

2-27-2023

## Facing the Crises of Higher Education: Reflections on a State University's Experiment with TILT

John LeJeune  
john.lejeune@gsw.edu

Judy O. Grissett  
Georgia Southwestern State University, judy.grissett@gsw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://csuepress.columbusstate.edu/pil>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Online and Distance Education Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

LeJeune, J., & Grissett, J. O. (2023). Facing the Crises of Higher Education: Reflections on a State University's Experiment with TILT. *Perspectives In Learning*, 20 (1). Retrieved from <https://csuepress.columbusstate.edu/pil/vol20/iss1/11>

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at CSU ePress. It has been accepted for inclusion in Perspectives In Learning by an authorized editor of CSU ePress.

## **Facing the Crises of Higher Education: Reflections on a State University’s Experiment with TILT**

**John LeJeune**  
*Georgia Southwestern State  
University*

**Judy Orton Grissett**  
*Georgia Southwestern State  
University*

### **Introduction**

The articles gathered in this volume document the efforts of faculty and administrators, all of them working at small regional universities in the University System of Georgia (USG), and all but two of its co-authors working at Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW) in Americus, GA, to increase student success in their classrooms and at their university, and to support the professional development of themselves and their colleagues. Collectively, these articles also represent an attempt to grapple with a number of problems that beset the kind of university at which they teach—a smaller, regional campus that serves a predominantly local, and largely first-generation population—and the hurdles that too often confront the students they serve. Add to this hurdle the disruption of COVID-19, whose effects on public education were immediately recognizable in the classroom, and whose long-term impact has just begun to be studied, and one starts to recognize the real origins of this volume—a multipronged crisis in higher education, one with many sources, few obvious solutions, and which disproportionately impacts teaching-oriented universities. But as we hope this volume demonstrates, there is no shortage of will and effort to confront the challenge, with some progress along the way.

In what follows, we contextualize the articles gathered in this volume, highlighting the context in which they happened and what, in our opinion, are the most consistent and important patterns that connect them.

The most fundamental link is, of course, the pedagogy of Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT), which, in its most popular form, is an evidence-based and straightforward way to modify classroom assignments to enhance student performance. Whether approached in terms of institutional initiatives (Section I), or classroom implementation (Section II), administrators and faculty members throughout the USG have adopted TILT (or some variant of “transparent” pedagogy) with the hopes of increasing student success and retention. The popularity of transparent pedagogy and course design is due largely to the outreach and innovation of Dr. Mary-Ann Winkelmes (Winkelmes, Boye, & Tapp, 2019; Winkelmes, 2013a.; 2013b; Winkelmes et al., 2016). We are especially appreciative of Dr. Winkelmes’s support, both for our TILT implementation at GSW, and of this volume.

This collection also tells an institutional story. As Orton Grissett (2023) documents at length, GSW identified TILT as its “Big Idea” to implement for the 2021-2022 academic year. The “Big Idea” initiative was,

in turn, part of the USG led Momentum Approach; and thus, “Over the course of 2021-2022 (spanning two academic years),” GSW “aimed to implement transparency practices...or TILT, into the fabric of the institution,” including “offering systematic, long-term programming surrounding TILT principles for faculty *and* staff across all units of the institution” (p. 14). Among the many initiatives this entailed, one included the sponsoring of TILT-themed Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs) at GSW. The contribution by Palmer et al. (2023) delves into one concrete example of these FLCs, and discusses how they worked. Subsequent articles (with the important exception of Wengier and Dubiusson [2023], which provides a useful lens into TILT practices at another Georgia state university) document GSW faculty members’ individual attempts to implement TILT in the classroom, with varying measures of success.

Read collectively, these articles tell a larger story about GSW’s institutional experiment with TILT, and perhaps a more generalizable story about the experience of higher education today, particularly at smaller regional universities, and even more particularly in the University System of Georgia. To begin with, though, we discuss how TILT programming, at GSW and elsewhere, was not adopted in a vacuum, but as an outcome of higher-level initiatives which, in turn, were responding to a larger set of problems currently facing universities, administrators, and professors. The next section tells this story, placing GSW’s university-wide initiative in a larger USG (and national) context. After this section, we briefly discuss each of this volume’s contributions, divided between institutional and classroom studies. A final section highlights what, in our opinion, are the most important patterns running through them

(other than TILT and GSW), adding a few personal reflections.

