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Executive Summary

Based on thorough research, Reading ROARS, a quality enhancement plan for Northeast Mississippi Community College, focuses on improving and reinforcing the reading skills and practices of students at various stages of their college careers. Because reading competency is fundamental to college success and because the demands of college-level reading increase as students move through the required curriculum in pursuit of a certificate or degree, this QEP is a comprehensive and integrative reading improvement project. Its main goals reflect a progressive scope:

1. To implement new guidelines and standards for the advising and scheduling of incoming students so as to maximize opportunities for development of necessary skills and to minimize potential barriers to success.

2. To expand and enhance the current developmental reading program to include an elective intermediate course so as to accommodate more effectively the broad spectrum of students’ needs for reading improvement.

3. To integrate into courses from each college division critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline so as to deepen students’ understanding of the reading process which they must undergo in order to become fully engaged with any reading material they will encounter as students and as informed, productive citizens.

4. To foster a reading-conducive environment across the campus so as to encourage self-initiated reading for personal and social growth as well as for academic achievement.

Assessment will employ direct and indirect methods to provide both formative and summative evaluation of progress and success. Key means of assessment will include comparing existing and future institutional research data indicating initial placement and progress of under-prepared students, administering pre- and post tests in reading comprehension and enhancement courses, applying rubrics, embedding test questions, and taking local surveys of students, faculty, and staff.

Contacts: dpkehoe@nemcc.edu; rjmurry@nemcc.edu
Chapter 1

Process Used to Identify the QEP Topic

A Brief History of the College

Northeast Mississippi Community College (Northeast) was established in 1948 as an agricultural high school and junior college serving Alcorn, Prentiss, Tippah, Tishomingo, and Union counties. A comprehensive, public, two-year community college with an enrollment of 3,108 in the Spring semester of 2009, Northeast is located on a 109-acre campus in the city of Booneville, Mississippi, population 8,619. In 1949, the institution changed its name to reflect its status as a junior college. On August 1, 1987, Northeast Mississippi Junior College became Northeast Mississippi Community College by action of the State Board of Trustees for Community and Junior Colleges. Since its inception, the College has continued to grow, expanding its curriculum offerings and its physical facilities to meet the needs of a growing, increasingly diverse population.

In 1958, Northeast was admitted to full membership in the Commission on Colleges (COC) of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Since that time, the College has been reaffirmed at ten-year intervals, with the most recent reaffirmation of accreditation occurring in December 2000.

The Broad-based Search for a QEP Topic

For the next SACS review and evaluation, scheduled for 2010, the College began early preparations, with special focus on meeting the newly-established SACS Core Requirement 2.12: the development of the QEP. From the outset and throughout this preparatory period, representatives of all segments of the institution have chosen to view the requirement as more than an official mandate, rather, as an unprecedented opportunity to implement a carefully-considered and individually-tailored plan to intensify and improve the quality of education students can receive at Northeast.
The journey of the Northeast QEP from the brainstorming stage to a fully-conceived plan began in 2006 and progressed steadily over the subsequent three years. In March of 2006, Northeast invited SACS Consultant Dr. Margaret Sullivan to visit the College for the express purpose of orienting all constituencies in the new features of the SACS reaffirmation process. Following Dr. Sullivan’s presentation, all in attendance were invited to respond in writing to the following prompt: Please list some possible topics for a quality enhancement plan to improve our college. As might be expected, a wide range of ideas was submitted; however, that simple request made that day, and again at the Fall 2006 in-service, when a duplicate prompt was distributed for feedback, effectively launched the institution’s broad-based search for a QEP topic.

In May of 2006, President Johnny Allen asked Rilla Jones and Deborah Kehoe to serve as co-chairs of a forthcoming QEP Committee and in that capacity to participate in the SACS Summer Institute in Orlando, Florida, in July of that year. In Orlando, they received an intensive introduction to both the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of a QEP, in addition to many of the practical dimensions to consider in meeting the new reaffirmation requirement.

In December of 2006, Ms. Jones and Dr. Kehoe were among a group of invited guests, including members of the administration, faculty, and staff from Northeast who traveled to the campus of Northwest Mississippi Community College in Senatobia, Mississippi, where Northwest faculty and staff graciously shared items of wisdom they gained from their experiences of being among the first institutions to achieve reaffirmation under the new SACS requirements. Later that month, a company of Northeast colleagues returned to Orlando to attend the 2006 annual meeting of SACS. There, Ms. Jones and Dr. Kehoe availed themselves of further possibilities to learn how best to approach the task of developing a QEP for Northeast.
In 2007, the College accelerated the pace of laying the foundation for the QEP. In April, the QEP co-chairs spoke in Corinth, Mississippi, to the Northeast Community College Strategic Planning Council Retreat, an annual event wherein approximately 40 members representing the Northeast Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, and staff gather for a day-long series of self-study sessions, reports, and revisions of long-and short-term goals in light of the College’s primary function as spelled out in the **Purpose Statement**:

Northeast Mississippi Community College is a public, comprehensive community college that exists to meet the educational and career needs of individual students and the community within the district it serves—Alcorn, Prentiss, Tippah, Tishomingo, and Union Counties—by awarding the Associate in Arts Degree, Associate in Applied Science Degree, and Certificates. Beyond this original scope, Northeast responds to the needs of all who seek a college education (*Five-Year Strategic Planning Document 2008-2013*, p.8).

The April 2007 retreat also afforded another chance to solicit feedback from a cross-section of institutional representatives to the question: **What can Northeast do to improve student learning?** Not surprisingly, the answers at this point were more focused than previous responses to the same ground-breaking question posed the previous year. The responses fell into eight broad categories of concern: reading, partnering, improving classroom instruction, math skills, collaborative learning, critical thinking, metacognitive instruction, and technology. Overall, the QEP focus group coordinators were encouraged by the retreat to feel that the institution’s collective understanding of the multiple dimensions of creating a successful QEP was strengthening.

During the summer of 2007, Rilla Jones was named Associate Vice President of Planning and Research at Northeast and was replaced by Rita Murry as QEP Co-chair. In July of that year, a cadre of twelve Northeast personnel, including again Ms. Murry and Dr. Kehoe, attended the SACS Summer Institute in Louisville, Kentucky, where they
gained additional valuable exposure to the experiences of sister institutions at varying stages of the reaffirmation process and attended workshops which contained incipient QEP topics, similar to some of those roughly identified in the twice-administered, informal, single-question survey about what Northeast could do to enhance student learning. The group returned well-prepared to share with their colleagues at home details of QEP experiences of other institutions, instructive stories of both success and failure and their potential applicability to Northeast.

In the Fall semester of 2007, important work was begun toward designing structures and marshaling human resources explicitly for the development of the QEP. In October, Vice President Larry Nabors contacted fifteen Northeast administration, faculty, and staff members to request that they serve on a QEP Design and Implementation Team. That original group of individuals eventually became what is now known simply as the QEP Committee, listed below:

- Charles Barnett - Dean of Instruction
- Collin Billingsley - Instructor of Psychology
- Diane Brown - Instructor of Reading
- Rebekah Donahue – Instructor of Mathematics
- Carla Falkner - Instructor of History
- Tim Gilmore - Program Director, Hotel and Restaurant Management Technology
- Rilla Jones- Associate Vice President, Planning and Research
- Deborah Kehoe - Instructor of English and QEP Co-chair
- Amanda Mattox - Instructor of Music
- Rita Murry - Program Director, Medical Lab Technology; QEP Co-chair
- Wilda Pounds - Instructor of Science
- Sherri Shadburn - Division Head, Health Sciences
In December 2007, members of the College attended the SACS annual meeting in New Orleans. Once again, Ms. Murry and Dr. Kehoe, accompanied by twelve fellow faculty and staff members, including some who had been selected to serve on the QEP Committee and who had never previously attended a SACS meeting, sought out sessions and workshops which offered helpful advice regarding the full spectrum of QEP development, from selecting an appropriate topic, garnering whole institutional participation and confidence, developing a sustainable budget, to assessing the success of the initiatives.

The year 2008 saw rapid growth in the Northeast QEP topic development and preparation. In January, immediately following the orientation meeting in Atlanta for institutions nearing their reaffirmation review dates, the QEP Co-chairs, with the help of campus Computer Center technicians, established a QEP e-mail address and placed a QEP suggestion drop box on the College website homepage through which to begin regular back-and-forth communications with the Northeast community at large. They did so with multiple purposes in mind:

1. To remind everyone of the need to participate in creating the QEP.
2. To keep everyone informed about the characteristics of an effective QEP.
3. To share with everyone pertinent statistics derived from local research, data from which an appropriate QEP topic might be generated.
4. To solicit ideas, questions, or any other contributions people had to offer the preparatory conversation about enhancing student learning at the College.

Examples of research data disseminated at that time included the following:

- According to the Office of Planning and Research at Northeast, 20% of 2007-2008 entering freshmen at Northeast had ACT reading sub-scores of
14 or below, an indicator that they were under-prepared for college-level reading.

✓ Also reported by the Office of Planning and Research at Northeast, only 16.9% of the aforementioned students were enrolled in the reading improvement course in either semester of the 2007-2008 academic year.

✓ According to the 2007 Institutional Report from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), 49% of Northeast students completing the survey identified themselves as first generation students.

Other types of information sent out across the campus included the titles and brief descriptions of QEPs developed by similar institutions as well as the five criteria for a successful QEP put forth by SACS. Additionally, early in the Spring semester of 2008, Ms. Murry and Dr. Kehoe began making in-person visits to each major instructional division and to the major student organizations on campus, Phi Theta Kappa, DECA, and Phi Beta Lambda, in an ongoing effort to generate and increase the discussion among the full spectrum of Northeast stakeholders about the QEP and its primary intention to improve student learning. After each meeting, attendees were invited to share with the QEP Committee any suggestions they had for a QEP topic.

The Narrowing of QEP Topic Choices

In March of 2008, the QEP Committee met to develop a survey to be disseminated among the Board of Trustees, administration, staff, faculty, students, and alumni for the purposes of narrowing down a list of topic ideas based on those concerns cited in earlier surveys as well as in the feedback the QEP co-chairs had been receiving via e-mail, the QEP suggestion box, personal conversation, and meetings. The survey asked participants to rank in order of importance the following topic areas of recurring interest and concern in the received feedback: (See Appendix A.)

- writing skills
- reading skills
- math skills
- first-year experience orientation
- collaborative learning/learning communities
- critical thinking skills
- student engagement
- meta-cognitive instruction
- technology

The community was allowed three weeks to return the survey. At the end of that period, 302 responses had been submitted. The following three topics received the highest rankings:

1. reading skills (with 32% of the first place rankings)
2. first-year experience orientation (25%)
3. math skills (12%)

The QEP Committee met in April of 2008 to discuss the survey results and to decide on the next step in the topic selection process. At the meeting, six committee members volunteered to work in pairs to conduct research over the summer on the three most popular topic choices in order to present findings at the Fall 2008 in-service, presentations that would briefly outline the justification for as well as suggest the strengths and weaknesses of each topic if it were chosen as the institution’s QEP focus. Deborah Kehoe and Rita Murry agreed to research and report on reading; Rebekah Donahue and Wilda Pounds agreed to do the same with math; while Joey Williford and Collin Billingsley volunteered to report on first-year experience orientation.

This research was conducted over the summer of 2008; at the August in-service gathering, Powerpoint presentations were made before a plenary session. Of the key points brought out in the presentations, some had a profound impact. For example, the fact that approximately only 20% of the Northeast students in serious need of reading
skills development were actually enrolled in the reading improvement course in either semester of the 2007-2008 academic year came as a surprise to many and was, therefore, difficult to dismiss because of the fundamental importance of reading competence in the general education curriculum, as well as the reality that reading demands only increase as students progress through college and into the workplace. Highlights of unsettling national and local trends regarding reading habits and abilities among members of the college-age generation also raised concerns.

Still, the fact that Northeast, a college with a high number of first generation students, is one of very small number of institutions with no organized first-year experience course made an impression as well. These realities, coupled with the fact that Northeast currently has in place a well-monitored developmental mathematics course series, suggested that two of the topic choices should have a prior claim on the attention of the College and portended a narrowing of the field to two topic choices, a prediction which would soon be proven accurate.

The QEP Committee allowed two weeks for the College population to consider the possibilities and merits of the three topics before putting the matter to a vote. During those two weeks, the researchers made their findings available to the College community on Blackboard and offered in-person Q & A sessions for those who wished to study and discuss the topic choices further.

Identification of QEP Topic

In early September, 2008, a vote was taken via Blackboard with all faculty and staff eligible to choose among the QEP topic candidates. Reminders to vote were distributed across campus, sent out through campus e-mail, and posted on the Northeast website homepage. One-hundred-and-sixty-nine votes were cast with the following results:

1. reading skills -79 (46.7%)
In light of this remarkable outcome, the QEP Committee first considered the possibility of combining the tying winners into a single topic. They soon dismissed that idea as impractical and focused instead on preparing for a run-off election. In an effort to seize an opportunity to generate greater voter participation, they decided to engage in some brief “campaigning” before taking a second vote. In order to do so, Deborah Kehoe and Collin Billingsley posted e-mail messages to vie for the support of eligible voters, citing many of the same statistics and logic as presented at the Fall 2008 in-service meeting, yet this time touting the qualifications of their “candidates,” reading and first-year experience respectively, as the better QEP topic focus for the College. Apparently, the strategy sparked new interest and changed minds. In a run-off election, 201 votes were cast, representing 64% voter participation, 47% of which came from faculty members. This time, reading emerged as the clear preference with 149 (74.1%) of the votes.

_Dividing to Conquer_

With reading as its democratically-elected topic in hand, the QEP Committee was ready to move forward with the monumental task of establishing the content details of its projected plan. At a QEP Committee meeting in late September of 2008, sub-committees were designed for this purpose. Each sub-committee (with the special exception of the Budget Sub-committee) was to be chaired by and include at least one member of the QEP Committee (identified below in italics) along with selected members of Northeast personnel whose talents and areas of expertise best match the purpose of each sub-committee. Vice President Nabors contacted prospective members to officially invite and encourage their participation. The following list provides the make-up of each sub-committee:
The chairs of these sub-committees agreed to convene their members immediately in order to establish an agenda, to remain in frequent contact with one another, to meet on as-needed basis, and to share minutes of each meeting with the QEP Committee, understanding that important decisions regarding one aspect of the QEP could not be made without the approval of the QEP Committee as a whole.

