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Dedication

This inaugural issue of Quality Approaches in Higher Education is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Eric L. Dey, who was regarded as a leading scholar in the field of higher education. He just had joined the faculty at the University of Virginia’s Curry School of Education when he passed away in November 2009. He previously had served many years as a professor at the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan.

Dey had an outstanding career as a higher education leader, professor, and scholar. He often said that his research was concerned with “the ways that colleges and universities shape the experiences and lives of students and faculty.” Furthermore, he was a systems thinker, always conceptualizing how to improve higher education research, engage students more, and teach better.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities wrote, “He leaves a legacy of research that offers a blueprint for how to create enabling college environments that open up educational opportunities for all, promote student development and learning, and raise moral questions about what it means to lead lives of personal and social responsibility.”

Dey touched the lives and mentored many students and faculty in positive and caring ways. He was supportive of the activities of ASQ’s Education Division and conducted research on the same quality issues for improving teaching and learning that have led to creation of this publication. As we launch Quality Approaches in Higher Education, we remember Professor Dey and his vision of bringing research and teaching together for improving education in our colleges and universities, and we hope that this publication will contribute to a dialogue he would have valued.
University Centers of Teaching and Learning

A New Imperative

Fernando F. Padró

Abstract

This article discusses centers of teaching and learning (CoTL) as promoters of quality teaching. Two factors position these centers in the middle of the debate on defining and improving university performance: interest in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) and the importance that policy makers and external reviewers place on student learning. A literature review is presented, supported by a review of 31 websites of 50 master’s comprehensive and doctoral/research universities from the midwestern and eastern parts of the United States. Furthermore, the article includes a discussion of the benefits and challenges of establishing CoTLs, as well as design recommendations.

Purpose and Background

CoTLs promote quality teaching by encouraging and providing capacity for academic staff to improve their instructional skills. They address topics ranging from classroom management to course design and how to work in different course delivery environments. Core functions of CoTLs include:

- Providing feedback to academic staff on their teaching.
- Helping them determine changes to their teaching strategies.
- Affording opportunities for implementing changes along with supporting materials.
- Assessing the effect that adopted changes have on the degree of success students achieve.¹

Many factors have combined to generate the need for CoTLs. Interest in SoTL and accreditation-driven appraisals have revitalized attention on pedagogical techniques by academic staff in higher education.

SoTL involves “the kinds of inquiry and investigation that faculty are most
likely to undertake when they examine and document teaching and learning in their classrooms in order to improve their practice and make it available to peers. SoTL is defined best through actual practice that encourages academic staff to consider how they engage with scholarship, put it into action, and contribute to it.

National and/or state governments have begun incorporating quality assurance into educational regulatory standards as well. There is much debate about insufficiency of accreditation—particularly its focus on meeting minimal expectations instead of reaching for optimal performance—and angst about who sets the standards. This new emphasis on quality-based assessments, however, increases systems-based thinking and attention on results as defined by student learning. Deming espoused that an organization can understand and evaluate itself better when viewed as an integrated system whose sum is greater than its parts and when external perceptions guide its review processes. In the case of CoTLs, the integrated system connects SoTL to student learning.

Furthermore, there is the emerging argument that post-industrialization thinking is compelling universities to replace their socio-cultural mission with a corporate mission based on managerial excellence. This contention is based on the following issues:

• The shifting paradigm from academia to the knowledge industry.
• A preference for a closer link to workforce development.
• Mistrust due to a misunderstanding related to the responsibilities of universities and academic staff.
• Stewardship and the need for institutions to be more capable of generating revenues from what they do.

CoTLs originally were intended to provide instructors pedagogical theory and practice at the undergraduate and graduate levels to improve student learning. Generally, universities sponsored CoTLs to improve the quality of instruction for professional development reasons. New technological developments, the search for new students coupled with the need to retain students, theoretical advances in learning, and the re-conceptualization of the profession have added new dimensions to teaching in higher education, affecting universities’ decisions on how to use existing CoTLs or create them.

Characteristics

In his book on this topic, Gaff reported that the size and scope of CoTLs reflect the “size, character, and traditions of the institution; the purpose, history, and nature of the program; and the interests, abilities, and the personalities of the persons involved.” He identified the following key features of a CoTL, and a review of university websites confirms them as still being applicable:

• Utilizes a centralized organization.
• Maintains a professional staff, program, budget, and other marks of an established academic division.
• Focuses on improvement within the institution.
• Features in-service, rather than a pre-service, emphasis.
• Focuses only on higher education.
• Is established primarily for faculty member clients.
• Serves not just as a media (or information technology) center.

Website reviews added the following details on common characteristics:

• Report to the university’s chief academic administrative officer.
• Have an advisory committee or policy board to oversee work and liaise with other members of the institution.
• Are independent of the institution’s formal advancement system to ensure the staff will not be in an evaluative relationship to the faculty clients and, instead, provide a professional, helping relationship.
• Are housed independently from schools/colleges of education.

The last point is an interesting one. Gaff points out that schools of education emphasize learning theory appropriate to primary and secondary level instruction. CoTLs, however, focus on adult learning theory that provides support and techniques for instructors involved with the traditional 18-22 year-old cohort group, as well as the older students who are now commonly enrolled in universities.

A review of 31 CoTL websites indicates the following programs and activities are typical:
• Conducting workshop/seminars.
• Providing consulting services for individual faculty members—mid-term reviews and micro-teaching/evaluation opportunities by staff or designated peers.
• Working with faculty on IT concerns, such as course management systems.
• Serving as resource centers and repositories of support materials.
• Providing opportunities for recognition, including internal presentations, conferences, internal newsletters, and journals.
• Sponsoring or contributing to new faculty orientation programs.
• Offering expanded programs for graduate students to prepare them in instructional techniques.
• Helping with language and cultural acclimatization issues of academic staff and graduate students who are not native English speakers.
• Providing teaching certificates for graduate students and academic staff to document pedagogical preparation.