### **The Crises of Higher Education and the USG Response**

The crisis in higher education that hovers over this volume can be separated into three distinct, but interrelated, parts. These parts are, respectively, crises of enrollment, student under-preparation, and COVID-19. The pressure from each of these three prongs inevitably bleeds over into the others, and as we discuss below, both the USG system, and particular universities within that system, have taken various initiatives to tackle each of them. As such, the work of this volume is but one chapter of a larger, systemwide story.

#### **Crisis in Enrollment**

Perhaps the most overarching crisis currently facing higher education is one of enrollment, itself a proxy for economic viability; for as an Atlanta-based reporter recently put it, “Fewer students means tighter budgets since the state system’s funding is enrollment-based” (McCray, 2022). In this volume, Cotter et al. (2023, p. 49) state the problem bluntly: “Two recent demographic trends have significant implications for higher education. First, college enrollment in the United States has decreased nearly 10% since 2010,” and “Second, the birth rate in the United States declined by 20% from 2007 to 2022...Thus, an ‘enrollment cliff’ is predicted when this cohort of children reaches college age; enrollments are predicted to drop as much as 15% starting in 2025, with regional four-year universities likely taking the hardest hit.” In addition, experts report that “higher-wage jobs have attracted would-be students to pick work over studies,” while “Uncertainty

brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic is still having an impact” (McCray, 2022).

In the state of Georgia, regional universities like GSW have already taken a hit. Over the last five years, undergraduate enrollment at Georgia’s public colleges fell by approximately three percent, and freshman enrollment overall fell by around seven percent between fall 2020 and fall 2022 (McCray, 2022). But notably, these declines were not equally distributed. As the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* reports, if “Many flagship universities and nationally renowned private colleges have been ‘doing just fine from an enrollment standpoint’ in recent years,” including “the biggest applicant pools in Emory’s history,” on the other hand “Many of the state’s smaller or regionally focused schools struggled with enrollment” (McCray, 2022). Perhaps most tellingly, in its most recent report from Fall 2022, the USG reported enrollment *growth* of 1.2% percent at “research universities,” but enrollment *declines* in all other sectors, with enrollment at “comprehensive universities” down by 3.7%, at “state universities” down by 5.7%, and at “state colleges” down by 2.4% (USG, 2022). Incidentally, the two “state universities” represented in this volume, Georgia Southwestern State University and Middle Georgia State University, saw Fall 2022 enrollment decreases of 2.6% and 2.5%, respectively (BOR, 2022, p. 1).

### **Crisis of Under-preparation**

The second crisis confronting the USG concerns the exceptional hurdles facing students who typically enroll in Georgia’s community colleges and regional four-year universities. These hurdles are not only academic, but also socioeconomic, and (especially for first-generation students)

cultural; and the problem is not unique to Georgia. A 2017 investigation by the *Hechinger Report*, covering 911 colleges in 44 states, found that “The vast majority of public two- and four-year colleges report enrolling students – more than half a million of them – who are not ready for college level work” (Butrymowicz, 2017); and a separate study found that “Only 25% to 38% of secondary education graduates in the United States are proficient readers or writers but many continue to postsecondary education” (Perin & Holschuh, 2019, p. 363). Compounding these academic hurdles are the alienation, isolation, and unfamiliarity with college procedures that first-generation students often experience (Ma & Shea, 2021; Stebleton & Soria, 2012; Unverferth et al., 2012).

As with the larger enrollment crisis, the salience of student under-preparation varies across the USG depending on university type, showing much the same pattern. The aforementioned *Hechinger* report confirms the well-known fact that “remediation rates are higher at community colleges, which are more likely to have open-door admissions policies” (Butrymowicz, 2017). And recent data showing that “28.1% of 2-year compared with 10.8% of 4-year college students enroll in developmental reading or writing courses” (Perin & Holschuh, 2019, p. 364) also highlights that “Even four-year schools, which are more likely to have some admissions criteria, were not immune” (Butrymowicz, 2017).