Shortly following the establishment of sub-committees, by way of student survey, committee discussion and vote, the QEP was dubbed Reading ROARS: Raising Our Academic Reading Success. With a topic, a title, and a creative, diverse organizational structure in place, the sub-committees went to work developing a plan. The following
chapters detail the fruits of their efforts and demonstrate how that work emanates from and ultimately re-invigorates the driving force behind the QEP: the effort to improve student learning at Northeast by focusing on what is arguably the root of all higher learning, the ability to read competently, proficiently, and fluently.
Chapter 2
Desired Outcomes

Initiatives

Compelled by relevant national and institutional research and committed to maintaining a clear connection between the projected QEP topic and the central purpose of the College, the Sub-committee on Initiatives and Student Learning Outcomes drafted a set of objectives for Reading ROARS: Raising Our Academic Reading Success. After much back-and-forth discussion among members of this and other sub-committees, the QEP Committee, and select Northeast personnel most likely to be directly involved in the early stages of their implementation, the initiatives went through multiple revisions and resulted in the following four goal statements:

1. To implement new guidelines and standards for the advising and scheduling of incoming students so as to maximize opportunities for development of necessary skills and to minimize potential barriers to success.

2. To expand upon the current developmental reading program to include an elective intermediate course so as to accommodate more effectively the broad spectrum of students’ needs for reading improvement.

3. To integrate into courses from each college division critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline so as to deepen students’ understanding of the reading process which they must undergo in order to become fully engaged with any reading material they will encounter as students and as informed, productive citizens.

4. To foster a reading-conducive environment across the campus so as to encourage self-initiated reading for personal and social growth as well as for academic achievement.

These initiatives reflect and possess the promise to enhance current efforts to achieve the purpose of the College, a connection which the following excerpts taken from the statement of institutional goals, found in the *Five-Year Strategic Planning Document 2008-2013* underscore:
To . . . prepare students for continued studies or immediate employment. To . . . facilitate the educational, career, personal, and social growth of students (p.8).

Additionally, the initiatives, particularly #1, 2, and 3, bear a direct relationship with the first competency listed in the Northeast General Education Core requirements, also found in the Five-Year Strategic Planning Document 2008-2013:

**Reading Competency**- Students who complete an Associate’s Degree must demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend at a level commensurate with the reading level of the textbook and other reading assignments (p. 57).

**Definition of Student Learning and Student Learning Outcomes**

The Sub-committee on Initiatives and Student Learning Outcomes made its decisions based on the College’s collective and fundamental definition of learning as a cumulative and incremental process of acquiring life-changing knowledge, practices, and experience. The Committee further assumed that for the purposes of designing a plan intended to directly influence learning, growth must be set in motion at the outset and sustained throughout implementation of the plan. Those intentions and expectations are revealed in the following statements, in which measurable behaviors and/or attitudes are underlined:

- Students will **understand** the consequences of concurrent enrollment in reading-intensive, college level courses.
- Students will **comprehend** the main idea in reading selections.
- Students will **interpret** context clues to infer the meanings of unfamiliar words in a reading selection.
- Students will **understand** and **utilize** the component parts of a dictionary entry.
- Students will **apply** in sentences of original composition new diction and syntax derived from their reading.
- Students will **demonstrate** a gain in reading skills upon completing every new level.
• Students will **utilize** component parts (i.e. title, preface, conclusion, index, etc.) in order to **identify** the purpose and meaning of multi-paragraph, course-required texts.

• Students will **summarize** logically the flow of informative or persuasive reading material.

• Students will **infer** suggested meaning through stylistic cues (i.e. syntax, diction, etc.).

• Students will **evaluate** the potential usefulness (i.e. scope, timeliness, and relevance to research or other learning goals, etc.) of reading material.

• Students will **value** the role of literacy in promoting personal and social growth.

• Students will **regard** independent reading as an important element of their college education.

In addition to being specific and demonstrable outcomes in and of themselves, they can also be seminal values which, if developed and nurtured in subsequent course work and/or self-regulated practice, should flourish into a host of transferable literacies applicable to virtually any academic or workplace challenge. The following chapter supplies relevant details found in a review of current scholarship, national and local research findings which support this approach to naming outcomes as well as recommended authoritative practices as to how they might be accomplished.
Chapter 3
Review of Literature and Best Practices

Rationale for Desired Outcomes

Few issues are less debatable in the Information Age than the importance of literacy across all segments of the population. As Pekins (2005) has summed up, “[T]he electronic age is creating an environment overflowing with the written word” (p. 233). As early as two decades ago, Kozol (1985), longtime advocate of democratic principles in education, powerfully illustrated in his study *Illiterate America* how the literacy deficiencies of individuals threaten the progress of society as a whole. Not surprisingly, according to a recent compilation of employers’ perspectives on the qualifications of people seeking entry into the 21st century workforce, reading comprehension and language skills rank highest among those traits labeled “very important” for emerging workers to possess (The Conference Board, Corporate Voices for Working Families, the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, and the Society for Human Resource Management, 2007).

This high demand for literacy in the workplace creates a potentially devastating predicament when coupled with the concurrent research which concludes that Americans, particularly adolescents and young adults, those Americans who will comprise the workforce of tomorrow, are becoming increasingly poor readers. The following excerpts from authoritative sources depict a sobering reality:

- According to the *Spellings Report* (2006): *…there are disturbing signs that many students who do earn degrees have not actually mastered the reading, writing, and thinking skills we expect of college graduates. Over the past decade, literacy among college graduates has actually declined.*

- According to ACT- Work Keys (2007): *An American Management Association survey in 2000 of midsized and larger businesses found that 38% of job applicants taking employer–administered tests lacked the reading skills needed in the jobs for which they applied.*
According to the National Endowment for the Arts (2007): There is a general decline in reading among teenage and adult Americans. . . . These negative trends have more than literary importance. [They] have demonstrable social, economic, cultural, and civic implications.

The academic records of teenagers and young adult Americans also reveal these distressing trends. Publications by the ACT (2006) report “only about half of our nation’s ACT-tested high school students are ready for college-level reading.” The statement by Carnegie Foundation scholar Asera (2006) that 98% of all community colleges offer developmental reading courses (as do 76% of all institutions which enroll college freshmen) supports the claim that an increasing number of students are exiting high school having never mastered essential language skills. Furthermore, the following statement from Student Effort and Educational Progress (2004) indicates that, as matters currently exist, students who arrive at the college door unprepared to engage in college reading are facing odds against their success which are more tremendous than those posed by any other academic deficiency: “The need for remedial reading appears to be the most serious barrier to degree completion: it is associated with more total remedial coursework and with lower rates of degree attainment than other remedial course-taking patterns.”

This reality of the declining number of college-ready readers is also apparent at Northeast Mississippi Community College. According to data compiled by the Northeast Office of Planning and Research, an average of 65% of the freshmen enrolled in the academic years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 had reading sub-scores of less than 21, the ACT benchmark score for college reading readiness. Furthermore, an average of 20% of that group scored below 14, the College’s current cut-off score for recommended placement in the developmental reading course. Collectively, these findings and their logical implications supply the basic rationale for the four initiatives constituting the Northeast quality enhancement plan Reading ROARS.
1.) **Standardize Advising and Scheduling Guidelines**

According to “Five Strategies that Work” found in *Committing to Student Engagement*, the executive summary of the 2007 findings of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), “academic advising and planning” are “central” to strategizing for student success. The students of Northeast Mississippi Community College evidently concur in this evaluation: the *Institutional Report* of the 2007 Northeast CCSSE indicates that 68% of respondents rated academic advising as “very important,” and according to a survey of 2008 graduates, Academic Advising/Course Planning Services received an average importance rating of 4.18 out of a possible 5.

The central importance of strategic and judicious advising becomes perhaps even greater when considering that, according to the aforementioned CCSSE executive summary, an estimated 61% of all entering community college students today are assessed as under-prepared for college-level work, a statistic corroborated by recent reports from the Community College Research Center (CCRC, 2008). Among this number are the approximately 65% of 2007-2008, 2008-2009 entering Northeast freshmen under-prepared for college-level reading. Yet, as reported by the Office of Planning and Research at Northeast Mississippi Community College, only 16.9% of the students with reading sub-scores of lower than 14, those students most in need of reading skills development, were enrolled in the reading improvement course in either semester of the 2007-2008 academic year, a statistic which improved only slightly in 2008-2009 when 21.3% of eligible students were enrolled in the reading improvement course in the Spring semester of 2009. These data suggest that a large number of Northeast students continue to be set up for failure by inadequate or short-sighted advising and course-planning.
The certainty that students who enter college with poor reading abilities and habits will encounter roadblocks on their path to successful completion of their college studies, albeit a common sense conclusion, has challenged the creativity of educators who seek ways to address in a timely and efficient manner the reality of the growing number of entering students who have reading deficiencies. While authorities have differed in their specific recommendations, they have commonly called for careful attention to pre-college advising and placement. For example, Amey and Long (1998) have suggested “mandatory placement and successful completion of developmental reading and English courses prior to or concurrent with enrollment in other college courses” (p.3). Illich, Hagan, and McCallister (2004) have indicated the need for cautious concurrent enrollment of students in developmental and college-level courses. Other researchers have suggested that colleges consider additional diagnostic procedures beyond preliminary standardized testing in order to pinpoint more precisely the needs of under-prepared readers (Behrman and Street; Wang, 2006). Likewise, Bailey, Jeong, and Cho (2008) have urged colleges to make “a major effort to counsel and guide students” needing developmental studies before they are placed in certain courses or course sequences.

In summary, existing research supports a comprehensive revision of advising and scheduling strategies on the part of Northeast Mississippi Community College for the benefit of those students who need enhanced instruction in reading, the most fundamental of all learning skills.

2.) Enhance Developmental Reading Instruction

According to Committing to Student Engagement, the executive summary of the 2007 findings of CCSSE, “Community colleges cannot significantly strengthen student success unless they first focus on providing effective developmental education and appropriate levels of student support.” Yet literacy experts have repeatedly indicated that
the acquisition of college-level reading skills is more complex than many realize. Asera (2006) has written that these “basic skills’ are not, in fact, so basic or simple . . . . [T]he reading process that most of us take so much for granted is highly complex.” Caverly, Nicholson, and Radcliffe (2004) have described this complexity as follows:

**College reading can be a daunting task. Not only must students read successfully and extensively, but also they must monitor their success, change strategies to meet varying learning demands, and attribute success to their strategic approaches to reading rather than to chance or external factors (p. 44).**

These conclusions are in keeping with the published guidelines of the National Council of Teachers of English Commission on Reading (2004) which contain the following overview of the reading process:

**Reading is a complex and purposeful sociocultural, cognitive, and linguistic process in which readers simultaneously use their knowledge of spoken and written language, their knowledge of the topic of the text, and their knowledge of their culture to construct meaning with text.**

While literacy scholars and educators have agreed that college-level reading competence is not a simple matter and have recommended modifying the traditional “discrete-skill building” and “word attack” approach employed by most college developmental reading instructors, they have differed on the specifics as to what those modifications should be. Linderholm (2006) has stated that it is important for reading skills instructors to consider closely the relationship between reading purpose and reading process and to work to convey this significance to students in a developmental reading course. Similarly, Caverly, Nicholson, and Radcliffe (2004) have promoted instruction which links a reading course with specific reading-intensive courses in order to cultivate in students transferable “strategic reading” practices. Additionally, Paulson (2006) has suggested adding a component of “self-selected reading for enjoyment” to developmental reading courses.
While laying out a diverse array of possible methodology, much of the current writing about reading instruction has been united by a call for a movement away from the “one size fits all” approach to strengthening under-developed skills and an active pursuit of innovation. In order for institutions to meet the growing demands on their remediation programs, the authors of *Bridges to Opportunity: Developmental Education Toolkit* (Community College Research Center, 2008) have recommended that community colleges practice versatility and flexibility regarding the structure and even the length of developmental courses in order to expedite students’ entry into college-level courses.

3.) *Integrate Reading Instruction across the Curriculum*

Considering the current widespread decline of reading skills and habits among today’s college-age students, as well as the high percentages of students who, according to current data (Bailey, Jeong, and Cho, 2008), do not persist when faced with multiple levels of developmental, not-for-credit courses, reading instruction can no longer reasonably be left *entirely* up to the developmental reading program of an institution. Bailey (2008) as well as Jenkins, Zeidenberg, and Kienzl (2009) are among contemporary community college researchers who have refuted the conventional belief that all basic skills, including reading skills, should be or even can be mastered in pre-college developmental programs. These researchers call for the augmentation of college-level courses, including career technical courses, to accommodate the growing number of students with varying degrees of reading weaknesses and for the consignment of only the lowest functioning students, such as those who score below 14 on the ACT reading test, to developmental studies courses.

Furthermore, educators would do well not to assume that even “college-ready” students enrolled in college-level courses today are sophisticated or even practiced readers and, therefore, need to devote more classroom attention to providing students with the scaffolding they may need to achieve the learning goals of any course. To
encourage and promote this assistance on the part of content-area instructors, Vacca and Vacca (1989) have authored a successful textbook originally based on eleven principles; the following three statements are Principles 5, 7, and 8:

A teacher reduces the uncertainty students bring to content material by helping them to use background knowledge, raise questions, and make predictions about what they will be reading.

As students develop sophistication in reading and study processes, they need to become strategic in their recognition and use of text organization as a tool for comprehending and retaining important information.

As students become more aware of how to learn from a text . . . they become better able to use and monitor strategies for studying (pp. vi-vii).

