members, student government members, theatre/drama department members, members of the black students association, members of the Hispanic student association, members of the GLBT student association and to the general student population. In the email, students interested in participating were asked to contact the principal investigator. In total, 12 students were interviewed who were recruited from this process.

Baseline Data from Student and Faculty Interviews

Student Interviews

Understanding the student experience at Eastern Illinois University is the top priority for the integrative learning project as the holistic development of the student is the goal of this approach. Due to the specifics of the interview protocol, a mixture of honors and non-honors students were interviewed to garner their varying perspectives of the EIU experience. The dual purposes of the student interviews were to show the baseline data of what level of integrative learning is taking place and to address study question regarding existing collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs. While the interviews were adapted to reflect the experiences of the individual students, the initial questions used included the following:

- Describe the connection you see between your life inside the classroom and outside the classroom at EIU?

- Are you involved in any organizations at EIU that are not related directly to your major field of study? If so, what organizations are you involved with and what is your level of involvement?
- Are you involved in any organizations at EIU that are directly tied to your major or future career aspirations? If so, what are these organizations and what is your level of involvement?
- Have you participated in a study abroad program during your college career, and if so, has that experience impacted the way that you perceive your in-class instruction and out of class experience? If you have not studied abroad, do you plan on doing that in the future?
- How connected do you feel to EIU?
- Do you feel part of the EIU community?
- Do you feel that you have a positive relationship with faculty members?
- Have faculty members taken an interest in you outside of the classroom? Can you provide examples? Has it been just one or two or do you feel the faculty overall takes an interest?
- Have you utilized the Student Affairs staff much since you arrived at EIU?
- Do you participate in the academic programs offered outside of the classroom (i.e. speakers, performances, lectures, panel discussions)?

The questions were designed to support the “4 C’s” as proposed by Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2008), thus the answers have been coded in a manner to reflect these points.

Honors Student Interviews

As noted previously, the Honors College itself has been intentionally incorporating integrative learning as part of its curriculum. Interestingly, many honors students used the term “integrative learning” without being prompted, thus reflecting their understanding of the term and its meaning to the university.

Culture

Overwhelmingly, honors students reflected positively on the culture of Eastern Illinois. The tone of the overall sense of culture at EIU was expressed best by one student who said, “I can’t imagine having a better experience anywhere.” Further, an additional student stated, “I feel very connected to EIU. It is very much part of my life. I don’t just go to school here, it’s helped me think about who I am.” This sentiment was also expressed by another who said, “I absolutely love it here. I’m really going to miss EIU. It will always be part of me.” In giving the EIU culture an overall score, a female student offered, “100%.”

In looking to the specific reasons that makes EIU’s culture so special to honors students, it was noted, “We have a really supportive culture.” Another elaborated, “You definitely aren’t a number like you are at U of I or other big schools. I think it has to do with the town being so small and the type of student that is attracted to this environment.” The size of the Charleston community was a continuing theme amongst honors students with all but three of the interviewees mentioning the small town environment as adding to the close knit culture of the institution. “I guess since the town is so small, EIU is

the town, really. I think of it all as one place,” said another. Additionally, a second student specifically mentioned a contrast with the University of Illinois, “[O]ne of the reasons I came here is because of the campus size. And technically it’s a large school ‘cause it’s over 10,000. But, um, it’s not U of I, it’s not a city in itself, and I think that’s part of what makes the atmosphere here different.”

In considering the culture of the honors program specifically, two students pointed to the culture as being slightly separate from the overall university. “We kinda do our own thing sometimes...We’re a group of really focused people,” said one student who went on to add, “But I have friends in lots of different groups. I mean, I have my honors friends and then my other friends but I don’t think of them that way. I guess I never really thought of it as being separate or, like, different until you asked.” Another added, “Most of my friends are other honors students.”

Community

In order to understand the level of involvement by students, a portion of the interview surrounded the issue of “community.” In this sense, involvement in the community helps to address research question #2 regarding existing collaborations as this. Theoretically, successful collaborations between academic affairs and student affairs would be illustrated by a higher level of involvement by students and a stronger sense of community.

Honors students reported a very high level of involvement in the EIU community with all those interviewed

having participated in campus activities to some extent. Students continually discussed the high number of activities in which they could participate. Further, the sentiment of a supportive culture often found its way into the discussions of campus involvement. A senior stated, “I think that you can get connected to campus pretty easily, there are a lot of opportunities to do so. Um, and I’ve lived on campus all four years and I think that makes a huge difference.”

The honors students were very proud of their level of involvement as well. “I’m pretty involved. I’ve tried to take advantage of just about everything that EIU has to offer. I figure that’s why I’m here.” In discussing the number of programs and opportunities that exist on campus, another student elaborated:

It seems that no matter what it is that you might want to do, there’s a club or program or something that is connected to it. Some of my friends got together when we were freshman and went to Student Affairs to start their own club related to some weird kind of game and they ended up getting approved for it.

Another student added a great deal about a personal connection to involvement:

Yes. I’ve gone to a ton of free movies with University Board; I’ve done the Student Mixers with the Student Board; I’ve participated in the orientation when I came here so that would be New Student Programs. I’ve volunteered off campus but then, you know, now I work a Student Community Service so you know

I do that. And then my mom works Financial Aid so I know that is Student Affairs also. So I have a lot of connections with her office just by knowing people for a while, so...

Yet, despite the high praise for the number of activities, students did offer a critique of the number of clubs, organizations and events. One junior noted,

I think that maybe there might be so many clubs and things going on that the people might get lost in trying to figure out what to do, you know? I mean, we all know about Greeks and student government and the newspaper but some of the other things get lost in the mix so we don't know about all the opportunities.

A sophomore offered a slight criticism as to how events are promoted, "There are flyers, people talking about them sometimes, um, they've chalked the sidewalk a lot this year, written whatever down there, and that can be obnoxious, actually, at times."

Curriculum

Honors students expressed rave reviews of the faculty as well as the in-class reflection and practical application opportunities available. As discussed previously, according to Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2008) a component to integrative learning is for students to "engage in reflection, and apply knowledge to their personal life" (28). "I can think of a few projects that I've done since I've gotten to campus in my classes that were really timely, they

had to do with current events," said one student. He continued, "I'm really into the environment and studying about that so I've had a lot of chances in classes to talk about global warming and how it related to politics today." Further, another student added, "During the election a lot of professors related what we did in class to politics and history."

Looking practically at the courses themselves, students singled out specific majors and professors. "I feel that um, because of that, [being an English major] I can take the lessons that I learn from literature and literature analysis, and put that into life as a whole. I mean that's something that I've just done, ever since...as far back as I can remember." The same student offered an assessment about his classmates in other disciplines:

But I have friends who are Bio majors and it's not often that I can hear 'oh, this is what happened in class' or 'this is what we talked about' or even 'hey this person did something x.' I feel like with the sciences, the field itself seems to be so intimidating that talking about it outside of its core group seems to be kind of...it doesn't work out.

In terms of the relationship to faculty, honors students give a great deal of credit to EIU professors. A female senior offered, "I mean, we have fantastic faculty here. I mean, I love the different people I've interacted with in the English department and yes, everybody, every University has its fair share of not-so-great professors, but I've been really lucky to not really run into that." Adding specifics, one student stated, "I've also had another professor, Dr.

Markelus, she, um, is doing a creative...is the professor for my creative writing workshop right now, and she, whenever she gets a story you know, and reads it, can take a kind of a personal interest in it..." Further, one student offered a comparison with other universities, "A large part of why I enjoy being here is because is...it's not that I don't like U of I, it's just that all the comparisons that I can think of...friends of mine go to U of I, or UWS, and they're all interacting with their TAs, or the professor is in a class with 500 other people so they don't know anybody."

The honors students offered mostly positive reviews of non-honors courses as well. One student provided a general review of all campus faculty with, "Um, fairly good all the way across." Another boasted, "And all the faculty has always been really, really understanding, very personable, and I just...it's been fantastic." An additional student noted, "Um, I feel that I know, that I am familiar, with a lot of the teachers and the staff here on campus and when I take classes I really feel like those teachers would do anything to help me pass if I were ever struggling in any sense." One student offered a slightly less positive critique in that, "In honors classes, there is definitely a big difference, mostly because they are smaller. We have a lot more time to digest information and apply it to our lives."

Involvement with faculty members is key to integrative learning. Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2008) point to the philosophy of "It takes a whole campus of whole persons to develop whole students". The role of faculty is largely to guide the process of

intellectual growth of students through classroom involvement thus a student's interaction with faculty members supports notions of community and curriculum that relate to integrative learning.

Co-curriculum

The co-curricular experience amongst honors students has been positive as well with all having experienced some level of involvement in activities related to their major. This level of involvement spanned the gamut from "I've participated in a couple panel discussions" to "I've been involved with just about every activity related to my major that there is." The role of co-curriculum involvement is key to integrative learning, as certain activities help students to further explore their intellectual and career interests.

Regarding those involved with Student Affairs, a senior pointed out, "Yes, but with that I would not have gotten my job, I would not have gotten my internship or my student worker job or the job that I have after my graduate had it not been for the connections I made with [Student Affairs staff]." Additionally, students pointed out their involvement with co-curricular activities that included honors societies across disciplines including English and Family Services. Organizations such as honors societies in majors allow students to integrate their classroom learning with their career interests.

It is important to note that in the initial client interviews, university officials were specifically interested in learning about the study abroad experience. Study abroad is a means for many

students to step outside of the traditional classroom environment and learn from their surroundings and experiences. In looking specifically at study abroad experiences, honors students generally expressed great interest. A sophomore stated, “I haven’t studied abroad yet but I will eventually.” A senior stated, “I studied abroad and participated in the National Student Exchange program. Even though those weren’t programs where I was in Charleston, it really helped me figure out what to do and get the most out of EIU, even though I wasn’t on campus.” Another student stated, “I studied abroad during the summer and that was one of the best things that I’ve done in college. I really think everyone should do it.”

Summary of Honors Students Interviews

The experiences of the honors students were quite impressive as they showed a passion for Eastern Illinois University and were very eager to share their experiences. As noted in the discussion, students give EIU overall high marks in each of the four areas that were being assessed reflecting that great strides are being made in holistic development and integrative learning in the Honors College.

Non-Honors Students Interviews

Among non-honors students, the overall ratings regarding EIU and its culture are also generally high; however, the level of involvement and connection to the community are not as high as their honors counterparts. The results from the interviews of the non-honors students are described below using the same four categories as used for honors students. As with honors students, the dual

purposes of the non-honors student interviews were to show the baseline data of what level of integrative learning is taking place and to address study questions regarding existing collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs.

Culture

In terms of the assessment of the culture of EIU, generally non-honors students shared the same high-level opinion as honors students. One student noted, “I really like the small atmosphere. I grew up in Chicago so this is a nice change.” Another added, “Everyone here at Eastern is incredibly friendly and easy to get along with. It doesn’t seem like anybody is stuck in their own world.” A senior offered, “I’ve been here four years and have loved every minute of it.” However, the small environment was not universally accepted as positive with one student stating, “Charleston was neat for my freshman year but it got really old really fast” and another commented “I like it here but I think I might have liked a big city environment better, but I’m not sure.”

Much like the honors students, no non-honors students expressed any major disapproval with the overall culture at EIU with one student going as far as saying, “I felt incredibly connected to everyone the moment I stepped on campus and I’ve never been the same.” A transfer student mentioned, “I came here because I thought that I’d fit better in a smaller town with a closer student body.”

For successful integrative learning to take place, an institution’s culture must be open and support a sense of

connection. Further, in terms of integrative learning, culture describes "...the accepted ways of doing daily business" (Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2008). Considering that students across-the-board reported a connection and praise for the university's culture, it is safe to say that EIU has a culture that supports integrative learning.

Community

Non-honors students expressed differing levels of opportunities than honors students. While all honors students were involved in activities to an extent, multiple non-honors students expressed taking part in no campus activities. One student stated, "I just don't have time to take part in anything on campus. I've got two part-time jobs and a full load this semester." Another stated, "I'd like to but I live off campus now and I don't really know about anything that goes on." One senior put it bluntly, "I'm ready to graduate and I just don't want to go to anything anymore."

However, several non-honors students reported very high levels of campus involvement. A male student noted, "I'm in just about everything there is – fraternity, intramurals and student government." Another student pointed to off campus activities as being a priority, "Well, actually, I volunteer, um, at my church and I teach Sunday school." A female student stated, "I don't have much time to be part of organizations not related to my major. But, when I first started here I joined a couple of clubs that were outside my element just to explore."

In discussing the level of community involvement among their peers, a non-

honors student found:

Well, I mean I've got a couple friends who live off campus, and even though they lived on the same floor freshman/sophomore year, junior year they move off and they just drop off the face of the map. You know, it's... 'cause it's different walking from 9th Street to go see your friend, instead of just walking down the hall inside your building. Or, you know, that kind of thing. That's a big difference.

The same student continued, "I think that most people who are involved can tell you that. Um, definitely the opportunities are out there, if you need them."

In looking at EIU's relationship to the overall Charleston community, one student commented:

I think that there are a lot of programs that are designed to have that community involvement and I think that's a positive thing but I think there definitely is a line between campus and community. And you can basically see it as you drive away from campus, but I think it's the same way at every college campus and it's just...you're dealing with different kinds of people and different atmosphere and there's a big difference between a nine-to-five job and you know, going to class.

Multiple students pointed to athletics as a key to bringing the Charleston

community into the fold at EIU. Regarding football, one student stated, “And there were a lot more people in the stands this year than what I had seen my freshman year. You know, if you keep up winning traditions like that, people show up.” A female student added,

So if you put on events that people are interested in, if you advertise them, you know, that kind of thing, and have them be successful, you know, events that are good...and it takes a few years for that shift to happen. I think that’s what we’re seeing now. Is that shift is starting to happen, and it can’t happen overnight.

A junior added, “I was involved with an organization last year that brought famous performers to campus and it was really frustrating when we couldn’t bring people out to concerts.”

Curriculum

In looking specifically at the mechanics of integrative learning, the curriculum section relates heavily to the university’s goals.

The level of development and reflection offered through actual courses varies greatly depending on the major, the class and the student. One student points out, “Through Eastern, depending on the classes, it really depends on the teachers on how integrative it could be.” From the non-honors students, a variety of responses were given regarding the actual courses themselves and the level of integration.

For example, one student described her major as being highly integrative. She said:

With me I am a family services major so we have a highly integrative program through family and consumer sciences because we are family services so we’ve done service projects and volunteer projects. And, a lot of the classes I take are writing intensive classes so it’s a lot of writing a paper and doing a presentation and then writing on how I felt about that and what I’ve learned and things like that and its highly integrative for me.

Another student also points to the high level of integration in some courses versus the low level in others. He states, “I’ve taken Biology and Environment classes that are really hands on with the community and then I’ve taken other classes that haven’t been so like I said it really just depends on the teacher that you have.” Another sciences major mentions, “We don’t really have much reflection at all. We just show up and do our work.” As described previously, reflection, particularly in terms of coursework, is a major component to integrative learning. A history major points out that the level of reflection in each of his courses is “hit or miss.” He adds, “It really depends on the professor not so much the class.”

Despite the varying degrees of integration that seem to be taking place in classes, students indicate valuing integrative learning. A senior states, “And I think that that personal touch that you’re able to add into a student’s experience really can make or

break...can really...I mean those are the motivations that improve people's technique." Another finds, "I really like when we can figure out how things relate to life. You know, like, how does math actually help you. I kinda wish we'd do that more."

Such sentiment is also reflected in terms of contact with professors. A student notes,

People need a reason to do better, and on one hand that means to be self-driven, like you need to be self motivated, but it certainly doesn't hurt to have somebody else, kinda, showing that they're...there's somebody out there that cares what's going on and thinks that what you're doing is worthwhile.

Further, the faculty are generally rated very high in terms of the attitude toward students. A female states, "All the faculty are very approachable. They take an interest in us during class. Well, when we go to them they seem happy about it but they don't always come to us." A male points out, "Yeah, I get along well with all of my professors." A freshman says, "I was surprised how nice they are. I thought that in college they'd all be so different from high school teachers." However, it should be noted that one interviewee was quick to point out, "I haven't ever talked to one of my professors out of class. I don't want to."

Co-curriculum

The co-curriculum aspects of a university and student learning relate to integrative learning in the sense that activities, organizations and non-

classroom learning support holistic development. Students can take part in activities that directly support classroom learning, relate to careers or help them to expand learning beyond their immediate majors and academic pursuits. In assessing the co-curricular aspects of the EIU experience, study question #2 is addressed in that these interviews provide insight into collaboration between academic and student affairs from the student perspective.

Much like the results discussed in the curriculum section, the overall feedback regarding co-curriculum was mixed with some students participating in numerous activities while others did not participate in any. Results ranged between two extremes of one student reporting that she is the president of a pre-professional society and other student stating, "I'm not in anything."

One student discussed membership in a pre-professional organization as being highly beneficial. She stated,

[O]ur advisor took four students to Nashville for a professional conference where we learned a lot more about [the organization] and about making those connections with other colleges and making those connections with other students so that we can find, make it easier for us to make more connections through other colleges instead of just looking at the smaller world of Eastern but try to connect with everybody.

A student who is planning to attend law school said, "I went to a few speakers over the past couple of years who have

been here to talk about grad schools and law schools and that was pretty helpful.” However, another student who is thinking about going to law school said, “I don’t really know of anything here that helps you get in law school.”

Two students who have secured internships that relate directly to their majors reported getting those internships by direct interaction with EIU faculty members. “I never would have known about [this employer] if my advisor hadn’t told me and made a call on my behalf and then everything worked out,” said one student. Another stated, “I worked part time in Student Affairs and my supervisor used to work with someone who helped steer me in the right direction for my internship. It was pretty random. I guess it is about who you know.”

The programming that students have been involved with that relates to their majors and/or future careers have come from a variety of sources at EIU. Of those interviewed who reported taking part in some level of co-curricular activity, three are part of pre-professional societies, three had attended additional lectures or panels that relate to their post-EIU life, two indicated their departments arranged career-related events and one indicated attending a Greek organization event related to graduate school.

For the most part, non-honors students reported that they have not pursued study abroad opportunities. A continuing theme was the cost. One student stated,

I think, at least from what I’ve been told, the way financial aid processes is that I use up my

financial aid during the year, so I wouldn’t have any for the summer and though I’ve heard of people getting scholarships here and there, uh, from the study abroad office, and that study abroad scholarships that increased, now I usually about people talking about they say they are getting a \$100, \$1,000—not to scoff at it, but I would need significantly more. I would pretty much need the trip paid for.

Another stated, “I’ve really always wanted to study in France but I just can’t afford it.” Additionally, a senior said, “I went to the study abroad office and I almost decided to go to London for a semester but I didn’t because it was too expensive.”

However, the cost was not a deterrent to two students. One junior who recently spent the summer in a study abroad program said, “I figure the experience was completely worth it.” A freshman indicated, “I don’t know where but I’m definitely going to do it [study abroad] either this summer or next. It just sounds awesome and everyone I know who did it had a blast.”

Summary of Non-Honors Students Interviews

In many ways, non-honors students and honors students report very similar experiences at Eastern Illinois. In large part, the non-honors students rave about the culture at EIU and report it as a major draw for them. Additionally, many non-honors students have taken part in a great deal of activities on campus; however, there was a generally

lower level of participation when compared to honors students. In terms of the curriculum and co-curriculum experiences, there are multiple differences with honors students and great variation that exists. In terms of the curriculum and co-curriculum experience, it seems that the level of development is truly student specific and depends on that individual's major, courses and personality.