But amongst the latter, smaller regional universities—often located in rural and economically less-developed areas, serving perennially underserved local populations, and applying lower admissions standards than academically prestigious doctoral research universities—enroll a

disproportionately large number of first-generation, underprepared, and nontraditional students. At GSW, for example, the university reports that of those undergraduates awarded bachelor's degrees in FY21, 51% were first-generation students, 54% had received the Pell grant while enrolled at GSW, and 21% were 29 or older at the time of graduation (GSW, 2021).

Explaining the crisis of under-preparation is complicated, and, particularly as it relates to unequal access to high-quality K-12 education and other socioeconomic factors, it is largely beyond our scope. Suffice it to say that if all students deserve access to high quality education, then small regional universities, alongside local community and technical colleges, exist to provide that access, including and especially to those students previously denied it. As such, they constitute a categorical leap in rigor, and a potentially overwhelming experience for many. On this point, Yadusky (2018, p. 3) observes that, "In the two decades preceding 2004, college enrollment more than doubled and continued to increase over the next decade an additional 30 percent." Over this period, the importance of social equity and equal access to higher education was increasingly recognized and championed, and a "college for all" ethos became pervasive in American education (Nix et al., 2021). And given the barriers placed in front of these groups in American history, it is no coincidence that much of this growth was attributable to increased minority and female enrollment (Yadusky, 2018, p. 3). But expanding college access to all, including to first-generation students, non-traditional students, students with hitherto unappreciated special needs and health issues, and students burdened by poverty and socioeconomic inequalities, did not by extension improve the educational opportunities provided at the K-12 level prior

to college. And thus, "During this same period, academically underprepared learners were also enrolling in colleges at ever increasing rates" (Yadusky, 2018, p. 3); and as college education became less a privilege of the elite, or even of the "traditional" college student, this also brought increased educational challenges, especially to community colleges and smaller regional universities, where underserved students and first-generation students tended to enroll. It thus became incumbent on institutions to adapt and adjust to their students' needs. This was *before* the enrollment crisis today.

Fast-forward to today, and regional four-year universities now find themselves in a double-bind, as the problem of (a) low retention rates amongst a high percentage of underprepared students, meets (b) increasingly acute demographic problems placing downward pressures on enrollment. This combination puts extraordinary pressure on these universities to focus not only on recruitment, but (and especially) on retention of students, by offering them the resources, flexibility, and environment to promote student success—i.e., to do whatever is necessary to maintain their enrollment. As such, it also places pressure on administrators to lower admissions standards, on departments to adjust (or remove) graduation requirements, and it can tempt faculty members to lower their academic standards, whether as a function of long-term morale attrition, perennially low course enrollments, or to simply avoid having *their* major designated as "low-performing," *their* department dissolved for "strategic reasons," or *their* class targeted for mandatory "course transformation," with the perfunctory faculty committees, out-of-town conferences, and course-level assessments.

Finding resources can also be difficult, particularly for schools (like GSW) located in rural areas and serving a regional population. A recent study by Koricich et al. (2020, p. 62, 63) found that, “in general, institutions located in more populous areas have greater per-student revenues and expenditures than institutions in towns and rural areas, sometimes by a considerable amount,” and that “The disparities are similarly striking for private gifts, grants, and contracts.” They write further that while “it is not uncommon for research-focused institutions to receive higher per-student funding than teaching-focused institutions, it is still concerning that the institutions in less-populated areas are more likely to have a regional, access-oriented mission that will bring students needing greater supports in order to be successful.” The “bottom line,” they write, is “that the public expects rural RPUs [regional public universities] to achieve comparable outcomes with less money, despite serving a population that often needs additional supports.”

