Chapter One

High-Impact Pedagogies

Supporting a high-quality undergraduate learning experience has long been a goal of colleges and universities. However, there has not always been agreement on the definition of *quality* in those discussions. Chickering and Gamson (1987) were among the first to help operationalize this concept with their Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education, guidelines for teaching, learning, and classroom practices:

- Encouraging contact between students and faculty
- Developing reciprocity and collaboration between students
- Promoting active learning within and outside the classroom
- Maintaining a timely feedback loop for evaluation processes
- Emphasizing time on task
- Communicating high expectations
- Respecting diverse talents and learning styles

These principles provided a framework for an effective teaching and learning experience and became the foundation for engaging pedagogies such as group learning strategies, integrated courses, team projects, peer review, team teaching, and the use of multiple instruction models in class (Erickson, Peters, & Strommer, 2006). They also paved the way for the use of new instructional tools, including portfolios, electronic communication, and online learning modules.

Swing (2002) added to this list of important teaching practices in his research on first-year seminars. Calling them ''engaging pedagogies,'' he empirically validated Chickering and Gamson's

principles by identifying five teaching strategies that were highly correlated with students' satisfaction and achievement of learning outcomes in first-year seminars:

- Use of a variety of teaching methods
- Challenging assignments
- Productive use of class time
- Encouragement for students to speak in class and collaborate
- Meaningful discussion and homework

More recent research by Goodman, Baxter Magolda, Seifert, and King (2011) continued to advance this notion of high-impact teaching strategies. From their work, they conclude that ''fostering student learning calls on faculty and student affairs educators to focus on the design of courses, programs, and services in ways that maximize challenge and high expectations, diversity experiences, and good teaching/high-quality interactions with educators'' (p. 9). These researchers also provide specific examples of each of the areas that they identify as critical to student learning. For instance, they note that academic challenge and high expectations include rigorous in-class activities, assignments, and exams that require higher-order thinking, and helping students integrate knowledge across multiple sources. They identify diversity experiences as both informal interactions such as meaningful conversations with diverse individuals and formal incorporation of content in class lectures or attendance at events about cultural diversity. Good teaching and high-quality student interactions with educators may consist of faculty interaction outside the classroom, organized syllabi and class sessions, clear expectations for student learning and performance, prompt feedback, and the perception that faculty are genuinely interested in students and student learning.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007, 2011) has identified ten curricular and cocurricular structures that tend to draw on high-quality pedagogies and practices in pursuit of twenty-first century learning outcomes (Kuh, 2008). Defined as ''teaching and learning practices that have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial for college students [toward] increase[d] rates of retention and student engagement''

(Kuh, 2003, p. 9), research continues to show positive results associated with these educational experiences, programs, and approaches (Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Koch, Foote, Hinkle, Keup, & Pistilli, 2007; Troxel & Cutright, 2008):

- First-year seminars and experiences
- Common intellectual experiences
- Learning communities
- Writing-intensive courses
- Undergraduate research
- Collaborative assignments and projects
- Diversity and global learning
- Service-learning and community-based learning
- Internships
- Capstone courses and projects

The common characteristics of these high-impact practices overlap significantly with the models put forth by Chickering and Gamson (1987), Swing (2002), and Goodman et al. (2011) and include an investment of time and energy, interaction with faculty and peers, diversity experiences, frequent feedback, reflection, integrative learning, and high expectations (Kuh, 2008). When they are implemented effectively and organized in a timely and integrated fashion, students' experience with two or more of these high-impact practices becomes the benchmark for a quality undergraduate experience (Kuh, 2008). Seven of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) high-impact practices are tightly connected to the instructional experience and classroom setting—first-year seminars, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects, service-learning and community-based learning, and diversity and global learning experiences—and thus may be construed as high-impact pedagogies (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007, 2011; Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Kuh, 2008).