Benefits

New research shows that outstanding performance is the product of years of deliberate practice and coaching, not of any innate talent or skill. In the past, the faculty’s baseline skills would have been sufficient, but that is no longer the case. Classic, Huber, and Maeroff cite Sir Eric Ashby’s belief in the need for a professional code of practice, and this is what CoTLs attempt to achieve. In fact, the one constant challenge in providing instructional support and development to academic staff is bringing research results into everyday academic policy and practice. This may be due in part to the gap that Kezar noted between the interests and rewards for practitioners and researchers. In an era where assessment and evaluation are commonplace, driving forces for demonstrating institutional effectiveness and viability, Braskamp and Ory’s assessment metaphor of “sitting beside” is vital. It implies that dialogue, discourse, and reciprocal understanding foster flexibility, innovation, creativity, and novelty in instruction.

CoTLs also provide the broader institutional laboratories necessary for a learning organization. For example, they help academic staff shift from teacher-centered to student-centered learning and social constructivism, identifying “which teaching and learning strategies would most assist the students in a particular learning environment rather than focusing primarily on what tools the professor should employ.” Kezar expands this idea by suggesting the need to study the effect of new theories, such as multiple intelligences, social and emotional intelligence, intuition, and creativity, on higher education classroom learning. CoTLs offer a conduit for such research—either as a source of expertise and guidance or by identifying external sources of potential funding, sponsoring conference presentations, and/or helping publish results. Other benefits of CoTLs include:

• Helping faculty members overcome the sense of isolation and disconnectedness they sometimes feel.
• Encouraging implementation of Arreola, Theall, and Aleamoni’s meta-model of the professoriate in which effective college teaching is based on professional skills and knowledge (content), as well instructional design, delivery, and assessment skills.
• Fostering meta-cognitive development, a critical component of learning communities, as well as personal and professional growth through both cohort-based and topic-based approaches.
• Promoting revenue generation by meeting policy steering concerns and selling research materials and/or providing consulting services (for example, Australia’s Learning and Teaching Performance Fund, which works as a policy tool incentive by funding programs based on their performance against metrics related to how instruction fosters student learning).

CoTLs are de facto quality units because they demonstrate the effectiveness of the link between instruction and learning, which “brings about a paradigm shift in the notion of teaching being a routine and subsidiary task, to a key performance indicator.” Fundamentally, student learning is more affected by academic staff than any other factor. This is why criteria and standards from various voluntary regional accreditation agencies in the United States recommend that external reviewers look for evidence of ongoing, substantial professional development by academic staff, substantiating their understanding of effective teaching/learning processes and outcomes, as well as how these lead to improvement recommendations.
There are other reasons for creating CoTLs and bringing fragmented academic staff instructional development activities under the umbrella of external review. Although some of these are controversial, they do support formation of CoTLs, with the purpose of promoting an opportunity for fruitful collaboration and a positive synergy of resources. Stufflebeam recommends viewing CoTLs through the lens of cost-effectiveness (costs associated with meeting institutional goals and objectives) and benefit-cost analyses (identifying a broader range of outcomes than just those associated with program objectives).

Issues

Many universities’ academic staff instruction development programs are fragmentary, poorly designed, or limited in scope; some universities do not even have programs of this nature. In these cases, instructional development is kept within academic units and is affected by unit notions of collegiality and professional advancement, perspectives driven by programmatic/disciplinary expectations, and/or linkage to licensing or accrediting standards. They reflect the paradox Welsh and Metcalfe considered typical of many universities: tenuous and shallow campus support of institutional effectiveness activities even in this age of accountability. Even when the need for a CoTL is recognized, it may be negated by a superficial cost-benefit analysis that only considers the actual costs of creating the program. In other words, universities somehow fail to establish a sense of urgency concerning instruction, which is the first reason Kotter gives for transformation efforts to fail.

Here is a brief list of other issues that affect academic staff development programs and CoTLs.

- **Over-emphasis of research.** Instruction and service often are viewed as less important than research when considering the triad by which academic success is measured. Boyer’s notion of SoTL calls for a more creative view of the professor and suggests defining academic staff work by four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching.

- **Recognition.** Peer and administrative reviews are the traditional basis for recognition in academia. Embedded in this process is the caveat of competition for courses to teach, laboratory space/equipment, committee assignments, and promotion and tenure slots represented by what Massy, Wilger, and Colbeck refer to as “hollowed collegiality.”

- **Distance between academic staff and the university.** Two perceptions lead toward a natural distance between academic staff and the university itself: a preference for disciplinary concerns and the outdated notion of the scholar as an independent contractor. Academic staff receive little or no training or support for any roles except those of disciplinary expert and researcher. Braskamp and Ory contend that universities should be more than the sum of their parts, which means the cultural clash among the goals of individual academic staff members, academic units, and the institution itself should be avoided.

- **Competition.** The American Council on Education highlights the temptation to embed discussions on pedagogical merit and quality of instruction in the competition for students, resources, other end users, and legitimacy of purpose. The goal of attaining successful learning should not transform instructors and institutions merely into suppliers of essential goods and services.

- **Academic identity and autonomy.** Academics are aware that the culture of accountability and the assessment movement want to align teaching to political will; therefore, recently CoTLs have begun to reflect the more entrepreneurial nature expected from colleges and universities. Imposing this model attacks academic freedom, increases the mistrust of the profession, and creates what Kegan and Lahey call competing commitment, when faculty members seem to apply more energy to creating resistance instead of fostering change, even when they may hold a sincere commitment to improve.

- **Perspective.** Some CoTLs are unable to change the problem in teaching from terminal remediation to ongoing investigation. The view that teaching may not be a problem that needs fixing diminishes a focus on improvement and makes academic staff defensive and less open to work on instruction—unless the reward system supports that action.

- **Student evaluations.** Aleamoni argues that the literature on the use of student evaluations legitimizes their use; however, he points out administrator misuse and misinterpretation of
data are legitimate concerns.\textsuperscript{34} Furthermore, new technologies and instructional practices create teaching and learning situations that are sufficiently different from traditional approaches, which may make previous evaluation methods largely invalid.\textsuperscript{33,36}

- **Success evaluation.** Academic freedom makes instruction a personal choice, and, academic staff generally can do what they choose; therefore, evaluating a CoTL may introduce Birnbaum’s concerns related to anarchic institutions.\textsuperscript{37} Evaluations based on a specific model would appear to be the best approach for validating the research. For example, Stufflebeam proposes the context, input, process, and product (CIPP) model.\textsuperscript{38} Figure 1 shows an adaptation of that model that also incorporates information from other approaches.