In relating the interview results directly to integrative learning, there are notable examples of students being engaged in reflection in the classroom as well as activities that relation learning to their lives. Several students also pointed out classroom activities that related to current events thus showcasing that, at least to some degree, professors on campus are incorporating integrative learning into their curriculum. Further, in looking to outside of the classroom learning and reflection, those students who take part in activities discussed the vast opportunities in campus to expand their learning. However, it should be noted that holistic development of students in an integrative environment should not be limited to only extroverted students who take advantage of activities on their own. Despite the any success stories of students taking part in co-curricular activities there were also stories of students who only attended classes and did not participate in activities that expanded learning.

Faculty Interviews for Baseline Data

The interviews of faculty members provides some beneficial baseline qualitative data to determine the current knowledge and willingness related to integrative learning of those working

within the Academic Affairs realm of the university. Considering that faculty have the greatest level of interaction with students, gain their perspective on integrative learning and its level of use in their classrooms is key to understanding the situation at EIU.

In order to determine the level of awareness faculty members have regarding integrative learning, the interviews were designed to target faculty members who teach honors courses and those that teach non-honors courses. In order of information to be gathered to provide data regarding faculty perceptions of integrative learning, the responses of the interviewees were divided into a hybrid of the "4 C's" of Braskamp, et al. (2008) and specifics related to the project. Therefore, responses have been coded relating to the following: Curriculum/Integrative Learning, Co-Curriculum, Community/Culture, and Collaboration with Student Affairs. The first three of these areas will be discussed in this section, with the responses related to "Collaboration with Student Affairs" being discussed in the sections related to Study Question 1. Specific questions posed to faculty members included:

- What are the mission and vision of your institution?
- How do they influence the culture of your institution?
- Who at your institution do you consider to be champions or leaders in guiding students to their search for meaning and purpose?
- How are faculty at your institution expected to guide students intellectually, socially, civically,

- physically, religiously, spiritually, and morally?
- How do your institution's mission and vision influence curricular and co-curricular priorities?
 - What are the key issues/barriers/opportunities that your institution needs to address in order to create a campus and a set of programs that foster holistic development?
 - How do you encourage and prepare faculty to work with students in the co-curricular context at your institution?
 - How is community defined at your institution? What can you and your colleagues do to cultivate an even greater sense of campus community?
 - How is your campus addressing the big questions of the "good life"?
 - How well do you know your students' outside (personal or professional) interests?
 - Do you take time to discuss with your students any co-curricular goals and non-academic life activities?
 - Do you include any opportunities for personal/professional reflection within the coursework requirements?
 - In your own words, describe the institutional mission of EIU?
 - Do you have the sense that your students know how to manage their educational experience effectively?
 - Does your department collaborate with any division within Student Affairs on a regular basis? If so, what areas are discussed and how structured is the collaboration?
 - What are some of the major barriers for collaboration with Student Affairs at EIU?

- How do you believe Academic Affairs and the faculty are perceived in the eyes of Student Affairs professionals?
- What do you feel are some of the successful collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs? How do you believe these collaborations have impacted students?

Honors Faculty Interviews

Curriculum/Integrative Learning

The honors faculty expressed a sincere interest in using reflection and integrative learning in their classrooms and were very confident that students benefited from such practices. Again, much like honors students, the faculty expressed positive feelings toward the honors program. However, honors faculty were not fully confident that integrative learning could take hold in all classrooms among all professors across all facets of campus. On the topic of the use of integrative learning in the classroom, on faculty members stated, "I think that integrative learning is something that we do very well in the honors program, although we haven't always used that name. In my classroom, we use reflection as an intentional tool with every lesson." Another faculty members stated, "The students really enjoy when we connect coursework to what is going on in the world and I enjoy watching them go down those paths and make those connections, too." This sentiment was echoed with an experienced faculty member stating,

"These students are what keep me young...They always come with new ideas in their writings

and assignments that keep me on my toes. I guess I've been using integrative learning in my teaching for years, but haven't always called it that."

In commenting on the student experience, a faculty member noted, "I really believe that our students in honors feel that we are trying to help them grow beyond what they might have experienced at another institution. When we go that extra mile, they are right there with us." Curiously, one history professor stated, "I don't really know how reflection fits into a history class."

In terms of spreading integrative learning across campus, the faculty members were less optimistic. Notably, all those interviewed mentioned other professors as the main obstacle. "We've been talking about integrative learning across campus for awhile now but the same people show up to the meetings and the same people are making the efforts. Really, it's not a large part of our faculty who show up and express interest." A very enthusiastic faculty member stated, "The administration has been communicating very effectively with everyone but that doesn't mean that everyone reads their e-mail." Another stated, "I think that many people see this as another passing phase." One professor provided great insight with, "When a colleague in my department first asked me about integrative learning, he said 'Does this mean I have to go to a frat party?'" A female stated quite frankly, "Until you write some of these people a check, they aren't going to do anything." A seasoned faculty member said, "I don't like when people assume that it's an age issue. I see this in some of the younger professors too. There is

an idea of a professor and a student being completely separate and that academia is supposed to be a cold place. I don't know why, but it will be very hard to change." A younger faculty member offered, "There isn't much of an incentive except that some of us enjoy the process of thinking that integrative learning brings about." Discussing the level of communication on the topic, one faculty member said, "They've done a great job at communicating what integrative learning is, but that doesn't mean anything will change."

The biggest complaint among the honors faculty has been the lack of communicated benchmarks and goals. The faculty member who praised communication efforts also added, "I think that people now know what integrative learning is, but they don't really know what is expected of them." A female professor commented, "I think we do this very well in honors, so I don't know what they want us to change." A history professor stated, "Maybe if a list of tangible goals was provided, that might help to move things along some."

Co-curriculum

The honors faculty speak very highly of their students' involvement with co-curricular activities and that these activities support students development. A faculty member gave a positive overview in his perspective,

If I look at co-curricular areas and especially student life, I think of key words like communication and helping to them establish the importance of good communication lines whether it be with administrators

or faculty and staff and their own personal day to day interactions with people. I think collaboration is important.

Another faculty member commented,

I feel our students are equipped with tools and I work quite a bit with a wide range of students from the Student Government Leaders to the Programming Board to the Multicultural Leaders, I think they have the tools to do that, I think they are at varying levels in terms of their skill level to actually utilize those tools and resolve conflict but I believe that they do have tool available to them to do that. But depending on their leadership level is and their level of involvement within their organizations, the ability to implement those into their skills, vary from student leader to student leader and from group to group.

Another added, “I think that we offer plenty of organizations and activities within our department that help students to grow intellectually outside of the classroom.” A male professor noted, “Students at Eastern in honors are very directed and have their end goals in mind.”

Regarding study abroad programs and participating in the National Student Exchange, professors reacted very positively. “I’m so glad to see so many students taking part in study abroad...its a great opportunity.” Another commented, “Study abroad programs have really taken off in the

last few years. That’s something, I think, we do well at Eastern. I’m not sure, but I think amongst our peer institutions we have a comparatively high participation rate.” One professor went as far to say, “I wish every student could have that experience.” Note that there were no professors who offered any substantive criticism of the study abroad programs at Eastern Illinois. In terms of the overall development of students, with curriculum and co-curriculum, a professor who works with numerous co-curricular activities stated,

I think, you know, when I look at the students I work with, they have a good sense of parts of who they are because if you are looking at the whole student, there is the academic component, you know, there is the personal development, the social development component; I mean there’s all these components of the students but since my area focuses more so on their social/leadership side, it’s hard to gauge if they have a whole, I guess, well-roundedness in terms of being the whole student and the complete student from the experiences that they get from me because I only see a certain part of that from my interactions with them and mainly that focus is on the personal development and the social development.

As an assessment of Eastern’s co-curricular opportunities, a faculty member commented, “I think if you look at the co-curricular side, they have much

more autonomy to express their ideas, they have much more autonomy to, you know, work on a project that they can actually see from start to finish.”

Community/Culture

Much like the results garnered from student interviews, the honors faculty at EIU sing the praises of the overall culture and spirit of community. The faculty frequently commented on the small size of Charleston as an attraction of EIU and saw the students as a close-knit group. One faculty member commented, “I believe that the students at Easter learn from one another because of their close interaction. I think of Easter as a big family in many ways and I can really see that amongst the student body.” This belief was consistent. Another faculty member added, “I can see the culture of the student body coming through whenever I assign group projects. Students here seem to work very well together and genuinely enjoy one another.” Also like the students, the faculty members favorably compared Eastern to larger schools. “I feel much closer to my students than my colleagues at the behemoth up the road [University of Illinois],” said a very seasoned professor. Another echoed this sentiment with, “I went to college at [an institutions with an enrollment in excess of 30,000 students] and I never had contact with professors to the level that students have here.” Despite overwhelming praise of culture and community generally, one professor was not as convinced as the others and stated,

You know, they come in contact with students that are different from them but I don’t feel our students take full advantage of

engaging those students or interacting with those students and recognizing that ‘you know, we’re diverse, we have a lot in common because we are Eastern students. We take classes together, we are in the same major’, but there are some things that are very unique to us and I don’t think that our students take full advantage of those opportunities to engage each other in dialogue. I think those two key elements that are missing and even though physically know there’s a difference, I’m not sure our students really recognize or see the importance of diversity because, again, I don’t think that our students take full advantage of the opportunities to engage each other or to even have dialogue or conversations about those differences.

The faculty view on the university mission seems to be unclear. Often, the faculty who were interviewed offered very broad versions of the mission without hitting upon specifics. For example, one tenure track professor stated,

Uh, in my own words, I think the emphasis on it, the university’s mission, is inclusiveness, the importance of enhancing diversity, providing opportunity for academic scholarship, and the promotion of that with student and faculty interactions and relationships. I think it is also important that our institution mission helps to promote civic responsibility and engagement

and just a lifelong learning outside the institutional experience.

An English professor indicated that EIU's mission is not unique among its peers when she stated, "I think our mission like that of any other institution...We have a great mission, but I don't know if it has any real definition that distinguished us from our colleagues." A faculty member that is new to EIU stated, "I don't know if we express our mission effectively in words so much as we act differently. Obviously, we care more about the experiences and holistic development of our students, as evidenced by you [the interviewer] being here." A professor who commented specifically on the honors program noted, "Within honors, our mission is clarified more than the university at large. We spend a lot of time on reflection and ensuring that our students leave Eastern different than when they came in."

Non-Honors Faculty Interviews

Curriculum/Integrative Learning

As a whole, non-honors faculty felt that EIU has a good core curriculum. However, when discussing integrative learning specifically, faculty were less positive. All felt that integrative learning has merit, but the shared sentiment of the non-honors faculty was that there is a lack of understanding about what they were supposed to be doing in regards to adopting integrative learning. An older faculty member stated, "Capstones, study abroad, internship, and the like have been around forever. I'm not sure how this is different from what we've always done." Another faculty member

who was frustrated with integrative learning said,

There is no clear direction. I can't find learning objectives. I'm not sure what the outcome is supposed to be. If we're supposed to be doing something different in our classes, I don't know what that is. If there were clearly stated objectives published someplace easily accessible, more faculty might participate. I'd participate because, in theory, it sounds like a good idea. We just need some guidance.

A third faculty member said, "If we are supposed to be continuously improving integrative learning, it would be nice to know specifically what is used to determine improvement. Grades? Capstones? Some sort of standard exam? What?" Another commented, "We've been doing integrative learning for what, a couple of years now? How do we know if we're accomplishing what the administration wants?"

Co-Curriculum

Much like their honor faculty peers, non-honors faculty praised EIU's co-curricular activities. Each mentioned the study abroad program as an excellent opportunity for students, although one expressed concern about cost as a possible barrier preventing some students from participating. A newer faculty member said, "Students benefit from the activities and organizations they participate in. They can be great learning opportunities." Another faculty member said that EIU "surely has one of the best student life programs." All

comments on the co-curriculum were generally positive.

Community/Culture

As with the students and honors faculty, non-honors faculty also positively noted EIU's spirit of community and culture, the rural location of the university, and the diverse student body. One faculty member said, "EIU's size is much more attractive to many parents and students than SIU [Southern Illinois University] or the University of Illinois. Most parents do not want their kids to be just a number." An older member of the faculty said, "A student who grew up in Chicago had a completely different experience than one who grew up in Effingham. These students can and do learn so much from each other." All non-honors faculty believe that the number and variety of student organization and events on-campus give students a chance to participate in the community and to have new cultural experiences.

There was an overall lack of understanding of EIU's mission statement, and in one case, a lack of understanding of the purpose of mission statements in general. A seasoned faculty member said, "I don't think it is necessary for me to know the mission statement. Mission is the job of the administration. My job is to teach." Another newer faculty member made the following observation, stating, "Our mission like most universities. Diversity, public service, developing a well-rounded student, etc. Few universities have unique missions. EIU excels in executing the mission. That makes us unique."

Study Question #1: What are the barriers and opportunities that exist between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs collaborations?

Barriers to Collaboration-Faculty Point of View

Despite the honors and non-honors faculty's overall positive view and enthusiasm for integrative learning generally, evidence of any collaboration with Student Affairs was quite scant. The honors faculty perspective is best summarized in one comment, "I can't say that I have [collaborated]. I'm embarrassed a little, but I've never thought about it much." Honors faculty generally expressed a little disappointment with their lack of collaboration after having considered the question of collaboration. A professor, who had been very enthusiastic throughout the interview up until this point shrugged her shoulders and said, "I, you know, we've never really...I'm not sure that...No, I guess I never have." Another said, "I've never asked them to but they've never approached me either." Additionally, a faculty member said, "We do a lot for students in the classroom that I guess I have never thought about it that much."

Interestingly, while the faculty themselves said they had not collaborated, most everyone assumed that other divisions/departments did. An English professor said, "I think that's something that happens on the departmental level and I think that the history department does a good job with it but we really don't." Interestingly, a history professor said, "We really don't do much collaboration with Student Affairs." A professor in the sciences

noted, “I never have and I don’t know of anyone else in the department that has but I think some other departments do a better job than we do.” Note that, when asked, this professor couldn’t name an academic department that had collaborated with Student Affairs.

Despite the lack of prior collaboration, all interviewees expressed some level of interest in collaborating in the future. A male professor said, “Sure. I’m sure we could come up with something.” A seasoned professor stated, “Yeah, I think it would be great.” Still, another pointed out, “Oh, yeah, I can see how that would be a good idea.”

Based on the interviews, it is a reasonable conclusion that honors faculty are willing to collaborate with Student Affairs but unsure how or what the process might be. Non-honors faculty also have little collaboration with Student Affairs. Two mentioned that they announce certain activities in their classes and encourage their students to participate. One of those two said, “I guess it’s hard to encourage students to participate in activities when I don’t go to many myself. Now that I think about it, I haven’t been very supportive of student life. I should be, but I haven’t.” The older faculty member previously mentioned who didn’t think integrative learning was anything new said, “Student Life has an important role on campus but it is completely separate from what happens in the classroom.” Yet another said, “I’ve thought about collaborating with student life to develop activities for class. That’s as far as I’ve gone. I never get around to it.”

When asked if other faculty or departments collaborate with Student

Affairs, the non-honors faculty were unsure. One said, “I think the honors program does some collaboration, but I’m not sure what.” Another faculty member stated, “Surely someone does. I just don’t know who.” Based on these interviews, most non-honors faculty would be willing to collaborate with Student Affairs. As previously mentioned with the honors faculty, most are unsure how or have never tried. Of course there will always be some resistors.

Barriers to Collaboration-Student Affairs Point of View

While the faculty interviews give a glimpse of the barriers, the interviews with Student Affairs professionals were a bit more telling on the perceived divide between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. During the individual interviews with members of the Division of Student Affairs, a number of items on the interview protocol were directly related to collaborations and perceptions between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. A complete collection of the questions posed during the Student Affairs interviews is available in Appendix A, and an overview of the conceptual breakdown of the Student Affairs interviews is included in Appendix B. The following questions related to collaborations were directed to all participating Student Affairs professionals:

- Does your division collaborate with any academic department/major on a regular basis, and if so, are there any shared learning outcomes?
- How often do you collaborate with someone on the academic side of campus?

- What are some of the major barriers to collaboration with Academic Affairs or faculty at EIU?
- Are there any avenues for structured discourse between your area in Student Affairs and any are in Academic Affairs?
- How do you believe Student Affairs is perceived in the eyes of the faculty?

The responses from Student Affairs professionals to these questions varied greatly depending on which specific area within Student Affairs the person worked. While there were definite differences in the perceptions of collaborative barriers, certain themes did become evident throughout the interviews as a whole, and these findings are closely tied to relevant literature available on collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Time Constraints

The issue of time affecting collaboration is prevalent on most any campus, and Eastern Illinois is no different. While not every Student Affairs professional interviewed indicated that time was a major barrier, it was mentioned frequently enough to warrant further examination to the issues impacting both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. It was evident through the interviews that the Division of Student Affairs was not well staffed across the different subdivisions, and therefore the professionals were asked to achieve many goals with professional and student staffing that may be inadequate. Student Affairs and faculty are concerned primarily with their own sphere of influence, be it inside the classroom or outside the classroom,

which is a result of time constraints (Getty, Young, & Whitaker-Lea, 2008). One staff member noted:

I think it has a lot to do with time...it just seems like everyone is just busy, everyone wants everything right now. So I think that provides a lot of pressure on everyone and I think that takes a lot of time. The biggest reason why people [faculty] do not participate is that they do not have the time to do so.

Since time is very valuable to both Student Affairs and faculty members, constraints in this area can greatly impact the level to which both sides can collaborate on integrative learning initiatives. With Student Affairs being stretched by low staffing and increases in student need, little time is available to reach out and develop the relationships needed with faculty members to create meaningful partnerships. An additional barrier related to time is the presence of a unionized faculty at Eastern Illinois. With a binding union contract and no perceived reward for additional work outside the classroom (Zeller, Hinni, & Eison, 1989; Martin & Murphy, 2000), faculty members may not even have reason to respond to requests for collaborations with Student Affairs. Regarding the unionized faculty, one Student Affairs professional stated:

Well, our faculty is all union...so there are, unfortunately, a lot of faculty who feel like 'I'm part of a union and I have a contract, I'm going to do what's on that contract and you can't tell me to do anything else'...

Lack of Knowledge and Common Vision

As higher education has progressed, the professionalization of both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs has risen sharply. Whereas faculty acted as mentors and *in loco parentis* throughout the earliest stages of college and university life, the outside the classroom activities of students has largely become relegated to professionals in Student Affairs and the pedagogical and knowledge creation aspects have come under the expressed realm of the faculty. Professionals on both sides are now highly trained in specific disciplines and techniques, therefore widening the gap between the Student Affairs and Academic Affairs (Brady, 1999). This increased specialization produces segmentation to where neither side is fully aware of the other's daily activities or responsibilities (Knefelkemp, et al., 1992, July; Philpott & Strange, 2003, January/February). The differences in organizational cultures between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is a result of differing goals related to student learning and development (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001, Winter), and represents what Martin and Murphy (2000) describe as a "traditional separation" between the two entities.

Referencing the different cultures and lack of knowledge between Student Affairs and faculty at Eastern Illinois, one staff member stated that: "Student Affairs is more instantaneously responsive and Academics is not that responsive, so there are some barriers on how they work and how Student Affairs works." Another staff member said "faculty need to have a greater understanding of what Student Affairs offers and our accessibility."