Institutional strategies with respect to high-impact practices vary. For example, a campus may choose to focus its energies around one high-impact practice or pedagogy that serves as the anchor for their student experience, as is the case at Kapiolani Community College (KCC), a two-year institution in the University of Hawaii system

that serves approximately ninety-three hundred undergraduates. KCC specifically identifies service-learning in the institutional mission statement and uses opportunities to pursue service-learning and community engagement as pathways through the university curriculum, the foundation of campus-community partnerships, and the framework for other integrated and applied learning strategies in the classroom and to facilitate faculty-student interaction. Similarly, the University of Maine, Farmington, a public liberal arts institution with approximately two thousand students, has a dedication to experiential education that features internships and service-learning initiatives prominently and is the foundation of the undergraduate experience for 70 percent of its students.

Conversely, a campus may connect many of these high-impact practices and pedagogies into a constellation of student success initiatives, as is typically the case for the host of institutions featured in the Documenting Effective Educational Practices study conducted by the Center for Postsecondary Research (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 2005) and that elect to participate each year in the Foundations of Excellence process sponsored by the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education (Barefoot et al., 2005).

Only one of these high-impact practices and pedagogies is, by definition, tied to the first year. However, since experiences in the first year often set the tone for students' entire undergraduate experience, it is important that colleges and universities expose new students to these practices and set high expectations for their learning experiences at the institution. Consequently, several of these high-impact practices are common components of an integrated, comprehensive, and intentional combination of academic and cocurricular initiatives that comprise a first-year-experience program and forge a successful pathway through the undergraduate years (Koch & Gardner, 2006; Barefoot et al., 2005). National research shows that institutions are using at least one, and often many, of these seven structures for high-impact pedagogies among first-year students, and a growing literature base provides evidence of their positive impact (Barefoot, Griffin, & Koch, 2012; Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Koch, Foote, Hinkle, Keup, & Pistilli, 2007; Leskes & Miller, 2006; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2007; Padgett & Keup, 2011; Pascarella &

Terenzini, 2005; Troxel & Cutright, 2008). Several of these practices and pedagogies represent the topic of chapters in this book.

Approaching the Work/Critical Partners

Throughout this book, we discuss the notion of response to student needs and consideration of institutional mission and culture as starting points for nearly all first-year student support initiatives. Not surprisingly, student needs are central to the development and implementation of high-impact pedagogies. In fact, they are paramount to creating a student-centered model of teaching and learning in which high-impact pedagogies can be effectively organized and supported.

Student-centered learning is consistent with the overall shift in higher education from an emphasis on teaching content, which places the professor at the center of the learning experience, to a focus on student learning, which elevates the student to a position of responsibility and prominence in the educational process (Barr & Tagg, 1995). As such, student-centered learning ''is an approach to focusing on the needs of the student rather than needs of others involved in the process, such as teachers and administrators . . . [and] places their needs and learning outcomes at the forefront of the resources offered and the course material presented'' (Keup & Petschauer, 2011, p. 16). While it may appear simple, the culture of higher education has not always fostered an environment where the student is at the center of the learning experience. Even at smaller institutions or at campuses committed to teaching over research as the focus of the faculty, the classroom often still emphasizes the sage-on-the-stage model. The consideration and adoption of high-impact pedagogies are often catalysts for a change in institutional culture rather than a reflection of the status quo.

Whenever one is adopting student support strategies that represent a potential departure from current culture and practice, as may be the case with high-impact pedagogies, it is important to fully assess both the barriers and points of momentum for the change. The most cited argument against effective implementation of high-impact pedagogies relates to physical and environmental structures such as an institutional focus

on graduate education and research at large research-focused institutions, a preponderance of large classes for undergraduates in general and especially for first-year students, an overreliance on lecturing as the delivery method for introductory and gateway course material, decentralized administration and programming, and institutional or disciplinary rewards structures for faculty that deemphasize teaching (Pascarella, Cruce, Wolniak, & Blaich, 2004). Since professors are often primary agents in the development and delivery of high-impact pedagogies, issues such as unionized faculty and a high number of part-time instructors will also have relevance to the consideration and implementation of these practices. Despite these challenges, and even because of them, it is prudent to engage leadership from the faculty senate, centers for teaching excellence, campuswide committees on teaching and learning, and faculty and staff from academic departments as partners in the effort to create a student-centered learning environment and promote the use of high-impact pedagogies. It is imperative to the institutionalization and sustainability of the effort to forge early collaborations with faculty and staff from areas of the campus that have been historically resistant to the effort, have a high attrition and failure rate among first-year students, and house common gateway courses for lower-division students.