- **Participation.** Competing priorities, including the pressure to publish to attain tenure and/or promotion may limit faculty involvement; however, junior faculty still often seek assistance and senior faculty volunteer to participate, demonstrating their commitment to the university and being recognized as role-model instructors.

### Recommendations

Obviously there are many issues affecting a university’s decision to create a CoTL. A key to success is integrating the CoTL with other university policies and programs, providing a more interrelated purpose and infrastructure. The following recommendations are intended to support that approach:

- Create an independent unit led by a director (or equivalent reporting directly to the chief academic officer). That unit should maintain close working relationships with those assessing learning outcomes, the library, information technology, the first-year experience program, disability services, and the learning center, as well as institutional research activities.

- Focus on meeting the needs of individual academic staff members.
• Begin by establishing a resource center and repository for information and equipment to help improve instructional performance.
• Initially provide topic-based seminars and workshops on key instructional and learning issues.
• Emphasize individual consultation services (e.g., micro-teaching with videotaping and feedback opportunities and mid-term instructor evaluations).
• Tie to the new academic staff orientation program and assist with or lead new academic staff professional development activities.
• Engage in on-campus and off-campus networking opportunities by sponsoring campus conferences, as well as attending conferences that address college-level instruction, assessment, student learning, and other related activities.
• Remain independent of the formal academic staff evaluation process; however, serve as an active voice in discussions on student evaluations and other performance evaluation processes.
• Wait until institutional commitment is solid and the CoTL is sustainable before seeking external funding, which directs energy from programming and consultation to grant writing.

Summary

Many universities now sponsor CoTLs as a key strategy for improving student learning. Review of research and current practices on CoTL performance supports this approach for higher education. Although challenges still exist, the benefits of these programs far exceed the issues. Scholarship of teaching and systems thinking have become a mantra for change. Furthermore, the evolving criteria and standards of accrediting bodies are affecting universities’ at the institutional and program levels significantly. With all these factors at work, CoTLs clearly are an essential part of the success equation for higher education.
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You can enhance student learning by using media that increases the enjoyment of the content.

Using Podcasting and Video Productions to Create Valuable Student Learning Experiences

Jamison V. Kovach, David Xin Ding, and Sharon Lund O’Neil

Abstract

Many educators believe that their role is to add value to their students’ learning experience; hence, instructors often develop innovative programs or activities to enhance student achievement. To this end, faculty in the Organizational Leadership and Supervision program at the University of Houston developed cooperative, multi-class projects that challenge static and passive learning patterns in traditional methods of instruction. These projects address technology literacy in addition to traditional course content by incorporating the use of technology, namely podcasts and video productions, into project-related activities to enhance students’ learning experiences and make learning fun. This work describes two technology-rich, multi-class projects and discusses project outcomes based on students’ perceptions about the projects. To support others in developing these types of projects for students in a broad range of disciplines, the basic equipment needed and the steps required to create podcasts and video productions for instructional purposes are also discussed.
Introduction

According to the Higher Learning Commission’s Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP), educational institutions help students learn through a variety of instructional design and delivery processes.¹ As a consequence, academicians have a professional obligation to continuously improve their instructional practices.² From a continuous quality improvement (CQI) point of view, educators should also constantly strive for a higher goal (e.g., to seek out and implement best practices including new learning modalities, teaching methods, facilitation strategies, and other approaches). Accreditation standards provide a framework for assuring quality within education; yet, at the course level, instructors often have the freedom to establish their own learning objectives for a given subject and determine how to assess and evaluate their courses to assure and continuously improve educational quality.³ For example, when a course is scheduled for another offering, many instructors revise their syllabi and add new content to the course through revised activities or different reading assignments. Such actions encompass the basic notion of what it means to continuously improve quality in education, and CQI practices provide educators with a method for rethinking the way they approach teaching and learning activities to do their best and improve student-learning outcomes.⁴

In terms of creating a learning-centered environment, many instructors believe that their role is to add value to their students’ learning experience; hence, they strive to provide students with useful knowledge and skills in exchange for the effort students’ expend in their course. In addition, a positive correlation has been found between student enjoyment (e.g., a proxy measure for intrinsic motivation) and performance in face-to-face classes.⁵ This research justifies the AQIP’s claim that educators should continuously improve and/or develop innovative programs, courses, or activities/assignments to enhance student achievement.¹

The Organizational Leadership and Supervision program at the University of Houston continuously strives to actively engage students in the learning process and improve student-learning outcomes. This program focuses on the management aspects of organizations that use and rely on technology on a day-to-day basis, and it teaches the application of science and technology management to make the world run better, faster, and smarter. Organizational Leadership and Supervision faculty members have previously established a strong record of successfully integrating technology into basic coursework. Most recently, instructors across several courses in this program have joined together to challenge traditional static and passive learning patterns in the instruction of leading change, operations management, quality improvement, team leadership, and/or technical writing principles. That is, together, several instructors developed cooperative, multi-class projects across various courses in the Organizational Leadership and Supervision program. These projects were specifically designed to:

- Reinforce the concepts taught in class.
- Motivate student involvement in the learning process.
- Incorporate technology within project assignments.
- Make learning fun!

These projects provided students with an opportunity to apply what they learn in class through hands-on simulations and real-world learning experiences. In addition, these projects address issues regarding technology literacy by incorporating the use of technology, namely podcasts and video productions, into project-related activities. The feedback from students about these projects has been extremely positive and provides evidence that these projects are a valuable part of students’ learning experiences.

The following sections discuss the basic equipment needed and the steps required to create podcasts and video productions for instructional purposes. In addition, two technology-rich, multi-class projects used within the Organizational Leadership and Supervision program at the University of Houston are described, followed by a discussion of project outcome assessment based on surveys of students’ perceptions about the projects.

Creating Podcasts and Video Productions

Podcasts

Instructional podcasts help to extend lessons beyond the classroom and can be used to provide supplemental explanations and examples. Such recordings may include expert interviews, pre-recorded lectures, how-to instructions, and/or
project presentations. General educational outcomes of using podcasts for instructional purposes include flexibility, portability, repeatability, multitasking, and increased interaction (e.g., student-to-student and student-to-instructor interaction). 6

Podcasting is a combination of the terms iPod and broadcasting; podcasts are audio or video recordings that can be downloaded from various sources. Like music, podcasts are available in different formats. Standard podcasts consist of an audio-only recording (e.g., *.mp3 files). Enhanced podcasts are audio recordings with still visual images added such as pictures or PowerPoint slides (e.g., *.mp4 files). Finally, there are video podcasts, or vodcasts, which are short videos formatted to play on a portable media player (also *.mp4 files). 7

Creating a podcast often involves developing a script. Then, a computer with the necessary software installed and a microphone are needed (headset microphones are recommended); the software required depends on the type of podcast one wishes to create.