Enhancing the reading skills of students is, at least in part, becoming the job of all who teach college courses. For example, community college English instructor Pekins (2006) has submitted, “An overall decline in reading . . . is certainly contributing to whatever difficulties we face in attempting to clarify what college-level writing means as a goal for first-year composition courses” and follows up by suggesting “more vigorous inclusion of reading and reading process instruction” in the classroom (p. 234). It is valid to assume that the same decline of which Pekins has written frustrates the efforts to establish and maintain high standards for learning in other college-level courses as well, especially those which are typically reading-intensive. The following fact tacitly supports this inference: an average of only 67% of students completing history courses in the 2008-2009 academic year at Northeast Mississippi Community College met minimal course standards. And a response similar to that of Pekins’ on the part of the instructors of these courses may be beneficial.

Moreover, reading fluency needs to advance along with the learning challenges students face as they ascend as well as cross the curriculum. In Creating Significant Learning Experiences (2003), Fink has lamented that colleges generally do not focus enough effort on “developing people who can engage in complex thinking” (pp. 2-3). He
has backed up his claim with the conclusions of earlier researchers indicating that while colleges may succeed in creating students who read well enough to identify main points and supporting evidence in a text, they apparently do little to help them advance to more critical reading skills such as the ability to identify implications, assumptions, or connections in their reading. Leamnson, in Thinking about Teaching and Learning (1999), has offered the comparable opinion that typical college students “struggle mightily . . . to extract the intent in someone else’s words” and asserts that the only way they will develop the “habit” of critical thinking is if college instructors “force the struggle with language” (pp. 27-28).

Fink and Leamnson receive general support for this opinion by Tinto (2008) who, in the “Foreword” to the 2008 CCSSE findings, has called for more rigor throughout the community college curriculum: “High expectations are an essential condition for student success. Simply put, no one rises to low expectations.” One effort to “raise the bar” in community college studies logically centers upon strengthening the reading/thinking connection in classroom instruction. Toward this end, a growing number of educators are linking the maturation of students’ critical thinking skills to an enhancement of their reading skills throughout their college careers. The Foundation for Critical Thinking, for example, has released a series of “thinkers’ guides” (2008), all of which cite the role of reading in higher level thinking; one of these guides, How To Read a Paragraph, is devoted entirely to leading students through the process of close readings of a wide variety of texts.

Teaching reading as a process is not a new concept in literacy studies. Originally published over fifty years ago and still in print, Adler’s How to Read a Book has long provided practical guidelines for active, analytical reading. Adler’s “rules for reading” with their emphasis on close analysis of multiple aspects of a text can readily be applied in courses across the academic disciplines to strengthen students’ reading and thinking
skills. Kurland, in his book *I Know What It Says ... What Does It Mean?: Critical Skills for Critical Reading* (2003), has complemented Adler’s rules for reading by spelling out concepts on which critical reading is based, including the following:

- **A text is read at various levels—as words, sentences, and paragraphs—and as a whole. Analysis is a tool for understanding at each of these levels.**

- **Readers read punctuation as well as words. Punctuation reflects the writer’s analysis of the sentence.**

- **Readers must “read” ideas as well as words to make sense of the text.** (These statements are found in the un-paginated frontal material.)

Other textbooks such as *Content Area Literacy* (Readance, Bean, and Baldwin, 1995) and *Breaking Through College Reading* (Smith, 1999) have also brought the discussion of reading as a process directly into the classroom, offering students and teachers a systematic approach to deepening understanding of content reading in multiple disciplines. Additionally, Fordham (2006) has offered concrete suggestions to instructors on how they may formulate and incorporate into class discussions text-based questions to facilitate higher degrees of reading comprehension and thinking. Finally, Maaka (2000) has identified patterns in student reading habits and perceptions and has used them to develop classroom resources for instructors seeking ways to help students become “independent synthesizers, organizers, interpreters, and appliers of information gained from content area readings” (abstract).

Having agreed on the benefits of integrating reading-as-a-process instruction across the curriculum, classroom instructors must focus on the central, practical issue of providing students with a venue for displaying their progress as engaged, critical readers. In other words, in addition to discipline-based, embedded exam questions, what add-ons can instructors across the disciplines implement in common to meet this common need? Many educators already familiar with process-instruction paradigms, such as those established when writing-as-a-process became a focus of English
departments across the country over three decades ago, recommend journaling as a way for students to record in writing their interactions with course-assigned texts in a format free of structural and mechanical conventions and therefore free of the constraining threat of error at the grammatical level, yet still assessable from a holistic perspective as established on a grading rubric. For example, Raymond (2007), author of *Questioning: Literary and Rhetorical Analysis for Writers*, has shown how reading journal exercises can provide instructors with substantial insight into students’ mastery of various dimensions of their reading and at the same time help students discover content for the more structured writing format of the essay. While Raymond’s exercises are designed specifically for English courses, imaginative instructors in all subject areas could easily adapt the prompts to fit their disciplines.

Such materials, along with faculty development workshops and networking among faculty members within the institution, appear to be easing the perceived burden of adding to content area instructors’ responsibilities “the job of reading teacher” as well. Learning practical ways to incorporate reading instruction into existing course materials is likely to prove useful to Northeast Community College instructors who may initially hesitate to answer a call to be part of the mission to improve students’ reading skills.

4.) **Foster a Reading-Conducive Environment**

The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) Commission on Reading in its overview of standards and guidelines has stated that learning to read is a life-long endeavor. Building on that premise, the Commission has recommended that students should be afforded daily opportunities to read books of their own choice as well as opportunities to reflect on their reading (2004). A recent article in *Inside Higher Ed* titled “A Place to Read” has touted the advantages and warned against the neglect of the seemingly simple measure of providing students a place to read: “A place to read? How many students come to scholastic grief because they never find one?” (Caesar, 2006).
Similarly, an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* titled “Time to Read” has addressed the “reading crisis that is upon us” by calling upon schools from elementary to graduate level to refrain from “the willful embrace of methods for teaching reading that are inimical to reading in depth” (Waters, 2007). Waters has summed up these inadequate instructional methods as those that fail to impress upon students two main points: first, that their reading progress and satisfaction depend upon their learning to “slow down” and become thoughtful, recursive readers, a process that seems counterintuitive in a culture that values speedy results; second, that their development as readers cannot be accomplished fully in the classroom alone. These two articles, parallel in title and tone, have pointed to the need for institutions of learning not only to encourage students to read outside the classroom but also to create and designate resources for them to experience the pleasure and benefits of intrinsic reading and to share those experiences within the community.

Apropos of these calls for action, colleges and schools across the country are working to create a culture of reading on their campuses. Mississippi University for Women with its *Common Reading Initiative* is one example. Furthermore, pro-active institutions are taking the additional step of encouraging their students to “pay it forward” and act as “reading ambassadors” within their communities, as did a group of English education students at Florida State University who launched a program aimed at increasing literacy among some of the area’s high-needs children (FSU News Release, 2009), a model concept which could be readily replicable at the community colleges. By taking such measures, institutions may reasonably expect to improve the degree of student engagement on their campuses and thereby lead to more encouraging results than those indicated in the 2008 CCSSE of Northeast students:

- Twenty-nine out of 100 reported that they had “read no books on their own during their time at the college.”
• Forty out of 100 reported that they had “read fewer than four books on their own during their time at the college.”

• Forty-three out of 100 reported that they had not gained and had no plans to gain any “field experience” [interpreted here to include community service].

• Seventy-three out of 100 reported that they had not participated and had no plans to participate in any “organized learning communities” [interpreted here to include colloquia and extracurricular but scholarly initiatives of duration beyond a single meeting].

• Forty-seven percent reported that they had never “discussed ideas from readings with instructors outside of class.”

In conclusion, this review of literature and best practices forms the basis for a progressive, interconnected reading improvement project which reflects both the wisdom of tradition and the demands of the times. The following chapter details specific actions which the College plans to implement in order to achieve its desired outcomes.
Chapter 4

Actions to Be Implemented

The vision for each of the four major goals of Reading ROARS includes specific measures to be taken by the College in order to reach the expected outcomes. The QEP Committee and key sub-committees, along with a wide cross-section of Northeast personnel and relevant decision-making bodies, worked together over many months to establish a reasonable course of action and a logical sequence in which to implement them. (For a detailed account of committee activities undertaken since the inception of the planning stage of the QEP and those proposed for the full implementation period, see Appendix B.) The following information breaks down each major goal of the QEP into prescribed actions, details the rationale behind them, and summarizes plans for their future.

Goal 1: To standardize advising and scheduling of students who are under-prepared readers.

Action 1: Compel students whose ACT reading sub-score is 14 or below and/or who fail to score 67 on the Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test test to enroll in REA 0113, Comprehension I.

Currently, Northeast does not practice mandatory placement of the aforementioned students; rather, the College strongly recommends that such students enroll in REA 0113, a policy which many view as too lenient, a flexibility that may have worked to the detriment of under-prepared students by subjecting them to the vicissitudes of inconsistent commitment and awareness on the part of advisors and allowing them to enroll in courses for which they are at high risk of failure and general discouragement regarding their overall chances of success. Statistical and anecdotal evidence appear to support this opinion: for example, according to the IE data submitted by history instructors for the academic year 2008-2009, an average of only 67% of
students completing reading intensive history courses were able to meet **minimal** course standards.

While mandatory placement in non-credit bearing courses is understandably objectionable from a strictly time-efficiency perspective and represents a thorny public relations problem for administration and admissions staff (a reality which prompted spirited debate in meetings of the QEP Committee), many Northeast classroom instructors hold that mandatory placement is not only appropriate, but necessary for students whose reading competence is at least seven points below 21, the ACT benchmark for college-reading readiness. Informal polls taken among faculty members in all major divisions across the campus show this consensus. For example, of fourteen English and Speech instructors informally polled via e-mail and in person in the Spring of 2009, twelve indicated that they were clearly in favor of mandatory placement into REA 0113 of students whose ACT reading scores were 14 or below.

In essence, Northeast proposes in Action 1 to join the 75% of public two-year colleges in the U.S. which **require** rather than **recommend** that students deemed under-prepared for college level work take the remedial courses to which they are referred (Bailey, Jeong, and Cho, 2008). Accordingly, all advisors across the College will consistently advise students with ACT reading sub-scores of 14 or below that they must enroll in Comprehension I. The justification for naming 14 as the cut-off score derives from the **ACT Technical Manual** table of “College Readiness Standards in Reading,” a table which correlates a score in the range of 13-15 with the lowest level of comprehension. Readers with a sub-score in this range are able only to “recognize a clear intent of an author or narrator in uncomplicated literary narratives” and “locate basic facts (e.g. names, dates, events) clearly stated in a passage” (ACT, 2007). In other words, the table implies that students scoring in the 13-15 range are able to function well enough only to master the least challenging reading requirements.
The College further intends to revise and extend current advisor training materials and procedures to reflect this renewed emphasis on conscientious advising of at-risk students. Beginning in the Summer of 2009, on the scheduled freshman orientation days, all academic advisors will be required to attend their own orientation sessions where they will be prepped in applying the new requirements as well as encouraged to remember the importance of their role in laying the groundwork for student success. At that time, advisors will be supplied with a quick reference sheet to aid them in this endeavor to take college advising to a new level of both efficiency and effectiveness. (See Appendix C.) In other words, Northeast Mississippi Community College expects to enhance its procedures of advising and placement to contend in the timeliest but most responsible manner possible with the current significant increase in numbers of under-prepared students knocking on the doors of higher education. As Morgan and Michaelides (2005) have advised, "Due to the high stakes that may be attached to placement decisions, it is imperative that the placement process be as solid and defensible as possible."

In addition to formerly recommending rather than requiring students to take developmental reading, Northeast has traditionally allowed those students to “test out” of REA 0113 by scoring 55 on the Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test exam, a cut-off score well below that of comparable institutions. This low cut score was also the object of much discussion among the QEP Committee members, and at a meeting in March of 2009, Joey Williford, Director of Guidance and Counseling; Collin Billingsley, Instructor of Psychology; and Rilla Jones, Associate Vice President of Planning and Research, agreed to investigate the issue further in order to recommend whether Northeast should raise the cut score in addition to implementing mandatory placement. They presented their findings at the next meeting, and based on information found in the
Accuplacer Technical Manual as well as in institutional data, the QEP Committee decided to raise the cut-off score to 67.

Action 2: Create a “Courses to Avoid” list and advise students who are to be enrolled in REA 0113 so that they are not concurrently enrolled in courses named on the list.

To reinforce the advising procedures and to ensure that enrollment standards conform with current research and respected practices in place at comparable institutions, the QEP Committee has worked with faculty, administration, and counseling staff to create a list of “Courses to Avoid,” a list approved by the Instruction Council to facilitate advisors in judicious concurrent course selection for students who are to be enrolled in Comprehension I. This list is also derived from the college-readiness findings of the ACT which predict that the further the reading sub-score falls below 21, the lower the chances of success in “typically reading dependent” courses (ACT, 2006). While the list will strictly apply only to those students who are true freshmen, it may help identify other students who need intermediate developmental reading instruction in that those students who fail to complete these courses may be indicating by their failure or withdrawal that they are candidates for further exclusive and intensive reading instruction. The official list includes the following courses:

- ART 2713
- BAD 2413
- All BIO courses, except Principles courses
- CHE 1213
- COM 2463, 2483
- ECO 2113
- All ENG literature courses
- EPY 2513
- All HIS courses
While the proposed actions outlined above are not all linked directly with specific discrete learning outcomes, they are, in essence, outcomes in themselves. Their successful implementation is sure to increase the prospect for future learning improvement and create a greater likelihood that the learning outcomes for Goal 2 will be achieved.

**Goal 2: To expand and strengthen current developmental reading program.**

**Action 1: Enlist currently employed instructors to teach overload sections of REA 0113.**

Based on institutional data indicating the number of students who in the past have needed but were not enrolled in REA 0113, the QEP Committee speculates that approximately an additional three to five sections of REA 0113 will likely be required when mandatory placement is enacted in the Fall of 2009. But because of the current economic constraints under which the College, as well as similar institutions across the state, must at least for the time being operate, Northeast has deemed it wise to call upon qualified instructors already employed full-time by the College to teach these new sections of REA 0113 as overloads, rather than to hire a new instructor for that purpose. The current full-time reading instructor on staff will continue to teach those REA 0113 students enrolled in technical programs, while the instructors who will be brought on board to handle the overloads will teach REA 0113 for students in academic programs.