Although the challenges to effectively implementing high-impact pedagogies are significant, they are not insurmountable and may be effectively addressed with the assistance of various resources on campus and trends in higher education. First, over the past few decades, first-year seminars, learning communities, and service-learning have gained a foothold in American higher education and a significant presence on many colleges and universities across the country. These programs are themselves high-impact practices and a hotbed of activity with respect to engaging pedagogies and faculty development strategies. Thus, there are likely initiatives already in place on campuses that are engaging high-impact pedagogies and providing training on these strategies. The directors of these programs are critical partners in the wide-scale consideration and adoption of high-impact pedagogies and can offer leadership in the administration, application, and assessment of these pedagogical principles.

Second, advancements in technology and the dawn of peer education provide low-cost tools to help create new learning environments that may be more appropriate to certain students' learning needs as well as to mediate the negative impact of large classes on pedagogy. Since the basic tenets of high-impact pedagogies are highly transferable (Brownell & Swaner, 2010), it is possible to creatively construct online learning modules and peer-led instruction models that incorporate and complement high-impact pedagogies. As such, university technology offices and peer-led student support services such as supplemental instruction, tutoring, and peer advising are likely to provide valuable partnerships for high-impact pedagogies.

Third, many accreditation processes have turned their focus to student learning, development, and success, particularly in the first year of college. Given the connection of high-impact pedagogies to student gains in these areas, there may already be a built-in need that has been established on the institutional level. Colleagues from the offices of institutional research, student assessment, and program review, as well as members of accreditation committees, may be able to help highlight the value of high-impact practices to the campus community.

Finally, there continues to be significant investment—institutional, regional, and national—in professional development options in the area of high-impact pedagogies. Leadership from campus-based centers for teaching excellence and for teaching and learning, institutional colleagues who oversee new faculty orientation and faculty development efforts, and interinstitutional partners forged by connections at national conferences are other key collaborators in any effort to incorporate high-impact practices. Numerous professional networks provide resources, research, training, and support in these various high-impact pedagogies, including the National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, the Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, and Campus Compact, as well as the work of AAC&U, which draws these bodies of work together. Several professional associations within the disciplines also provide resources and recognition for teaching and learning and the high-impact pedagogies associated with those efforts.

Organization/Implementation Process

High-impact pedagogies span different academic areas of the campus, often engage student support units, and may leverage student affairs partnerships, which also imbues them with incredible potential to cross historic boundaries in higher education and break down organizational silos. Therefore, it is important to gain high-level support for these initiatives early in the process. Whether it is selected as the focus of an accreditation process, is a grassroots effort by the faculty and staff, or represents a campuswide initiative to improve student learning, performance, and retention, the effort toward implementing high-impact practices is most effective and has the greatest impact with support from the institution's senior leadership: the president, chancellor, provost, vice president of academic affairs, or assistant or associate provosts. Buy-in generated at the level of deans will create even more of an impetus toward change. As such, a first step is to engage support, in the form of buy-in and financial resources from institutional leadership.

A valuable resource toward generating and maintaining such support is to conduct an institutional audit of current high-impact practices and pedagogies. As we already noted, there are often pockets of student-centered teaching and high-impact pedagogies on campus that can provide momentum and leadership toward more widespread adoption. Common areas for these activities are first-year-experience programs, university colleges, centers for teaching excellence, and academic departments. The high-impact pedagogies used in these programs can then be examined for scalability across new areas on campus or serve as a template for other efforts.