When ready to record the material, first set up and test the equipment. When the recording is finished, produce the recording in the necessary format (typically an *.mp3 or *.mp4 file). Podcasting software generally provides many choices for “producing” the recordings; choose a format compatible with the way users will access the recordings. In addition, review the podcast to ensure that it sounds as intended. Once complete, upload the podcast to a website (e.g., the course management’s system) or an aggregator, such as iTunes. 8

**Video Productions**

Video productions help to enhance students’ learning experiences and communication skills beyond traditional classroom interactions and can be used as a supplement to traditional case studies and group projects. Video productions may include face-to-face interviews, scenarios, or a combination of both. The general educational merits of video productions in higher education settings include portability, publicity, visuality, and interactivity. 9 In addition, videos capture and disseminate tacit organizational teaching knowledge in distance learning. 10

Recording high-quality videos requires a digital camcorder (high definition is optional), a directional microphone, several memory cards (or internal memory), a steady tripod, and a video light (optional). In addition, the production process involves assigning roles, creating scripts and storyboards, videotaping, editing, and distributing the final video; hence, this work requires a team effort. In the early planning stages, it is helpful to break down the production project into different work packages, which you can assign to various team members. Alternatively, you can assign team members to different roles depending on the number of people involved in the project. A typical video project may include job titles such as director, producer, researcher, scriptwriter, storyboard artist, set designer, camera operator, sound, film editor, and actors. A typical video project may include job titles such as director, producer, researcher, scriptwriter, storyboard artist, set designer, camera operator, sound, film editor, and actors. 8

To create the video, start by drafting scripts and storyboards to outline the project. Then, to record a preliminary video, use the storyboards to create the scenes and videotape every scene in the proper order. Please note that during recording, you may need to modify or revise the scripts and/or storyboards. After videotaping is finished, begin editing the preliminary video. This process includes reviewing and cutting footage, adding effects such as transitions and music, correcting text and credits, and making final edits. There are several software packages that can be used to edit videos. After editing is complete, you need to convert the final video into the appropriate format (e.g., *.m4v, *.mpeg, *.mov) to fulfill the desired resolution and size requirements. Depending on the target audience and available resources, you can publish the video in a high definition format for projection or in a lower definition for streaming over the Internet. 8

**Integrating Technology Within Student Projects**

At the beginning of the semester, the course instructors constructed a detailed plan for each project. This plan encompassed:

- The activities in which student teams in each class would participate as part of these cooperative projects.
- The materials that each class would deliver to the other classes involved in these projects.
- An integrated course outline that established the timeline for these projects.

Based on this plan, the instructors individually created detailed project assignments for each course. The instructions for the assignments described how students were to conduct project activities that
would result in the creation of project materials to forward to the subsequent classes involved in these projects. The project schedules specified the dates for: students to submit project assignments in their respective classes, instructors to transfer project materials between classes, and students to access materials from other classes, which were posted in the course management system. Throughout the semester, instructors guided the activities associated with these projects in their respective courses and oversaw the transfer of project-related materials between classes. The projects culminated in semester-end events in which the results of each class’ contributions to the overall projects were reviewed. This involved playing the podcasts and/or videos produced by the students and facilitating an open discussion among students in which they were encouraged to constructively critique the work completed by the other classes. At these events, students also evaluated the significance of these projects in terms of their overall learning experience through a survey administered by the course instructors.

In the podcasting project, student activities focused on revitalizing the town of “Desperation” (an online 3-D environment) to teach the concepts of visioning through decision making, development through technical writing, and quality assessment through physical audits. Students in the leading change course played the role of city council members and developed a vision for the town. Communications students acted as developers and created the construction plans to carry out the city council’s vision. Students in the quality improvement course acted as producers and developed script notes to guide the written aspects of the video productions based on their review of the preliminary videos. The quality improvement students summarized their feedback in a business memo, and the production and service operations students used this feedback to revise their scripts and reshoot their videos. Finally, team leadership students played the role of the screen critics and critiqued the final videos for instructional effectiveness. The project concluded with a red carpet event, which was planned and executed by students in the team leadership class. During this event, team leadership students gave oral presentations to communicate their assessment of the final videos to the other classes involved in the project.

Assessing Project Outcomes

To measure the significance of these technology-rich, multi-class projects, the instructors collected data assessing students’ perceptions (e.g., attitudes and feelings) about these projects through a survey. These surveys included both quantitative (e.g., Likert scales) and qualitative (e.g., open-ended comments) items. Additional items were included in the video project student survey to enhance assessment of the project. These items were adapted from the general skills category of the “Course Experience Questionnaire.” These surveys were administered to the students involved in these projects during the semester-end events.

The results of the podcasting project survey, shown in Table 1 and Figure 1, indicated that most students felt the project provided a valuable learning experience, and the majority of students viewed the project as an appropriate learning/teaching strategy. In terms of understanding the concepts taught and learning new concepts, the majority of students indicated that hands-on simulations in which they develop solutions to realistic problems were either valuable or very valuable to them.
As a result of this project, most students indicated that they felt podcasting is a valuable or very valuable form of communication. Finally, when asked to describe how the podcasting project impacted their learning experience, students provided the following comments:

- “This project was a fun and informative experience.”
- “I feel this project was a great way to use technology in teaching and greatly improved the retention of learning what was taught.”
- “I really enjoyed being able to learn new software and try new techniques.”
- “I enjoyed working on the project because I thought it was a very realistic simulation of a real life project.”