### **Crisis of COVID-19**

Beginning in March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic fundamentally transformed public education. Its impact on the classroom lasted for well over a year, but its impact on students and institutions has been farther reaching. As a recent report published by the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts Performance Audit Division states, “In March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic upended K-12 education in Georgia. Academic disruptions continued through the 20-21 school year, particularly for students in school systems that delayed in-person instruction. The pandemic has continued to impact the 21-22 school year, but the focus is shifting towards addressing the learning losses that occurred over the

prior 18 months” (GDAAP, 2021, p. 1). Among other things, the report highlights that, in K-12 institutions throughout Georgia, “Learning disruptions negatively impacted enrollment, student engagement, and academic achievement” (GDAAP, 2021, cover). In both English and math, passing rates declined in all grade levels, on average, by 3.7 and 3.2 percentage points, respectively; and these declines were larger in districts with higher shares of economically disadvantaged students (GDAAP, 2021, pp. 24-25). Moreover, “these course passing rates likely understate the actual learning loss because teachers and school systems implemented more lenient grading policies,” including, at one extreme, “most school systems lowered the weight of the Milestones end-of-course tests to 0.01% so poor test performance would not impact final course grades” (GDAAP, 2021, p. 25).

In the short term, this meant that for at least two years, entering college freshmen whose junior and/or senior years were disrupted by COVID-19 (to say nothing, of course, of those students already enrolled in college, whose classes were similarly disrupted by abrupt transitions to virtual learning) would enter college with even greater academic hurdles than before, especially those living in economically disadvantaged areas, and many of whom would in turn attend small regional universities like GSW (and the five campuses comprising Middle Georgia State University, also represented in this volume). Not coincidentally, USG universities throughout the state, and especially smaller regional universities, saw retention rates plummet. At GSW, full-time freshman retention at the institutional level went from 66.2% in 2019 to 53.9% in 2020, then rebounded slightly to 59.7% in 2021. Perhaps more disturbingly, retention of GSW freshman system-wide

went from 73.8% in 2019, to 62.1% in 2020, then slightly up to 65.9% in 2021. Retention of students at all USG State universities within the USG system was 78.8% in 2019, 74.3% in 2020, and 76.8% in 2021 (GSW, 2022). To compare, one-year freshman retention at the University of Georgia, a highly-ranked public research university, was 94.4%, 95.0%, and 94.3% in 2019, 2020, and 2021, respectively (UGA, 2022, App. A); while at the Georgia Institute of Technology, it was 97%, 97%, and 98% over the same years, respectively (GTech, n.d.).

### **USG Responses:**

#### **Tightening the Belt and Offering to Help**

The USG has tried several strategies to address these crises. One longer term strategy involved university consolidations; and since 2011, USG has seen no fewer than nine consolidations joining 18 institutions. On its face, the core of this initiative was to reduce expenses in light of the demographic realities just discussed—and indeed, among the six “Guiding Principles” adopted by the Board of Regents to steer this process, two (“Create significant potential for economies of scale and scope”; “Streamline administrative services while maintaining or improving service level and quality”) focused squarely on economics (USG, n.d.).

Alongside these structural changes, however, the USG has sponsored and facilitated various initiatives aimed at enhancing professional development and helping USG faculty better serve their students. Among these initiatives, and perhaps the most impactful to both faculty and students, has been the USG Chancellor’s Learning Scholars (CLS) program (Galle & Domizi, 2021, 2022). Piloted in the 2018-2019 school year, and running through the

2022 academic year—the CLS program brought together cohorts of faculty from all 26 USG institutions (ranging between one and four faculty per institution, per cohort), and trained them to lead FLCs on their home campuses on a variety of predetermined teaching topics. As described by Denise Domizi, one of the CLS coordinators, the mission of the program was threefold: “(1) to promote leadership in educational development, (2) to develop a network of strong relationships and enhance collegiality among faculty, and (3) to facilitate pedagogical conversations that lead to course enrichment” (Domizi, 2022, p. 19). FLC’s, in turn, “are designed to give small groups of faculty (typically 8 to 12) the opportunity to engage in sustained, meaningful conversations about teaching and learning with supportive colleagues from across campus. Members meet regularly throughout the length of the program as they explore areas of interest, leading to changes in their teaching practice” (Domizi, 2022, p. 19).