The creation of a task force or steering committee is advisable to oversee the implementation of high-impact pedagogies. The critical partners mentioned in the previous section and the faculty and staff overseeing areas that currently use high-impact pedagogies are a logical fit for membership in this group. Although these early adopters and supporters are natural leaders of the effort, it is also advisable to include partners from areas of campus that have faced structural or cultural barriers to the incorporation of high-impact pedagogies. By including some objectors in the effort, it is possible to gather information about challenges,

address concerns, and begin to create new advocates for the effort. Furthermore, while pedagogy may feel as if it is solely an academic domain, the cocurriculum is a significant learning space as well. Therefore, student affairs colleagues represent a pool of knowledgeable partners who often oversee support programs and structures that are instrumental to the success of high-impact pedagogies and should be represented on any committee related to their implementation and organization. This committee may choose to work as a whole or divide the expertise of the group into subcommittees related to different high-impact pedagogies or different aspects of implementation (e.g., administration and logistics, campus communication, assessment). Regardless of the approach that is selected, the committee should commit to regular meetings and electronic communication between meetings to facilitate momentum around the effort toward widespread adoption of high-impact pedagogies.

Once members of the committee have been selected and a communication and meeting strategy identified, the first task of the group should be to determine the desired outcomes of the effort to advance high-impact pedagogies. As part of this effort, it is essential to develop common definitions for the high-impact practices themselves and student-level and program-level performance metrics. As referenced in the summary of literature and program descriptions contained in this chapter, there are many high-impact practices and pedagogies and each of them represent a highly-flexible structure. So it is important to operationalize what is meant by the umbrella term, what will count as a high-impact experience, and how the effectiveness of these strategies will be gauged. Once these definitional issues have been clarified, the committee can turn its attention to the identification of a reasonable time line, leaders and support personnel, appropriate resources, and assessment strategies for implementation and scalability of high-impact pedagogies for first-year students.

Leadership Roles/Communication

Leadership for the implementation of high-impact practices is likely to be a shared endeavor, and much of it will come from the collective energy of the members of the task force or steering

committee. However, as with many other student success efforts, collective ownership and shared leadership is not always an efficient and sustainable model. Therefore, institutions should identify an individual to lead the development, implementation, and oversight of high-impact pedagogies.

Candidates for this leadership role include faculty members or academic staff with proven experience with high-impact practices and pedagogies. This person may be a vice provost or vice president overseeing undergraduate education initiatives that typically include high-impact practices and pedagogies, or an assistant or associate vice president or director-level position reporting to one of these senior roles. If the effort is connected to an accreditation process, the leader may be drawn from the institutional accreditation committee. Similarly, if the implementation of high-impact practices is coupled with an emphasis on the first-year experience, the director or dean of the first-year experience or seminar may be tapped for leadership with respect to high-impact pedagogies. Finally, high-level administrators in a university college may be nominated for this leadership position. Regardless of the professional role of the leader who will oversee the effort around high-impact pedagogies, she or he should remain connected to the core academic activities of the institution in physical proximity and with respect to reporting lines so that his or her efforts are not easily marginalized.

Once identified, this leader will need to be an active representative of the effort. He or she will likely serve as the head of the task force or steering committee on high-impact pedagogies and practices, the primary vehicle for cross-campus collaboration and communication. This leader also must create other channels of communication with various stakeholders, such as faculty, academic support staff, student affairs colleagues, alumni, parents, common employers of graduates, and community partners. Regular written reports to campus constituents, websites, and electronic communication channels can highlight achievements, current trends and issues, training resources, and assessment results as they relate to high-impact pedagogies. In addition, in a campuswide effort such as the adoption and support of high-impact pedagogies, communication must flow both ways. The leader of the effort and the task force or steering committee should

create opportunities for critical partners, members of the campus community, students, and external entities such as employers, alumni, or community partners to provide feedback on both process and outcomes with respect to high-impact pedagogies.

Resource Needs/Personnel

Since high-impact pedagogies are generally a decentralized, campuswide effort, costs for core staff, office space, and operational expenses are not likely to be as significant as for other first-year student success initiatives. However, these budget items may come into play if the efforts to advance high-impact pedagogies include the development of an institutional teaching support center or the creation of a centralized faculty development program or if structures that currently exist in these areas need supplemental funding. As with other initiatives, these types of expenses can be managed with an initial infusion of funds from an internal budgetary reallocation or an external grant. However, the leader of the effort needs to work with campus administration and staff to plan for a transition to sustainable long-term funding and a recurring budgetary source.