The perception from the interviews of Student Affairs professionals seemed to indicate that faculty had little idea of what Student Affairs does on a regular basis, and likewise, the Student Affairs professionals had limited knowledge of the professional life of faculty. This disconnect could be attributed to the finding that there was a noticeable absence of shared learning outcomes with Academic Affairs, and even an absence of defined learning outcomes within Student Affairs. Regarding learning outcomes within Student Affairs, one professional stated that, "Inside the programs, we talk about what we need the students to gain. Now as a division, we have not set forth any learning outcomes. There are not written learning outcomes divisionally." A similar statement was given by another Student Affairs professional, this time related to shared learning outcomes with Academic Affairs and faculty:

I guess it's more of a coordination of activities. I think the learning outcomes piece I feel like we talk about a lot, and in the time I've been on-campus, it's a conversation we've been having, but I have yet to see us really make learning outcomes happen. It's one of those areas where we're good at talking about it and we're good at starting the plan, and then it never comes to fruition.

Communication Issues

Since Student Affairs and Academic Affairs tend to act independently from one another in most of the day-to-day aspects of their respective divisions

(Philpott & Strange, 2003, January/February), the perceived lack of communication at Eastern Illinois is not surprising. Issues with communication are likely tied to different organizational structures (Dale & Drake, 2005, Fall; Getty, Young, & Whitaker-Lea, 2008), cultural and professional differences between the two divisions (Brady, 1999; Bourassa & Kruger, 2001, Winter), and a lack of shared knowledge (Knefelkamp, et al., 1992, July; Dale & Drake, 2005, Fall). With little common ground to share outside of working with the same students, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs are bound to have difficulties in communicating without shared outcomes or vocabulary.

A majority of the interviews with Student Affairs at Eastern Illinois indicated that there was limited communication with academic departments or faculty on a regular basis. However, it was not evident through the interviews that avenues for communication were necessarily closed; simply that communication was sporadic between certain subdivisions within Student Affairs and faculty. It was mentioned by one Student Affairs professional that Academic Affairs and Student Affairs members do sit on a number of committees together, and that this was an expectation of President Perry. Certain subdivisions within Student Affairs, mainly New Student Programs and Residence Life, showed far higher levels of communication with faculty members than elsewhere within the division. One professional made reference to some positive communication with faculty:

I may be off base, but I would say that my department has the

most connections...I could pick up the phone today and call any one of the deans and I know that they would take my phone call and they won't ask what I am calling about and we can have a great conversation. And if I have something new, they are going to entertain it...I feel really good about being able to have tenured faculty, adjunct faculty, deans, and department chairs that we can call and they are going to understand where we want to go and how to make it happen.

While communication between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs at Eastern Illinois seems to be somewhat limited, although accessible, the interviews with Student Affairs professionals indicated that there was a lack of emphasis placed on communication being passed down from the higher levels of administration. This may be based partly on the lack of common and explicitly stated learning outcomes, as it may seem fruitless for professionals on both the academic and student development divide to collaborate if there are no shared goals. Within Student Affairs, there were various statements regarding communication issues and a lack of guidance on what was expected related to integrative learning:

While it [collaboration] hasn't been a top-down kind of thing, it's going to be a grass roots kind of initiative coming.

I would say probably the big thing from our division there is no clear cut focus on integrative learning and academics working together...we've had no clear cut

focus or plan as to how to proceed as a division...”

Divisionally, we are missing the mark when it comes to collaborating on the academic side of the campus. It should be more or a top-down level expectation, and think divisionally, that vision isn't there.

Institutional Politics

Internal political pull and hierarchy was evident in some of the responses from professionals within Student Affairs. This is to be expected, as these forces tend to be highly prevalent throughout most institutions. Martin and Murphy (2000) describe “tribe and territory” as a major barrier for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs collaborations, as faculty members tend to be very highly protective of their resources, time, and energy. Additionally, Degen and Sheldahl (2007, Spring) and Colwell (2006, Winter) indicate that structural dynamics of higher education institutions create invisible divides that pose problems for collaborative efforts. While there are a number of political problems that may be manifest that could cause Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to compete for resources, Zeller, Hinni, and Eison (1989) outline three problems that were common among responses at Eastern Illinois.

The first such issue is the tendency for faculty members to identify primarily with the pedagogical and research functions of the university, and more specifically, those within their chosen field. While Eastern Illinois is not an

institution with a high level of research activity, faculty are focused primarily on the academic mission of the university, which would be primarily in the classroom. This centralized focus on the academic mission leads to the second problem stated by Zeller, Hinni, and Eison (1989), which is the tendency for faculty to view additional academic goals outside the classroom as secondary in importance. This factors into perception, and the answers from Student Affairs professionals regarding how they believe faculty members perceive Student Affairs reiterate this “secondary” status. One professional stated, “I think we are perceived well, but I do not know if we are perceived as being very involved in the academic mission. I think there is a narrower scope in terms of providing services to students.”

When asked as to how faculty view Student Affairs, another professional stated:

Supplemental, I think. More or less, I think academics is the focus. They [students] are coming to get an education and sit in class, to study, and I think Student Affairs is oftentimes seen as supplemental. I think if Student Affairs wasn't there, college would still go on. I think that's many of their [faculty] view.

Zeller, Hinni, and Eison (1989) also point out the status differential between members of the faculty and Student Affairs professionals. Faculty members tend to have advanced degrees and significant levels of teaching experience, whereas Student Affairs professionals

may have limited academic credential past the Master's level, especially in the entry-level positions. As a result, faculty may perceive that the business of teaching students and developing new knowledge should be reserved for those with the proper credentials. Likewise, Student Affairs professionals may feel ill equipped to work directly with faculty members in development of certain higher level learning opportunities because of perceived difference in status. Through the interviews, it was not evident whether or not Student Affairs professionals refrained from collaboration with faculty based on the status differences, but some statements did show evidence that faculty might not be as open to collaboration based on the view of Student Affairs as non-academics. One professional did allude to this perception by saying, "On the negative side, I think that the faculty does not see those of us in Student Affairs as scholars, which is personally a little bit frustrating for me because I am a scholar as well."

Lack of Intentionality

For optimal student learning, both in and out of the classroom, structures must be intentionally developed that both lay a framework and provide opportunities for development (Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2008). To facilitate student learning, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs partnerships must be persistent and continuous over the course of time to create meaningful impact. In the case of Eastern Illinois, the integrative learning component is still in its infancy, so intentionality on both parts is of the utmost importance in creating collaborations that will positively benefit students.

At the time of the interviews with Student Affairs professionals, there appeared to be the notion of integrative learning as an important part of the future of campus life and academics, but no real plan in place to bring the two sides together from a larger divisional standpoint. New organizational structures have been advocated in the literature as a way to bring Student Affairs and Academic Affairs together in new reporting lines (Keeling, 2004, January), which could then result in the development of an open campus model where professionals from various disciplines and departments work together on common goals (Kuh, et al., 2005). Martin and Murphy (2000) also advocate for a campus-wide task force to bring together Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in an intentional setting. As stated previously, the perception of many of the Student Affairs professionals interviewed was that integrative learning was becoming more of a "grass roots" phenomenon instead of a "top-down" expectation.

Although intentional collaboration with Academic Affairs was somewhat lacking in the interviews, two subdivisions, New Student Programs and Residence Life, did exhibit some proactive initiatives with working with faculty members. New Student Programs was mentioned by a number of professional staff members as an exemplary example at Eastern Illinois. When asked about successful collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, one professional stated, "New Student Programs does with 'Eastern Reads,' where we are tying in a book where all the incoming freshman need to read, and encouraging faculty and staff to lead

these reading circles.” The same professional also stated that in regards to intentional partnerships:

We just have to make sure that from the top-down, we’re extending that expression of partnership and enthusiasm. Sometimes it may get stuck halfway because our Directors all go off to meetings and stay so busy that the front line staff maybe isn’t getting told.

Other professional staff members also discussed the involvement of New Student Programs in the University Foundations course as the possibility of an “awesome collaboration.” There was repeated mention that many Student Affairs subdivisions work with the University Foundations course to acclimate first year students to campus life and the services offered through Student Affairs.

Residence Life was also repeatedly mentioned as having intentional relationships with faculty, mostly through the Faculty Fellows program. One professional staff member outlined the Faculty Fellows program as follows:

It’s kind of like ‘Adopt a Highway’ program where you volunteer to clean up one mile of interstate. We have about seventy faculty members on-campus that have adopted twelve residence halls...a team on average around eight to nine faculty members who were asked to do at least three things in that residential community.

Another staff member noted that, “If you look at the Faculty Fellows program, students are seeing faculty outside of their respective classroom settings and in much more of an informed and informal setting.”

In addition to the Faculty Fellows program, Residence Life has also allocated funds towards a more informal program where student leaders and Resident Assistants are encouraged to bring faculty guests to meals in the dining facilities. Related to this program, one staff member said:

This is one way to integrate the faculty into the dining and social realm of the students’ world...These are more down-to-earth discussions that happen between faculty and students to help students learn more about the faculty member outside the classroom, that they are people, too.

Summary of Barriers: Student Affairs Point of View

While the interviews of Student Affairs professionals did not represent the entirety of the division, the responses point to the general sentiment within Student Affairs that there have been problems with collaborations with Academic Affairs, but there have also been successes and positive hope for future partnerships. The most prevalent issues tended to be related to intentionality and communication issues within Student Affairs, not necessarily the external relations with faculty. The successes tended to coincide with the subdivisions of Student Affairs where educational missions cross (New Student

Programs, Career Services, and Community Service), and areas with little collaboration represented the traditional inside the classroom vs. outside the classroom experiences (Student Activities and Greek Life). What was most surprising was the success of Residence Life in tying in with the academic mission of the university through the Faculty Fellows program and bringing faculty into the student realm through informal programming.

Since the integrative learning component at Eastern Illinois is a relatively new institutional initiative, it is likely that more intentional partnerships will be developed over the course of time, and this increase in intentionality should filter down to the director-level and entry level Student Affairs staff members. Increased communication, both within Student Affairs and with Academic Affairs, should increase with the development of more centralized and explicit learning outcomes. While it was evident throughout the interviews that these learning outcomes have not been developed, it seemed that specific expectations are both desired and needed to increase the level of integrative learning at Eastern Illinois.

Study Question #2: What existing collaborative practices between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs should be kept and what practices are needed for more effective collaborations?

Existing Collaborations to Build Upon

While there were several existing collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs that showed positive results in enhancing integrative

learning on-campus at Eastern Illinois, two specific initiatives were frequently referenced throughout the interviews of Student Affairs Professionals: the Faculty Fellows program within Residence Life and initiatives under the auspice of New Student Programs.

Faculty Fellows Program

The Faculty Fellows program has been a joint venture between Residence Life and Academic Affairs as a way to bring faculty into the living environment of students living on-campus. There are approximately 70 faculty members participating in the program each year, with these faculty split into teams and assigned to one of 12 residential complexes. These teams of Faculty Fellows interact with the residents in the facilities on a regular basis for formal and informal programs. Communication has been paramount for the success of this initiative, and team leader from each of the respective complexes is expected to have regular conversations with the Residence Life professional staff members to create new opportunities for faculty and students to interact. The Faculty Fellows program has also led to the development of an offshoot program where student leaders are encouraged to invite and faculty member, not just those in the Faculty Fellows, to meals in the campus dining establishments for further interaction with students, and this program is funded through Residence Life.

Having faculty be involved with the residential lives of students is highly beneficial to integrating the curricular and co-curricular lives of students. Having faculty involvement in the living spaces of students is helpful in the

creation of a seamless learning environment (Martin & Murphy, 2000). Faculty are able to interact with students on a level that may not be possible in the classroom or lab, and this interaction may also allow for students to develop a more positive perception of faculty members through discussions that are still developmental in nature, but possibly more informal and outside the faculty member's specific discipline. Additionally, time spent by the faculty in residential facilities with students may increase the opportunities for interaction with informal student groups (Kuh, et al., 1994). Since some faculty members may serve as advisors for recognized student organizations or pre-professional groups, their sphere of influence may be limited to a select number or demographic of students. Participation in residential living programs allows for faculty members to engage with students they might not otherwise come into contact.

Keeling (2004, January) speaks of "new organizational cultures" as a way to increase the level of cooperation between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Certainly having faculty participate in residential living programs would classify as a new organizational culture. The downside to the opportunity for faculty to interact with students in on-campus residences is the amount of time needed to create beneficial interactions. In an overview of the DEEP (Documenting Effective Educational Practice) schools, Kuh et al. (2005) state that developing meaningful learning environments on college campuses is a very labor intensive endeavor, especially on the part of the faculty. Since time is extremely valuable to faculty, the increased pressures of research,

publication, and pedagogy may override the need or desire of faculty members to interact with students outside of the classroom. However, if there is a perceived benefit for increased interaction with students, be it tenure or stipend, faculty members may be more willing to put in the time and effort to develop learning partnerships with students outside the classroom, and with Student Affairs departments as well (Martin & Murphy, 2000; Zeller, Hinni, & Eison, 1989).

While there are a variety of different approaches to integrating faculty members into the residential facilities on a campus, the highest level of immersion would be in faculty-in-residence programs. In this model, faculty would actually live on-campus with the students, similar to historical models and the truest form of a residential college (Kellogg, 1999; Bourassa & Kruger, 2001, Winter). However, faculty living on-campus is not the most feasible model for most contemporary institutions. Programs designed collaboratively between Academic Affairs and Residence Life to bring faculty into the residential living facilities on a regular basis have been shown as positive forces in the creation of learning communities on-campus (Kuh, et al., 2005). Through increased collaboration and development, both faculty members and Residence Life professionals can gain increased appreciation and understanding for one another's strengths and talents, thereby equalizing tension that can be normal with professional staff members working with faculty members (Zeller, Hinni, & Eison, 1989).

New Student Programs

New Student Programs at Eastern Illinois works collaboratively with faculty members and Academic Affairs on a regular basis to aid in the matriculation and acculturation of new students. This collaboration is benefited by having faculty members take an active role in advising new students during summer orientation session, work with Student Affairs in the development of University Foundations courses, and through facilitating first year reading opportunities. Professionals in New Student Programs have extensive interaction with faculty members to develop orientation and advising schedules and information, and various professionals throughout the Division of Student Affairs are active in some teaching during the University Foundations courses. The first year reading component, known as Eastern Reads, is also developed jointly between New Student Programs and Academic Affairs, and faculty or staff led reading groups are developed to increase the level of integration first year students received related to the common text inside and outside the classroom.

Kuh et al. (2005) highlights the importance of first year seminar (FYS) courses in aiding in overall student development and setting students on the path to success. Since the first year of college is pivotal for many students, increased emphasis on collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is important for holistic development. By combining the level of expertise faculty members have with pedagogical concerns and concept mastery with the expertise of Student Affairs professionals related to student development theory and practice, a

comprehensive and integrative course for first year students can be developed. This cooperation is also beneficial to the student orientation process through acclimation to college life and the development of an academic plan for students to begin their college degree towards a specific field of study (Degen & Sheldahl, 2007, Spring; Kuh, et al., 2005). Additionally, by including Student Affairs in the actual development and teaching of FYS courses can have benefits to students, faculty, and Student Affairs professionals. Students can receive information related to campus policies and procedures, faculty can become more acquainted with the areas of student development in which Student Affairs is involved, and Student Affairs professionals gain insight into the development of courses and pedagogical techniques (Martin & Murphy, 2000).

Common readings are an important part of developing active learning within student populations. If student populations are exposed to similar experiences, this can lead to further small group discussions, possibly led by faculty and staff members (Kuh, et al., 2005). Through development of a common reading component, a campus can generate a general conversation around a chosen topic, and in the view of Kellogg (1999), “create a common vision of learning” and “a common language.” When the creation of a common text is a partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, the result can lean more towards global and cultural competencies, rather than strictly academic ideals (Keeling, 2004, January), which can enhance the reach of the common reading by impacting a more general student population. Having

Student Affairs involved in the planning of the common reading component is also a beneficial tactic in increasing the level to which Student Affairs is involved in the general education component of undergraduate education (Brady, 1999, Winter).

Possible Beneficial Practices for Collaboration

While there are a few existing practices at Eastern Illinois that support the notion of the Student Affairs and Academic Affairs working collaboratively towards integrative learning, there are ample opportunities for more intentional interaction between the two sides. Many opportunities were alluded to during the interviews with Student Affairs professionals on-campus, and most could be adapted and applied with a little more time and concerted effort. In a publication from the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), Martin and Murphy (2000) outline ten different applications of the adequately dubbed “Partnership Model” between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Five of the ten proposed ideas already exist in some shape or form at Eastern Illinois: FYE Courses, Faculty-in-Residence Programs, Crossover Committee Membership, Restructured search teams, and Team Teaching. The remaining five ideas are definitely possible at Eastern Illinois, and could be quite influential in developing the integrative learning component in the future.

Campus-Wide Task Force

While Martin and Murphy (2000) advise in the article for this campus-wide task force to be focused on retention, an

adaptation to make the task force focus on integrative learning would be beneficial in the case of Eastern Illinois. There has been a movement within the field over the last few years for Student Affairs to move away from the more traditional social outcomes of student development theory towards specific co-curricular learning outcomes that can be aligned with curricular missions and goals (Getty, Young, & Whitaker-Lea, 2008). With this trend being manifest at Eastern Illinois where the Student Affairs professionals displayed a need for specific outcomes throughout the interviews, the student development professionals could bring various forms of expertise to a task force charged with developing integrative learning and specific student learning outcomes.

Keeling (2004, January) offers up a number of specific learning outcomes in which Student Affairs can help faculty develop, including engaged citizenship, career planning, ethics, and leadership. Co-curricular areas such as experiential learning and service learning could also be applied to this list (Knefelkamp, et al., 1992, July). As citizenship is a primary goal of Eastern Illinois, having Student Affairs professionals working with faculty on developing related outcomes could be highly beneficial. Additionally, professionals with expertise with student conduct could benefit goals related to ethics, and development of experiential learning within Student Activities, Greek Life, and Community service could enhance integrative learning opportunities and promote leadership development in students.

Enhanced General Education Core with Cocurricular Components

Adding in definitive co-curricular pieces into syllabi and course requirements could greatly enhance the level of integrative learning at Eastern Illinois. According to Martin and Murphy (2000), such commitment to co-curricular development would compliment the overall undergraduate curriculum, as well as provide a mutual cost-sharing initiative if the price of programs and developments was split between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. According to Fried (2007), one of the tenets of a developmentally rich undergraduate experience is the “constructions of self in society,” and adding a co-curricular component to the general education core would be helpful in reaching this outcome.

Some development of required service learning as a co-curricular component is advocated by Knefelkamp et al. (1992, July) and Kuh et al. (2005), and such a requirement be beneficial not only in certain courses or majors, but across the campus to impact all students. With a proactive Community Service subdivision of Student Affairs, building service learning into the curriculum would be reciprocal in benefit. There might also be requirements for student participation in institutionally recognized student organizations or clubs, which would encourage student engagement. Whatever the structure is for the co-curricular component, such an initiative would aid in the development of a campus ethos of involvement and integration, allowing students to more fully mesh their public and private lives on-campus (Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2008).

Coursework in Leadership Development

As students continue to work through undergraduate courses on the premise of being employable upon graduation, the advent of required coursework in leadership development could be highly beneficial at Eastern Illinois, and would require the collaboration of both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to ensure practicality and significant academic rigor (Kellogg, 1999). Martin and Murphy (2000) advocate for leadership development courses to be widespread, incorporating multiple curricular areas with various learning outcomes. The idea of developing “practical leadership” skills was explained by Keeling (2004, January) as giving students the skills necessary to become leaders in real world situations. As Student Affairs professionals are charged with the task of working with and developing talented student leaders, expertise from the areas of Student Activities, Greek Life, and Residence Life would be highly beneficial in developing a curricular emphasis on leadership development.