In the first two years of the CLS program alone, approximately 140 trained facilitators on all 26 USG campuses led FLCs involving between 1,400 to 1,500 faculty, or 14% of the total faculty at all Georgia public institutions of higher education (Galle, 2022a, p. 2). And notably, TILT was a popular choice among FLC leaders, presumably for its relative ease of understanding and application. As Jeffrey Galle, a CLS coordinator who gathered extensive data on the program, reports, while “By far, [small teaching] turned out to be chosen by the greatest number of learning scholars” (Galle, 2022a, p. 8), “In the second year of the CLS program [the first year TILT was an option], TILT became the topic that a majority of learning scholars selected for their community to explore” (Galle, 2022b, p. 86).

Having participated in the USG CLS program ourselves, it is hard to overstate the support, positivity, and practicality of this program, which not only led to manageable and incremental improvements in our classes, but helped enhance a sense of collegiality and friendliness among faculty on and across campuses. In a university context of many, and seemingly endless, initiatives that are perfunctorily implemented, or seem blithely disconnected from reality, the CLS program brought a genuine sense of enthusiasm and progress. As such, both the CLS program, and the TILT pedagogy it introduced to several GSW faculty, was a critical inspiration for GSW's 2021-2022 "Big Idea" programming, which placed philosophical-pedagogical emphasis on TILT, and whose implementation was primarily via university-sponsored FLCs.

USG support for the FLC's remained in place during the COVID crisis, and these provided additional technical and moral support to faculty members at that challenging time. We omit discussion here of the finances surrounding COVID-19. Suffice it to say that USG budget cuts of nearly 11 percent in the wake of COVID, combined with a variety of federal funding sources (like the CARES Act/HEERF Fund) to make up the difference, produced a complicated fiscal environment for Georgia's higher education institutions to navigate. Ultimately, and perhaps more importantly, it was the day-to-day work of instructors during this crisis to adapt their courses to meet student needs in a virtual environment, and to subsequently address the lagging learning losses caused by COVID when face-to-face classes resumed. Among other things, one especially helpful, and additional, initiative by the USG Office of Faculty Development at this time was to establish a free webinar series in Summer and

Fall 2020, and Summer 2021, to support faculty members in both contexts.

### **Bringing it Together**

The previous discussion provides the context—namely, of faculty members at a small regional university in Georgia, facing several crises at once, each of them overarchingly defined by enrollment, retention, and student success, aided (and mandated) by multiple initiatives from the USG to do something about it, and hopeful of making a positive impact on the lives of students—that the bulk of the work gathered in this volume was done. This discussion is not to suggest that any of this context defines the motivation of any particular administrator or instructor—and indeed, at the point of contact in the classroom, such concerns dissolve in the face of simply trying to help and communicate with students. More than likely, the story just told was the last thing on our several authors' minds. But the story is also necessary to tell, to contextualize how it is we got here, and how it is that TILT—one pedagogical approach among many—has entered so many classrooms in the USG system, in such a short amount of time. Having now said something about its origins, in the following two sections we summarize how GSW's experiment with TILT actually went, both in and out of the classroom.

### **Institutionalizing TILT at the University Level**

The current issue begins with three articles that describe the implementation of the TILT initiative at GSW, the first from the vantage point of the program coordinator (Orton Grissett, 2023), the second from a TILT steering committee member and summer faculty learning community



facilitator and her FLC participants (Palmer et al., 2023), and the third from two GSW faculty who reflect on the implementation of TILT practices in their own classrooms (Crosby & Short, 2023). Together, these three articles provide a holistic look at the TILT program impact across the institution and consider the multiple players at stake—students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

In the first article, “Institutionalizing Transparency Across an Institution,” Orton Grissett, who served as the Director of Experiential Learning at GSW during the time of the campus-wide concentrated TILT program, and who orchestrated many of the planned faculty (and staff) development sessions, describes GSW’s TILT program’s origin, its development and implementation, and faculty and facilitator perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the summer faculty development series in Summer 2021 and 2022.