A primary area of budgetary investment with respect to high-impact pedagogies is in the area of professional development, training, and faculty support. While faculty are experts in their respective fields and highly trained in their content area and research practices, their academic and professional backgrounds do not often include instruction in pedagogy and classroom practices. Even if an institution maintains a campus center related to teaching support, extra funds will probably need to be dispersed to the respective departments for professional development in these practices. Funds may be used to organize specialized training at the department level, send faculty to regional and national conferences on the topic of high-impact practices and engaging pedagogies, or create a library of print and electronic resources related to this topic. Given the diversity of opportunities to address the need for professional development on high-impact practices and engaging pedagogies, funding must be budgeted appropriately on the department level to cover conference registration fees and travel expenses; purchase of books, online modules, and

other instructional materials; and compensation for consultants and speakers to come to campus.

The investment in professional development with respect to high-impact practices will be successful only if it is paired with incentives and rewards structures that allow, and even encourage, faculty and instructional staff to take advantage of these opportunities. Thus, funds should be directed toward the development of internal grants for professional and course development, opportunities for sabbaticals to advance teaching as well as research goals, and course buyouts to create time and space for faculty to reconsider their courses and the pedagogies they have been using. Whenever possible, these opportunities should be structured in a way that is consistent with the tenure and promotion standards and rewards structures that are meaningful in a faculty career, including acquisition and award of grants, a focus on scholarship, and involvement in the larger disciplinary community. Furthermore, investing in the development of institutional rewards and recognition programs focused on excellent use of high-impact practices and highlighting notable teaching is recommended. There are national awards for teaching excellence in the first year that often include the use of high-impact pedagogies as a criterion for which institutions should consider nominating faculty. These awards include the Outstanding First-Year Student Advocate Award and Excellence in Teaching First-Year Seminars Award that are sponsored by the National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition and awarded annually. Although it requires the investment of human and fiscal resources, institutions should organize efforts to nominate campus colleagues for these awards or even use them as a template for the development of campus, systemwide, or regional awards that recognize similar areas of excellence in use of engaging pedagogies, effective use of high-impact practices, and support of first-year student success.

Another area of resource need for high-impact pedagogies is related to the provision of faculty mentorship, especially for new professors. Identifying experienced faculty members who effectively integrate these pedagogies in their courses and then pairing them with more junior faculty will help model these desired practices, communicate a strong institutional investment

in these strategies, and forge faculty connections and collegiality that will add momentum toward the integration of high-impact practices and pedagogies. Often these efforts are most effective when they mirror the very practices that they are promoting in the classroom among students. For example, the creation and facilitation of faculty learning communities focused on the topic of learning strategies and student-centered classrooms will help professors at all levels with their continued development in this area and do so using the structure of a high-impact practice. Similarly, it may be possible to identify a common reading on these topics that new professors are asked to read, reflect on, and discuss. Although these efforts require an outlay of valuable human resources, opportunities for collaboration and learning among faculty will pay dividends in the creation of a student-centered culture, the successful adoption of high-impact pedagogies, and the quality of the learning experience for students.

Assessment

Assessment activities are one of the primary ways for individuals to provide input and improve any process, including the adoption and oversight of high-impact pedagogies for undergraduate education and first-year-student success. One of the challenges of assessing high-impact practices and pedagogies is the general overreliance on easily acquired but limited outcomes such as retention, grade point average, and satisfaction (Padgett & Keup, 2011). High-impact pedagogies are intended to promote a host of learning experiences, skill acquisition, career training, and preparation for responsibly citizenry. Therefore, it is essential to use assessment measures that truly capture student learning outcomes and not just retention, grades, and satisfaction measures.

Schuh, Upcraft, and Associates (2001) identify six learning outcomes that are common measures of student learning: complex cognitive skills, knowledge acquisition, intrapersonal development, interpersonal development, practical competence, and civic responsibility. These same items are mirrored in the general guidelines for the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (2009) and are noted in the Association of American Colleges and Universities' 21st Century

Learning Outcomes (2007, 2011), which also include intercultural knowledge and competence, information literacy, written and oral communication skills, and ethical reasoning.