**Action 2: Provide new faculty development opportunities for REA 0113 instructors.**

In preparation for implementing the second goal of *Reading ROARS*, the sub-committee on Faculty Development expended considerable time and effort into finding
updated training for instructors of developmental reading. In their search, the sub-committee located ample resources designed for teachers of children and adolescents, but comparatively scarce programs that would be of use to instructors who routinely work with older adolescents and adults. However, their research ultimately yielded some encouraging possibilities. The most appealing for the purposes here was a conference of the College Reading and Learning Association to be held in October of 2009, in Richmond, Virginia. The purpose of the meeting, according to the CRLA website, is “to provide opportunities for sharing ideas, information, and research about teaching reading at the college level.” As an added benefit, the Association offers to participants its publication of Great Instructional Strategies which includes specific ideas for college reading instruction. The opportunities to discover innovative methods and to network with other instructors united in a common purpose, so much in demand today, should prove valuable to the College’s enthusiastic REA 0113 instructors and should help reinvigorate the developmental reading program at Northeast.

Also, in a move to employ cutting-edge methods in their teaching, instructors of REA 0113 will begin podcasting instructional material on iTunes U in the Fall of 2009. This innovation will provide students with a supplement to the traditional classroom instruction in a contemporary format.

Action 3: Create a second, intermediate, level reading course: REA 1213, Reading Enhancement I.

Not surprisingly, a major focus of QEP Committee discussion among its members and with other Northeast faculty was the primary need to provide for those students whose ACT reading sub-scores are 14 or below. Yet, according to the ACT benchmark, students may not be fully prepared to undertake college reading if their scores fall below 21. The number of students entering Northeast in the fall of 2008 whose reading sub-scores fell between 15 and 20 was 688 out of 1468 (46%). The
overwhelming response to this significant statistic was that any institution choosing the improvement of reading as its Quality Enhancement Plan cannot justifiably under-serve a cohort of this magnitude.

An additional consideration of the Committee was the number of similar institutions in the state of Mississippi which already provide multiple levels of reading instruction, not exclusively remedial, yet still developmental. Research of college catalogs reveals that the two sister colleges that share the northern region of the state with Northeast offer at least two and up to five reading courses all together. The consensus among the QEP Committee members was that in order to be competitive as well as compatible, Northeast should modify its current offerings to accommodate the growing reading needs of today’s college students. Proposed to begin in Fall 2010, the course will have the following attributes:

**Name: REA 1213 Reading Enhancement I**

**Purpose:** To build on the fundamentals and help students strengthen and refine reading skills necessary for success in college.

**Primary Candidates:** Incoming students whose ACT reading sub-scores fall between 15 and 20 and current students who withdraw from any course listed on the **Courses to Avoid** list.

**Proposed Text:** As the ultimate text in the series already in use in REA 0113, *Ten Steps to Advanced Reading* would provide continued reading skills improvement compatible with grade levels 10 through 14, making it appropriate for a wide range of student needs.

Additionally, because Reading Enhancement I will be elective and credit-bearing, it may attract those students whose scores indicate that they are ready for college-level reading but who are still seeking a boost to their reading competencies and their GPA’s as well.
Goal 3: To integrate reading instruction across the curriculum.

Action 1: Incorporate elements of critical reading instruction in English Composition I.

The QEP Committee believes that the logical starting place for an institution-wide program of reading quality enhancement is the English department where instructors already make widespread use of meta-cognitive measures to effect literacy improvement. English teachers, the primary, and in some cases the only writing instructors students have, have long understood that they could not expect students to improve as writers unless they were made aware that effective writing is a complex, graduated, and recursive thinking process, and in order for their final written products to be satisfactorily developed, adequate attention must be given to the various stages of that process. College English instructors have more recently realized that they must apply that same approach to students’ reading.

Even more recently, educators have noted that if students are to derive full benefits from any course readings, not just those used in English courses, they require some degree of instruction in understanding the process of how a reader interacts with, breaks down, translates, and interprets the various elements of a text, from the explicit and finite to the implicit and open-ended. However, those educators may still reasonably turn to the English faculty for guidance. In an attempt to provide this leadership and to be the springboard for a cross-curricular initiative, the Northeast English Composition I faculty has undertaken and/or intends to undertake the following actions:

1. In the spring of 2009, the English department, on behalf of the Division of Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences, invited Dr. Rich Raymond, MSU English Department Chair, to lead the workshop “Improving Critical Reading & Writing” primarily for faculty members from that division and selected, invited guests. The principal function of the workshop was to share classroom exercises in which students are required to recognize and evaluate the significance of such rhetorical elements as voice and syntax in their reading and to use those elements to develop a focus for their own writing.
2. In the spring of 2009, the English Composition faculty voted to adopt as its primary course text *Back to the Lake: A Reader for Writers*. The book represents state-of-the-art scholarship and praxis in college-level reading instruction particularly as it relates to writing.

3. In the fall of 2009, the English Composition faculty will participate in at least one departmental workshop to devise uniform methods of reading-as-a-process instruction in English Comp I classes. Specifically, they plan to establish consistent ways of using and assessing reading journals in the course.

4. In the fall of 2009, in the aforementioned workshops, English Composition faculty will also explore possible applications to English Comp I of suggested exercises found in *How to Read a Paragraph: The Art of Close Reading*, a pamphlet published by the Foundation for Critical Thinking. The booklet is especially appealing for the purposes of furthering QEP Goal 3 expressly because its origin is not an English department and is therefore less likely to be perceived as having a literary or otherwise exclusive bent when its contents are shared with instructors of other disciplines at subsequent inter-campus forums.

**Action 2: Establish a Reading-across-the-Curriculum Committee.**

In order to ensure the diversity necessary for the creation of effective cross-curricular course materials and to provide vital opportunities for interaction and networking among all instructors united in a common effort, the following faculty members have agreed to serve on a Reading across the Curriculum (RAC) Committee for the duration of the QEP implementation period.

- Phyllis Colson (Workforce Training instructor)
- Janet Cox (Paralegal Technology instructor)
- Carla Falkner (History instructor and QEP Committee member)
- Kathy Green (Division Head, Humanities and Social/Behavioral Sciences and English instructor)
- Deborah Kehoe (English instructor and QEP Committee Co-chair)
- Amanda Mattox (Music instructor)
- Rita Murry (Program Director, Medical Lab Technology and QEP Co-chair)
• **Wilda Pounds (Science instructor and QEP Committee member)**

• **Dana Walker (Nursing instructor)**

The RAC Committee will convene for the first time in the fall of 2009 to lay out plans for group and individual implementation of critical reading instruction according to the progressive timeline. (See Appendix D.) At that meeting, the committee members will examine instructional methods already being considered by the English faculty in anticipation of their lead-off role in the initiative, especially the use of reading journals as a means of recording and assessing student reading progress and obstacles. However, the possibility of additional, as yet unexplored, avenues to helping students develop as strong readers will also be entertained and integrated as each division implements elements of critical reading instruction according to the prescribed timeline.

**Action 3: Host an outside reading consultant to lead an inter-divisional workshop in reading across the curriculum.**

The RAC Committee, along with the Health Sciences faculty and selected individuals from all divisions, will participate in a workshop proposed for early Spring of 2010, to be led by Dr. Dorsey Hammond, nationally recognized and proven consultant. Unlike Dr. Raymond, leader of the first QEP-related training exercise (held in February of 2009, for Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences division members), Dr. Hammond is not an English professor, but an education professor who approaches the issue of reading instruction not as a rhetorician or literary scholar, but as a veteran teacher who applies his expertise and interest in cognitive theory and the learning process specifically to the teaching of reading. This educational-specialist-led training event was conceived and is being organized by members of the QEP Faculty Development Sub-committee led by Carla Falkner in an effort to inspire and support more broad-based involvement in the reading-across-the-curriculum movement. At Dr. Hammond's presentation, participants should gain the seeds for ideas which they can
share within their divisions as they anticipate their assigned time to introduce elements of critical reading directly into their curriculum.

**Action 4: Provide new library resources for faculty development.**

One means by which Northeast maintains its commitment to the professional and intellectual growth of faculty is by increasing its library holdings in sync with current events and undertakings of the College. Glenice W. Stone, Director of the Northeast Library and member of the Initiatives and Student Learning Outcomes Sub-committee, began early, upon recommendations from faculty and through her own initiative, to build a storehouse of QEP-related resources for faculty members. The following list contains selected key items already acquired which promise to be of considerable use for all instructors across the curriculum in preparing and carrying out classroom activities designed to improve students’ academic reading experiences.

- *The Reading Zone: How to Help Kids Become Skilled, Passionate, Habitual, Critical Readers* by Nancie Atwell
- *Ways of Reading: An Anthology for Writers* by David Bartholomae and Anthony Petrosky, eds.
- *How to Read a Book* by Mortimer J. Adler
- *The Art of Reading Poetry* by Harold Bloom
- *How to Read Literature Like a Professor; A Lively and Entertaining Guide to Reading Between the Lines* by Thomas C. Foster
- *The Reading Teacher's Book of Lists* by Edward B. Fry and Jacqueline E. Kress
- *Teaching Reading in Social Studies, Science, and Math; Practical Ways to Weave Comprehension Strategies Into Your Content Area Teaching* by Laura Robb
- *The Science of Reading: A Handbook* by Margaret J. Snowling and Charles Hulme, eds.
- *Reading Improvement: A Journal Devoted to the Teaching of Reading*
Goal 4: To create a reading-conducive environment across the campus.

Action 1: Increase library holdings of leisure reading materials.

In addition to accruing items appropriate for faculty research and classroom application, Library Director Stone has also begun diligently acquiring reading materials representing a diversity of genre, style, and subject matter specifically for the purposes of serving another goal of the QEP. The books and periodicals have been selected, based upon recommendations and requests from Library patrons, for their relevance and possible appeal to college-age readers today. The following list provides items of leisure reading obtained to date expressly for the QEP.

Books

*Home Safe* by Elizabeth Berg

*The Immortality Factor* by Ben Bova

*Dresden Files: Storm Front, Volume 1: The Gathering Storm* by Jim Butcher

*Knock Out; An FBI Thriller* by Catherine Coulter

*Roadside Crosses* by Jeffery Deaver

*The Maytrees* by Annie Dillard

*Finger Lickin’ Fifteen* by Janet Evanovich

*Dead and Gone* by Charlaine Harris

*Portrait of a Scientific Racist: Alfred Holt Stone of Mississippi* by James Hollandsworth

*Relentless* by Dean Koontz

*Summer on Blossom Street* by Debbie Macomber

*The 8th Confession* by James Patterson

*My Sister’s Keeper* by Jodie Picoult

*The Geometry of Sisters* by Luanne Rice

*Wicked Prey* by John Sanford
Action 2: Create designated reading areas across the campus.

In the course of trying to effect significant institutional changes, relatively small and practical measures can be overlooked. The QEP Committee believes that if the College wishes to encourage intrinsic reading among students, it should remove any physical impediments to that end. With that point in mind, as the QEP timeline progresses, gradually encompassing each instructional division of the College, the physical accoutrements of the campus will also develop in order to invite and accommodate self-initiated reading. These accommodations will take the form of strategically placed chairs and tables, along with posters offering suggestions and inspiration for readers. These features will begin to appear in the buildings which house the division introducing reading instruction in its curriculum at that time.

Action 3: Institute a College Reading Colloquium.

The Northeast chapter of Phi Theta Kappa, the esteemed, two-year-college honor society, is a thriving organization of students eager for stimulating and challenging experiences in which they may grow intellectually and socially. Over the past few years,
PTK members have enthusiastically participated in semester-long honors colloquia centering upon timely and timeless topics such as social justice, racial reconciliation, and environmental responsibility, at which they have read pertinent texts, attended lectures, and exchanged opinions and reflections at weekly meetings.

The College proposes to employ this pre-existing structure of the PTK honors colloquium to create a College Reading Colloquium, open to any student willing to make the commitment and who would be awarded one hour of institutional credit as well as valuable experience and intellectual exercise. As with the PTK Honors Colloquium, voluntary faculty involvement and leadership will be consequential factors in its success. While, in the past, the Honors Colloquium members have focused on a single issue and engaged in short, related readings, this forum will center on a single text, chosen for its high literary quality, such as a Great Books selection or a contemporary publication of critical acclaim.

**Action 4: Develop reading-related partnerships with local high schools.**

In the manner of PTK, whose members routinely undertake projects designed to better the community, the College Reading Colloquium members will also reach out in service to others in the area. Specifically, as “Reading Ambassadors,” Northeast students will interact with students from local secondary schools, where research indicates the greatest decline in reading habits is occurring, to promote the role of independent reading in a healthy and socially desirable lifestyle. This experience would be especially valuable to students interested in pursuing a career in teaching. In order to facilitate that proposed outreach, Northeast plans to solicit the services of an outside consultant knowledgeable in the procedures most likely to bring about effective results in this kind of project.
Marketing Activities

The College understands that if the carefully considered actions of the QEP are to have sustained broad-based involvement and support, they must be marketed to the community. In order to come up with ways to sell Reading ROARS to all Northeast constituencies—with students comprising the primary focus—the Marketing Subcommittee went to work early to plumb the rich sources of local talent to be found in Northeast art, music, and business classrooms. The results were many creative ideas such as the following list itemizes:

- **A QEP logo designed by a Northeast marketing student which will receive high profile exposure emblazoned on items (tee shirts, bags, planners, and pens) to be given to incoming students as well as to be placed strategically across the campus.**

- **A QEP jingle written by a Northeast liberal arts student which will be performed for the first time at the Fall 2009 in-service meeting.**

- **A QEP brochure to be distributed widely across the main campus as well as at the Northeast sites located in the College’s service area.**

In addition, the Northeast Mass Communications students also contributed their talents to the efforts to inform and invite support for the QEP. Well-versed in the leading-edge technology of podcasting, members of the Spring 2009 broadcasting class produced a segment devoted entirely to the QEP for its *TigerTales* series, available from *iTunes U*, via the Northeast website.