In her article Orton Grissett reiterates a point articulated earlier in this article, that campus-wide TILT efforts at GSW existed already in the form of teaching circles and faculty participation in USG system-wide programs like the Chancellor’s Learning Scholars and Governor’s Teaching Fellows programs, where TILT was an important, though not necessarily central, component. Many of the GSW TILT steering committee members were introduced to TILT themselves by participating in one of these statewide programs, and they in turn brought their experience and burgeoning expertise back to GSW in the form of teaching circle programs. For example, the model of the Chancellor’s Learning Scholars program required participating faculty CLS leaders to hold meetings across the semester that focused on one of a list of topics (e.g., inclusive pedagogy, small teaching, TILT). This

expectation fit into the existing teaching circle structure, and therefore, many of the CLS leaders held their sessions through the teaching circle program. From here, faculty development efforts became more concentrated and ubiquitous when TILT was identified as GSW’s “Big Idea” for Momentum Approach in 2020, particularly in the form of the summer faculty learning communities (Summer 2021 and Summer 2022) and the TILT Brown Bag series, which included professional development opportunities for GSW faculty and staff.

Orton Grissett provides a look at the institution-wide professional development opportunities offered to faculty and staff during the Momentum phase of TILT programming at GSW, namely the TILT FLC summer series and the TILT Brown Bag series. Each served a different purpose—the FLC’s allowed faculty to make a course element more transparent, and the Brown Bags were one-hour workshops offered to faculty and staff about a TILT-related topic. Orton Grissett collected follow-up reflections and surveys of faculty who participated in the TILT FLC summer series; however, data were not collected following the Brown Bag series. The survey and reflections completed by FLC participants revealed several trends in the data. Faculty said the interdisciplinary nature of the groups and the structure and peer support the FLCs provided were two major strengths, while challenges included the restricted timeline for the summer program and issues with technology (e.g., technical issues with meeting software).

The TILT program at GSW was largely designed for faculty participation; however, Orton Grissett describes that staff were also included in some of the professional development sessions, namely one session of the TILT Brown Bag series—an informal

professional development model where attendees eat while listening to a presenter and participate in interactive activities—which was geared specifically toward staff. With this beginning, the article acknowledges that much more is still to be done to ensure staff inclusion in future professional development activities, as staff are instrumental in implementing a more fully transparent experience for our students.

In the second article, “Facilitating TILting as a Faculty Community,” Palmer et al. delve deeper into the workings of the FLC Orton Grissett describes, this time from the perspectives of the facilitator (Palmer) and participants in a Summer 2021 FLC group. Serving as a summer TILT FLC facilitator, Palmer had previously participated in the Governor’s Teaching Fellows Program and Chancellor’s Learning Scholar program, leveraging her experience from each program to build a rich experience for her faculty participants, each of whom had various levels of prior experience with TILT and the FLC model.

Throughout the article, Palmer and her colleagues expressed their own perspectives of the positives and challenges of the FLC experience. Positives included interacting with faculty colleagues from across the institution, not just from within their own department, and receiving constructive feedback from peers. Appreciation for the interdisciplinary nature of the summer FLC series was a sentiment that was strongly reflected across all summer FLCs in the post-participation survey and reflective writings (Orton Grissett, 2023). Palmer and her colleagues listed having different course elements to make transparent, as well as technology issues as two major challenges. The latter—technology issues—was also listed as a common negative experience in

faculty surveys and reflective writings at the end of the FLC series (Orton Grissett, 2023). Regarding the other challenge of having different course elements to revise, Palmer et al. suggest that FLCs focus on a specific type of course element, which is something GSW explored the following summer (2022) with the development of an FLC group focused solely on the development of more transparent multiple-choice questions, led by John LeJeune.