### Table and Figure 1: Results of the Podcasting Project Student Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Statement</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Valuable/To a Great Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was appropriate as a learning/teaching strategy.</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was a valuable learning experience.</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on simulations in which students develop solutions to realistic problems were a valuable technique for understanding concepts.</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on simulations in which students develop solutions to realistic problems were a valuable technique for learning new concepts.</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of this project, I think podcasting is a valuable form of communication.</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A five-point “agree-disagree” Likert scale was provided.
The results of the video project survey (see Table 2 and Figure 2) indicated that the majority of students felt this project provided a valuable or very valuable learning experience, and most students thought that the project was an appropriate or very appropriate learning/teaching strategy. In terms of enhancing students’ general skills, students overwhelmingly indicated that the project helped to develop their ability to work as a team member. Most students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Statement</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project was appropriate as a learning/teaching strategy.</td>
<td>26.8 40.8 21.1 9.9 1.4 0.0 26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was a valuable learning experience.</td>
<td>16.9 39.4 28.2 11.3 4.2 0.0 16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project helped me to develop my problem-solving skills.</td>
<td>23.9 25.4 31.0 14.1 2.8 2.8 23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project sharpened my analytic skills.</td>
<td>26.8 31.0 25.4 11.3 2.8 2.8 26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project helped to develop my ability to work as a team member.</td>
<td>43.7 36.6 14.1 4.2 1.4 0.0 43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of doing this project, I feel more confident about tackling unfamiliar problems.</td>
<td>24.3 45.7 11.4 10.0 5.7 2.9 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project has improved my written communication skills.</td>
<td>19.7 39.4 23.9 11.3 4.2 1.4 19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project helped me develop the ability to plan my own work.</td>
<td>29.6 36.6 16.9 8.5 5.6 2.8 29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of this project, I think videos are a valuable form of communication.</td>
<td>26.8 47.9 19.7 2.8 0.0 2.8 26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A five-point “agree-disagree” Likert scale was provided.

The results of the video project survey (see Table 2 and Figure 2) indicated that the majority of students felt this project provided a valuable or very valuable learning experience, and most students thought that the project was an appropriate or very appropriate learning/teaching strategy. In terms of enhancing students’ general skills, students overwhelmingly indicated that the project helped to develop their ability to work as a team member. Most students...
also indicated that the project helped them feel more confident about tackling unfamiliar problems, improve their written communication skills, and develop their ability to plan their work. In addition, the majority of students said that the project helped them somewhat or to a certain extent to develop their problem-solving skills and to sharpen their analytic skills.

As a result of the video project, most students indicated that they felt videos are a valuable or very valuable form of communication, and when asked to describe how the video project impacted their learning experience, students provided the following comments:

• “I learned how to communicate more effectively and think on my toes while coordinating with my team members in order to produce a successful end result.”
• “It was a great experience and a fun new way to learn.”
• “I learned the importance of finding a solution to a particular business problem and how that problem can affect the business goals and operations.”
• “It taught me how to perform critical evaluations, which is something that I may have to do in my future career.”
• “The video project helped me remember to always follow my plans and refer to them as I conduct a project.”
• “I have learned so much from participating in the video project. The knowledge from this project will enable me to handle future projects better.”

**Conclusion**

The technology-rich, multi-class projects used in the Organizational Leadership and Supervision program at the University of Houston were an extremely positive endeavor for instructors and students alike. With project-based assignments using podcasting, video productions, and similar innovative approaches to learning, the outcome truly is a “value-added” experience that extends well beyond traditional, rigid educational walls. There is considerable merit in such collaborative learning/teaching experiences because they can focus on real workplace practices. When educational activities are linked closely to the work environment, it creates a natural bridge for students to smoothly transition from school to work; therefore, it follows that students who have the knowledge, skills, and confidence to quickly become productive workers will not only be an asset for their organization, but will also will benefit society at large.

As stated in the survey results, these projects are a fun way to learn and provide students with valuable learning experiences. In addition, these projects establish a mechanism for meaningful and simultaneous collaboration between multiple classes, which further enriches students’ learning experiences. With minor modifications, it should be relatively easy for other instructors to develop these types of projects for students in a broad range of disciplines, thereby extending this work to enhance student achievement through the development of innovative student projects.
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Engaging Multiple Stakeholders to Ensure College Access and Success for All

Jamie Merisotis

Commentary

In this inaugural issue of Quality Approaches in Higher Education, we are including a speech of Jamie Merisotis, president, of Lumina Foundation for Education. This presentation to the Governor’s Conference on Higher Education in State College, PA, on March 17, 2009, reminds us that we must engage many stakeholders to achieve significant improvement in both college access and graduation rates. Lumina Foundation for Education has established its “Big Goal” for 60% of Americans to hold high quality two- and four-year degrees by 2025, compared to the current rate of 39%.

This new publication focuses on improving quality and identifying best practices in higher education. Clearly, collaborative effort and innovative thinking will be required to achieve Lumina’s goal, and the information shared in this supplement can provide insight on how to achieve this higher level. Furthermore, ASQ’s Education Division is actively working to contribute to this effort. The Quality Approaches in Higher Education supplement will provide a venue for bringing case studies, success stories, applied research, and conceptual/innovative ideas to engage higher education leaders, faculty, students, and community members in further dialogue—a discussion that the division hopes will improve higher education learning outcomes and increase graduation rates at colleges and universities.

—Cindy Veenstra, associate editor and chair-elect of ASQ’s Education Division

Higher education improves individual lives and ensures our society’s economic health and social stability.
Speech

"Thank you. And my thanks to Governor Rendell, Secretary Zahorchak, and Deputy Secretary Shaw for hosting this conference and inviting a range of stakeholders—including myself—to be part of it. Your timing couldn't be better.

In my travels I often interact with either/or audiences. They're composed of either higher-education administrators or government officials. They're either colleagues from the foundation world, or they're representatives of public-policy institutions. Certainly there's a need for such tightly targeted conversations, but so is there a need for settings like this. The challenges we face in postsecondary education today are so big and so complex that we have to work collaboratively to solve them—and conferences such as this help us do just that.

So let me begin with a word about our work at Lumina and how this multiple stakeholder engagement is so important to our work. We're the largest national foundation—in a field of some 60,000 foundations across America—that focuses exclusively on helping students gain access to higher education...and to succeed once they get there. Access and success are what we're about. Each year we distribute more than 50 million dollars in grants to partners and stakeholders who share our commitment to this very precise mission.

A little over a year ago we created a stir when we went public with what we call our 'Big Goal.' People thought we had gone way out on a limb when we announced that by the year 2025, Lumina Foundation wants 60% of Americans to hold high quality two-year and four-year degrees. Sixty percent. That's far beyond the current 39% attainment rate that has remained unchanged since it flat-lined back in the 1970s.