Once the appropriate outcomes are identified for high-impact pedagogies, it is important to consider how to measure the achievement of these metrics. The Association of American Colleges and Universities created a set of rubrics for assessing achievement of skills related to its twenty-first-century learning outcomes (Rhodes, 2010). These rubrics provide benchmark measures, interim milestones, and capstone levels for fifteen learning outcomes of undergraduate education, such as quantitative literacy, creative thinking, teamwork, problem solving, civic engagement, and integrative learning.

Similar rubrics of assessment are offered for information literacy through the American Library Association and on excellence in the first year and for transfer students in the Foundations of Excellence self-study process by the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. Finally, certain theoretical frameworks in the higher education and student affairs literature offer guidelines for the development of rubrics for student outcomes. In particular, stage theories of psychosocial and cognitive-structural development of students provide useful definitions and descriptions of incremental change and progress toward student learning, adjustment, and success (Skipper, 2005). These all represent valuable tools, but these guidelines and rubrics should not be adopted wholesale. Instead, they should serve as a template and be adapted to the institutional context, student characteristics, and elements of the high-impact pedagogy.

Other methods of data collection are also useful to the assessment of high-impact practices. Course and teaching evaluations, which are widely administered but vastly underused as a source of assessment data, can provide a valuable means to gather information about students' experiences with high-impact pedagogies. Inclusion of supplemental items can provide constructive feedback to instructors about how their student-centered teaching efforts were received, generate ideas for improvement, and even collect self-ratings of learning and development among students. E-portfolios are another way to gather data on students' growth and development as the result of high-impact pedagogies.

These collections of student work are not only valuable to the faculty and the institution with respect to the outcome of efforts related to high-impact practices but can communicate to potential employers the level of achievement based on students' learning experiences.

In addition, several national assessment instruments have adopted items that measure students' experiences with high-impact practices and pedagogies, as well as measures of outcomes associated with these experiences. Examples of such instruments include the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, the suite of surveys from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (i.e., the Freshman Survey, Your First College Year Survey, and College Senior Survey), and assessments of individual high-impact practices, such as first-year seminars, from Educational Benchmarking Inc. (EBI). These national tools provide an efficient and effective method to capture institutional data and compare them to institutional peer groups and national trends on high-impact pedagogies and related student outcomes. However, the desired outcomes of high-impact pedagogies are complex and will likely require qualitative methods of assessment (e.g., open-ended responses, student reflections and journals, focus groups, individual interviews) as a complement to quantitative assessment tools.

Benefit Analysis

The effective implementation of high-impact pedagogies often represents a significant cultural shift for a campus, which can be challenging and requires time as well as human and fiscal resources. However, institutional assessments and higher education research show that high-impact pedagogies yield substantial gains when they are implemented individually and even greater positive results when they are offered early in the undergraduate experience and administered as an integrated web of support structures for first-year students. Students who experienced high-impact practices and pedagogies tend to record higher persistence to the second year, higher graduation rates overall, and better grades (Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Koch et al., 2007; Troxel &

Cutright, 2008). Research has also shown that student-centered practices and pedagogies foster a sense of community on campus and greater satisfaction with college (Brownell & Swaner, 2010). These practices had a substantial positive effect for historically underrepresented minorities, low-income students, and first-generation college students (Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Cruce, Wolniak, Seifert, & Pascarella, 2006; Santiago, 2008). Accordingly, high-impact pedagogies can help advance an equity agenda on campus as well as increase the performance of all students.