In the third and final article in Section I, “Positive Impacts of TILT: Two Professors’ Journeys in Creating More Student-Centered Teacher Education Courses,” Crosby and Short, who are education faculty members at GSW, describe how their implementation of TILT in the classroom has led to positive student feedback and has contributed to a more student-centered classroom. Unlike the more empirical articles explored by faculty in Section II of the current issue, Crosby and Short focus on their own positive experiences with assessing assignments and creating student-centered syllabi. “The journey of developing transparent assignments and student-centered syllabi is time-consuming, challenging, and on-going, but the benefits of a student-centered classroom are invaluable.” (Crosby & Short, 2023, p. 47). Their work demonstrates that TILT not only brings satisfaction to the student but can positively impact the teacher and bring course material into new light.

Together, the three articles in Section I demonstrate the multi-layered dimensions and level of commitment within all areas of an institution that allow TILT to take root and become part of the fabric of an institution. From the work completed at GSW, with the support and guidance at the university system-level, it is clear that all members of an institution of higher education are responsible

for taking on the challenge of implementing transparent practices for the students whom they serve. What is further illustrated in Section I is the importance of connections between people across campus. This was reflected in the positive experience with interdisciplinary teaching circles (Palmer et al., 2023), the connection with staff, who are too often excluded from student-success professional development opportunities (Orton Grissett, 2023), and the connection students have with their professors, their field of study, the courses they take, and the content they consume, create, and reflect upon (Crosby & Short, 2023).

### **TILT in the College Classroom**

The five articles gathered in “Section II: TILT in the College Classroom” relate efforts to apply transparent pedagogy in the university classroom. All but one of these articles document recent practices at GSW. The contribution by Wengier and Dubuisson (2023) comes from Middle Georgia State University in Macon, GA. Together they cover several disciplines—Psychology (Cotter et al., 2023), Biology (Jacobs, 2023), Political Science (LeJeune, 2023), English (David, 2023; Wengier & Dubuisson, 2023), and Interdisciplinary Studies (Wengier & Dubuisson, 2023); as well as a rich diversity of methods applied, including transparent course assignments, study tactics, transparent syllabi (see also Crosby and Short, 2023), transparent test questions, and broader strategic approaches (including regular feedback) consistent with a philosophy of transparency. Together, these studies demonstrate how transparency, as a general approach to teaching, translates flexibly across the university curriculum, and can be applied to many, if not all, aspects of course design.

In “The Impact of Transparent Instructions Upon Academic Confidence and Writing Performance,” Cotter et al. (2023) examine the impact of TILting nine short writing assignments in a lower-division lifespan developmental course taught at GSW. Gathering data from four class sections over two academic years, the study assesses whether students performed better on assignments, and ultimately in the course, when given TILted versus standard instructions, and whether the same intervention impacted students’ perceptions of competence and belonging, based on separate survey results.

Cotter et al.’s hypotheses are consistent with positive results documented in prior studies (Winkelmes et al., 2016; see literature review at Cotter et al., 2023, p. 49-51). But surprisingly, their data did not show a positive TILT effect. Instead, “students receiving transparent assignment instructions did not perform significantly better than students receiving standard instructions, either on the assignments assessed or on other indicators such as course grades, academic confidence, or feelings of social belonging” (p. 58). Also contrary to predictions, no meaningful patterns were found when comparing data among Nonwhite/White, Low Income/High Income, or First-generation/Non-First generation students.

In “Can TILT be used to teach study basics? A case study in a biology classroom,” Jacobs (2023) documents an attempt to use a transparently designed (or TILted) concept mapping assignment, offered to students as a useful study tactic, to increase student test scores. As Jacobs states, “The goal of this project was to determine whether using a TILted assignment to expose students to a new study tactic could improve performance in an introductory biology course” (p. 68);

and more specifically, “While the assignment given in this study followed the TILT format (Purpose, Task, and Criteria for Success), the broader goal was to begin making the process of studying itself more transparent to students by providing them with a novel and concrete study tactic to employ” (68).

However, as in Cotter et al.’s study, the data failed to show positive results. As Jacobs (2023, p. 70) reports, “Overall, the observed trend was the opposite of the predicted trend; exam scores in Fall 2021 were lower than the two preceding years,” and “The proportion of students scoring 60% or better showed a similar trend,” although neither trend was statistically significant.