The Big Goal represents about 16 million more graduates than the United States is likely to educate if it continues to conduct business as usual. Our motivation in setting the Big Goal was this: The U.S. once had the best-educated population in the world. Now we've slipped behind many of our top economic competitors, such as Canada, Japan, and Korea. Our country is among the few developed nations where older adults are more educated than younger adults.

Some argue that it's not necessary to increase the number of Americans who complete postsecondary education. They say it's enough for the U.S. to educate a small, elite group of thinkers who drive the innovation that leads to economic growth. But the rest of the developed world disagrees. The advanced economies of Europe, Asia, and Oceania are increasingly acting on the assumption that the overall level of educational attainment is the truest measure of the vibrancy of the economy, not the idea that a select few represent a country's brain trust.

Our Big Goal announcement was greeted with some skepticism. We meant it as a rallying cry, but initial feedback included words such as 'daunting' and 'audacious.' Some stakeholders worried that the goal set unrealistic expectations for higher education. They feared that colleges and universities would be held to unattainable standards.

But that was then. This is now. And things have changed. I don't have to tell you about the job market...the unemployment numbers...the economic forecasts...and the workforce projections. You've heard that three-fourths of today's fastest-growing occupations require more than a high school diploma. You know that the majority of jobs created by the newly-enacted stimulus package will require some form of postsecondary education. As President Obama recently said, 'college success is not just a pathway to opportunity; it's a prerequisite. If followed, the path leads to jobs...the jobs lead to prosperity...and prosperity leads to economic and social stability for individual Americans and for the country at large.'

Today our Big Goal doesn't seem so audacious. If we're still out on a limb, we have some pretty good branch neighbors. The College Board and the State Higher Education Executive Officers have embraced goals similar to ours. And, three weeks ago, President Obama drew applause from both sides of the aisle when he pledged to Congress that America once again will have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world.

So there you have it. The gauntlet is down, and the race is on. This is not an issue with sharp partisan divisions or radically different world views. The vast majority of leaders in our nation recognize that this goal is the right one to achieve. How
we get there, of course, will be a source of debate and dialogue—as it should be.

Indeed, how will we increase the number of college graduates, especially at a time when funds are in short supply and much of the advice we hear takes the form of shop-worn clichés? We’re urged to ‘think outside the box.’ But we’re told to ‘tighten our belts.’ And we’re warned not to ‘throw money at the problem.’

Thankfully, many proposals go beyond clichés and deserve our consideration. Some are safe; some are risky. Some are costly, and some are controversial. My role today isn’t to endorse or reject any specific suggestion. I encourage you to keep the ideas coming. Instead, what I’d like to do is add to the discussion by sharing a broad policy proposal that Lumina Foundation strongly supports. It’s one piece of advice that we’ve offered our new president as he works to return American higher education to a position of global leadership.

The policy proposal is this: ‘Let’s make the development of human capital a cornerstone of U.S. economic policy, and let’s position postsecondary education as the nation’s workforce-development system.’

Rather than having economists working over here, education policymakers huddling over there, and labor experts operating somewhere in between, we’re suggesting that we unite as partners behind the concept that higher education can and should play a major role in restoring and sustaining economic prosperity and social stability in America. Think of postsecondary education not as an end in itself...but as a means to an end.

We are not suggesting that training for specific jobs is the only purpose of higher education—quite the contrary. Indeed, this assumption—that workforce development and higher education are different processes—is flawed and behind the times. The reality today is that almost everyone needs two sets of skills: the general thinking and communication skills that we have always liked to think are representative of education beyond high school; and an ever-changing set of skills and knowledge linked to a specific occupation. Everyone—and I mean everyone—needs both kinds of knowledge and skills, and our postsecondary education system is where people should come to get them.

Currently, only eight states are on track to reach the level of educational attainment required to meet our country’s future workforce demands. Washington and California lead the pack; Pennsylvania is doing better than most, but it isn’t among the top eight. Right now Pennsylvania ranks on par with the nation in the percentage of young adults, ages 25 to 34, with college degrees. This state stands at about 38%, and projections indicate that you’ll narrow—but not close—the gap in the next 15 years.

To prepare the number of career-ready workers that our country needs, we must aggressively reach out to traditionally underserved students. I include in that group: low-income students, students of color, first-generation students, and the new wave of adult learners who have been displaced by the current economic downturn. Achievement gaps within these populations have not only endured for decades, they’re actually widening—and that is an ominous sign in light of demographic and economic trends.

Research tells us that the U.S. population will swell by 56 million in the first two decades of this century. Of that 56 million people, 46 million will be members of minority groups. We’re well on our way to becoming a minority-majority nation.

In many states—Pennsylvania among them—the population groups that are on track to grow the fastest are the same population groups that post the lowest levels of academic success. As an example, Latinos make up the youngest and most rapidly expanding population in our country, but they have the lowest educational attainment, by far. Projections indicate that by the year 2025—the same year Lumina hopes to reach the Big Goal—one out of every four new workers will be Hispanic. Yet right now, only 18% of Latinos in the U.S.—19% in Pennsylvania—hold associate degrees or better. That’s not good enough. We must improve.

Stated plainly, our future workforce as a nation—indeed, our economic, social, and cultural prosperity—will very much depend on how well we educate this emerging majority. If we’re serious about reaching out to these populations and equipping them with marketable skills, we’re going to have to protect two important areas that often fall victim to budget slashes. The first is
need-based financial aid, and the second is developmental education.

Lumina Foundation and many of our colleagues in philanthropy believe that inadequate support in both of these areas will only delay our country’s economic recovery. It will leave the nation poorly positioned when business picks up and skilled workers are in greater demand. We see need-based aid and developmental education not as drains on a state’s resources but as investments in its future workforce. I was encouraged to read that Pennsylvania’s proposed budget contains an 11% increase in need-based grant money for students to attend college. I hope this is attainable in the final analysis, and I encourage other states to follow your lead.

As states shape their education budgets, I also encourage them to do all they can to support and improve developmental education. Without question, this will be a critically important tool as we seek to improve attainment rates—and it’s a tool we need to sharpen.

Right now, about 28% of all students who enroll in postsecondary education require some developmental education. And, of the students who do take developmental-ed courses, less than 40% ever go on to earn a degree. Still, recent research shows that, if done the right way, developmental education can be an effective strategy for boosting attainment rates.