In combination, the activities, programs, changes, and additions specified in the present chapter should function cooperatively to bring the expected goals of the QEP from “page to stage” and put into vibrant action the College’s intentions to raise the academic reading success of its students. To determine whether or not these actions to be implemented attain the high level of achievement for which they aim, a thorough system of formative and summative, direct and indirect methods of assessment has
been designed. These evaluation plans will be delineated and explained in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

Methods of Assessment

Acting on the advice offered by leaders and fellow participants at the numerous SACS meetings which Northeast has attended since 2006, the QEP Committee has kept foremost in mind the importance of devising regular and rigorous methods for formative and summative assessment throughout the QEP development process. The QEP Assessment Sub-committee has compiled the following explanation of major assessment measures Northeast will use to monitor and evaluate the success of the QEP. While each instrument offers multiple measurement applications, the descriptions below highlight its primary connection to a specific goal or goals which the QEP intends to accomplish.

**Reading Advisement Survey**

The Reading Advisement Survey will be used to determine the level of satisfaction students have with the advising they received concerning their need to be placed in REA 0113. This survey will be administered by the course instructor, and the Office of Planning and Research will analyze the results. (See Appendix E). The Reading Advisement Survey will be used in part to assess Goal 1.

**Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test (Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test)**

The Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test is a computerized adaptive test developed by the College Board to provide useful diagnostic information concerning the skill level of students. Designed to be secure, reliable, and un-biased, the twenty multiple choice questions appear in two forms: one, reading passages of varying lengths followed by questions regarding main idea, secondary ideas, possible implications and applications of ideas; two, sets of sentences followed by questions concerning the kind of relationship (i.e. supportive, contradictive, or repetitive) among the sentences. The
Office of Planning and Research will be responsible for reporting the test results on the QEP Institutional Effectiveness Plan. (See Appendix F.)

Already in use by the College as an additional placement indicator for students whose ACT reading sub-scores suggest that they need to enroll in REA 0113, the Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test will serve the QEP in two main ways. One, it will continue to provide an additional placement indicator for students with ACT reading sub-scores of 14 or below before requiring those students to enroll in REA 0113, Comprehension I. The Northeast Counseling Center will continue to be responsible for administering this placement testing.

Second, the Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test will be used to measure students’ progress in REA 0113. The test will provide pre-and post-test scores of those students who enter and complete REA 0113. A comparison of the two test results should demonstrate an increase in reading skills level. The REA 0113 instructor will be responsible for administering the pre- and post-tests.

In the event that a Career-Technical student (students who often do not have ACT scores) does not have an ACT score, that student will be required to take the reading section of the Ability to Benefit test, which is identical to the Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test. If the student is placed in REA 0113, the score from the reading portion of the Ability to Benefit test will be used as the pre-test score. The Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test will be used in part to assess Goal 1.

**Combined Skills Pre- and Post-Tests**

The Combined Skills Pre- and Post-Tests, already a feature of the existing REA 0113 course, will be administered in both the REA 0113 and REA 1213 courses. This test will be given by the course instructors at the beginning as well as at the end of the semester to all students enrolled. The questions on the test examine students’ mastery of the basic skills included in the textbooks utilized in these courses: John Langan’s *Ten
Steps series for building, improving, advancing college reading skills. **Combined Skills**

**Pre- and Post-Tests will be used in part to assess Goal 2.**

**Reading Students’ Satisfaction Survey**

A recently developed item which will be embedded in the Combined Skills Post-Tests, the Reading Students’ Satisfaction Survey will be given to students enrolled in REA 1213 Reading Enhancement I. By echoing similar wording used in the course learning outcomes, the survey should reveal students’ perceptions as to how well the main goals and objectives of the course are being met. The course instructor will oversee the administration of the survey, and the Office of Planning and Research will analyze the results. (See Appendix G.) **Reading Students’ Satisfaction Surveys will be used to assess Goal 2.**

**Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP)**

The CAAP, a standardized, nationally-normed assessment instrument created by the American College Testing service (ACT), enables post-secondary institutions to evaluate, appraise, and improve the outcomes of their general education programs. It is typically administered to a random selection of 100 Associate of Arts students upon completion of the general education cores, usually at the end of their sophomore year. Northeast administers the CAAP in this manner.

This test is especially helpful to the assessment of the QEP because it now contains a reading module, included for the first time in the Spring of 2009. The reading module is a forty minute test which measures reading comprehension in two broad categories: Referring Skills and Reasoning Skills. In the Referring Skills section, the students must recognize main ideas of paragraphs and passages and identify important factual information and relationships among different components of textual information. The Reasoning Skills section requires students to determine implicit meanings and apply those meanings by drawing appropriate conclusions and making
comparisons. Students are given four prose passages in the areas of prose fiction, humanities, social studies, and natural sciences. Reading selections similar to those found in the college curricula will be used to measure reading comprehension of the students who will be asked to interpret meaning, make associations and generalizations, manipulate information, and draw conclusions. Three scores are derived from the CAAP Reading Test, a score and two sub-scores.

The CAAP test yields an ACT/CAAP Linkage Report, a report which reveals value added from the time the student was admitted to the time he or she completes the general education core, with the ACT score used as the pre-test score and the CAAP result as the post-test score. Through the Linkage Report, a comparison can be made between the progress of Northeast students and similar students at all user institutions who also took the ACT and the CAAP. The Office of Planning and Research will oversee the administration as well as the analysis of the CAAP test results. The CAAP test will be used in part to assess Goal 3.

**ACT-Work Keys**

The ACT-Work Keys measures workplace-readiness skills such as applied math, reading for information, and locating information, as well as displays personal attributes which may be used to predict on-the-job behavior. It is given to a random selection of Career/Technical students in the last semester of their program of study. Particularly useful for assessing the QEP, the Reading for Information section measures the reading skill students will need to perform well in the workplace. There are thirty-three items in this section with five levels of difficulty. As students move toward the higher levels, the reading material becomes longer and more challenging. The Office of Planning and Research will oversee the administration as well as the analysis of the Work Keys test results. The ACT-Work Keys will be used in part to assess Goal 3.
**The Survey of Student Opinions (SSO)**

The Survey of Student Opinions is given annually at Northeast to students at the time of their college graduation. Overall, the survey provides a snapshot of students’ retrospective satisfaction with the various programs of the institution. It includes questions about the students’ background, various college services, the college environment, and any additional questions which are relevant to current institutional concerns and efforts. Starting in Spring of 2010, it will contain questions related to the QEP. For example, students will be asked if they value the role of literacy in promoting personal and social growth. They will also be asked to rate the importance of independent reading in their college education. The Office of Planning and Research will oversee both the administration of the SSO and the analysis of its findings. With the 2010 survey providing baseline data, Surveys of Student Opinions will be used in part to assess Goal 4.

**Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)**

Established in 2001 as a project of the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas, Austin (an organization now known as the Center for Community College Student Engagement), CCSSE remains the banner instrument administered at the community college level to assist community colleges in assessing the quality of education they provide. Students respond to a wide variety of questions in five key areas: active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, support for learners, and, particularly useful for QEP purposes, reading and advising. These questions examine students about their individual history, habits, and routines, and about institutional practices.

The responses are used to create the Community College Student Report, a valuable source of information concerning student engagement, arguably the most indispensable element in student learning. The report may be used as a benchmarking,
diagnostic, and monitoring tool. The results provide both institutional benchmark scores and national benchmarks. At Northeast, the CCSSE has been administered since 2006. By comparing past results with those produced in Spring of 2012, the College will use CCSSE to ascertain the degree to which students’ attitudes and practices regarding independent reading have improved over the implementation course of the QEP. The Office of Planning and Research will oversee future administration and analysis of the CCSSE. The CCSSE will be used in part to assess Goals 3 and 4. 

Professional Development Surveys

As the QEP is gradually rolled out, those faculty members directly involved in its implementation, such as instructors of REA 0113, 1213 and of courses from across the curriculum, will participate in various professional development opportunities, beginning in the year 2009-2010. Upon completion of each professional development occasion, faculty participants will be polled for their feedback regarding the relative usefulness of the event. The Office of Planning and Research will develop, administer, score, and analyze the survey following each professional development opportunity. Professional Development Surveys will be used in part to assess Goals 1, 2, 3, 4.

Other Assessment Tools

In addition to the methods and instruments described above, Northeast instructors are currently designing and will continue to develop and apply course-embedded tools to measure the effectiveness of QEP-related initiatives within each discipline. For instance, rubrics, already a feature in English classes as a means of holistically evaluating student writing, are now being created by English Composition I faculty members to assess the level of student engagement in reading journals. The rubrics will evaluate the following components: commitment, comprehension, analysis, interpretation, and vocabulary building. (See Appendix H). Northeast English instructors will share this rubric with RAC instructors in the future, as the QEP unfolds, and together
they will work to improve the effectiveness of reading journal assignments and the evaluation rubric, as well as explore further methods of promoting and assessing students’ growth as readers. Also, Northeast English Composition I faculty are currently considering uses for the booklet authored by The Foundation for Critical Thinking *How to Read a Paragraph: The Art of Close Reading*. The booklet contains guided exercises in deep comprehension of readings drawn from a wide spectrum of texts, exercises which could be used as models adaptable to any discipline.

With today’s increasing emphasis on the wholesale improvement of reading skills and practices, educators do not have to look far to find a growing abundance of ideas for test questions, portfolio assignments, and group projects to demystify, facilitate, and examine the reading process of and for students. As the College maintains the forward-looking mission laid out in *Reading ROARS*, the number of Northeast faculty, staff, and administration members dedicated to mining the potential of available instructional and assessment resources is sure to steadily increase as well.
Chapter 6

Budget

The QEP Budget Sub-committee led by the Northeast Vice President for Finance and Operations established the following table of cost projections for the duration of the QEP implementation period. The Northeast QEP budget is derived from state and local funding solely, with no expectation of grants or other financial sources. The figures below are based on the institution’s predictions regarding funding and represent realistic, sustainable projections. (For descriptive details concerning each major item, see Appendix I.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeast Mississippi Community College</th>
<th>QEP Budget</th>
<th>FY10 - FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>FY11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$123,802</td>
<td>$124,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>37,322</td>
<td>37,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>161,124</td>
<td>161,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>13,814</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>25,610</td>
<td>8,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>42,324</td>
<td>18,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$203,448</td>
<td>$180,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

In the Fall 2009 semester, Northeast Mississippi Community College will begin partial implementation of Reading ROARS. The College will do so not because the institution presumes unqualified approval of its QEP by SACS, but because the actions laid out for the reinvigoration of advising and scheduling of under-prepared readers, and the incorporation of reading instruction in key college-level courses are objectives worth pursuing under any circumstances.

As an open-admissions institution, Northeast has always been willing to meet students where ever they are academically when, in the tradition of many citizens in this democratic society, they turn to higher education as a means to better the economic condition of their lives. In this respect, Northeast is always eager to serve those students who might elsewhere be dismissed as not “college material.” But to offer this service effectively and realistically requires at the outset a vigorously united system of responsible advising, placement, and scheduling. While such an approach has long been a part of the Northeast mission theoretically, practically speaking, in this time of widespread financial hardship, it merits new and reinforced attention if the full profits of a community college education can be realized by all who seek it. The role of the community college in helping the country regain its economic strength is currently being touted by the highest levels of education officials: for instance, Education Secretary Arne Duncan declared early in 2009 that the nation’s two-year colleges will “play a big role in getting America back on its feet again” (quoted in Time 20 July 2009).

Because the place of the community college in higher education can no longer rightfully be consigned to the category of primarily remedial institution, Northeast has chosen to reach broadly in designing its quality enhancement plan. To shore up advising and re-focus on wise schedule planning of incoming students is only the first step in
unfolding this interconnected, multiple-stage effort to improve student reading. From advantageous groundwork, efforts to meet the evolving reading needs of all students can grow. If implemented according to the proposed actions and timeline, *Reading ROARS* can release throughout the entire Northeast population a momentum of widespread reading improvement—the bedrock of meaningful learning experience—the foundation for life improvement in the twenty-first century.
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Based on feedback gathered from QEP e-mails and Topic Suggestion Drop Box, the Strategic Planning Council meeting (April 2007), and a Faculty In-service (Jan.2006), the QEP Leadership Team has identified several areas of interest and concern which could lead to our QEP topic. As we work to refine and focus our topic, we should keep in mind the following criteria. The QEP must:

- address needs peculiar to our institution,
- directly relate to student learning,
- provide measurable results,
- be sustained and developed over five years.

We are requesting your help to identify this important QEP topic. Listed below are general topic categories, along with examples of how the topic might be applied. Please rank these possible topics, with 1 being the most important and 9 being the least important to you. Space is provided for you to offer additional suggestions. Use the back of the survey if you need more room. Obviously, if you offer additional suggestions, the rankings would increase proportionally.

**Rank Topic**

1. **Writing across the curriculum:** Develop initiatives for writing requirements in courses across the disciplines.

2. **Reading ability:** Improve the reading ability of students on multiple levels: from developmental reading classes to reading intensive courses. Devise methods of capturing early those students who need reading enhancement.

3. **Mathematical ability:** Improve the mathematical ability of students in developmental and other Math courses.

4. **First Year Experience/Orientation Course:** Help students develop skills and habits to improve chances of academic success; possible areas to cover: Study Skills, Time Management, Career guidance, Goal setting, and Academic integrity.

5. **Collaborative Learning/Learning Communities:** Increase use of collaborative and technological based instructional techniques. Participate in community service projects.

6. **Critical Thinking Skills:** Improve analytical, problem-solving, and logical reasoning skills.

7. **Student engagement:** Increase the level of student engagement in the classroom as well as elsewhere on campus.

8. **Metacognitive Instruction:** Help students identify their learning styles in order to improve their chances of success and retention rates.