Leadership is a definite component of engaged citizenship, so Student Affairs and Academic Affairs at Eastern Illinois should work collaboratively to add an integrative component to the curriculum to facilitate progress towards this goal. Kuh et al. (1994) states that collaborative efforts with increasing levels of impact on student learning should encompass high expectations for student performance under the premise that if an institution expects more out of its students, it will in turn receive more from its students. If producing good citizens is a focal point of the institutional mission at Eastern Illinois, more emphasis should be placed on leadership development and how this

relates to citizenry. A collaborative effort between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs could effectively raise the level of expectation for students related to leadership development, and in return, reap the benefits of having more intentional student leaders on-campus.

Instructional Technology Workshops for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

The rapid development of technologies has oftentimes outpaced the embrace and utilization of technology in curricular and cocurricular learning situations. As students become more connected to available advancements in electronic media and exposed to wider arrays of accessible information, it would benefit faculty and staff members to develop a more common understanding of what technologies are available (Martin & Murphy, 2000), and more importantly, how to properly utilize them to benefit integrative learning. In the review of institutions with high levels of success in developing positive educational environments, Kuh et al. (2005) advocates for the use of “engaging pedagogies” as impetus for student learning across all areas of collegiate life. Developing new ways to integrate the available electronic technologies into the learning lives of students would be highly beneficial for faculty and Student Affairs seeking to bridge learning inside the classroom with experiences outside the classroom.

By establishing an ongoing series of workshops or symposiums for faculty and Student Affairs staff related to technology advancements and implementation, Eastern Illinois might create a paradigm shift in the way technology is viewed as a tool for

curricular and co-curricular learning. Fried (2007) notes that such an initiative might be beneficial for the professionals involved by establishing the legitimacy of different methods of pedagogy and how these might relate to overall student learning. Additionally, workshops for faculty and Student Affairs staff related to better utilization of technologies might create a mutual need for collaboration between the two sides (Knefelkamp, et al., 1992, July) to better understand new advancements in technology, as well as increase the cultural awareness of how students utilize new technologies in a living and learning environment (Keeling, 2004, January).

Broader Definition of Faculty or Student Affairs Service

Since one of the major costs of collaborative efforts is time, the development of a better system to reward time spent in working across divisional lines between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs could be beneficial at Eastern Illinois. It has been stated that rewards on the faculty side are usually related to tenure, rank, and funding (Zeller, Hinni, & Eison, 1989; Martin & Murphy, 2000), so making sure that faculty are rewarded for a willingness to interact with students outside the classroom and work with Student Affairs on integrated initiatives would be important. Taking this a step further and requiring collaborative work with co-curricular student learning could possibly be even more effective, by a making a preference an essential priority. Conversely, instituting some incentive or requirement on the part of Student Affairs staff to collaborate with faculty could be more beneficial in the

long run by setting a precedent for partnerships and working outside of the typical co-curricular student development realm.

By broadening what is expected or rewarded in terms of service in the faculty and Student Affairs positions, Eastern Illinois might enhance the overall community of the campus through these redefined relationships, bringing about a more integrated campus by starting with the professionals charged with providing integrative learning opportunities for the students (Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2008). Essentially, if Eastern Illinois is adamant about setting the expectation for students to show increased integrative competencies by meshing learning inside the classroom with experiences outside the classroom, bringing expectations of faculty and Student Affairs staff more in line with the student expectations could be highly effective in creating a new campus ethos related to integrative learning (Kuh, et al., 1994).

Study Question #3: Is there an assessment plan that is adequate for integrative learning?

Integrative learning is an ambitious student learning goal, long espoused in higher education and in the world at large. It is also a goal that for too long has depended upon serendipity rather than planning in its achievement and is often not included as an element in assessments. But if a college or university is committed to integrative learning as an expected outcome, it must create intentional approaches to providing integrative experiences and assessing the quality of student integrative achievement (Miller, 2005).

When EIU identified the need to further develop integrative learning at the University, it was determined that an assessment plan was needed to identify pertinent data, devise a methodology for data collection, and determine the most effective manner of presenting data. That need was echoed in the faculty interviews. As previously mentioned, one complaint among honors faculty and non-honors faculty alike is the lack of goals and assessments. There seems to be an overall lack of visibility and knowledge about integrative learning assessment.

Many colleges and universities have assessment plans for their integrative learning programs. However, the literature repeatedly indicates that assessment plans for integrative learning must be created at the local level in order to be successful. With this in mind, this section of the report will provide a brief discussion of pertinent information needed to develop an assessment plan.

Overview

Prior to the 1970's, college degrees were not questioned in regards to quality or value added to the student and society. In the 1970's fiscal problems put into question the quality and necessity of higher education in the United States. During the 1980's, multiple reports called for reform of higher education and increased accountability from college systems and campuses. By the end of the 20th Century, all regional accrediting agencies included assessment as an integral part of requirements for continued good standing (Huba & Freed, 2000). Today, the nationwide movement for assessment continues both on

campuses, in systems, and among state and national legislators. This is occurring in a climate of increasing enrollments and decreasing resources making the need for cost-effective assessments imperative (Bloxham & Boyd, 2007).

A first step in developing a successful assessment plan is defining what assessment is and identifying its purpose. Several definitions of assessment that have common elements exist in literature. Common elements include identifying assessment as a process in which data is gathered and reviewed. It is commonly stated that the purpose of assessment is to improve learning. Berheide (2007) writes that the end result of assessment “is the improvement of student learning at the individual, program, and institutional levels.” A sampling of assessment definitions may be found in Appendix C.

Huba and Freed (2000) provide a definition of assessment that reflects the common elements found in most definitions:

The process of gathering and discussing information from multiple and diverse sources in order to develop a deep understanding of what students know, understand, and can do with their knowledge as a result of their educational experiences; the process culminates when assessment results are used to improve subsequent learning.

As multiple definitions of assessment exist, so do multiple descriptions of the assessment process. Seymour (1992) cites the Shewhart Cycle of assessment

and continuous improvement developed by at the Bell Telephone Laboratories. The Shewhart Cycle has four-steps: plan, do, check, and act. While other assessment processes may include additional or fewer steps, most assessment processes tend to be based on this simple plan. A sampling of assessment processes may be found in Appendix C.

Huba and Freed (2000) developed the following four-step assessment process:

1. Formulating statements of intended learning outcomes.
2. Developing or selecting assessment measures.
3. Creating experiences leading to outcomes.
4. Discussing and using assessment results to improve learning.

Once an assessment process, or plan, has been developed it must be successfully implemented in order to be of use to the institution. Unfortunately, institutes of higher education are slow to see the need for assessment (Banta, 2007). Accordingly, the reaction to assessment implementation is usually less than receptive. Berheide (2007) states, “I have never met a faculty member who was excited about doing assessment, although rumor has it they exist.”

Allen (2004) acknowledges the following stages in implementation: denial, acceptance, resistance, understanding, campaign, collaboration, and institutionalization. Specific to formal, objectively scored standardized tests, faculty are resistant due to a fear that education will be reduced to teaching to the test (Boyd, ND). Faculty can point to high-stakes tests such as

progress exams and the SAT / ACT in P-12 education, tests that lead to performance funding such as the C-BASE in undergraduate education, and entrance exams such as the GRE for graduate studies.

There are ways to mitigate the earlier stages in order to gain institutionalization sooner. Ongoing faculty development is important because many faculty are not familiar with complex assessment techniques and are, therefore, uncomfortable with the process. It is equally important to provide adequate resources to support assessment efforts. Collaboration, mentor programs, and strong leadership both from the administration and from within the faculty are other ways to reduce resistance to assessment implementation (Allen, 2004). The campus's reaction should be anticipated prior to implementation in order to make implementation as efficient as possible.

Best Practices in Assessment

Since the 2007 Spellings Commission on Higher Education, there has been concern among those in the academy that a governmental push for standardized, high stakes, exit testing is forthcoming. This comes at a time when there are increased demands for accountability from states and stakeholders. External forces demand accountability assessment while internal constituencies are more concerned with assessment that leads to improvement of student learning. Best practices from many sources seek to satisfy both with one assessment plan.

To begin a discussion of best practices in assessment, the Vanderbilt study team

conducted a survey of the websites of the 10 Carnegie Integrative learning Project campuses. Of the 10 schools, seven mentioned integrative learning in their general education core curriculum student learning outcomes. Only three had integrative learning easily accessible on their website. Only one, Michigan State University, posted student learning outcomes specific to integrative learning. Of the seven schools with integrative learning in their general education core curriculum learning outcomes, six have an outcome or outcomes that address some or all of the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) four essential learning outcomes recommended for integrative learning (Kean, Mitchell, & Wilson, 2008). Those outcomes are:

1. Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
2. Intellectual and Practical Skills
3. Personal and Social Responsibility
4. Integrative learning

The website at EIU was surveyed for the elements found on the 10 Carnegie Integrative learning Project campus websites. On EIU's website, there is no mention of integrative learning in EIU's general education core curriculum student learning outcomes. In fact, it was very difficult to locate the general education outcomes on EIU's website. EIU has developed what appears to be learning outcomes for its integrative learning program. Those outcomes follow:

Integrative Learners are intentional learners who adapt to change and new environments, integrate knowledge gained from different sources and experiences, and

continue learning as a lifelong habit. They are:

- Empowered through the mastery of intellectual and practical skills;
- Informed by understanding the social and natural worlds;
- Responsible for their actions and values

These learning outcomes fulfill the previously mentioned American Association of Colleges and University's four essential outcomes for integrative learning. However, they do not align with the six characteristics of integrative learning derived from the definition of integrative learning that EIU adopted: intentionality, reflection, metacognition, problem-solving, collaboration, and engagement. Additionally, these outcomes are not easily measured.

It is important to note that the integrative learning outcomes were not easily found. After much searching, they were found embedded in a draft document titled *The What, Why and How of Integrative Learning and the Integrated Academic and Personal Development of Students* (ND) found linked to EIU's integrative learning webpage. All learning outcomes should be highly visible to students, faculty, administration, and external stakeholders in order to emphasize the importance of learning outcomes to the institution.

Assessment Requirements for Accreditation

All regional accrediting agencies have assessment requirements that must be met for continued accreditation (Allen, 2004). Eastern Illinois University

receives primary accreditation from the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The most recent Criteria for Accreditation became effective January 1, 2005 (NCA, 2003). NCA, like all regional accreditation bodies, has a statement regarding assessment. "More than just an effective strategy for accountability or an effective management process for curriculum improvement, assessment of student achievement is essential for each higher learning organization that values its effective on the learning of its students (NCA, 2003)."

NCA has five criteria for accreditation found in the Handbook (2003). Four of the following five require a strong assessment plan of student learning outcomes.

1. Mission and Integrity – The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.
2. Preparing for the Future – The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve, the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.
3. Student Learning and Effective Teaching – The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.
4. Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge – The organization promotes a life of

learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

5. Engagement and Service – As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

Imbedded in the criteria are seven Core Components that are relevant to development of assessment plans. The assessment plan for integrative learning should address these seven Core Components. An assessment plan for integrative learning is additionally advantageous to EIU because it will provide future evidence of compliance of the seven Core Components and therefore help with accreditation. The relevant Criteria and the seven Core Components may be found in Appendix D.

Resources for Assessment

Once learning outcomes have been developed they must be measured and the results must be easily accessible. This leads to improved teaching, continued accreditation, and an overall effective learning environment. Texas A&M University hosts an annual assessment conference each February that serves as an excellent resource for best practices in assessment. Examples of best practices from select institutions that participate in the conference may be found in Appendix E.

In summary, assessment plans should be able to address both the internal assessment needs for improving student learning while at the same time

providing the data to satisfy external assessment requirements from accrediting agencies. In reviewing assessment best practices, it is apparent that there is not a “one size fits all” assessment plan adequate for all colleges and universities. Instead there are several elements that should be used in building an assessment plan for integrative learning unique to each institution. However, important elements can be gleaned from other schools that will serve as a guideline for integrative learning assessment.

1. There should be an agreed upon definition of, and a clear purpose for assessment.
2. A framework for the process should be chosen.
3. Integrative learning student learning outcomes need to be developed and widely disseminated.
4. Multiple direct and indirect measures need to be selected or developed for gathering data on student learning outcomes.
5. The assessment plan should be designed in such a way that accreditation criteria needs are met.

Study Question #4: What assessment tools already exist that can be used to measure integrative learning?

At the heart of all assessment plans are the tools or measurements that gather relevant data. A wide variety of assessment tools exist. Tools can be direct or indirect. Direct tools include pre and posttests, comprehensive exams, portfolio evaluation, and grading with rubrics. Indirect tools include exit interviews, surveys, graduation rates, and number of students who travel abroad. Tools can be developed locally

to meet specific assessment needs or can be developed to establish comparisons between schools nationwide. Measures can be designed to measure simple skills such as memorization, or complex skills like the ability to integrate knowledge gained from four years of general education courses and major courses and apply that knowledge to a field specific case.

Assessment tools must be valid and reliable in order to accurately measure integrative learning. In brief, a valid test is one that measures what it is suppose to (Salkind, 2005). “Aligning local assessments with the educational experiences that students have is required to assure reasonable validity of assessments (Miller, 2005)”. A reliable test is one that yields the same or similar results each time it is given (Salkind, 2005).

Before introducing specific assessment tools that may be of interest to EIU, it is important to discuss the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) that EIU participates in. Developed by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, the Voluntary System of Accountability supplies data for College Portraits. Data gathered include cost of attendance, financial aid, plans of graduates, student experiences and perceptions, and student learning assessment. Three hundred universities participate in VSA and the College Portraits (College Portraits, 2009).

Integrative learning and the VSA can easily share an assessment tools. This is beneficial for several reasons. First, students will take fewer exams / surveys

thus reducing test taking fatigue. Second, using the same assessment tools for multiple purposes will save money. Third, using one plan to assess multiple initiatives will save time and reduce confusion. Three of the assessment tools that will be discussed are recommended for the VSA.

Multiple assessment tools should be used to assess the success of a program. With this in mind, EIU is already piloting the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE will provide data that can be used to show the success of integrative learning and that can be used in the VSA. However, NSSE cannot be the sole survey for these two programs.

Assessment Tools

VALUE Rubrics

The American Association of Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with faculty from all across the country, has developed VALUE rubrics for assessing undergraduate education. VALUE stands for the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (AAC&U, 2009). Twelve leadership campuses piloted the first VALUE rubrics. As of late 2009, over 100 campuses use VALUE rubrics to evaluate both general education and major specific learning (AAC&U, 2009). 15 VALUE rubrics have been developed to measure the following:

- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical thinking
- Creative thinking
- Creative thinking
- Written communication
- Oral communication

- Reading
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork
- Problem solving
- Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
- Integrative learning

In each rubric, each category of learning is given a score of one, for low achievement of skills, to four for mastery of skills. For example, the integrative learning rubric assesses five categories:

- Connection to Experience – connects relevant experience and knowledge
- Connection to Discipline – makes connections across disciplines and perspectives
- Transfer – adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations
- Integrated Communication – self-explanatory
- Reflection and Self-Assessment – Demonstrates a developing sense of self as a learner, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts

The following AAC&U statement describes the intended use for the VALUE rubrics. This statement accompanies each of the fifteen rubrics.

The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student

learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all fifteen of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success. (AAC&U, 2009).

Due to the recent development and adaptation of the VALUE rubrics, AAC&U is currently establishing validity and reliability. AAC&U has established national committees to address these two equally important statistical standards. From the available literature, it appears that experts from around the country will continue to work to improve the VALUE rubrics. Interrater reliability will be used to see if different evaluators using the rubrics will come to similar conclusions about the quality of the work being reviewed. Although the literature does not address validity, content validity is present due to the number of reviews of the VALUE rubrics conducted by experts in the disciplines to be measured.

VALUE rubrics have strengths and weaknesses. A strength of the VALUE rubrics is that the AAC&U offers the rubrics free to member colleges and universities. Since EIU is already a member of AAC&U, there will be no cost in adopting VALUE rubrics. A second strength is that the VALUE rubrics provide a measurement tool that

is designed specifically for integrative learning (AAC&U, 2009). The weakness of the VALUE rubrics is that validity and reliability have not yet been established. The VALUE rubrics were just finalized in the fall of 2009. The next step is to test validity and reliability (AAC&U, 2009). Examples of VALUE rubrics from the AAC&U are included in Appendix F.

Collegiate Learning Assessment

Scott Jaschik in *Inside Higher Ed* (2008) dubbed the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), developed by the Council for Aid to Education, “a hot assessment tool”. CLA is designed to measure learning outcomes and value added by colleges. Edwin H. Welch, president of the University of Charleston, one of the 10 Carnegie integrative learning schools, said that the CLA “is light years ahead of the fill-in-the-blank format of most standardized tests (Traub, J. 2007).

The CLA is not the typical standardized test with multiple choice or true / false questions. Instead, CLA evaluates written student responses to open-ended questions. The student is expected to draw from knowledge gained in numerous courses and experiences to create a real world answer. Rubrics are used to evaluate student responses. ACT/SAT scores are then used as a control to measure value added (Council on Aid to Education, 2008).

An important feature of the CLA is a respect for faculty autonomy, acknowledging that different teaching styles can still create value added to the students’ knowledge and skills. As such, CLA meets both the summative

assessment needs of the school as a whole and the formative assessment needs of individual.

CLA is considered to have content validity since many faculty (experts) review the student responses using the CLA rubric (Salkind, 2005). To further demonstrate validity, the Council on Aid to Education is conducting a construct validity study in conjunction with the ACT and ETS. To establish reliability, a second scorer grades ten percent of responses. Over the last two administrations of CLA, the correlation between the first and second scorers ranged from .76 to .87 indicating strong interrater reliability. The correlations from the previous six administrations also fall into this range. Internal consistency reliability is also strong. For the fall of 2007, the average alpha for individual assessment scores was .84 and .92 for school-level assessment scores (Council for Aid to Education, 2007-2008).

Two important strengths of the CLA are worth mentioning. First, CLA is one of three standardized assessment tools recommended for use with the VSA. Second, CLA generates an easy to read report for each school. The report presents information in a way that prospective students, donors, accreditation agencies, etc. can easily see the value added at a CLA institution.

ETS Proficiency Profile

Formerly known as the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP), ETS Proficiency Profile measures program effectiveness, assesses proficiency in the general education core, compares scores to a

national cohort of schools, shows trends in improvement, and provides data to guide curriculum and instruction (ETS, 2010). It is the second of two assessment tools recommended for the VSA.

The basic ETS Proficiency Profile is a multiple-choice exam. Up to fifty additional questions may be added by the institution to localize the test. An optional essay can also be added and evaluated by ETS.

Three methods are used to determine construct validity. First, a panel of expert judges reviewed the test. Second, Proficiency Profile scores were compared to other national exams that measure similar items. Third, scores on the Proficiency Profile are tested using related psychological theories. In all three cases, the test was determined to be valid (Young, 2007). ETS plans to conduct further studies on validity and reliability in the future.

Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency

Developed by ACT, the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) is a standardized assessment tool that measures learning outcomes both in the undergraduate core, and in specific disciplines (ACT, 2010). CAAP is a multiple-choice test that can be used in a variety of ways. It can be administered as a standalone test in order to compare institutions to the national norm. It can also be used along with the ACT to measure value added. Additionally, it can be used twice with the same group of students over a specified period of time in a pre / post test fashion the measure the

effectiveness of teaching over a shorter period of time (ACT, 2010).