While retention and grades are of common interest to campus stakeholders, it is valuable to note that high-impact practices and student-centered pedagogies are meaningful predictors of other outcomes. For example, Pascarella et al. (2004) found that these practices and pedagogies in undergraduate education are linked to the increase in cognitive and personal development during college, which was validated in several other studies (Cruce et al., 2006; Kuh, 2003; Mayhew, Wolniak, & Pascarella, 2008). More specifically, Brownell and Swaner (2010) summarize the evidence found in several studies of high-impact pedagogies to show that they generally improve students' academic engagement, intellectual development, writing and reading skills, critical thinking, and integrative learning. Leskes and Miller (2006) found consistent relationships between the use of ''powerful educational practices'' and inquiry learning, global learning, and civic learning (p. 32). These practices not only foster the development of skills and learning outcomes but help students develop more positive learning orientations, lead to greater intellectual curiosity, and foster an interest in graduate degree plans (Cruce et al., 2006; Mayhew et al., 2008).

High-impact practices and pedagogies were also found to have an impact on noncognitive measures, such as greater self-efficacy and identity development. In addition, research shows that these practices and pedagogies contribute to higher levels of civic engagement and social responsibility, appreciation for diversity, and intercultural awareness (Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Mayhew et al., 2008). Finally, these studies show that students who have high-impact learning experiences tend to have meaningful and positive interactions with faculty, fellow students, and peers from diverse backgrounds.

Institutional Practices

LaGuardia Community College

LaGuardia Community College is a two-year public institution on Long Island, New York, with over eighteen thousand students who represent a wide array of constituents such as freshmen, transfers, veterans, and adult learners. It has an established history of commitment to student success and the first-year experience and was an early participant in the Foundations of Excellence self-study process sponsored by the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education and a frequent institutional contributor to publications by the National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition. As part of this commitment to first-year-student success, LaGuardia Community College offers multiple high-impact learning experiences for students that create ''opportunities that rival those at most four-year institutions'' (Barefoot et al., 2005, p. 75).

A robust learning community program provides a primary structure for high-impact pedagogies and student-centered educational practices for first-year students at LaGuardia. Several learning communities are offered, including liberal arts and sciences introductory clusters, which have been in place since 1976. These clusters adopt a traditional coenrollment learning community model with thematic connections and interdisciplinary readings and assignments. English as a Second Language learning communities provide students an opportunity to connect their English language instruction with introductory content in major courses. In yet another example, learning communities called ''first year academies'' are offered in business and technology, applied health, and liberal arts. These programs connect developmental courses, introductory courses in the respective majors, e-portfolio construction, and a connection to social and global issues. Faculty coordinators for each of these learning community programs ensure student-centered experiences that feature high-impact pedagogies and tight connection with twenty-first-century learning outcomes as defined by AAC&U.

High-impact practices and pedagogies are also supported at LaGuardia through its Cooperative Education Department, which provides experiential learning and internship opportunities for students. This department has been part of the campus learning experience for over thirty years and maintains a mission ''to engage students in a process of active learning that links work experience with opportunities for critical analysis and reflection'' (LaGuardia Community College, n.d.a). Working closely with local employers, the

department uses three-month internships to help provide learning experiences that complement education occurring in the classroom and cocurriculum. Many associate degree programs require an internship, and the connection between the academic departments and the Cooperative Education Department is strong at this institution.

In addition, high-impact pedagogies are supported in multiple opportunities for LaGuardia Community College students to study abroad, which are coordinated by the Office for International Connections. Understanding the vast potential of diverse and global learning experiences as a high-impact pedagogy, the Office for International Connections seeks to ''identify, organize, and promote activities at home or abroad that will prepare students to function in the globally interdependent world of the 21st century'' (LaGuardia Community College, n.d.b). Close connections between this office and faculty ensure ample opportunities for students to collaborate across cultures, develop intercultural awareness, appreciate diverse viewpoints, and engage in internships that provide a global focus.

Drury University

Founded in 1873, Drury University is a small (sixteen hundred undergraduates), private liberal arts college located in Springfield, Missouri. It seeks to prepare students to find personal meaning, advance career success, and foster engaged citizenry through the infusion of diversity and global learning across the undergraduate experience. More specifically, the institution's Global Perspectives 21 Curriculum is a required core component for all students, thereby advancing intercultural competency and ''resulting in a global studies minor for all students'' (Leskes & Miller, 2009, p. 52). The six-course program combines a focus on mathematics and science literacy (Scientific Perspectives) with a focus on critical writing, language skills, and the study of cultural heritages (Global Studies). The outcomes of this program of study include ''facility with a second language, communication, reasoning, and problem-solving skills related to global issues; and substantial awareness and appreciation of other cultures'' (Leskes & Miller, 2009, p. 52).