9. **Technology:** Utilize resources to diversify and enhance instructional methods beyond traditional lecture.

Additional Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________________
# QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN ACTIVITIES TIMELINE (2007-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>SPECIFIC ACTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PERSONS</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 1 Initial Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an e-mail account</td>
<td>Begin sending weekly QEP News and requests for topic ideas to everyone</td>
<td>Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry</td>
<td>1/15/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review IR office data</td>
<td>Look for trends that represent needs for quality enhancement</td>
<td>Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry</td>
<td>1/15/2008</td>
<td>9/2008</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop QEP Website</td>
<td>Determine layout and required information for website pages</td>
<td>Jeffrey Powell Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry</td>
<td>1/15/2008</td>
<td>8/2009</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PHASE 2 QEP Topic Selection** | | | | | |
| Review QEP topics from other colleges | 1. Distribute list of colleges with QEP topic titles, status, and actual document when available 2. Read and review information available from other colleges | QEP Committee | 1/15/2008 | 3/2008 | Completed |
| Develop QEP Suggestion Drop box | 1. Design database for QEP suggestions 2. Add QEP suggestion drop box to the NEMCC website | Jeffrey Powell Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry | 1/15/08 | 4/2008 | Completed |
| Meet with various divisions | Inform members of each division about the QEP requirements | Rilla Jones Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry | 2/19/08 | 5/7/08 | Completed |
| Meet with Civic Organization | Inform members of a Booneville Civic Organization about the QEP | Bill Stone Collin Billingsley | 3/11/08 | 3/11/08 | Completed |
| Meet with QEP Committee | 1. Review successful QEPs from other institutions 2. Discuss topic suggestions | QEP Committee | 3/19/08 | 3/19/08 | Completed |
| QEP Topic Survey | Develop and distribute the QEP Survey | Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry | 3/20/08 | 4/25/08 | Completed |
| Survey Results | 1. Compile survey results 2. Identify top four topics | Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry | 4/28/08 | 4/28/08 | Completed |

<p>| <strong>PHASE 3 QEP Development</strong> | | | | | |
| Meet with QEP Committee | 1. Discuss survey results 2. Form Topic Subcommittees for Literature review and Best Practices research | QEP Committee Morgan Ricks (Student) Kimery Bradford (Student) | 5/1/08 | 5/1/08 | Completed |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Meeting/Committee/Assessment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Completed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Subcommittee research</strong></td>
<td>Lit review on three focused topics</td>
<td>5/1/08</td>
<td>8/08 Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meet with QEP Committee</strong></td>
<td>1. Discuss research in progress</td>
<td>6/3/08</td>
<td>6/3/08 Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Meet with QEP Committee**      | 1. Discuss research in progress  
2. Prepare for the August Faculty/Staff In-service reports on the four topics  
3. Discuss plans for follow-up to the Faculty/Staff In-service – Division meetings | QEP Committee | 8/5/08  | 8/5/08 Completed |
| **QEP Topic Presentation at 2008 Fall Inservice** | 1. QEP presentation  
2. Subcommittee Topic Paper Reports | Deborah Kehoe  
Rita Murry  
Collin Billingsley  
Rebekah Donahue  
Joey Williford  
Wilda Pounds | 8/11/08 | 8/11/08 Completed |
| **QEP Question and Answer Session** | 1. Following the Faculty Association Meeting  
2. During Activity Period – Hospitality Room on Tuesday and Thursday | Deborah Kehoe  
Rita Murry  
Collin Billingsley  
Rebekah Donahue  
Joey Williford  
Wilda Pounds | 8/13/08; 8/19/08; 8/21/08 | 8/21/08 Completed |
| **Topic Selection Vote**         | Vote on the focused topic via BlackBoard | Everyone | 9/2/08  | 9/5/08 Completed |
| **Topic Selection Vote**         | Tally Topic Selection Vote | Deborah Kehoe  
Rita Murry | 9/8/08  | 9/8/08 Completed |
| **QEP Committee Meeting**        | 1. Report Topic Selection Vote Results  
2. Discuss the formation of Operational Subcommittees  
3. Discuss QEP Initiatives  
4. Report from SACS-COC Summer 2008 Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation– Collin Billingsley and Diane Brown | QEP Committee | 9/9/08  | 9/9/08 Completed |
| **QEP Subcommittee Assessment**  | Develop practices and instruments to assess the QEP process | QEP Assessment | 10/09/08 | 7/2009 Completed |
| **QEP Subcommittee Marketing**   | Develop various strategies to promote awareness and involvement in the QEP | QEP Marketing  
SGA President, Art Students, Marketing Students | 10/09/08 | 5/2009 Completed |
<p>| <strong>QEP Subcommittee Initiatives/Student Learning Outcomes</strong> | Develop the initiatives and student learning outcomes that make up the QEP | QEP Initiatives/Student Learning Outcomes | 10/10/08 | 10/2008 Completed |
| <strong>QEP Subcommittee Faculty Development</strong> | Develop a plan for faculty development as related to the QEP | QEP Professional Development | 10/16/08 | 5/2009 Completed |
| <strong>QEP Subcommittee Budget</strong>      | Assess the financial needs of the QEP and develop a budget | QEP Budget | 10/23/08 | 7/2009 Completed |
| <strong>QEP Newsletter</strong>              | Update all faculty/staff and the Board of | Rita Murry | 10/08  | 10/2008 Completed |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Title Selection</td>
<td>Use a selective survey to choose the title of the QEP.</td>
<td>QEP Subcommittee</td>
<td>10/09/08</td>
<td>11/7/08</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Logo and Jingle Contest</td>
<td>Develop creative means of promoting the QEP</td>
<td>QEP Subcommittee</td>
<td>01/09</td>
<td>4/2009</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 4 Pre-Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write the QEP</td>
<td>Write the QEP document following SACS-COC guidelines</td>
<td>Deborah Kehoe</td>
<td>01/09</td>
<td>09/2009</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for placement and scheduling of developmental reading students</td>
<td>Establish guidelines for advisors scheduling students with substandard reading scores.</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Barnett Rilla Jones Deborah Kehoe Rita Murry Joey Williford Carla Falkner</td>
<td>01/13/09</td>
<td>7/2009</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Committee Meeting</td>
<td>1. Executive Summary</td>
<td>2. Time line 3. Subcommittee updates</td>
<td>QEP Committee</td>
<td>01/15/09</td>
<td>4/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading Workshop</td>
<td>Introduce faculty to methods of critical reading instruction</td>
<td>Richard Raymond, MSU Professor Humanities/Social Sciences Division Faculty Representatives from area high schools</td>
<td>02/13/09</td>
<td>2/2009</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Sub-Committee Meetings</td>
<td>1. Continue meeting to prepare for implementation of the QEP 2. Promote the QEP</td>
<td>QEP Sub-Committees</td>
<td>02/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Rollout</td>
<td>Launch the QEP</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Across the Curriculum Committee (RAC)</td>
<td>Established a RAC Committee to implement Goal 3 – Reading across the curriculum</td>
<td>Deborah Kehoe Kathy Green Carla Falkner Phyllis Colson Janet Cox Amanda Mattox Dana Walker Wilda Pounds Rilla Jones Rita Murry</td>
<td>04/27/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>In-Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE 5 QEP Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS-COC Approval</td>
<td>SACS-COC Site Visitors will evaluate the QEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP begins</td>
<td>Full Implementation of the QEP will begin</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NEMCC Advisor
Quick Reference

Avoid List
(as approved by the Instruction Council)

*Students with ACT Reading sub-score of 14 or below must be referred to the Counseling Center for Accuplacer or be registered for REA 0113 AND advised against registering for the following reading intensive classes:

- ART 2713
- EPY 2513
- BAD 2413
- HIS (avoid all)
- BIO (avoid all except BIO 1114, 1124, 1514)
- CHE 1213
- PHI 2113
- COM 2463, 2483
- PSC 1113, 1123
- ECO 2113
- REA (take 0113 only)
- ENG (avoid all literature)
- SOC 2133

(*REA 0113 mandatory only for incoming freshmen. Students who have completed courses on the Avoid List do not have to enroll in REA 0113.)

These recommendations have been approved based on the assumption that these students are true freshmen. The Instruction Council also recommends that all online classes be avoided until REA is successfully completed.

Accuplacer/ACT Guidelines

(see p. 2-3 of the Advisor Handbook for additional information on Accuplacer)

ACT English sub-score of 14 or below: refer student to Counseling Center for Accuplacer OR student must begin in ENG 0113 (Beginning English)

ACT Math sub-score of 18 or below: refer student to Counseling Center for Accuplacer OR student must begin in MAT 0123 (Beginning Algebra)

ACT Reading sub-score of 14 or below: refer student to Counseling Center for Accuplacer OR register student for REA 0113 (Comprehension I)

Science Courses: refer to p. 9-10 of the Advisor Handbook for ACT/pre-requisites regarding science course placement.

Class Attendance Policy
See p. 26 of the Advisor Handbook

College Transfer Information
See p. 22-23 of the Advisor Handbook

Distance Learning
Contact Holly Melvin at ext. 7193 (also see p.12 of Advisor Handbook for more information)

FAQ about Financial Aid/Scholarships

- 12 hours (full-time status) is required for students who receive financial aid and for those who reside in dormitories
- 15 hours is required for students to maintain institutional scholarships
- Please remind students who have financial aid/scholarships to go by or call the Business Office and charge their fees or schedules will be deleted during the purge for non-payment

*Reminder: LLS and COE courses will not count towards full-time enrollment for students who receive federal financial aid (Pell grants/loans) UNLESS the course is listed within the student’s curriculum. It is acceptable for a student who has 12 hours of curriculum based courses to take LLS/COE courses in addition to their other coursework (p.21 in Advisor Handbook). Please contact financial aid with further questions regarding this matter.

Fee Information
See p. 13-14 of Advisor Handbook

Graduation Requirements
See p. 18-19 of the Advisor Handbook

Student Email Account Questions
Advise student to go to the NE website and click on ‘student email help’

Important Dates to Remember

Fall 2009
- July 7-August 7: Fee pymt. for registered students
- August 11, 12: Open registration/fee pymt.
- August 19: Last day to register/add classes
- August 21: Last day to register for distance learning classes
- August 26: Last day to drop classes
- November 6: Last day to withdraw from distance learning classes
- November 17: Advising Day
- October 19-December 1: Class withdrawal period (college withdrawals can occur at anytime but must be complete by December 1)

Spring 2010
- January 4-6: Open registration/fee pymt.
- January 14: Last day to register/add classes
- January 15: Last day to register for distance learning classes
- January 21: Last day to drop classes
- March 9: Advising Day
- March 9-12, 15: Pre-registration
- April 1: Last day to withdraw from distance learning classes
- March 8-April 28: Class withdrawal period (college withdrawals can occur at anytime but must be complete by April 28)
- May 14: Graduation
### GOAL 1: To implement new guidelines and standards for the advising and scheduling of incoming students so as to maximize opportunities for development of necessary skills and to minimize potential barriers to success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advise students more consistently so that they are not concurrently enrolled in reading-intensive college-level courses and Comprehension I.

Place students in the appropriate level of reading according to multiple means of assessment, beginning with the ACT reading sub-score.

### GOAL 2. To expand and enhance the current developmental reading program to include an elective intermediate course so as to accommodate more effectively the broad spectrum of students’ needs for reading improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hire additional Reading instructors as needed.

Provide professional development for Reading faculty.

Expand the developmental reading program to include two levels: Level 1-Comprehension I; Level 2-Reading Enhancement I.
### GOAL 3. To integrate into courses from each college division critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline so as to deepen students’ understanding of the reading process which they must undergo in order to become fully engaged with any reading material they will encounter as students and as informed, productive citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide faculty development opportunities (outside consultants, etc.) for pilot faculty to learn current best practices in critical reading instruction (on an incremental basis beginning with English)</td>
<td>X (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>X (Engineering Technology &amp; Occupational Education)</td>
<td>X (Mathematics/Sciences)</td>
<td>X (Fine Arts, Business &amp; Business Technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate into college-level courses across the curriculum at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline</td>
<td>X (Humanities and Social/Behavioral Sciences)</td>
<td>X (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>X (Engineering Technology &amp; Occupational Education)</td>
<td>X (Mathematics/Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement faculty collaboration opportunities (team teaching, mentoring, workshops, etc.) to share critical reading instruction methods</td>
<td>X (RACC)</td>
<td>X (RACC)</td>
<td>X (RACC)</td>
<td>X (RACC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 4. To foster a reading-conducive environment across the campus so as to encourage self-initiated reading for personal and social growth as well as for academic achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand and promote the library’s holdings of leisure reading materials.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create designated reading areas across the campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute a College Reading Colloquium (modeled on past PTK colloquia) to choose and discuss college-appropriate books with literary distinction, such as Great Book selections or contemporary, critically acclaimed publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange for students in CRC to visit area high schools to share reading experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading Advisement Survey

To be completed by any student who meets the following guidelines:

Q1 Please choose one of the following statements:
- Enrolled in Comprehension I (REA 0113) and **did not** take the Accuplacer Reading Comprehension Test ..............................
- Enrolled in Comprehension I (REA 0113) and **took** the Accuplacer Reading Comprehension Test .................................

Q2 Please rate the following statements using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My advisor explained the Placement Testing Policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Quality Enhancement Plan

Based on thorough research, Reading Roars, a quality enhancement plan for Northeast Community College, focuses on improving and reinforcing the reading skills and practices of students at various stages of their college careers. Because reading competency is fundamental to college success and because the demands of college-level reading increase as students move through the required curriculum in pursuit of a certificate or degree, this QEP is a comprehensive and integrative reading improvement project. Its main goals reflect a progressive scope:

1. To implement new guidelines and standards for the advising and scheduling of incoming students so as to maximize opportunities for development of necessary skills and to minimize potential barriers to success.

2. To expand upon the current developmental reading program to include an elective intermediate course so as to accommodate more effectively the broad spectrum of students’ needs for reading improvement.