The fact is, developmental education works for many students—but it suffers from a serious image problem. Although it is a vital steppingstone to success for millions of students, too many policymakers see it as a ‘do-over’—a costly band-aid to cover inadequacies in the K-12 system. Too many faculty members view it as professional purgatory. Too many students see it, at worst, as a badge of dishonor or, at best, a series of hurdles blocking the path to ‘real’ college classes.

We need to change all of that.

At Lumina Foundation, we’re working in partnership with several other national foundations in efforts to de-stigmatize developmental-ed and make it a priority in policy and in practice. Through these efforts, which are just getting under way, we hope to redefine the way students, policymakers, and faculty view developmental education. We also hope to improve the way institutions deliver it, the way state policies support it—even the way instructors teach it.

Not surprisingly, this effort to strengthen developmental education is centered in the nation’s community colleges—a group of institutions that represent another vital tool in increasing attainment rates.

Today, 46% of all U.S. undergraduates—and 55% of Latino students—are enrolled at community colleges. Clearly, if we hope to meet our goal—and the president’s goal—for college completion, these two-year institutions will be key. They provide broad access; they offer vital programs that serve the needs of the workforce; they are a cost-effective gateway into higher education, and they offer development education.

Five years ago Lumina Foundation recognized the important role that community colleges were likely to play in preparing underserved, underprepared, and under-funded students for the workplace and for life. We launched an initiative called Achieving the Dream as a data-driven effort to improve success rates, particularly among low-income students, first-generation students, and students of color. More than 80 colleges now participate in Achieving the Dream, including seven Pennsylvania colleges that joined the initiative in 2006.

The investments we have made in Achieving the Dream are now bearing fruit. Colleges are learning important lessons about how to close those pernicious achievement gaps and foster student success. In fact, I understand that some of those lessons were shared in a breakout session that immediately preceded my remarks.

Still, at the risk of repeating what you may have already heard today, I’d like to make just three points about what we’re learning from Achieving the Dream:

• First of all: Start with the data. When colleges look closely, consistently, and systematically at their student outcome data—and then use that data strategically to address achievement gaps—student performance can improve.

• Second: Student success can be a transformative idea. With strong and committed leadership, a college can reorient itself and make student success—not merely enrollment—an institution’s central priority.
• Third: Broad engagement generates momentum. By collaborating on a student success agenda with all of its stakeholders (including area employers, policymakers, and the public), a community college can serve as a vital economic engine—at a time when this nation needs all of the locomotive power it can muster.

Another way to increase the transformative power of American higher education is to unleash its penchant for innovation—and that is a central goal of Lumina’s newest initiative, called Making Opportunity Affordable. If you’re not familiar with Making Opportunity Affordable—MOA, for short—let me briefly explain. MOA is a multi-year initiative focused on increasing productivity within U.S. higher education, particularly at two-year and four-year public institutions. We want to help schools become more productive so they can use the savings that they generate to serve more students and serve them better.

In December, Lumina announced MOA grants to 11 states where elected officials and higher-education leaders are developing and refining strategies that will cut costs and use the savings to educate a greater number of students. These states will be working toward removing public and institutional regulations and policy barriers so the campuses can implement new approaches. The initiative will focus on how to best gauge returns on investment without sacrificing quality. That last point is important: We’re adamant that quality should never be compromised in the interest of reaching enrollment goals.

Let me give you a quick overview of some of the projects that the grants will support:

• Colorado plans to accelerate efforts to re-enroll adults who are fewer than 30 credits shy of finishing a degree or certification program.

• Indiana is looking at a new funding formula for higher education that includes financial incentives for course and degree completion.

• Maryland is focusing on strengthening and expanding the postsecondary pipeline between two-year and four-year institutions in areas of workforce shortages. Those areas include teaching, nursing, and engineering.

• Mississippi is planning to advance a system-wide redesign of its developmental education courses.

• Ohio is forming a statewide Efficiency Council that will identify and disseminate best practices across the system in a high-profile, public forum.

• California will use grant money to study student flow from point of entry—enrollment—through what they call the ‘bottleneck experiences’ where students are most at risk of becoming frustrated and dropping out.

These programs are designed to increase productivity and demonstrate how to use resources effectively and efficiently. At the end of 2009, the 11 states that are serving as laboratories for innovation will compete for multimillion-dollar Opportunity Grants to implement their plans. Stay tuned for progress reports.

Part of the challenge of improving efficiency and effectiveness is that measures of productivity are not well developed. As a starting point, we believe that practices of collecting, measuring, and analyzing data deserve increased exploration on all campuses. We think every institution should track basic information such as student enrollment, progress, and program completion according to ethnicity, income, and age. Every institution should define and report learning outcomes in a manner that clearly shows the value added.

I would even argue that every state should have a student-unit record system that combines K-12, higher-education, and employment data. The best of these systems would permit cross-state tracking and analyses. By taking these steps, higher-education institutions could more precisely identify and measure productivity gains.

Earlier, I resurrected some familiar clichés to make a point: ‘Think outside the box;’ ‘Tighten your belt;’ ‘Don’t throw money at a problem.’ Well, here’s another one: ‘Everyone wants progress, but no one wants to change.’ Like most clichés, there’s an element of truth to that one. Change can be uncomfortable, particularly if the change involves practices that have been in place for decades. But we live in uncomfortable times.

There are new and better ways for colleges and universities to do what they do—innovative and cost-efficient methods that serve students well and meet immediate workforce needs. New ideas often emerge in response to the kind of economic
pressures we’re now experiencing. Sometimes it’s the absence of new money that prompts new action that otherwise wouldn’t be possible.

We also should learn a valuable lesson from the experience of the news media. Like higher education, the media was convinced that its role was so essential, so vital to our democracy that the fundamental operating model would not need to change. But circumstances have altered all of that, not only because of technology, but because the ways in which Americans get news and information have been transformed. Now, we are looking at the cessation of major newspapers, industry mergers, and a general sense that the fourth estate is no longer the sacrosanct enterprise that we once believed.

Higher education is, of course, different, but we should not lose sight of the obvious parallels. Economic conditions, changing learning styles, technology...all of these things are transforming the way people acquire and generate knowledge. We would do well to heed the lessons of the news media’s experience and get ahead of the curve, making the necessary changes to our business model before circumstances dictate those changes.