While Drury's commitment to global and diverse learning is itself a high-impact practice as defined by AAC&U, the university engages a host of other high-impact pedagogies and structures in support of global and diverse learning, many of them featured in the first year of college. For example, Drury supports a first-year seminar that lasts two terms with the same students and instructor. These seminars focus on connecting students to the

university, Springfield, and global communities; use a common interdisciplinary reader; and strive to advance students' interdisciplinary understanding, analytical skills, and oral and written communication proficiency (Schroeder & Swing, 2005). The goals, themes, and student groupings of the first-year seminar also serve as the foundation for various orientation activities such as an early summer registration day, a common reading experience, welcome week activities, and convocation. Therefore, Drury's first-year seminar affords several opportunities for common intellectual experiences and serves as ''a gateway to the Global Studies 21 curriculum'' (Schroeder & Swing, 2005, p. 149).

In their case study of this institution's first-year program, Schroeder and Swing (2005) noted, ''A critical ingredient in the success of Drury is reflective, evidence-based practice . . . [and a] well-developed and comprehensive assessment of skills and knowledge drives innovations'' in the first-year seminar, core curriculum, and orientation activities (p. 160). Value-added models of assessment (pretest and posttest) are used for writing, oral communication, and critical thinking, and various measures of multicultural competence provide a feedback loop to students to enhance their skills. In addition, historic and ongoing administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement ''clearly indicate that Drury students exhibit a considerably higher level of engagement in academic and intellectual experiences than students at peer institutions'' and gains in a host of student skill areas measured by the instrument such as ''reading and writing, . . . quality undergraduate experiences, time use, and educational and personal growth'' (Schroeder & Swing, 2005, pp. 161–162).

University of Southern California

The University of Southern California (USC) is a highly selective, four-year private institution located in Los Angeles. It maintains an institutional mission dedicated to being a ''global university'' and serves over seventeen thousand undergraduate students. Despite its size, USC offers a number of high-impact practices and student-centered learning experiences for its undergraduates, especially its population of low-income and historically underrepresented students. Examples include a rich array of diversity courses as part of general education requirements, numerous opportunities for undergraduate research, various study-abroad initiatives, and a recently implemented first-year seminar. Two of the institution's premier programs, the Joint Education Program (JEP) and a Writing in the Community course,

feature high-impact pedagogies and are especially worthy of note (Sanchez, 2011).

The JEP is one of the oldest and largest service-learning programs in the country and connects USC to the surrounding community. Over two thousand students engage in service experiences in greater Los Angeles, which includes many disadvantaged and low-socioeconomic areas. These experiences in the field are then combined with undergraduate course work to facilitate integrated and applied learning, as well as global and diversity learning principles. High levels of faculty interaction, weekly personal and intellectual reflections, mentorship from student program assistants, technology, and active learning strategies in the classroom ensure that the service and academic components are tightly coupled to create meaningful learning experiences for the students.

USC's general education requirements include a writing program, which generally consists of a first-year writing and critical reasoning course, a course related to social issues, and an advanced writing course (WRIT 340). Writing in the Community is one variation of WRIT 340 and includes a community engagement component within the course. This version of the course draws its content from the social, economic, and political landscape of the Los Angeles community and incorporates reflection into the writing process. Similar to USC's service-learning initiative, students in this course partner with community groups to place their writing in a real-world context and identify and address social issues through their instruction on composition and rhetoric. ''Although the tenets of good writing remain the central focus of the course, the semester will culminate in a media-driven, documentary-style final project, which will use writing, research, and personal experience to communicate these issues in a way meaningful to a broader public audience'' (University of Southern California, 2013, para. 2). Through this connection, students develop not only their written communication skills but also their civic engagement and diversity and global skills.