3. To integrate into courses from each college division critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline so as to deepen students’ understanding of the reading process which they must undergo in order to become fully engaged with any reading material they will encounter as students and as informed, productive citizens.

4. To foster a reading-conducive environment across the campus so as to encourage self-initiated reading for personal and social growth as well as for academic achievement.

Assessment will employ direct and indirect methods to provide both formative and summative evaluation of progress and success. Key means of assessment will include comparing existing and future institutional research data indicating initial placement and progress of under-prepared students, administering pre- and post tests in reading comprehension and enhancement courses, embedding reading-related questions in discipline-specific tests, and taking local surveys of students, staff, and faculty.

Process Used to Select the QEP Topic

The journey of the Northeast QEP from the brainstorming stage to a fully-conceived plan began in 2006 and progressed steadily over the subsequent three years. Highlights of the process are as follows:

- March 2006- Dr. Margaret Sullivan visited the College and conducted an orientation session for all constituencies in the new features of the SACS reaffirmation process.
- May of 2006-President Johnny Allen asked Rilla Jones and Deborah Kehoe to serve as co-chairs of a forthcoming QEP Committee and to participate in the SACS Summer Institute in Orlando, Florida, in July of that year.
- December of 2006- QEP co-chairs and other staff attended SACS annual meeting in Orlando to attend workshops on the QEP process.
• April 2007-QEP co-chairs presented a program on QEP fundamentals to the Strategic Planning Council and solicited topic suggestions.
• July 2007- QEP co-chairs, faculty and staff attended SACS Summer Institute in Louisville, KY.
• October 2007- Vice President Larry Nabors contacted fifteen Northeast administration, faculty, and staff members to request that they serve on a QEP Design and Implementation Team. That original group of individuals eventually became what is now known simply as the QEP Committee.
• December 2007-QEP co-chairs, members of the QEP committee, faculty and staff attended the SACS Annual Meeting in New Orleans.
• January 2008-Accreditation Leadership Team attended Accreditation Orientation in Atlanta GA.
• January 2008- QEP email and suggestion drop box established on campus website.
• January 2008-QEP co-chairs began regular communication with the campus at large to accomplish the following tasks- to remind everyone of the need to participate in creating the QEP; to keep everyone informed about the characteristics of an effective QEP; to share with everyone pertinent statistics derived from local research, data from which an appropriate QEP topic might be generated; and to solicit ideas, questions, or any other contributions people had to offer the preparatory conversation about enhancing student learning at the College.
• March 2008-QEP committee developed a survey to be disseminated among the staff and faculty for the purposes of narrowing down a list of topic ideas based on those concerns cited in early rough surveys as well as in the feedback the QEP co-chairs had been receiving via e-mail, the QEP suggestion box, personal conversation, and meetings.
• April 2008-QEP committee met to discuss survey results. Three subcommittees were formed to conduct research on the three most popular topics.
• August 2008- The research from the three most popular topics was presented to the campus community at the fall 2008 in-service program.
• August & September 2008- researchers made their entire findings available to the College community on Blackboard and offered in-person Q & A sessions for those who wished to study and discuss the topic choices further.
• September 2008- topic selection vote was held using BlackBoard for all campus faculty and staff.

As development and implementation of this QEP continues, the following accomplishments have been and continue to be made through the joint effort of faculty, staff and students:

**2008-2009 Accomplishments:**

1. Conducted a review of relevant institutional research using a variety of sources (ACT scores, CAAP results, CCSSE results, Success and Retention Rate Studies, Audits of registrations to inform the campus community of student learning issues.)
2. Established a QEP email and website presence.
3. Opened lines of communication between QEP co-chairs, QEP Committee and the campus community to solicit ideas, questions, or any other contributions people had to offer the preparatory conversation about enhancing student learning at the College.

4. Conducted a campus wide survey to gauge interest in possible QEP topics.

5. QEP subcommittees conducted a “mini” literature review on the three most popular QEP topics.

6. Subcommittee members presented their research findings to the campus community during the fall 2008 in-service.

7. Conducted a campus wide vote for the QEP topic and a campaign and revote after an initial tie.

8. Formed the following QEP subcommittees to establish the content details of the projected plan: Budget, Initiatives and Student Learning Outcomes, Professional Development, Marketing and Assessment.

9. Conducted a QEP logo contest and a QEP jingle contest.

10. Devised the title Reading Roars: Raising Our Academic Reading Success.

11. The Initiatives and Student Learning Outcomes subcommittee devised four student learning outcomes and initiatives to implement.

12. The Professional Development subcommittee began work on the advising initiative to be implemented during orientation sessions in July and registration in August.

13. An “Avoid” list was established for advisor use in helping students with ACT sub-scores in reading of 14 and below.

14. A registration help sheet was established for advisors to use during summer orientation and registration.

15. The Assessment subcommittee and key personnel established a testing process using the “Accuplacer ReadPro” to align the developmental reading program with the existing programs offered for mathematics and English.

16. Implemented the Professional Development phase of the QEP by offering “Improving Critical Reading and Writing” in February of 2009. Faculty from the Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences Division participated in this training.

17. QEP co-chairs launched an instructional iTunes podcast to inform students about the QEP.

18. Established the QEP Institutional Effectiveness Plan.

Five-Year Projections:

2009-2010

1. Advise students more consistently so that they are not concurrently enrolled in reading-intensive college-level courses and Comprehension I.

2. Place students in the appropriate level of reading according to multiple means of assessment, beginning with the ACT reading sub-score.

3. Provide professional development for Reading faculty.

4. Incorporate into college-level courses in Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline.

5. Provide faculty development opportunities (outside consultants, etc.) for Health Sciences faculty to learn current best practices in critical reading instruction.
6. Expand and promote the library’s holdings of leisure reading materials.

2010-2011

1. Advise students more consistently so that they are not concurrently enrolled in reading-intensive college-level courses and Comprehension I.
2. Place students in the appropriate level of reading according to multiple means of assessment, beginning with the ACT reading sub-score.
3. Provide professional development for Reading faculty.
4. Implement faculty collaboration opportunities (team teaching, mentoring, workshops, etc.) to share critical reading instruction methods.
5. Incorporate into college-level courses in Health Sciences at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline.
6. Provide faculty development opportunities (outside consultants, etc.) for Engineering Technology & Occupational Education faculty to learn current best practices in critical reading instruction.
7. Expand and promote the library’s holdings of leisure reading materials.
8. Hire additional Reading instructors as needed.
9. Expand the developmental reading program to include two levels: Level 1-Comprehension I; Level 2- Reading Enhancement I.
10. Create designated reading areas across the campus.

2011-2012

1. Advise students more consistently so that they are not concurrently enrolled in reading-intensive college-level courses and Comprehension I.
2. Place students in the appropriate level of reading according to multiple means of assessment, beginning with the ACT reading sub-score.
3. Provide professional development for Reading faculty.
4. Implement faculty collaboration opportunities (team teaching, mentoring, workshops, etc.) to share critical reading instruction methods.
5. Incorporate into college-level courses in Engineering Technology & Occupational Education at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline.
6. Provide faculty development opportunities (outside consultants, etc.) for Mathematics/Science faculty to learn current best practices in critical reading instruction.
7. Expand and promote the library’s holdings of leisure reading materials.
8. Conduct a success and retention rate study for a course on the “Avoid List” and students who have completed one level of the developmental reading program and students that have completed two levels of the developmental reading program.
9. Create designated reading areas across the campus.
10. Institute a College Reading Colloquium (modeled on past PTK colloquia) to choose and discuss college-appropriate books with literary distinction, such as Great Book selections or contemporary, critically acclaimed publications.

2012-2013

1. Advise students more consistently so that they are not concurrently enrolled in reading-intensive college-level courses and Comprehension I.
2. Place students in the appropriate level of reading according to multiple means of assessment, beginning with the ACT reading sub-score.
3. Provide professional development for Reading faculty.
4. Implement faculty collaboration opportunities (team teaching, mentoring, workshops, etc.) to share critical reading instruction methods.
5. Incorporate into college-level courses in Mathematics/Science courses at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline.
6. Provide faculty development opportunities (outside consultants, etc.) for Fine Arts/Business and Business Technology faculty to learn current best practices in critical reading instruction.
7. Expand and promote the library’s holdings of leisure reading materials.
8. Conduct a success and retention rate study for a course on the “Avoid List” and students who have completed one level of the developmental reading program and students that have completed two levels of the developmental reading program.
9. Create designated reading areas across the campus.
10. Institute a College Reading Colloquium (modeled on past PTK colloquia) to choose and discuss college-appropriate books with literary distinction, such as Great Book selections or contemporary, critically acclaimed publications.
11. Arrange for students in CRC to visit area high schools to share reading experiences.

2013-2014

1. Advise students more consistently so that they are not concurrently enrolled in reading-intensive college-level courses and Comprehension I.
2. Place students in the appropriate level of reading according to multiple means of assessment, beginning with the ACT reading sub-score.
3. Provide professional development for Reading faculty.
4. Implement faculty collaboration opportunities (team teaching, mentoring, workshops, etc.) to share critical reading instruction methods.
5. Incorporate into college-level courses in Fine Arts and Business and Business Technology least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline.
6. Conduct a success and retention rate study for a course on the “Avoid List” and students who have completed one level of the developmental reading program and students that have completed two levels of the developmental reading program.
7. Expand and promote the library’s holdings of leisure reading materials.
8. Create designated reading areas across the campus.
9. Institute a College Reading Colloquium (modeled on past PTK colloquia) to choose and discuss college-appropriate books with literary distinction, such as Great Book selections or contemporary, critically acclaimed publications.
10. Arrange for students in CRC to visit area high schools to share reading experiences.
Institutional Effectiveness Plan
Quality Enhancement Plan
2009-2010

College Purpose Statement Goals: (P1) - To provide degree and certificate programs that prepare students for continued studies or immediate employment. (P3) To provide developmental studies within the curriculum to strengthen the basic skills of students.

Strategic Long-range Goals: (L1) – To produce graduates in academic, technical, and career programs that are life-long learners prepared for either transfer to four-year institutions or possess the skills needed for a global economy. (L2) – To focus on improving teaching and learning by implementing visionary curricula and new methods of instruction to meet the needs of a global workforce. (L5) - To provide a high quality program of professional development opportunities for faculty and staff, in the integration of technology applications into the College’s classrooms, work environment, and College’s procedures and policies. (L8) - To develop a process that allocates College resources to meet instructional, student services, and administrative support needs.

Short-Term Goals: (S1.1) - Improve Student Retention

QEP Purpose Statement: Northeast Mississippi Community College’s Quality Enhancement Plan’s purpose is to strengthen academic advising and schedule planning, to enhance and expand the existing developmental reading program, to enhance the reading skills of students across the curriculum, and to encourage students to engage in intrinsic reading.

QEP Goals:

Goal 1 – To implement new guidelines and standards for the advising and scheduling of incoming students so as to maximize opportunities for development of necessary skills and to minimize potential barriers to success.

Goal 2- To expand and enhance the current developmental reading program to include an elective intermediate course so as to accommodate more effectively the broad spectrum of students’ needs for reading improvement.

Goal 3- To integrate into courses from each college division critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline so as to deepen students’ understanding of the reading process which they must undergo in order to become fully engaged with any reading material they will encounter as students and as informed, productive citizens.

Goal 4- To foster a reading-conducive environment across the campus so as to encourage self-initiated reading for personal and social growth as well as for academic achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria/ Procedures</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Through the advising process, incoming students enrolled in Comprehension I (REA 0113) will gain an understanding of the consequences of concurrent enrollment in reading-intensive college-level courses. (Goal 1)</td>
<td>1a. 90% of incoming students enrolled in Comprehension I (REA 0113) will Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement “My advisor informed me of the Avoid List and the consequences of trying to complete reading intensive college level courses this semester” on the Reading Advisement Survey administered during the .</td>
<td>1a. An avoid list was devised and approved through the instruction council. A Reading Advisement Survey was formulated and distributed for use in the Comprehension I classes. The Office of Planning and Research will compile the results of the survey in August 2009.</td>
<td>1a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Through the advising process, incoming students with ACT reading sub scores of 14 or below will be placed in Comprehension I (REA 0113). (Goal 1)</td>
<td>2a. 90% of incoming students with ACT reading sub scores of 14 or below will be enrolled in Comprehension I (REA 0113) or will have achieved an Accuplacer Reading Comprehension test score of 67 or above as determined by an audit of ACT sub scores and class enrollment performed by the Office of Planning and Research in the fall semester.</td>
<td>2a. For summer orientation sessions in July 2009 the following statement was added to the ACT information card used by advisors: ATTENTION: If the ACT Reading Sub score is 14 or below the student must either 1. Enroll in Comprehension I (REA 0113) OR 2. Take the Accuplacer Reading Comprehension test at the Counseling Center</td>
<td>2a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Through the advising process, students will be informed of the elective intermediate reading course Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) and the potential benefit of enrollment. (Goal 1) | 3a. 90% of students will Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement “My advisor informed me of the elective course ‘Reading Enhancement I’ and the potential benefits of enrollment” on the Reading Advisement Survey administered during advising day.  
3b. 50% of students withdrawing from courses on the Avoid List will Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement “My advisor/counselor informed me of the elective course ‘Reading Enhancement I’ and the potential benefits of enrollment” on the Reading Advisement Survey administered by the Counseling Center during the withdrawal process.  
3c. 50% of students completing Comprehension I (REA0113) will enroll in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) as determined by an audit of class enrollment performed by the Office of Planning and Research. | 3a. The QEP co-chairs with the assistance of the Office of Planning and Research will compile the results of the surveys in August 2011.  
3b. The QEP co-chairs with the assistance of the Office of Planning and Research will compile the results of the surveys in December 2011.  
3c. The QEP co-chairs with the assistance of the Office of Planning and Research will conduct the audit and distribute the results to the Comprehension I (REA 0113) instructors, the Dean of Instruction and the QEP committees in December 2011. | 3a. |
| 4. Students who complete Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will comprehend the main idea in reading selections. (Goal 2) | 4a. 90% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will correctly answer the embedded main idea questions on the post Combined Skills Assessment administered at the end of the course.  
4b. 95% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will be Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement on the post Combined Skills Assessment “This course has helped me identify the main idea in reading selections.” | 4a. and b. To be collected by instructors of Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) during the spring 2011 semester. | 4a. |
| 5. Students who complete Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will infer through context clues the meanings of unfamiliar words in reading selections. (Goal 2) | 5a. 90% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will correctly answer the embedded contextual clue questions on the post Combined Skills Assessment administered at the end of the course. | 5a and b. To be collected by instructors of Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) during the spring 2011 semester. | 5. |
5b. 95% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will be Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement on the post Combined Skills Assessment “This course has helped me interpret contextual clues in reading selections.”