CAAP is the third of three assessment tools recommended for the VSA. Unfortunately, the ACT provides no information about validity or reliability on their website. It is only available by submitting a request to ACT.

The College Student Expectations Questionnaire and The College Student Experience Questionnaire

The College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ) developed by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research measures a student's expectations as to what he or she may experience in college. CSXQ examines how much times students will spend working with faculty, participating in organized activities, studying, and other typical college activities. (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2008).

The College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) also developed by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research measures a student's perceived experience during a set period of time at school. CSXQ and CSEQ can be used as a pre / posttest: Together, they can measure the difference in the expectations and the experiences of the student as well as value added from college (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2008).

The strength of this assessment is that, when used together, CSXQ and CSEQ measure institution-wide data in order to see how both academic and non-academic endeavors influence student

learning (Indiana University, 2007). Thought nearly impossible for years, institute-wide assessment such as what is accomplished by CSXQ and CSEQ is vital to integrative learning (Getty, Young, & Whitaker-Lea, 2008).

Reliability and validity are a concern. The internal consistency for the CSEQ as a whole is .70, meaning that the test is acceptably reliable. However, individual items do not score as well as the entire test. The item “Proactive” had the highest reliability with an alpha of .57. The item “Influencing” had the lowest reliability with an alpha of .39. The only information available about validity is that a factor analysis has been conducted and that there is “some evidence of the construct validity of the scale” (Testgrid, 2007). The factor analysis is available on request. In short, there is little information about validity and reliability, and what is available does not indicate validity and reliability as strong as that for the CLA.

E-portfolios

E-portfolios are not a measurement tool for assessment. Instead, e-Portfolios are showcase that students build during a course, an academic year, or their entire college career. Through the e-Portfolio, students demonstrate what they have learned to faculty and to potential employers. Through a collection of e-Portfolios, colleges and universities can demonstrate the value added they provide to their students.

Integrative learning occurs simply by using e-Portfolios. Student-centered active learning and the dynamism of digital communication are combined in a tool that makes assessment relatively

easy and that responds to the fluidity of the both the job market and education. Students create e-Portfolios that represent what the students have learned and what skills they possess (Clark & Eynon, 2009). In most cases, students may keep e-Portfolios throughout their education and career.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities strongly recommends that institutions adopting VALUE rubrics also consider e-Portfolios. E-Portfolios also work well with VSA and the other tests mentioned.

Since EIU participates in the VSA it would be effective to either review the choice of assessment tools used for that purpose or choose a new tool that can evaluate both the VSA and integrative learning. Five possible assessment tools, including three specifically recommended for the VSA have been discussed. Once an assessment plan using the appropriate assessment tools have been developed, e-Portfolios can serve as a way for students to submit material for assessment.

Recommendations

After reviewing the literature available on integrative learning collaboration and assessment; and analyzing the data gathered from faculty, Student Affairs staff, and students regarding integrative learning at Eastern Illinois University, the Vanderbilt study team has drafted six main recommendations with key sub points. These recommendations address EIU’s twofold request reiterated here.

1. Construct a literature-based management framework outlining recommendations for effective

collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs regarding Integrative Learning.

2. Address the need for baseline data by identifying pertinent data, devising a methodology for data collection, and determining the most effective manner of presenting data.

Recommendation #1: Developing Intentional Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Partnerships

Based on a review of the Integrative Learning Project campuses (included in Appendix G), the available literature on Student Affairs and Academic Affairs collaborations, and the results of the interviews with Student Affairs staff members at Eastern Illinois, three areas have been identified as possible entry points towards the development of a more collaborative partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. These three recommendations are related to developing a campus wide task force for integrative learning containing members of both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, internal benchmarking based on the Faculty Fellows program and New Student Programs, and a leadership development component for the general education curriculum.

Campus-Wide Task Force

During a search of the Eastern Illinois Web site (2009) for existing areas related to integrative learning, a page was discovered showcasing the “Integrative Learning Team” that was developed to attend a conference on integrative learning and serve as the starting point for advancements at Eastern Illinois. While the list of team

members was fairly diverse in terms of fields of study and different academic divisions within the university, all members of the team were faculty members, and no Student Affairs staff members were listed as being on the team. It was apparent through a number of the interviews conducted with Student Affairs staff that some director-level professionals had attended some training related to integrative learning, the publicized “Integrative Learning Team” seemed to indicate that Student Affairs and Academic Affairs were taking different paths of professional development towards the common goal of integrative learning.

If Eastern Illinois is committed to developing an integrative learning component on-campus that encompasses the student experience in both curricular and co-curricular areas of college life, it is imperative that goals on both sides be tightly aligned in order to create a seamless learning environment (Getty, Young, & Whitaker-Lea, 2008). If the advertised “Integrative Learning Team” is comprised solely of faculty members, development of integrative learning at Eastern Illinois will be largely one sided. Many of the stated or unstated goals of the university can be greatly aided by competencies that are central to student development and the Student Affairs profession, including engaged citizenship, career planning, ethics, leadership, and service learning (Keeling, 2004, January; Knepfkamp, et al., 1992, July). While it is highly likely that the faculty members of the “Integrative Learning Team” are more than capable of developing initiatives related to co-curricular areas, not involving Student Affairs professionals in the discussion of learning goals for

outside the classroom experiences would ultimately be detrimental to the overall integrative learning initiative at Eastern Illinois.

As the tight alignment of curricular and co-curricular experiences would be beneficial to the overall effectiveness of the integrative learning initiative, it is recommended that the “Integrative Learning Team” be reestablished as a collaborative task force that includes relatively equal numbers of both faculty members and Student Affairs professionals. If an equality of numbers between Student Affairs and faculty could not be achieved, adding additional Student Affairs professionals from subdivisions most closely related to academics (New Student Programs, Residence Life, and Career Services) could be helpful in providing enough balance on the task force to ensure that curricular developments related to integrative learning were congruent with co-curricular developments. Additionally, a common professional development path should be established, either internally or externally, for both faculty and Student Affairs staff to learn the same new concepts for integrative learning instead of having to attend separate conferences or trainings related to the same fundamental information. The suggested time frame for adding Student Affairs professionals on the Integrative Learning Team is to begin during the summer of 2010.

Internal Benchmarking

The second recommendation for building an effective partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is for current best practices in Residence Life and New Student

Programs to serve as the internal benchmark between future collaborations. Initiatives in both areas were identified repeatedly during interviews as being successful at bringing faculty and Student Affairs staff together to develop programs that encompass both curricular and co-curricular goals for student learning. The best practices of Residence Life and New Student Programs should be analyzed throughout the 2010-2011 academic year.

Kuh, et al. (1994) highlighted the benefit of having faculty involvement in residential facilities as a way to increase the amount of time students interact with professors. The Faculty Fellows program at Eastern Illinois has proven that it is possible to incorporate large numbers of faculty members into co-curricular student life on the campus in a way that is beneficial to both the professionals and students involved. The program has also served as a way to better educate faculty on the professionalization of the Residence Life staff and the living environment students experience during undergraduate study. Given the designed frequency of collaboration that is expected between the Faculty Fellows and the Residence Life professional staff, the program has also proven that required interaction between faculty and Student Affairs can yield positive results in regards to executing effective programs. The idea of a “fellowship” component in other areas of Student Affairs such as Student Activities, Greek Life, and Community Service could increase the interaction faculty members may have with these different areas by placing a structured form of collaboration that requires equal time and effort from both parties. Adopting a

“fellowship” model in various areas of Student Affairs may increase faculty participation in co-curricular events on-campus while simultaneously affording faculty members additional opportunities for service to the student population, as well as possible rewards such as tenure or rank in professorship (Zeller, Hinni, & Eison, 1989; Martin & Murphy, 2000).

New Student Programs seemed to have the highest level of collaboration with faculty and academic departments, based largely on the need for faculty members to help in the development of academic advising and other areas related to orientation and the University Foundations courses. Interaction between New Student Programs and Academic Affairs occurred almost on a daily basis, and while such frequent interaction may not be needed for many subdivisions within Student Affairs, higher frequencies of collaboration are possible. Academic advising is an essential component of creating a meaningful first year of college for most students, and having input from Student Affairs in the development of first year seminar courses (University Foundations at Eastern Illinois) is highly advantageous for equipping students with curricular and co-curricular competencies at the beginning of the college career (Martin & Murphy, 2000). Student Activities, Career Services, and Community Service would benefit from more frequent conversations with Academic Affairs, as faculty input could be invaluable for creating campus-wide educational programming, the career preparation of students moving through their major course of study, and identifying service opportunities that

would apply curricular concepts to everyday situations.

New Student Programs also works with faculty in the development of the common reading experience for first year students, Eastern Reads. The initiative requires faculty and staff participation for the development of discussion groups related to the common text for first year students. Having faculty, staff, and students involved in the same experience can create a consistent theme across the campus and the development of a “common language” (Kellogg, 1999). At many of the Integrative learning Project campuses (Huber & Freed, 2007, January), a common reading book was utilized to develop a common experience, and at SUNY Oswego, the common text was extended to include all faculty, staff, and students, not just those involved with the first year experience. Applying a reading component at Eastern Illinois to all faculty, staff, and students could be an effective starting point in developing a common theme across campus, as well as providing a way for curricular and cocurricular initiatives to be developed around the theme, thereby increasing the number of opportunities students would have to integrate classroom instruction with the larger campus experience. Programs through Students Activities, Residence Life, and Greek Life could be easily adapted to include components and ideas contained in the larger common reading initiative.

Leadership Curriculum within the General Education Core

With fostering citizenship being a central piece of the mission of Eastern

Illinois, the development of a leadership based component within the general education core may aid in the production of more engaged and effective citizens upon graduation. Leadership training in the undergraduate core curriculum could be effectively developed through collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, thereby ensuring that theoretical and practical implications are evenly expressed.

Just as the University Foundations course for first year students is a required curricular component for undergraduate students, it is recommended that a leadership development course be developed later in the undergraduate experience for the students at Eastern Illinois. A leadership course in the junior or senior year would allow for a general education requirement to be placed later in the course of study, and with a course being collaboratively developed by faculty and Student Affairs staff, the leadership requirement would represent an integrative learning opportunity that could build on previous curricular and co-curricular experiences. In order for the course to adequately address theoretical and practical leadership concerns, faculty and Student Affairs would need to be involved in the course development, planning, and assessment of outcomes (Kellogg, 1999).

While the proposed leadership course would be part of the general education requirement, course assignments could be tailored to the individual student majors and future professions. This would be similar in concept to the senior capstone experience at Philadelphia University, which is an integrative learning component of the general

education core that encourages students to research global concepts related to majors and professions (Huber, Brown, Hutchings, Gale, Miller, & Breen, 2007, January). While the initiative at Philadelphia University focuses more on humanistic approaches to specific disciplines and professions, the proposed course at Eastern Illinois could address leadership dilemmas and practices related to the student's area of interest. As nearly all professions require some level of leadership capability, the development of the leadership course at Eastern Illinois should focus on practical leadership concerns, as advocated by Keeling (2004, January), therefore encouraging students to identify areas where theory and practice meet in their future profession. An appropriate time frame for implementation of leadership curriculum within the general education core would be for a course or course to be developed during the 2010-2011 academic year and then have a trial run during the Fall 2011 semester.

Recommendation #2: Developing an Integrative Learning Assessment Plan

Based on information gathered about the 10 Carnegie integrative learning schools, and what the university has already developed, EIU has an opportunity to set the standard in integrative learning assessment. Keeping in mind that successful assessment plans are developed locally, the following actions are suggested for developing an integrative learning assessment plan.

Establish an Integrative Learning Assessment Task Force

EIU should establish an Integrative Learning Assessment Task Force. This

task force should have representation from stakeholders previously mentioned: honors and non-honors faculty, honors and non-honors students, and Student Affairs staff. Additionally the task force should include an upper-level administrator and personnel from the campus's institutional research office. This is not to be confused with the "Integrative Learning Team" mentioned in the previous recommendation. The Integrative Learning Assessment Task Force should begin development during the summer of 2010.

The Integrative Learning Assessment Task Force should be charged with developing an assessment plan that measures the effectiveness of integrative learning as well as provide data for other initiatives such as the VAS and to provide data for accreditation purposes. Using Huba and Freed's (2000) four-step process, the following assessment plan is recommended as a starting point for the task force's work.

Formulate statements of intended learning outcomes

As previously mentioned, EIU has developed student learning outcomes for its integrative learning program.

Integrative Learners are intentional learners who adapt to change and new environments, integrate knowledge gained from different sources and experiences, and continue learning as a lifelong habit. They are:

- Empowered through the mastery of intellectual and practical skills;
- Informed by understanding the social and natural worlds;

- Responsible for their actions and values.

These learning outcomes are not measurable nor do they provide much in the way of guidance for faculty and staff wishing to implement integrative learning. The Integrative Learning Assessment Task Force should develop a new set of learning outcomes for EIU's ILE. The new learning outcomes need to:

- Be measurable
- Fulfill the American Association of Colleges and University's four essential outcomes for integrative learning: knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; intellectual and practical skills; personal and social responsibility skills; and integrative learning
- Reflect the six characteristics of integrative learning: intentionality, reflection, metacognition, problem-solving, collaboration, and engagement

A marriage of integrative learning program outcomes and core curriculum learning outcomes is key to a successful integrative learning program. As such, the Integrative Learning Assessment Task Force should recommend a revision of the general education core curriculum student learning outcomes. Seven of the 10 Carnegie integrative learning schools have integrative learning specifically mentioned in their general education outcomes. The revision will add one learning outcome that reflects integrative learning.

1. EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to write effectively.

2. EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to speak effectively.
3. EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to think critically.
4. EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to function as responsible global citizens.
5. EIU graduates will demonstrate the ability to be integrative learners.

This simple addition will bring greater focus to integrative learning for all stakeholders: faculty and staff, students, perspective students, or employers. Learning outcomes should be developed collaboratively over the summer of 2010 and posted and disseminated widely during the Fall 2010 semester.

Develop or select assessment measures

It appears that currently each college within EIU is responsible for assessing integrative learning. Unfortunately, as previously mentioned, it appears faculty are often unaware of these assessments. It needs to be made clear what assessment measures are being used by each department for integrative learning. Most importantly EIU should adopt standardized assessment tools at the institutional level to establish baseline data enabling the institution to recognize and track trends and provide comparisons both within EIU and with other schools using the same assessment tools. While the selection process for assessment tools will require a great deal of work, it is suggested that the various options be thoroughly examined throughout the remaining 2010 calendar year, with selections being made during the Spring 2011 semester.

When selecting assessment tools, it is important to consider assessment

fatigue. Research at the University of North Carolina at Willingham (2009) indicates that too many surveys and tests during an academic year can have negative effects on responses. Assessment fatigue leads to fewer, less accurate responses from students. To mitigate assessment fatigue assessment measures should meet multiple needs. Many different assessment measurements that were previously discussed are excellent. The following are recommended because they will provide data that can be used for multiple purposes.

Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) developed by the Council on Aid to Education.

The University of Charleston, a Carnegie integrative learning institution, along with over 400 other colleges and universities use CLA. CLA will satisfy assessment requirements for three needs that the university has: measurement of general education core curriculum student learning outcomes for the VSA, measurement of integrative learning outcomes, and assessment requirements for NCA accreditation. Using ACT/SAT scores as a control to measure value added is a powerful indicator of program success.

As previously mentioned, the advantages of using CLA are many. First, the exam has strong validity and reliability. Second, it is one of three assessment measurements recommended for the VSA. Third, integrative learning institutions such as the University of Charleston are already using CLA with success. Fourth, it may reduce faculty resistance to assessment plans and measurements because it acknowledges

faculty autonomy and different teaching styles. Finally, stakeholders can easily understand the reports generated by the CLA.

VALUE Rubrics

Developed by the AAC&U, VALUE Rubrics are currently used by over 100 institutions. Considering the definition of integrative learning that EIU has adopted the university should consider at least three of the 15 VALUE Rubrics: the Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric, the Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric, and the Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric.

Although validity and reliability are still being determined, VALUE Rubrics should still be considered because the advantages of the Rubrics are many. Because EIU belongs to the American Association of Colleges and Universities use of VALUE Rubrics is free. The VALUE Rubrics will allow the EIU to compare the success of integrative learning with that of many AAC&U member schools. And as with the CLA, the data gathered from VALUE rubrics can also be used to satisfy assessment requirements for NCA.

Many departments at EIU have implemented the use of e-portfolios as a way to assess the success of their majors. EIU should consider adopting the use of e-portfolios along with VALUE Rubrics as a way to demonstrate evidence of integrative learning from each student. These e-portfolios should concentrate primarily on the general education core curriculum and extracurricular activities.

Create experiences leading to outcomes.

EIU has already created many experiences leading to the integrative learning outcomes. They provide capstone courses, study abroad opportunities, internships, practicum opportunities, and other experiences.

Discuss and use assessment results to improve learning.

Assessment data are often presented in a way that is difficult for the majority of stakeholders to understand. This often causes a breakdown in the feedback loop that is vital to any assessment plan. However, there is a new trend in reporting assessment data called an assessment dashboard. Dashboards, much like dashboards in cars, provide selected information about the university in easily understood graphics. One of the best examples of an assessment dashboard can be found at the Minnesota State College and University System (Ramaswami, 2010). The following is a screen shot of a portion of the dashboard they have created.



The needle points to the level of success of a given indicator. Red indicates that expectations were not met. Blue indicates expectations were met. Yellow indicates that expectations were exceeded. The icons below each dial link to more detailed, yet still easily understood, data. These data are usually graphically represented.

Once the Integrative Learning Taskforce has developed an assessment plan for integrative learning, a mandatory, all-campus meeting to introduce the new assessment plan needs to be held. The revised integrative learning outcomes must be emphasized in order to give guidance to faculty and staff. After the meeting, ongoing efforts must be made to reduce resistance (Allen, 2004). This may include be accomplished through collaboration, mentor programs, and strong leadership both from the administration and from within the faculty.

Recommendation #3: Develop an improved webpage for Integrative Learning

Eastern Illinois University is developing a strong integrative learning program. Already, EIU has made good progress toward Dr. Perry's vision of becoming the national leader in integrative learning. This is a point of pride that needs to be highlighted. However, while conducting research for this project, the Vanderbilt study team found few references to integrative learning on EIU's website. There is no mention of integrative learning on the university's homepage. Although there are references to certain components of integrative learning on the Academics webpage, integrative learning is not specifically mentioned. With the exception of an announcement of an upcoming faculty development workshop, there is no mention of integrative learning on the faculty and staff webpage. There is no mention of integrative learning on either the webpage for future students or the webpage for current students. Integrative learning is not found on the A to Z index. To reach the first link referencing

integrative learning, one must follow these links:

EIU home → Academics →
Academic Affairs, Office of →
The EIU Integrative Learning
Experience

Once at EIU's Integrative Learning Experience webpage, there are links to helpful AAC&U information and a few examples of integrative learning projects at EIU. But integrative learning outcomes, assessment, or other information that could be helpful to a faculty member who wants to build a class based on integrative learning, is absent. Furthermore, there is nothing on the Integrative Learning Experience webpage for students or prospective students.

One element of EIU's request was to determine an effective way to present assessment data. In order to effectively present assessment data, and to highlight EIU's Integrative Learning Experience, a link to the ILE webpage should appear on the university's homepage along with a brief description of the program. Then the ILE webpage should be updated to include the following elements at a minimum:

- Dr. Perry's vision for integrative learning
- Definition of integrative learning
- EIU's revised integrative learning outcomes
- VALUE rubrics
- Information about the Collegiate Learning Assessment
- The integrative learning assessment dashboard
- Examples of integrative learning projects

- Both the existing bibliography and the bibliography on collaboration provided in this report.
- AAC&U links
- Information about how integrative learning is helpful to student
- Reports provided by NSSE, the College Portrait, and CLA

While webpage design and enhancement can be a laborious process, it is suggested that changes and developments be made to the integrative learning webpage in an on-going process throughout the 2010-2011 academic year.