Throughout my talk I’ve mentioned several works in progress that Lumina has a stake in. We don’t yet know the results for many of them. We don’t know if lessons learned in Colorado will have application in Pennsylvania. Two of our roles that we take seriously are that of connector and convener. As we learn the results of our work—and our partners’ work—we’re committed to sharing the information with the public and especially with you, the members of the higher-education and policy communities.

After all, as an organization dedicated to fostering success in higher education, we’re keenly aware that knowledge is power...and that power works best when it’s shared.

In fact, that’s the fundamental purpose of our Big Goal: We want to magnify the power of postsecondary education, to share it as broadly as possible so that it can be used to improve individual lives and ensure our society’s economic health and social stability.

We are committed to this cause, and we are very grateful to share it with so many committed partners—including all of you. So thank you for all you’ve already done to increase student success—and for your leadership as we work together to improve American higher education and, thereby, enhance our collective well-being as a nation.

Thank you very much.”

Jamie Merisotis

Jamie Merisotis is president and chief executive officer of Lumina Foundation for Education, one of the nation’s 45 largest private foundations. Under his leadership, Lumina employs a strategic, outcomes-based approach in pursuing its mission of expanding college access and success, particularly among low-income, minority, and other historically underrepresented populations. Merisotis founded and served for 15 years as president of the Institute for Higher Education Policy and as executive director of the National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Postsecondary Education, a bipartisan commission appointed by the U.S. president and congressional leaders. Merisotis also helped create the Corporation for National and Community Service (AmeriCorps), and has served on numerous national and international boards of directors, including Scholarship America, the European Access Network in London, and Bates College in Maine. He can be contacted through the foundation’s website at www.luminafoundation.org/.
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• Double quotation marks are used around the names of magazine, newsletter, and journal articles and conference proceedings’ titles. Punctuation marks fall inside the quotation marks in almost every case.
• It’s not necessary to include the city with the publisher’s name.
• When inserting the reference numbers in the body of the text and in front of the reference information in the list at the end of the article, use the “superscript” function in Microsoft Word.
• Periods behind the reference number or a space before or after the reference number are not used, as shown below:

  Correct: Text in body of the article¹
  Correct: ¹Reference information
  Incorrect: Text in body of the article1
  Incorrect: ¹Reference information
  Incorrect: Text in body of the article ¹
  Incorrect: ¹Reference information

Summary

Thank you for considering having your article published in the Quality Approaches in Higher Education supplement to The Journal for Quality and Participation. We look forward to reviewing your manuscript. Please feel free to contact our editor, Deborah Hopen, at debhopen@nventure.com if you have any additional questions.
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Manuscripts published in the Quality Approaches in Higher Education supplement to The Journal for Quality and Participation undergo a blind review by two or more reviewers. The review process takes approximately two months during which time the reviewers advise the editor regarding the manuscript’s suitability for the supplement’s audience and/or make suggestions for improving the manuscript.

Prior to the review process, the supplement’s editor screens each manuscript to verify its appropriateness for formal review. The editor promptly returns manuscripts that do not match the supplement’s audience or mission.

Reviewers consider the following attributes:

1. **Contribution to knowledge**: Does the manuscript present innovative or original ideas, concepts, or results that make a significant contribution to knowledge in the field of quality in higher education and are appropriate to the supplement?

2. **Significance to practitioners**: Are the results of practical significance and clearly presented in a fashion that will be understood and meaningful to the principal readership of the supplement?

3. **Conceptual rigor**: Is the introduction and conceptual basis of the manuscript (literature review, logical reasoning, hypothesis development etc.) adequate?

4. **Methodological rigor**: Is the research methodology (research design, analytical or statistical methods, survey methodology, etc.) appropriate and applied correctly?

5. **Conclusions and recommendations**: Are the conclusions and recommendations for further research insightful, logical, and consistent with the research results?

6. **Readability and clarity**: Is the manuscript well organized and presented in a clear and readable fashion?

7. **Figures and tables**: Are figures and/or tables used appropriately to enhance the ability of the manuscript to summarize information and to communicate methods, results, and conclusions?

8. **Organization and style**: Is the content of the manuscript logically organized? Is any technical material (survey scales, extensive calculations, etc.) placed appropriately in an appendix? Is the title representative of the manuscript’s content?

9. **Attributions**: Are sources properly cited? Are attributions clearly indicated in the reference list?

Prospective authors should use these attributes as a checklist when reviewing their manuscript prior to submission; this will improve its likelihood of acceptance.

**Outcomes of Review**

We log all article submissions into a database and delete all references to the author. These “blinded” versions then go to the editorial review team for comments and recommendations. Two or three reviewers evaluate each article in this blind review. There are three possible outcomes of this review.

- **Accept with standard editorial revisions**: In this case, the content of the article is accepted without requiring any changes by the author. As always, however, we reserve the right to edit the article for style.

- **Accept with author revisions**: Articles in this category are suitable for publication but first require changes by the author, including editing to fit our length requirements. We provide specific feedback from our reviewers to guide the revision process. We also assign a tentative publication date, assuming the author will submit the revised article by the deadline.
• *Decline to publish.* Occasionally authors submit articles that do not fit our editorial scope or reader guidelines. In these situations, we may provide the author with suggestions for modifying the article to make it more appropriate to our publication, but we do not assign a tentative publication date.

**Helpful Hints**

1. Manuscripts should emphasize application and implications. Language usage similar to that found in *The Journal for Quality and Participation* is appropriate.  
   • Use the early paragraphs to summarize the significance of the research.  
   • Make the opening interesting; use the introduction to answer the “so what?” question.  
   • Spell out the practical implications for those involved in higher education.

2. Detailed technical description of the research methods is important, but not necessarily of interest to everyone. Place this description of methods and analysis at the end of the manuscript, preferably in an appendix.

3. Throughout the manuscript, keep sentence structure and word choice clear and direct. For example, references should not distract from readability. As much as possible, limit references to one or two per key idea, using only the most recent or most widely accepted reference.

4. Avoid acronyms and jargon that are education-, subject- or organization-specific. Try not to use variable names and other abbreviations that are specific to the research. Restrict the use of acronyms to those that most readers recognize. When acronyms are used, spell them out the first time and indicate the acronym in parentheses.
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