6. Students who complete Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will interpret different components given in dictionary entries. (Goal 2)

6a. 90% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will correctly answer the embedded dictionary component questions on the post Combined Skills Assessment administered at the end of the course.

6b. 95% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement on the post Combined Skills Assessment “This course has helped me interpret components given in dictionary entries.”

6a and b. To be collected by instructors of Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) during the spring 2011 semester.

7. Students who complete Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will demonstrate gain in reading. (Goal 2)

7a. 95% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will demonstrate a 40% gain between the Accuplacer Reading Comprehension Test Pre and Post-tests administered during the course.

7b. 95% of students enrolled in Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) will demonstrate a 40% test score gain between the Pre-and Post Combined Skills Assessment administered during the course.

7a. and b. To be collected by instructors of Reading Enhancement I (REA 1213) during the spring 2011 semester.

8. Faculty will participate in professional development designed to improve reading instruction. (Goal 3)

8a. Developmental reading instructors will attend a national conference on reading instruction in developmental reading in year one of the QEP.

8b. 100% of faculty in the Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences will attend a division specific reading instruction training opportunity

8c. 100% of instructors will respond with “Excellent” or “Very Good” to the 8a. To be attended in October of 2009.

8b 65.6% (21 out of 32) of faculty participated in a full-day workshop entitled “Improving Critical Reading and Writing” presented by Dr. Rich Raymond on February 13th, 2009 at Northeast Mississippi Community College.

8c. 71.5% of instructors responded with “Excellent” or “Very Good” to the 8b. The workshop conflicted with a statewide Speech symposium and the two speech faculty were not able to attend. Coaching staff did not attend. The Professional Development Committee decided to strengthen language on the announcement for professional development opportunities.

8c. The diversity of subject matter taught in the Humanities and Social and
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8d. 100% of faculty will participate in a rubric training workshop given the school year their division incorporates the QEP.</strong></td>
<td><strong>8d. Assessed by the Office of Planning and Research in the fall of 2010 beginning with the Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences as division.</strong></td>
<td><em>Behavioral Sciences made it difficult to provide discipline specific instruction. The Professional Development Committee decided to offer upcoming training by discipline or area rather than by division.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Students will demonstrate a gain in reading skills. (Goal 3)</td>
<td>9a. Average scores from the reading section of the CAAP standardized assessment will increase by 25% over the baseline average levels achieved in the spring of 2009 and 2010 CAAP administration.</td>
<td>9a. Assessed by the QEP co-chairs with the assistance of the Office of Planning and Research in June 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9b. 75% of students who sit for the CAAP examination will demonstrate student performance gains in reading as demonstrated by comparing entry level ACT reading sub scores and the CAAP reading test module as determined by the CAAP linkage report.</td>
<td>9b. CAAP linkage reports attained for spring 2009 and spring 2010 baseline samples. To be assessed by the QEP co-chairs with the assistance of the Office of Planning and Research in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9c. Average Reading for Information scores from the ACT Work-Keys examination will increase by one level over the baseline average level achieved in the spring 2009 and spring 2010 administrations.</td>
<td>9c. To be assessed in spring 2011 by the QEP co-chairs with the assistance of the Office of Planning and Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9d. The average level score of the Reading for Information section from career-technical students sitting for the Work-Keys examination will meet the reading requirement for 95% of the jobs profiled by ACT.</td>
<td>9d. To be assessed in spring 2011 by the QEP co-chairs with the assistance of the Office of Planning and Research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students will utilize component parts (such as title, preface, conclusion, index, etc.) in comprehending the purpose and meaning of course-required texts. (Goal 3) Integration by division according to following timeline: 2009-Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences 2010- Health Sciences</td>
<td>10a. 95% of students will achieve an average rating of 2 on a 3 point rubric evaluating purpose and meaning of course-required texts in assigned reading journals.</td>
<td>10a. Assessed by faculty members as critical reading integration occurs by division. English Composition I (ENG 1113) will begin fall 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Goal 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Students will summarize logically the flow of informative or persuasive reading material. (Goal 3) Integration by division according to following timeline: 2009-Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences 2010- Health Sciences 2011-Engineering Technology &amp; Occupational Education 2012-Mathematics/Science 2013- Fine Arts; Business and Business Tech. 95% of students will achieve an average rating of 2 on a 3 point rubric evaluating flow of information or persuasive reading materials in assigned reading journals. Assessed by faculty members as critical reading integration occurs by division. English Composition I (ENG 1113) will begin fall 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010- Health Sciences</td>
<td>Students will infer suggested meaning through stylistic cues (syntax, diction, etc.). (Goal 3) Integration by division according to following timeline: 2009-Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences 2010- Health Sciences 2011-Engineering Technology &amp; Occupational Education 2012-Mathematics/Science 2013- Fine Arts; Business and Business Tech. 95% of students will achieve an average rating of 2 on a 3 point rubric evaluating stylistic cues in assigned reading journals. Assessed by faculty members as critical reading integration occurs by division. English Composition I (ENG 1113) will begin fall 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-Engineering Technology &amp; Occupational Education</td>
<td>Students will evaluate the potential usefulness (relevance, credibility, etc.) of reading material obtained through research. (Goal 3) Integration by division according to following timeline: 2009-Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences 2010- Health Sciences 2011-Engineering Technology &amp; Occupational Education 2012-Mathematics/Science 2013- Fine Arts; Business and Business Tech. 95% of students will achieve an average rating of 2 on a 3 point rubric evaluating potential usefulness of reading material obtained through research in assigned reading journals. Assessed by faculty members as critical reading integration occurs by division. English Composition I (ENG 1113) will begin fall 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2012-Mathematics/Science  
2013- Fine Arts; Business and Business Tech | 14. Student success and retention rates will increase following integration of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline. (Goal 3) | 14. Success and retention rates studies will be conducted on English Composition I (ENG 1113) in January 2010 by the Office of Planning and Research. | 14. Success and retention rates will increase by 3% in selected courses in each division following the integration of at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline. | 14. Success and retention rates will increase by 3% in selected courses in each division following the integration of at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline. | 14. Success and retention rates will increase by 3% in selected courses in each division following the integration of at least one element of critical reading instruction appropriate to the discipline. |
| 15. Students will value the role of literacy in promoting personal and social growth. (Goal 4) | 15a. 75% of students completing the Survey of Student Opinions will Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement “I believe literacy is important to my personal and social growth.” | 15a. To be reported by the Office of Planning and Research in June 2010. | 15b. 50% of the students completing the Community College Survey of Student Engagement will Disagree with the statement they had not planned nor had plans to participate in any “organized learning communities.” | 15b. To be reported by the Office of Planning and Research in July 2012. | 15c. 50% of the students completing the Community College Survey of Student Engagement will Disagree with the statement that they had not gained nor had plans to gain any “field experience.” | 15c. To be reported by the Office of Planning and Research in July 2012. |
| 16. Students will regard independent reading as an important element of their college education. (Goal 4) | 16a. 75% of students completing the Survey of Student Opinions will Agree or Strongly Agree with the statement “I believe independent reading was an important element of my college education.” | 16a. To be reported by the Office of Planning and Research in June 2010. | 16b. 75% of students completing the Community College Survey of Student Engagement will report they have read greater than four books on their own during their current school year. | 16b. To be reported by the Office of Planning and Research in July 2012. | 16c. 70% of students will report reading one to three books during the semester for leisure on the Library Student Survey administered during English Composition I during the fall semester. | 16c. To be reported by the Office of Planning and Research in July 2010. |
Reading Enhancement I Student Survey
(Embedded on Post-test)

Please rate the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This course has helped me identify the main idea in reading selections.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This course has helped me identify contextual clues in reading selections.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This course has helped me interpret different components given in dictionary entries.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Rubric for Reading Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows evidence of thorough reading, based on multiple specific references to assigned passages</td>
<td>Shows evidence of strong comprehension, based on accurate identification of main and secondary ideas</td>
<td>Shows evidence of thorough understanding of the parts of texts</td>
<td>Contains a reasonable number of statements or questions revealing logical attempts to interpret stylistic cues</td>
<td>Consistently identifies a reasonable number of unfamiliar words and supplies correct meaning through inference or dictionary consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows evidence of some reading, based on occasional general references to assigned passages</td>
<td>Shows evidence of moderate comprehension, based on occasional accurate identification of ideas</td>
<td>Shows evidence of basic understanding of some parts of the text</td>
<td>Contains a fair number of statements or questions revealing logical attempts to interpret stylistic cues</td>
<td>Identifies a fair number of unfamiliar words and supplies occasional correct meaning through inference or dictionary consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows little or no evidence of thorough reading</td>
<td>Shows little or no evidence of comprehension of ideas</td>
<td>Shows little or no evidence of understanding the parts of the texts</td>
<td>Contains few or no statements or questions of an interpretative nature regarding stylistic cues</td>
<td>Identifies no unfamiliar words and/or no correct meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points:**

**Comments:**
Budget Details

**Implementation Year 2008-2009**

Salary and Fringe Benefits:
- Co-chairs
  - D.Kehoe (.5) and R. Murry $65,007
  - Fringe Benefits 16,276
  - Subtotal Fringe Benefits 81,283

Contractual (Advertising, Consultant, Postage, etc.) 1,675
Commodities (Supplies, Equipment, etc.) 81
Travel 0
Subtotal 1,756

**Total Expenditures** $83,039

**Year One 2009-2010**

Salary and Fringe Benefits:
- Co-chairs
  - D.Kehoe (.5) and R. Murry $63,407
- Reading Instructors
  - D.Brown (49595) 49,595
  - New instructor (3 overloads per semester) 10,800
  - Additional (3 overloads per year) 123,802
- Fringe Benefits (19.65%) 24,327
- Health and Life Insurance (state) 12,995
Subtotal Fringe Benefits 37,322

**Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits** 161,124

Postage and Freight 100
Printing Commercial 714
Consultant and Professional Fees 4,000
Advertising and Publicity 9,000
Classroom Supplies 500
Office Supplies 1,000
Other Materials and Supplies (Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test 600 @ 1.85/each) 1,610
Printing Institutional 1,000
Meal Expense 500
Data Processing Equipment 21,000
Travel
  - Out-of-State 2,900
Total Non-Personnel Items 42,324

**Total Budget** $203,448
Year Two 2010-2011

Salary and Fringe Benefits:
- Co-chairs
  D.Kehoe (.5) and R. Murry $63,707
- Reading Instructors
  D.Brown (49595) $49,895
  New instructor (3 overloads per semester) $10,800
  Additional (3 overloads per year) $5,400
  Subtotal $124,402
- Fringe Benefits (19.65%) $24,445
  Health and Life Insurance (state) $12,995
  Subtotal Fringe Benefits $37,440

Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits $161,842

Postage and Freight $100
Printing Commercial $500
Consultant and Professional Fees $4,000
Advertising and Publicity $3,000
Classroom Supplies $500
Office Supplies $700
Other Materials and Supplies (Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test 600 @ 1.85/each) $1,724
Printing Institutional $800
Meal Expense $500
Data Processing Equipment $4,000
Travel
  Out-of-State $2,900

Total Non-Personnel Items $18,724

Total Budget $180,566

Year Three 2011-2012

Salary and Fringe Benefits:
- Co-chairs
  D.Kehoe (.5) and R. Murry $64,000
- Reading Instructors
  D.Brown (49595) $50,000
  New instructor (3 overloads per semester) $10,800
  Additional (3 overloads per year) $5,400
  Subtotal $130,200
- Fringe Benefits (19.65%) $25,584
  Health and Life Insurance (state) $12,995
  Subtotal Fringe Benefits $38,579

Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits $168,779
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Freight</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Commercial</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant and Professional Fees</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Publicity</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials and Supplies (Accuplacer/Reading)</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension Test 600 @ 1.85/each, CCSSE @ $5,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Institutional</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Expense</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Equipment</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Personnel Items</td>
<td>23,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$192,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year Four 2012-2013**

Salary and Fringe Benefits:
- Co-chairs
  - D.Kehoe (.5) and R. Murry $64,000
- Reading Instructors
  - D.Brown (49595) 50,000
  - New instructor (3 overloads per semester) 10,800
  - Additional (3 overloads per year) 5,400
  - Subtotal 130,200
- Fringe Benefits (19.65%)
  - Health and Life Insurance (state) 12,995
  - Subtotal Fringe Benefits 38,579

Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits 168,779

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Freight</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Commercial</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant and Professional Fees</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Publicity</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials and Supplies (Accuplacer/Reading)</td>
<td>7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension Test 600 @ 1.85/each, CCSSE @ $5,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Institutional</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Expense</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Equipment</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Personnel Items</td>
<td>23,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Budget  $ 192,129

**Year Five 2013-2014**

Salary and Fringe Benefits:
- Co-chairs
  - D.Kehoe (.5) and R. Murry $ 64,000
- Reading Instructors
  - D.Brown (49595) 50,000
  - New instructor (3 overloads per semester) 10,800
  - Additional (3 overloads per year) 5,400
  - Subtotal 130,200

  Fringe Benefits (19.65%)
  - Health and Life Insurance (state) 12,995
  - Subtotal Fringe Benefits 38,579

Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits 168,779

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Freight</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Commercial</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant and Professional Fees</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Publicity</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Accuplacer/Reading Comprehension Test 600 @ 1.85/each, CCSSE @ $5,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Institutional</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Expense</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Equipment</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Personnel Items</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Budget $ 191,779