*Recommendation #4: Use the
Honors College to Model
Curriculum*

Based on interviews of both students and faculty, the Honors College faculty do an exceptional job of integrating reflection, metacognition and a general integrative learning approach in their classrooms. Many honors students pointed to examples of projects and assignments that have been linked directly to current events or to their future careers. Faculty in each academic discipline who teach honors courses should lead workshops or share their curricular approaches with faculty within their disciplines who do not teach honors courses. For example, a history professor who stated that reflection did not have a place in a history classroom could learn from another professor about ways in which integrative learning applies to the history department. A key understanding is that while there are often barriers in collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, there is also a great deal that can be learned from within the

academic arena amongst faculty members.

*Recommendation #5: Create Common
Curricular Components over the
Undergraduate Experience*

The various campuses involved in the Integrated Learning Project from the AAC&U and The Carnegie Foundation present a number of curricular options that have proven beneficial in creating a campus ethos focused on integrative learning. Two of these practices, expanded common reading and the use of e-Portfolios, may have benefit at EIU.

Three of the ten Integrated Learning Project campuses (Philadelphia University, Salve Regina University, and the State University of New York-Oswego) employ the liberal use of common readings for students. As was evidenced in the interviews at EIU of Student Affairs staff members, first-year students at EIU are subject to a common reading, but this does not extend to the remainder of undergraduate study. At Salve Regina, the core curriculum that is required of all students has about 75% of the texts as common readings. At SUNY-Oswego, a common reading text is established each year that is required of all students, faculty and staff (Huber, et al., 2007, January).

EIU could benefit from establishing a common reading program similar to the example at SUNY-Oswego, where the selected text extends across the entire campus population. By having a common text, the campus could be united around a central theme each year. While it may not be possible for curricular components related to a common text to be implemented in every

program, having assignments in general education and first-year seminar courses would engage a large portion of the student population. The common text could also allow for significant cocurricular programming opportunities in the form of speakers or events related to be developed that would promote learning outside the classroom. Suggestions for a university-wide theme and common reading text may be gleaned from faculty, staff, and students during the 2010-2011 academic year, with a decision being made on the common theme and text in Spring 2011, with full implementation of the campus-wide reading program in Fall 2011.

The use of e-Portfolios for student writing could also benefit the curriculum at EIU. Among the Integrated Learning Project campuses, Salve Regina University, Portland State University, and Carleton College all use the e-Portfolio (Huber, et al., 2007, January). The ability to compile written assignments and projects allows for students to use the e-Portfolio as tool to showcase progress over the undergraduate experience (Clark & Eynon, 2009). The e-Portfolio can also serve as great assessment tool for faculty to look back at students' previous entries to gauge intellectual growth and mastery of subject matter. For implementation at EIU, it is recommended to develop an e-Portfolio program that allows students to build their portfolios with written assignments related directly to their major, but not excluding assignments from non-major courses. Assignments from courses outside a student's major could prove beneficial to assessing how well the student can apply knowledge from their major course of study to various other disciplines or real world

situations. Various e-Portfolio software programs should be examined throughout the 2010-2011 academic year, with a choice being made for implementation in Fall 2011.

Recommendation #6: Explore Grant Opportunities for Integrative Learning

Carleton College in Minnesota received a \$1.5 million grant from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute in 2008, allowing for the development of the Carleton Interdisciplinary Science & Math Initiative (CISMI), discussed further in Appendix G. Eastern Illinois should investigate the possibility of funding individual components of the integrative learning initiative through similar grant opportunities. A list of grant examples is provided in Appendix H.

Conclusion

The concept of integrative learning comes with it the holistic goal of developing the overall student. Gone are the notions of students simply receiving a degree but, with integrative learning, the institution takes upon the larger role of educating the student in a manner that will prepare them for life and the critical thinking skills that are needed to approach the modern world. In many ways, integrative learning has been taking place on campuses, including Eastern Illinois, without necessarily having the name "integrative learning" attached. However, by taking the step to adopt the goal of incorporating integrative learning into everyday life, EIU has committed itself openly to this innovative practice.

Throughout the United States, integrative learning has taken hold in different capacities at institutions of varying size and type. Fortunately for EIU, there are several notable models of success that can be modified to meet the circumstances at EIU. While integrative learning is now at the point in American academia that it is the subject of numerous conversations, research studies and conferences, there is room for innovation and adaptation of the concept to meet the needs of the individual institution.

Eastern Illinois University is a diverse institution with committed students, faculty and staff. Throughout the process of assessing EIU in terms of its strengths, weaknesses and opportunities, the dedication of the members of the EIU community became rather apparent. Members of the EIU community at all levels were very quick to compliment the institution and often found it difficult to offer any criticism. The research and anecdotal evidence of commitment to success at Eastern is truly overwhelming and shows signs of great opportunities. Truly, students feel a connection to their school on a level that shows that EIU is already serving them well. The connection felt by members of the community is helpful in adopting new techniques such as integrative learning.

Building upon the notion of commitment, in many respects EIU is already utilizing integrative learning to an extent. As was noted by students and

faculty, the size of the institution and the city of Charleston lead students to interacting with one another frequently and allows the university to become the central part of their lives. Further, faculty members, particularly in the Honors College, are intentionally using integrative approaches and the impact is noticeable in their students. Allowing the Honors College to serve as a model for the rest of the university community is an important step.

However, despite the reflection that is taking place in some classrooms, barriers still exist between the academic community and Student Affairs. Fortunately, with a few exceptions, the barriers do not seem impenetrable. By utilizing the recommendations and techniques suggested, faculty and Student Affairs staff will begin to cooperate and collaborate in new ways that will ultimately benefit students and the entire university community.

Overall, Eastern Illinois University provides its students with a very supportive environment that will be a benefit for the remainder of their lives. By fully adopting integrative learning, EIU will continue to distinguish itself among its peer institutions and reach new levels of holistic development of students. Based on the interviews conducted and other interactions with members of the EIU community, Eastern has a strong future and will continue to meet success.

Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Adapted from Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward (2008)

Faculty Interview Protocol

1. What are the mission and vision of EIU? How do they influence the culture of your EIU?
2. Who at EIU do you consider to be champions or leaders in guiding students to search for meaning and purpose?
3. How are faculty at EIU expected to guide students intellectually, socially, civically, physically, religiously, spiritually, and morally?
4. How does the mission and vision of EIU influence curricular and cocurricular priorities?
5. What are the key issues/barriers/opportunities that EIU needs to address in order to create a campus ethos and set of programs that foster holistic development?
6. How do you encourage and prepare faculty to work with students in the cocurricular context at EIU?
7. How is community defined at EIU? What can you and your colleagues do to cultivate an even greater sense of campus community?
8. How is your campus addressing the big questions of the “good life”?
9. How well do you know your students’ outside (personal or professional) interests?
10. Do you take time to discuss with your students any cocurricular goals and non-academic life activities?
11. Do you include any opportunities for personal/professional reflection within the coursework requirements?
12. In your own words, describe the institutional mission of EIU.
13. Do you have the sense that your students know how to manage their educational experience effectively?
14. Does your department collaborate with any division within Student Affairs on a regular basis? If so, what areas are discussed and how structured is the collaboration?
15. What are some of the major barriers to collaboration with Student Affairs at EIU?
16. How do you believe Academic Affairs and the faculty are perceived in the eyes of Student Affairs professionals?
17. What do you feel are some of the successful collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs? How do you believe these collaborations have impacted students?

Student Affairs Interview Protocol

1. In your own words, describe the institutional mission of EIU.
2. Do the students you work with regularly know how to resolve conflicts in an effective manner?
3. Do the students you work with regularly have a sense of who they are? How do they relate to others different from them?

4. Do you have the sense that your students know to manage their educational experience effectively?
5. What are some of your divisional goals related to student learning?
6. Does your division collaborate with any academic department/major on a regular basis? If so, are there any shared learning outcomes?
7. How often do you collaborate with someone on the academic side of campus?
8. Are there any avenues for structured discourse between your area in Student Affairs and any area in Academic Affairs?
9. What are some of the major barriers to collaboration with Academic Affairs or faculty at EIU?
10. What do you feel are some of the successful collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs at EIU?
11. How have these successful collaborations impacted students?
12. How do you believe Student Affairs is perceived in the eyes of faculty?

Student Interview Protocol

1. Describe the connection you see between your life inside the classroom and outside the classroom at EIU?
2. Are you involved in any organizations at EIU that are not directly related to your major field of study? If so, what organizations are you involved with and what is your level of involvement?
3. Are you involved in any organizations that are directly tied to your major or future career aspirations? If so, what are these organizations and what is our level of involvement?
4. Have you participated in a study abroad program during your college career? If so, has that experience impacted the way that you perceive your in-class instruction and out of class experience?
5. If you have not studied abroad, do you plan on doing so in the future?
6. How connected do you feel to EIU?
7. Do you feel part of the EIU community?
8. Do you feel that you have a positive relationship with faculty members?
9. Have any faculty members taken an interest in you outside of the classroom? Can you provide examples? Has it been just one or two faculty members, or do you feel the faculty overall takes an interest?
10. Have you utilized the Student Affairs staff much since you arrived at EIU?
11. Do you participate in academic programs offered outside the classroom (i.e., speakers, performances, lectures, panel discussions)?

Appendix B: Student Affairs Interview Matrices

Divisional/Institutional Items

Respondent	In your own words, describe the institutional mission of EIU	What are some of your divisional goals related to student learning?
Student Activities		
New Student Programs		
Student Standards		
Career Services		
Community Service		
Residence Life		
Greek Life		
Health Services		
Assessment		
VP of Student Affairs		

Student Perceptions

Respondent	Do the students you work with regularly know how to resolve conflicts in an effective manner?	Do the students you work with regularly have a sense of who they are and how they related to others different from them?	Do you have the sense that your students know how to manage their educational experience effectively?
Student Activities			
New Student Programs			
Student Standards			
Career Services			
Community Service			
Residence Life			
Greek Life			
Health Services			
Assessment			
VP of Student Affairs			

Collaboration with Academic Affairs

Respondent	Does your division collaborate on a regular basis with any academic dept./major? Shared outcomes?	How often do you collaborate with someone on the academic side of campus?	What are some of the major barriers to collaboration with Academic Affairs or faculty at EIU?	What do you feel are some of the successful collaborations between Student and Academic Affairs? How do these impact students?
Student Activities				
New Student Programs				
Student Standards				
Career Services				
Community Service				
Residence Life				
Greek Life				
Health Services				
Assessment				
VP of Student Affairs				

Faculty Perceptions of Student Affairs

Respondent	Are there any avenues for structured discourse between your area in Student Affairs and any area in Academic Affairs?	How do you believe Student Affairs is perceived in the eyes of the faculty?
Student Activities		
New Student Programs		
Student Standards		
Career Services		
Community Service		
Residence Life		
Greek Life		
Health Services		
Assessment		
VP of Student Affairs		

Appendix C: Additional Definitions and Processes

Definitions

Palomba and Banta (1999) adopt the following definition of assessment developed by Marchese.

Assessment is the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development.

The Office of Institutional Assessment at Texas A&M (2009) uses the following definition in all assessment-related work. “The systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs and other support programs undertaken for the purpose of program improvement, student learning, and development.”

Processes

Allen (2004) describes a “who, when, and how” approach that includes direct and indirect measurements, tests of validity and reliability, and issues of ethics. Texas A&M (2009) uses a five-step approach of development, design, implementation, interpretation, and modification.

Bond (ND), writing for the Carnegie Foundation, developed a six-step system for assessing integrative learning. These are what Bond refers to as the minimum elements:

1. A framework and set of assessment specifications
2. Exercises that reflect the agreed upon assessment specifications
3. A scoring rubric
4. An assessor training protocol and a procedure for assessor calibration
5. A procedure for adjudicating disagreements between assessors
6. A quality control mechanism for assuring that assessors remain calibrated and do not “drift” over time.

Bond points out that writing is central in good assessment of integrative learning because it illustrates thinking. He also argues objectively scored, standardized tests (multiple-choice, true / false, matching) are inadequate to capture student achievement of integrative learning.

In addition to these descriptions of the assessment process, it is helpful to consider an econometric model of higher education. Such a model considers inputs, resources and outputs to determine if higher education is effective and successful. In order to determine the added value of a higher education there should be a minimum of three assessment measurements: incoming competencies, outcomes, and the change between inputs and outputs (Dwyer, Millet, & Payne, 2006).

Appendix D: NCA Criteria Core Components Relevant to Assessment

Criteria	Core Component
Criterion Two	Core Component C The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.
	Core Component D All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.
Criterion Three	Core Component A The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.
	Core Component C The organization values and supports effective learning outcomes.
Criterion Four	Core Component B The organization demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills, and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its education programs.
	Core Component C The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to student who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.
Criterion Five	Core Component 5D Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.

Appendix E: Best Assessment Practices Resources

In addition to hosting the annual assessment conference, Texas A&M's website provides useful information on establishing assessment plans for free use by other colleges and universities. Of particular interest is information on direct and indirect methods of assessment. According to the website, multiple measures are needed to gather sufficient evidence of student learning. Direct measures include pre and posttests, course-embedded assessments, comprehensive exams, senior thesis or major project, portfolio evaluation, case studies, reflective journals, internship evaluation, and grading with rubrics. Indirect measures include departmental surveys, exit interviews, alumni surveys, focus groups, graduation rates, and percentage of students who study abroad. Texas A&M also provides a rubric for assessment of assessment plans. This is a valuable tool to examine the overall effectiveness of assessment programs.

Chickering and Gamson's (1987) Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education provide the framework for Winona State University's assessment program. The seven principles are:

1. Encouraging contact between students and faculty.
2. Developing reciprocity and cooperation among students.
3. Encouraging active learning.
4. Giving prompt feedback.
5. Emphasizing time on task.
6. Communicating high expectations.
7. Respecting diverse talents and ways of learning.

Winona State provides links to rubrics from other institutions around the country related to the evaluation of debate, ethics, essays, and other criteria.

The University of Alabama participates in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). The VSA includes data on undergraduate success rates, cost of attendance and financial aid, student faculty ratios, data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and information about student learning assessments.

The motto of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at the University of Alabama is, "Good data are paramount to good decisions" (2009).

In addition to colleges and universities, outside organizations are also providing best practices and innovations in assessment. One example is the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) initiative (Kean, Mitchell, & Wilson, 2008). LEAP focuses on a set of learning outcomes that illustrate what matters in college and that give students a guide for their learning. LEAP seeks to engage the public in discussions about what really matters in college, to give students a to guide for their learning, and to make a set of essential learning outcomes the preferred framework for educational excellence, assessment of learning, and new alignments between P-12 and college.

A second example is the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). They publish general standards that apply to different function areas in the college organizational

structure. The 2003 standards for outcome assessment and program evaluation includes the following statement:

Outcomes assessment and program evaluation services must conduct regular assessment and evaluations. The program must employ effective qualitative and quantitative methodologies as appropriate, to determine

whether and to what degree the stated mission, goals, and student learning and development outcomes are being met. The process must employ sufficient and sound assessment measures to ensure comprehensiveness. Data collected must include responses from students and other affected constituencies (2003).

Appendix F: Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric (American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2009)



INTEGRATIVE LEARNING VALUE RUBRIC

For more information, please contact rubric@aaacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

Framing Language

Fostering students' abilities to integrate learning—across courses, over time, and between campus and community life—is one of the most important goals and challenges for higher education. Initially, students connect previous learning to new classroom learning. Later, significant knowledge within individual disciplines serves as the foundation, but integrative learning goes beyond academic boundaries. Indeed, integrative experiences often occur as learners address real-world problems, unscripted and sufficiently broad, to require multiple areas of knowledge and multiple modes of inquiry, offering multiple solutions and benefiting from multiple perspectives. Integrative learning also involves internal changes in the learner. These internal changes, which indicate growth as a confident, lifelong learner, include the ability to adapt one's intellectual skills, to contribute in a wide variety of situations, and to understand and develop individual purpose, values and ethics. Developing students' capacities for integrative learning is central to personal success, social responsibility, and civic engagement in today's global society. Students face a rapidly changing and increasingly connected world where integrative learning becomes not just a benefit...but a necessity.

Because integrative learning is about making connections, this learning may not be as evident in traditional academic artifacts such as research papers and academic projects unless the student, for example, is prompted to draw implications for practice. These connections often surface, however, in reflective work, self-assessment, or creative endeavors of all kinds. Integrative assignments foster learning between courses or by connecting courses to experientially-based work. Work samples or collections of work that include such artifacts give evidence of integrative learning. Faculty are encouraged to look for evidence that the student connects the learning gained in classroom study to learning gained in real life situations that are related to other learning experiences, extra-curricular activities, or work. Through integrative learning, students pull together their entire experience inside and outside of the formal classroom; thus, artificial barriers between formal study and informal or tacit learning become permeable. Integrative learning, whatever the context or source, builds upon connecting both theory and practice toward a deeper understanding.

Assignments to foster such connections and understandings could include, for example, composition papers that focus on topics from biology, economics, or history; mathematics assignments that apply mathematical tools to important issues and require written analysis to explain the implications and limitations of the mathematical treatment, or art history presentations that demonstrate aesthetic connections between selected paintings and novels. In this regard, some majors (e.g., interdisciplinary majors or problem-based field studies) seem to inherently evoke characteristics of integrative learning and result in work samples or collections of work that significantly demonstrate this outcome. However, fields of study that require accumulation of extensive and high-consensus content knowledge (such as accounting, engineering, or chemistry) also involve the kinds of complex and integrative constructions (e.g., ethical dilemmas and social consciousness) that seem to be highlighted so extensively in self-reflection in arts and humanities, but they may be embedded in individual performances and less evident. The key in the development of such work samples or collections of work will be in designing structures that include artifacts and reflective writing or feedback that support students' examination of their learning and give evidence that, as graduates, they will extend their integrative abilities into the challenges of personal, professional, and civic life.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Academic knowledge: Disciplinary learning, learning from academic study, texts, etc.
- Content: The information conveyed in the work samples or collections of work.
- Contexts: Actual or simulated situations in which a student demonstrates learning outcomes. New and challenging contexts encourage students to stretch beyond their current frames of reference.
- Co-curriculum: A parallel component of the academic curriculum that is in addition to formal classroom (student government, community service, residence hall activities, student organizations, etc.).
- Experience: Learning that takes place in a setting outside of the formal classroom, such as workplace, service learning site, internship site or another.
- Form: The external frameworks in which information and evidence are presented, ranging from choices for particular work sample or collection of works (such as a research paper, PowerPoint, video recording, etc.) to choices in make-up of the portfolio.
- Performance: A dynamic and sustained act that brings together knowing and doing (creating a painting, solving an experimental design problem, developing a public relations strategy for a business, etc.); performance makes learning observable.
- Reflection: A meta-cognitive act of examining a performance in order to explore its significance and consequences.
- Self-Assessment: Describing, interpreting, and judging a performance based on stated or implied expectations followed by planning for further learning.



INTEGRATIVE LEARNING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact rubric@aacu.org

Definition

Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and cocurriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

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

	Capstone 4	3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Connections to Experience <i>Connects relevant experience and academic knowledge</i>	Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view.	Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks of fields of study.	Compares life experiences and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledge perspectives other than own.	Identifies connections between life experiences and those academic texts and ideas perceived as similar and related to own interests.
Connections to Discipline <i>Sees (makes) connections across disciplines, perspectives</i>	Independently creates wholes out of multiple parts (synthesizes) or draws conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.	Independently connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.	When prompted, connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.	When prompted, presents examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.
Transfer <i>Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations</i>	Adapts and applies, independently, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways.	Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues .	Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation to contribute to understanding of problems or issues .	Uses, in a basic way, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation .
Integrated Communication	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) in ways that enhance meaning , making clear the interdependence of language and meaning, thought, and expression.	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) to explicitly connect content and form , demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience.	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) that connects in a basic way what is being communicated (content) with how it is said (form).	Fulfills the assignment(s) (i.e. to produce an essay, a poster, a video, a PowerPoint presentation, etc.) in an appropriate form .
Reflection and Self-Assessment <i>Demonstrates a developing sense of self as a learner, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts (may be evident in self-assessment, reflective, or creative work)</i>	Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.	Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).	Articulates strengths and challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness).	Describes own performances with general descriptors of success and failure.

FOUNDATIONS AND SKILLS FOR LIFELONG LEARNING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact valuel@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Lifelong learning is "all purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence". An endeavor of higher education is to prepare students to be this type of learner by developing specific dispositions and skills described in this rubric while in school. (from The European Commission, 2000. Commission staff working paper: A memorandum on lifelong learning. Retrieved September 3, 2003, www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/lifelong-oth-enl-t02.pdf.)

Framing Language

This rubric is designed to assess the skills and dispositions involved in lifelong learning, which are curiosity, transfer, independence, initiative, and reflection. Assignments that encourage students to reflect on how they incorporated their lifelong learning skills into their work samples or collections of work by applying above skills and dispositions will provide the means for assessing those criteria. Work samples or collections of work tell what is known or can be done by students, while reflections tell what students think or feel or perceive. Reflection provides the evaluator with a much better understanding of who students are because through reflection students share how they feel about or make sense of their learning experiences. Reflection allows analysis and interpretation of the work samples or collections of work for the reader. Reflection also allows exploration of alternatives, the consideration of future plans, and provides evidence related to students' growth and development. Perhaps the best fit for this rubric are those assignments that prompt the integration of experience beyond the classroom.

FOUNDATIONS AND SKILLS FOR LIFELONG LEARNING VALUE RUBRIC



for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

Lifelong learning is "all purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence". An endeavor of higher education is to prepare students to be this type of learner by developing specific dispositions and skills (described in this rubric) while in school. (From The European Commission, 2000, Commission staff working paper: A memorandum on lifelong learning. Retrieved September 3, 2003, from www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/lifelong-oth-en1-t02.pdf.)

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

	Capstone 4	3	2	1
Curiosity	Explores a topic in depth, yielding a rich awareness and/ or little-known information indicating intense interest in the subject.	Explores a topic in depth, yielding insight and/ or information indicating interest in the subject.	Explores a topic with some evidence of depth, providing occasional insight and/ or information indicating mild interest in the subject.	Explores a topic at a surface level, providing little insight and/ or information beyond the very basic facts indicating low interest in the subject.
Initiative	Completes required work, generates and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work, identifies and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work and identifies opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.	Completes required work
Independence	Educational interests and pursuits exist and flourish outside classroom requirements. Knowledge and/ or experiences are pursued independently.	Beyond classroom requirements, pursues substantial, additional knowledge and/ or actively pursues independent educational experiences.	Beyond classroom requirements, pursues additional knowledge and/ or shows interest in pursuing independent educational experiences.	Begins to look beyond classroom requirements, showing interest in pursuing knowledge independently.
Transfer	Makes explicit references to previous learning and applies in an innovative (new and creative) way that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes references to previous learning and shows evidence of applying that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes references to previous learning and attempts to apply that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.	Makes vague references to previous learning but does not apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.
Reflection	Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) in depth to reveal significantly changed perspectives about educational and life experiences, which provide foundation for expanded knowledge, growth, and maturity over time.	Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) in depth, revealing fully clarified meanings or indicating broader perspectives about educational or life events.	Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) with some depth, revealing slightly clarified meanings or indicating a somewhat broader perspectives about educational or life events.	Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) at a surface level, without revealing clarified meaning or indicating a broader perspective about educational or life events.

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

Framing Language

Preparing graduates for their public lives as citizens, members of communities, and professionals in society has historically been a responsibility of higher education. Yet the outcome of a civic-minded graduate is a complex concept. Civic learning outcomes are framed by personal identity and commitments, disciplinary frameworks and traditions, pre-professional norms and practice, and the mission and values of colleges and universities. This rubric is designed to make the civic learning outcomes more explicit. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual volunteerism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. For students this could include community-based learning through service-learning classes, community-based research, or service within the community. Multiple types of work samples or collections of work may be utilized to assess this, such as:

- ① The student creates a service program that engages others (such as youth or members of a neighborhood) in learning about and taking action on an issue they care about. In the process, the student also teaches and models processes that engage others in deliberative democracy, in having a voice, participating in democratic processes, and taking specific actions to affect an issue.
 - ① The student researches, organizes, and carries out a deliberative democracy forum on a particular issue, one that includes multiple perspectives on that issue and how best to make positive change through various courses of public action. As a result, other students, faculty, and community members are engaged to take action on an issue.
 - ① The student works on and takes a leadership role in a complex campaign to bring about tangible changes in the public's awareness or education on a particular issue, or even a change in public policy. Through this process, the student demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.
 - ① The student integrates their academic work with community engagement, producing a tangible product (piece of legislation or policy, a business, building or civic infrastructure, water quality or scientific assessment, needs survey, research paper, service program, or organization) that has engaged community constituents and responded to community needs and assets through the process.
- In addition, the nature of this work lends itself to opening up the review process to include community constituents that may be a part of the work, such as teammates, colleagues, community/agency members, and those served or collaborating in the process.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Civic identity: When one sees her or himself as an active participant in society with a strong commitment and responsibility to work with others towards public purposes.
- Service-learning class: A course-based educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity and reflect on the experience in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.
- Communication skills: Listening, deliberation, negotiation, consensus building, and productive use of conflict.
- Civic life: The public life of the citizen concerned with the affairs of the community and nation as contrasted with private or personal life, which is devoted to the pursuit of private and personal interests.
- Politics: A process by which a group of people, whose opinions or interests might be divergent, reach collective decisions that are generally regarded as binding on the group and enforced as common policy. Political life enables people to accomplish goals they could not realize as individuals. Politics necessarily arises whenever groups of people live together, since they must always reach collective decisions of one kind or another.
- Government: "The formal institutions of a society with the authority to make and implement binding decisions about such matters as the distribution of resources, allocation of benefits and burdens, and the management of conflicts." (Retrieved from the Center for Civic Engagement Web site, May 5, 2009.)
- Civic/community contexts: Organizations, movements, campaigns, a place or locus where people and/or living creatures inhabit, which may be defined by a locality (school, national park, non-profit organization, town, state, nation) or defined by shared identity (i.e. African-Americans, North Carolinians, Americans, the Republican or Democratic Party, refugees, etc.). In addition, contexts for civic engagement may be defined by a variety of approaches intended to benefit a person, group, or community, including community service or volunteer work, academic work.

Definition

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

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

	Capstone 4	3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity.	Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.	Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
Analysis of Knowledge	Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
Civic Identity and Commitment	Provides evidence of experience in civic engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.	Provides evidence of experience in civic engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.	Evidence suggests involvement in civic engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.	Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic identity.
Civic Communication	Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action	Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do more than one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.
Civic Action and Reflection	Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Demonstrates independent experience and team leadership of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Has clearly participated in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.	Has experimented with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action.
Civic Contexts/Structures	Demonstrates ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.	Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.	Demonstrates experience identifying intentional ways to participate in civic contexts and structures.	Experiments with civic contexts and structures, tries out a few to see what fits.

Appendix G: Overview of the Integrative Learning Project Campuses

The Integrative learning Project (ILP) was a three-year joint venture between the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). Beginning in 2003, the ILP started with submissions from 139 colleges and universities throughout the United States. Institutions applying for inclusion in the ILP showcased a wide array of classifications, enrollment sizes, and specializations. The largest percentage of submissions came from Master's colleges and universities (37%), followed by Doctorate-granting universities (21%), and Baccalaureate colleges (18%). Proposals focused on a number of areas related to integrative learning, especially assessment of student/program outcomes, faculty development, and curriculum development (DeZure, Babb, & Waldmann, 2005, Summer/Fall). Out of the 139 total applicant colleges and universities, 10 campuses were selected into the final ILP study:

Associate's Colleges

- College of San Mateo (San Mateo, CA)
- LaGuardia Community College (Long Island City, NY)

Baccalaureate Colleges

- Carleton College (Northfield, MN)
- Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts (North Adams, MA)
- University of Charleston (Charleston, WV)

Master's Colleges and Universities

- Philadelphia University (Philadelphia, PA)

- Salve Regina University (Newport, RI)
- State University of New York College at Oswego (Oswego, NY)

Doctorate-Granting Universities

- Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI)
- Portland State University (Portland, OR)

While all 10 campuses of the ILP exhibit trends and practices that could be widely applicable for practice related to integrative learning, for the purpose of the project at Eastern Illinois, the three institutions included in the Master's Colleges and Universities classification would be most applicable for benchmarking, based on institutional size, mission, and student characteristics. Additional best practices from the other seven ILP institutions that might have possible application at Eastern Illinois are also referenced. Unless otherwise noted, all information in this section is contained in the online public report issued by the AAC&U and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Huber, Brown, Hutchings, Gale, Miller, & Breen, 2007, January).

Integrative learning at Philadelphia University

Founded in 1884 with ties to the American textile industry, Philadelphia University boasts a "liberal-professional" education that ties classical learning to real-world practice. This connection between the liberal arts and professional education was the basis for the ILP proposal in 2003. With a strong core curriculum, known as the College

Studies Program, Philadelphia University had a foundation for strong integrated practices, with a number of programs being already in place before inclusion in the ILP initiative. These included the First Year Experience, Information Literacy Initiative, Writing at PhilaU, and the Senior Capstone Experience. For the ILP initiative, Philadelphia University focused on curriculum matters related to specific points in the undergraduate experience where integration could take place between the liberal arts and professional aspects. These areas were the First Year Experience, Junior-level integrative seminars, and the Senior Capstone Experience.

The proposal for the First Year Experience at Philadelphia University focused building learning communities on-campus through common experiences through the curriculum, the residential life spaces, and co-curricular activities. A major component of building the learning communities and integrating experiences was a common theme and reading book, which was the focus of both Freshman Writing Seminar, History I, and Drawing I classes. With additional programming related to the common theme and the reading book, students displayed connections between the in-the-classroom experience with the co-curricular offerings through writing and other projects, which were then assessed by faculty members to show evidence of knowledge integration across and between courses and experiences.

The proposed Junior-level integrative seminars were expected to encompass an intensive writing component to bridge the gap between classroom instruction and practical application. Entitled

“Integrative Professional Seminars”, these seminars were to be available to all classified juniors at Philadelphia University, and comprised one half of the junior-level curriculum in the College Studies program. The Integrative Professional Seminars would allow students to focus on various points of view related to professional and academic topics through a writing intensive course designed to integrate the liberal and professional aspects of topics.

Philadelphia University also proposed a revamped Senior Capstone Seminar that would serve as the culminating experience for the College Studies program. The Capstone would focus on current global events through a major research project with a significant writing component. To enhance the integrative nature of this course, faculty from the professional majors would serve as major consultants for the curriculum development process to cohesively combine the liberal arts and professional nature desired of the course.

According to the report from the ILP initiative website, Philadelphia University was successful in implementing changes to the First Year Experience program and the Senior Capstone course. No information was given to the success in offering the proposed Junior-level integrative seminars, but a standing College Studies Committee was developed to bring together faculty from across the various professional schools to work on the continuing development of the core curriculum, the College Studies Program.

As integrative learning was preexisting in the First Year Experience through usage of a common theme and book, the advent of providing a more integrated component related to the liberal and professional elements was the intended outcome. While the assessment done at Philadelphia University did show that the First Year Experience did produce increased levels of integrative learning, it also displayed problems in implementing integrative learning in the first year courses taken by students in the professional schools. According to the report, expanding all of the commonalities across the various courses “was already a significant challenge” and “would further strain our resources.”

The Senior Capstone Seminar was somewhat better received at Philadelphia University, and began with a series of faculty workshops on “signature pedagogies.” Through experimental assignments aimed at allowing students to look at global issues through the lens of the future professional discipline. Through assessment in 2005 and 2006, Philadelphia University was able to ascertain that senior students were able to display integrative learning through the capstone project, although some faculty believed that instituting integrated approach to such a high stakes project could be counterproductive if students were not exposed to such tasks earlier in the general curriculum. It was determined that the best integrated practice moving forward would be to have students to research professional issues in global context in a way that was more coherent with research tactics taught in the general undergraduate curriculum instead of attempting a

curricular overhaul so deep into a student’s academic progress.

Integrative learning at Salve Regina University

While Salve Regina University would differ greatly from Eastern Illinois based on some classifications (private vs. public, religiously affiliated vs. non-religiously affiliated), the overall academic mission, degrees awarded, and learning outcomes are somewhat similar. Salve Regina University is based on the Catholic tradition and seeks to integrate faith and learning with service and commitment to knowledge. In regards to integrative learning and the ILP initiative, Salve Regina University worked towards development related to the core curriculum.

There were two primary goals at Salve Regina for the ILP: develop an integrative senior capstone course and an assessment program through an Integrative e-Portfolio. These goals would work in periphery of the basic Core Curriculum, which included four overarching goals: 1) an education with a Catholic identity, 2) a liberal education, 3) responsible citizens of the world, and 4) lifelong learning. Each of the four Core Curriculum goals included specific learning objectives that include knowledge and skills, analysis, and synthesis, for a total of 28 objectives. While the first goal, related specifically to the religious tenets of Salve Regina, would not be widely applicable to other institutions, the remaining three goals could be quite applicable for other Master’s level colleges and universities with a specific undergraduate core curriculum.

Assessment of the impact of integrative learning in the Core Curriculum was achieved through a matrix that was distributed by faculty to students in core classes to gauge how well topics were being covered in line with the various goals. The process of developing the mapping instrument and implementation took place well before and throughout the ILP initiative at Salve Regina. The assessment was paramount in determining effectiveness in integrative learning, and overall outcomes from the mapping matrix provided insight as to which objectives were being met and at what frequency. Input from faculty was included throughout the development and implementation process, and faculty were given flexibility as to which objectives would or could be taught in the courses. The development of the mapping matrix and changes to the core curriculum were the precursors for the development of the senior capstone course, which was implemented on a pilot basis in 2006.

The core curriculum development at Salve Regina eventually led to a common syllabus for most core classes, with 75% of the readings being the same across the various courses throughout the four-year undergraduate experience. In this way, Salve Regina was able to develop increased commonalities for the undergraduate population, thereby deepening the integrative process. This common experience was manifest fully in the senior capstone courses, which were based as seminars to allow students to reflect holistically on their own undergraduate experience, further develop a worldview, understand challenges in the modern world, and further develop liberal arts skills. A review of the common syllabus for the

senior capstone course reveals that students were asked to contemplate and connect themes and knowledge from both the core curriculum and their major/minor areas of study. Assessment of integrative learning was conducted through a series of papers written after specific sections of the capstone course and an oral final exam, in lieu of a major research project.

The Integrative e-Portfolio was designed for use throughout the undergraduate experience at Salve Regina as a means of assessment of the overarching learning objectives. Rubrics were developed to guide faculty members in assessing student progress throughout the e-Portfolio process, and extensive training was administered for faculty members to gain higher levels of competence when assessing student writing in relation to the common goals of the core curriculum and the goals for each individual course. The grading rubric was also expanded into a handbook for the First Year Experience and New Student Seminars, which included in great detail the various competencies that students were expected to gain during the first year of study.

The final component of ILP implementation at Salve Regina related to the core capstone course, called Living Wisdom: Contemporary Challenges. Connections were developed by a faculty led development team in 2005 to link the capstone experience to the first year course, Seeking Wisdom, and the overall core curriculum. The Living Wisdom course was designed to be small in size (15-20 students) and involved heavy use of the e-Portfolio system that students would create during

their time of study leading up to senior year. Specific texts were identified to highlight different worldviews, and two pilot sections of the capstone were used in the spring 2006 semester. Primary objectives for the capstone were related back to the four goals of the core curriculum, and a majority of the faculty participation in the course came from the philosophy and religious studies areas. The principal reasoning behind philosophy and religious studies being the primary instructional areas was related to the non-professional nature of the capstone course, since the students were to explore differing worldviews and philosophies, not necessarily areas related to various professions. However, in the proposal, *Salve Regina* did highlight that eventually teaching opportunities for the capstone would widen as more faculty became interested in teaching the new course.

Integrative learning at the State University of New York College at Oswego

The State University of New York College at Oswego (SUNY Oswego) is part of the State University of New York system of public institutions. Although a part of the largest higher education system in the world, SUNY Oswego is comprised of 8500 students and over 100 baccalaureate and graduate level programs. Full-time faculty numbers are around 300, and are referred to as “teacher-scholars.” In relation to integrative learning, SUNY Oswego offered several different areas for students to display competencies across disciplines and develop cognitively both in and out of the classroom prior to work with the ILP initiative, and a direct result of the ILP was called the Catalyst

Project. These previously developed integrative learning programs were: 1) the Oswego Reading Initiative, 2) the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies, 3) the Arts Programming Board, and 4) the Honors Program.

The Oswego Reading Initiative was developed between 2000 and 2001 through a specialized faculty task force on-campus. Beginning in the summer of 2002, a common book was designated as a summer reading text for the entire campus. While the idea of a common text had been previously been instituted at a host of institutions across the country, the program at SUNY Oswego was different in that it applied to all students, faculty, and staff, not just subsections divided by classification, specific courses, or majors. Faculty were asked to work the book into existing courses, regardless of discipline, to enhance discussions of the subject matter of the common reading, thereby promoting critical thinking and interactions between students and faculty and staff members. The faculty task force morphed into a standing committee charged with the development of the overall Oswego Reading Initiative, including choice of the common text, development of resources for faculty related to the common text, and additional campus-wide activities related to the shared experience.

The SUNY Oswego Center for Interdisciplinary Studies was designed to offer integrative learning opportunities across multiple disciplines and increase opportunities for interaction between students and faculty in both traditional study and through research. Currently, the Center offers twenty-two degree granting programs that are

interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary in nature. The degree programs display a healthy mix of arts and science disciplines, such as American Studies and Biochemistry, as well as more professionalized fields of study like Journalism and Applied Mathematical Economics. To further develop integrative learning throughout the interdisciplinary programs, the Center offers a number of additional learning opportunities in the form of lectures, performances, and panel discussions to increase student-faculty interaction and collaboration outside the classroom.

SUNY Oswego also offers a number of integrative learning opportunities through the Arts Program Board, a group which brings a wide variety of speakers, musicians, and theatre productions to campus. These programs are designed to facilitate growth not only in the disciplines on-campus directly related to the arts, but also additional learning experiences for all disciplines in relation to global competencies and varying worldviews. The last, and most robust, of the integrative learning initiatives preceding the involvement of SUNY Oswego in the ILP is the Honors Program. Students in this program are not confined to specific major courses of study, but are challenged to examine topics within their selected major through a different set of criteria than non-Honors students. The Honors Program is based on integrative practices such as smaller class sizes, increased student-faculty interaction, and an 18 hour Honors Core. The Honors Program offers somewhat of a “rolling admission,” in that while some students are selected into the program coming out of high school based on GPA and standardized test scores, first and second

year students can apply for the program based once enrolled at SUNY Oswego.

As a result of the ILP initiative, SUNY Oswego developed the Catalyst Project as a more comprehensive and intentional form of integrative learning on-campus. A team of faculty began developing Catalyst in 2004, and the project essentially focuses on student reflection at four different points related to the undergraduate experience. Students are asked to examine their learning experiences prior to college (summer orientation), during the first year (at completion of First Choice course), during the general curriculum (at completion of Intellectual Issues course), and completion of their major course of study (at completion of the Capstone). The First Choice, Intellectual Issues, and Capstone courses are provided across majors and disciplines, and represent the various cognitive stages of development that students are expected to experience over the course of completing a baccalaureate degree. In assessing the reflective pieces produced by students, SUNY Oswego has been able to identify areas where integrative learning is manifest and increase development in certain courses to further promote learning integration. Additional emphasis has been, and will continue, to be placed on faculty development in areas related to integrative learning to promote conversations about learning across the campus, as well as the continued enhancement of courses across the disciplines to provide additional opportunities for students to apply knowledge to various contexts outside their area of study.

Additional Best Practices from the Integrative learning Project Campuses

While the results from the ILP initiative at Philadelphia University, Salve Regina University, and SUNY Oswego may contain the most immediate best practices for possible implementation at Eastern Illinois based on Carnegie classification similarities, certain offerings developed at the remaining seven ILP institutions could be adjusted for use in developing a more robust integrative learning component. The following are a few of the most prevalent examples of ILP success at additional campuses that might be adapted for use at Eastern Illinois.

Interdisciplinary Approaches

In addition to integrative learning approaches developed through the ILP, Carleton College in Minnesota, received a \$1.5 million grant from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute in 2008, allowing for the development of the Carleton Interdisciplinary Science & Math Initiative (CISMI). The program seeks to move beyond traditional pedagogical processes in study of math and science by bridging the gap between scholarship and practical application in a complex world. CISMI takes an evidence approach to student assessment, and faculty are involved not only in research related to their subject area, but also research related to student learning and outcomes. While students receive integrative learning benefits through research of how math and science impact real world problems, faculty are also recipients of the learning process through constant assessment of student learning how pedagogical techniques might be augmented to have optimal impact on learning outcomes (Carleton College Web site, 2009).

The College of San Mateo in California has developed a Learning Communities (LCOM) model that involves cohort participation and the exploration of connections between different disciplines and subjects. LCOM is divided into three separate tracks: the Paired Course Model, the Confluence Model, and Hard-Linked Learning Communities. In the Paired Course Model, two separate courses are linked with a shared cohort of students and revolve around a common theme. While two separate instructors teach the individual courses, team teaching is practiced and encouraged through shared class meetings, collaborative activities, common readings, and similar assignments aimed at connecting the two courses and promoting students to think of subject matter in varying contexts. The Confluence Model encourages students to learn from instructors in other areas of study through the use of a common focus that links multiple courses. Students in participating courses may share a common class hour from time to time, work together on a common theme/project, or work on a shared learning activity. The commonalities between the different courses allow for connections between subjects and disciplines to be explored and put into a real world application. While the Paired Course and Confluence Models allow for student choice in various courses, the Hard-Linked Learning Communities are more explicit in desired outcomes and require for students to enroll in specific courses related to a particular track while still promoting connections of subject matter within a common group of students.

LaGuardia Community College-CUNY also makes use of learning communities to foster cross-disciplinary study. In a similar cohort model, students at LaGuardia are able to take clusters of classes with the same group of students, and these class clusters may be tied in with a specific major or course of study. There are specific learning communities for Liberal Arts and Sciences and ESL students, but the flagship learning community at LaGuardia is the First Year Academy, which affords students the opportunity to take requirements in specific majors early in the college process alongside some basic skill development courses. Within the First Year Academy program, three groups (Technology/Business, Liberal Arts, and Allied Health and Sciences) are comprised of student cohorts that will go through similar classes for program completion. While not fully implemented as of yet, the First Year Academy program will eventually be comprised of four linked courses within each group: New Student Seminar, Fundamentals of Professional Advancement, Specialized Basic Skills, and an Introductory course specific to the major.

Writing Portfolios

At Portland State University in Oregon, connection between separate courses is achieved through the core courses making up the University Studies Program. This four-year program promotes critical thinking and effective communication, and a major tenet of University Studies, especially in the first-year, is the e-Portfolio program. First-year students in Freshman Inquiry (FRINQ) courses are able to use an online system provided by Google to

highlight academic work and build a comprehensive writing portfolio to show learning progress over the course of the year. However, the current capabilities of the e-Portfolio program at Portland State do not allow for students to access or use the online system after the first-year. To combat this problem, development of an Open Source Portfolio (OSP) is being developed that would allow students to carry over work from year to year, building a longitudinal body of academic composition that could be used on the culminating capstone project during the senior year.

Carleton College also utilizes an extensive writing portfolio system to gauge student progress towards integrative learning. The Carleton program is positioned during the term when students must declare a major course of study and before specific methods, comprehensive, and cornerstone/capstone courses are taken. The writing portfolio is comprised of self-selected student work (paper with the best grade and additional personal selection), all papers from one writing course, and a writing exam. Portfolios are submitted for faculty review, and the process emphasizes student choice on which writings are to be submitted. Additionally, students are required to produce a self-reflection piece evaluating how their own writing skills have progressed since being in college.

Progressive Educational Practices

At the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts (MCLA), integrative learning is a major component of the core curriculum on-campus. The original focus of the ILP at the campus was to develop

objectives, assessment methods, and course for the upper level integrated capstone courses, but the idea of integrative learning filtered down to cover the entire core curriculum model at MCLA. Over the course of undergraduate study, students move through three Tiers designed with specific competencies for the various levels of the core curriculum that represent a holistic liberal arts mission. In Tier I, students are taught in such a way as to develop in the areas of writing, math, computer literacy, and a foreign language. Tier II, known as the Domain Courses, requires students to select two courses from each of the following domains: Human Heritage, Self and Society, Creative Arts, and Science and Technology. Then students are to complete a Capstone to the Core, Tier III, which is essentially a large capstone course incorporating at least two of the domains from Tier II. To successfully progress through the liberal arts core at MCLA, students are required to move systematically through various disciplines and courses in an integrated fashion that builds multiple competencies in various areas.

Similar to MCLA in scope, but not overall outcomes, the University Studies Program at Portland State University also follows a four-year model of integrative learning. Freshman Inquiry (FRINQ) and Sophomore Inquiry (SINQ) allow for student progress in the core curriculum across various disciplines and perspectives, and result in Upper Division clusters of students going through similar classes. Ultimately, students at Portland State work on a senior capstone course, which is a community-based learning class. Students are able to connect the SINQ

courses and Upper Division Clusters based on personal interests in the various areas of study.

The University of Charleston in West Virginia has developed an innovative completion path that places much of the responsibility for integrative learning in the hands of the students. Entitled “Learning Your Way,” the ILP at Charleston allows for students to define and explore every available option in which to show progress towards and achievement of various learning outcomes. Through a healthy mix of curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities, such as internships and service learning, students at Charleston are allowed to develop their own Independent Learning Plans that allow for movement through academic study at an accelerated pace. Students are able to prove competency in a certain area in their own way, an example being the use of personal international travel to prove competence in global awareness. The process highlights a unique partnership between the university and the student by allowing students to use personal experiences as evidence of learning outside the classroom.

Discussion of Integrative learning Project Campuses

For future application at Eastern Illinois, the campuses included in the ILP initiative hold a number of possibilities. Overall, two major themes are prevalent throughout the ten ILP schools: enhancement of current strengths in relation to integrative learning and institutional assessment of the practices instituted.

As noted in the overview of practices at Philadelphia University, Salve Regina University, and SUNY Oswego, the developments that came about as a result of the ILP initiative were directly related to existing programs, curricula, and campus missions. For example, SUNY Oswego already had a number of programs in place on-campus that facilitated integrative learning prior to 2003 and their ILP participation, and the resulting Catalyst Project was more of an extension of what was already being accomplished. Similarly, at Salve Regina and Philadelphia, the ILP served as more of an impetus for intentionality rather than a starting point for redevelopment. Salve Regina was already steeped in deep religious beliefs prior to ILP, and the results of the project reiterated the foundation of Catholic identity that was to be passed on to students throughout the core curriculum. At Philadelphia, a long history of mixing the traditional disciplines with pre-professional development made changes from the ILP fit seamlessly into the core curriculum for certain majors, although the campus did find that expanding some integrated practices across the entire university would not have been feasible. These three examples, along with other examples from additional ILP campuses, prove that drastic reinvention is not necessary for a development and implementation of successful integrative learning components. It is more beneficial for a campus to identify and enhance preexisting integrated practices that have been successful than to create an entirely new model for integrative learning in unexplored areas of curricular and co-curricular life.

Various assessment practices are prevalent within the campuses involved

with the ILP initiative. As integrative learning involves various forms of inquiry and development on the part of the students, assessment tools for gauging student progress through education on various disciplines and perspectives are paramount. Additionally, assessment of the worth of the individual campus programs related to integrative learning is also important, especially when examining the logistics of implementation and the overall breadth of the programs.

Assessment of student learning is the most important area for review, and the various writing components, course offerings, and capstone experiences provide snapshots of student progress towards the mastery of various competencies over the course of undergraduate study. Individual student work on writing assignments and culminating research presented through capstones show students moving through developmental stages and towards greater acknowledgement of personal and intellectual growth. The ILP at Salve Regina identifies various integration types, ranging from social to spiritual competence, and most of the other ILP campuses center learning objectives around ideals such as critical thinking, analytical thinking, citizenship, and cultural/global understanding. To measure programmatic impact on students, institutions like Carleton College and SUNY Oswego ask institutionally specific questions related to general learning outcomes and program performance throughout the integrative learning process. Carleton also makes use of nationally known survey instruments (College Student Experiences Questionnaire and the Collegiate Learning Assessment) for

data, and to enhance the impact of findings, and adds additional questions related directly to the integrative learning. As stated previously, SUNY Oswego questions students at four different points during the undergraduate

experience, enabling faculty and administrators to gauge student progress through these common writing assignments.

Appendix H: Grant Possibilities

Institute	Grant Name	Website	Description
Howard Hughes Medical Institute	Science Education Grant	http://www.hhmi.org/grants/institutions/	Grants for innovative science education at the undergraduate level.
Teagle Foundation	Outcomes and Assessment Initiatives	http://www.teaglefoundation.org/grantmaking/overview.aspx	Grants for sustained and systematic assessment programs.
Ford Foundation		http://www.fordfoundation.org/grants	The Ford Foundation gives approximately 2000 grants annually. Many grants are given to educational institutions for a variety of initiatives.
Lumina Foundation for Education		http://www.luminafoundation.org/resources/	Grants for a variety of higher education innovations including assessment and international education.
Carnegie Foundation		http://carnegie.org/grants/grants-database/	Multiple grants for education initiatives.

References

- ACT. (2010). Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency. Retrieved January 24, 2010 from <http://www.act.org/caap/>.
- Allen, M. (2004). *Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2009) The VALUE Project Overview. *peerReview: American Association of Colleges and Universities, 11*(1), pp. 4-7.
- American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2009). VALUE: Value Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education. Retrieved December 7, 2009 from <http://www.AAC&U.org/value/metarubrics.cfm>.
- Banta, T. (2007). Can assessment for accountability complement assessment for improvement? *peerReview: American Association of Colleges and Universities, 9*(2), pp. 9-12.
- Berheide, C. (2007). Doing less work, collecting better data: using capstone courses to assess learning. *peerReview: American Association of Colleges and Universities, 9*(2), pp. 27-30.
- Bloxham, S. & Boyd, P. (2007). *Developing effective assessment in higher education: A practical guide*. New York: McGraw Hill Open University Press.
- Bond, L. (ND). Assessment: It's not for experts anymore. Retrieved November 7, 2009 from <http://bondessays.carnegiefoundation.org/>.
- Bourassa, D.M., & Kruger, K. (2001, Winter). The national dialogue on academic and student affairs collaboration. *New Directions for Higher Education, 116*, pp. 9-38. Retrieved August 25, 2009, from Wiley InterScience, DOI: 10.1002/he.31.
- Brady, S.M. (1999, January). Students at the center of education: A collaborative report. *Liberal Education, 85*(1), 14-21. Retrieved August 29, 2009, from Education Module. (Document ID: 39900034).
- Braskamp, L., Trautvetter, L.C., & Ward, K. (2008). Putting students first: Promoting lives of Purpose and meaning. *About Campus, 13*(1), pp. 26-32.
- Carleton College Web site (2009). The Carleton Interdisciplinary Science and Math Initiative (CISMI). Accessed October 22, 2009, at <http://serc.carleton.edu/cismi/>.
- Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. The American Association for Higher Education

- Bulletin. Retrieved November 10, 2009 from <http://honolulu.hawaii.edu/intranet/committees/FacDevCom/guidebk/teachtip/7princip.htm>
- Clark, J., & Enynon, B. (2009) E-portfolios at 2.0 – Surveying the field. *peerReview: American Association of Colleges and Universities*, 11(1). pp. 18-23.
- College Portraits. (2009). Voluntary System of Accountability Program. Retrieved December 7, 2009 from <http://www.voluntarysystem.org/index.cfm>.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2007). Frequently Asked Technical Questions 2007-2008. Retrieved January 12, 2010 from <http://www.collegiatelearningassessment.org/>.
- Dale, P.A., & Drake, T.M. (2005, Fall). Connecting academic and student affairs to enhance student learning and success. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 131, pp. 51-64. Retrieved August 25, 2009, from Wiley InterScience, DOI: 10.1002/cc.205.
- Degen, G., & Sheldahl, E. (2007, Spring). The many hats of teaching in small colleges: The seamless web of student and academic affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 117, pp. 47-56. Retrieved August 22, 2009, from Wiley InterScience, DOI: 10.1002/ss.232.
- DeZure, D., Babb, M., & Waldmann, S. (Summer/Fall 2005). Integrative learning nationwide: Emerging themes and practices. *Peer Review*, 7(4), pp. 24-28. Retrieved July 23, 2009, from the Association of American Colleges and Universities Web site: http://www.AAC&U.org/peerreview/pr_sufa05/pr_sufa05contents.cfm.
- Dwyer, C., Millett, C. & Payne, D. (2006). *A Culture of Evidence: Postsecondary Assessment and Learning Outcomes*. Princeton: ETS.
- Eastern Illinois University. (ND). The what, why, and how of integrative learning, and the integrated academic and personal development of students draft. Retrieved on November 10, 2009 from <http://www.eiu.edu/~acaffair/IntegrativeLearning/EIUIntegrativeLearning.php>
- Eastern Illinois University. (2009). *First-Time Freshmen Class Profile*. EIU Admissions Office.
- Eastern Illinois University Web site (2009). The Integrative Learning Team. Retrieved January 20, 2010, from the Eastern Illinois University Web Site: http://www.eiu.edu/~facdev/IntegrativeLearning_Team.php.
- Educational Testing Services. (2010). ETS Proficiency Profile

- Overview. Retrieved January 12, 2010 from <http://www.ets.org>.
- EIU at a Glance. (2009). Retrieved December 2, 2009 from <http://www.eiu.edu/~pubaff/glan ce.php>.
- Fried, J. (2007). Higher education's new playbook: Learning reconsidered. *About Campus*, 12 (1), pp. 2-7.
- Getty, L.J., Young, D.Y., & Whitaker-Lea, L.D. (2008). Casting the assessment net wide: Capturing all student learning. *About Campus*, 13(2), pp. 10-16.
- Huba, M. & Freed, J. (2000). *Learner-Centered Assessment on College Campuses: Shifting the Focus from Teaching to Learning*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Huber, M.T., Brown, C., Hutchings, P., Gale, R., Miller, R., & Breen, M. (2007, January). Integrative learning: Opportunities to connect. Public Report of the Integrative Learning Project sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Stanford, CA. gallery.carnegiefoundation.org/illp.
- Huber, M.T., Brown, C., Hutchings, P., Gale, R., Miller, R., & Breen, M. (2007, Spring). Leading in initiative for integrative learning. *Liberal Education*, pp. 46 -51.
- Jaschik, S. (2008). Assessing a Hot Assessment Tool. Retrieved December 7, 2009 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/11/10/cla>.
- Kean, R., Mitchell, N. & Wilson, D. (2008). Toward intentionality and transparency: Analysis and reflection on the process of general education reform. *peerReview: American Association of Colleges and Universities*, 10(4), pp. 4-8.
- Keeling, R.P. (Ed.). (2004, January). Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience. *The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and The American College Personnel Association*.
- Kellogg, K. (1999). Collaboration: Student affairs and academic affairs working together to promote student learning. *ERIC Digest*, pp. 1-6. Retrieved August 23, 2009, from ERIC Database: ED432940.
- Knefelkamp, L.L., et al. (1991, November 2). "Is this good for our students?" *Two papers from the 1991 CIC Deans Institute*. Keynote address from the Council of Independent Colleges Deans Institute. Retrieved August 23, 2009, from ERIC Database: ED356720.
- Kuh, G. D., Douglas, K. B., Lund, J. P., & Ramin Gyurmek, J. (1994). Student learning outside the classroom: Transcending artificial boundaries. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*,

- No. 8. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Retrieved August 24, 2009, from ERIC Database: ED 394444.
- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J., & Associates (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Martin, J., & Murphy, S. (2000). *Building a better bridge: Creating effective partnerships between academic and student affairs*. Invited paper, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
- Miller, R. (2005). Integrative Learning and Assessment. *peerReview: American Association of Colleges and Universities*, 7(4), pp. 11-14.
- National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. (2008). Retrieved January 24, 2010, from <http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/CollegesUniversityPrograms.html>.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. (2003). *Handbook of Accreditation* (3rd. ed.). Chicago: The Higher Learning Commission.
- Palomba, C. & Banta, T. (1999) *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education* (p. 4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pearson, R. (2009). *Eastern Illinois University Facts*. EIU Admissions Office.
- Philpott, J.L., & Strange, C. (2003, January/February). "On the road to Cambridge": A case study of faculty and student affairs in collaboration. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(1), pp. 77-95. Retrieved September 22, 2009, from JSTOR: Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3648265>.
- Ramaswami, R. (2010, February). Revving up performance. *Campus Technology*, pp. 15-16, 21.
- Salkind, N. (2005). *Statistics for People Who Think They Hate Statistics* (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Seymour, D. (1992). *On Q: Causing Quality in Higher Education*. (p. 77). New York: ACE Macmillan.
- TestGrid. (2007). CSEQ – Customer Service Excellence Questionnaire Technical Manual. Retrieved January 24, 2010 from <http://www.testgrid.com.au>.
- Texas A&M Help with Assessment. (2009). Retrieved December 2, 2009 from www.http://assessment.tamu.edu/asmt/assess_help.html
- Traub, J. (2007). No Gr_du_te Left Behind. *The New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved January 12, 2010 from <http://>

www.cae.org/content/pdf/CLANYT_Mag.pdf.

University of Alabama. (ND). Retrieved November 20, 2009 from <http://oira.ua.edu/>.

Young, J. (2007). Validity of the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) Test. Retrieved January 12, 2010 from <http://www.ets.org>.

Zeller, W., Hinni, J., Eison, J. (1989, Winter). Creating educational partnerships between academic and student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 48, pp. 49-59.