In “A Multiple-Choice Study: The Impact of Transparent Question Design on Student Performance,” LeJeune (2023) examines whether altering the format of multiple-choice test questions to make them more “transparent” to students positively impacts student performance. In an introductory American Government course at GSW, students were given tests with either “TILTED” or “unTILTED” versions of the same question, where TILTING entailed either removing unnecessarily difficult vocabulary, avoiding All-of-the-Above (AOTA) and None-of-the-Above (NOTA) options, or adding additional cues to trigger marginal knowledge. In the process, LeJeune links the philosophy of transparency to previous research and existing strategies related to effective multiple-choice question design.

The results were mixed. Eliminating difficult vocabulary and eliminating AOTA/NOTA options had a meaningfully positive impact on student performance on 50% and 40% of the relevant questions, respectively; while adding cues and context

only helped on 17% of relevant questions, and on one occasion seemed to distract students from the correct answer. In sum, LeJeune concludes that “instructors writing multiple-choice tests would do well to scan their tests for potentially problematic vocabulary terms,” (p. 83), that having “AOTA-only” distractors is “a significant problem for test-takers” (p. 84), and “adding information to question stems to cue prior or marginal knowledge can be a delicate process, with potential advantages and disadvantages” (p. 84).

In “Making Composition I Visible: ‘TILT-ing’ the Course to Better Aim at Student Learning,” Dave (2023) considers the impact of TILTING assignments and adopting a broader strategy of transparency at the core of an English Composition I course at GSW. As Dave (2023, p. 93) writes, following a summer 2020 GSW TILT workshop, “I used the [TILT] framework in redesigning the course assignments, [and] I ended up using a few additional strategies that align with and flow from TILT.” These included selecting writing assignment topics (like career exploration and world problems) specifically for “connecting with [students’] concerns or desire to acquire skills” (2023, p. 95), and giving regular and detailed feedback, both to the class as a whole and individually, and via formats including PowerPoint and printed sheets. In authoritative discussions of the TILT approach, regular and often scaffolded feedback on assignments is frequently highlighted (e.g., Winkelmes, 2019).

Results were gathered via a survey instrument delivered towards the end of the semester. Consistent with Dave’s approach, “the students ranked instructor feedback and assignments as the top two [aspects of the course], respectively,” and nine of 12 respondents found the TILTed assignments

“either very or extremely valuable,” so “the TILT elements appeared to have played a role in the assignments’ success in engaging students” (p. 99). On the other hand, “At the end of the fall 2021 semester when I sat down to grade ENGL 1101 essays, I felt disappointment,” making these student survey responses “[feel] a bit unreal” (p. 102).

Our final submission comes from Middle Georgia State University, and a different kind of classroom. In “Promoting Student Success with TILT in Asynchronous Online Classes,” Wengier and Dubuisson (2023) offer a qualitative study of two, asynchronous, online courses in Methods in Interdisciplinary Studies and English Composition I, both of which included TILTED assignments (Appendices B and C) and additional elements of transparency, including emphasis on feedback and consistent communication with students through various mediums. As the authors note, transparency—with emphasis on clear communication—can be especially important in online settings. And following Garrison et al. (2000), they argue that transparent teaching methods are important because they “help establish and sustain the three forms of presence recommended in building a community of inquiry in online learning environments” (Wengier & Dubuisson, 2023, p. 107)—namely, teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence.

Drawing on survey results from both classes, including write-in responses, Wengier and Dubuisson (2023, p. xx) found that TILT assignments and transparent course were generally effective, and more specifically, that “All responses to the question regarding clarity stated that the instructions are clear,” and students consistently indicated that the “purpose” section was effective. Moreover, an

additional “Tips” section, described by one student as a “sort of checklist” (p. xx), was praised by students, and led to minimal errors overall on matters in that section.

## **Conclusions**

To conclude, we identify three additional and important themes running across these articles, and close with a few personal reflections.

### **Collaboration and Community, System and University**

Much of the work in this volume was facilitated by USG and university-sponsored initiatives to increase faculty exposure to effective teaching practices, especially through Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs). These include USG-sponsored programs like the Governor’s Teaching Fellows, the aforementioned Chancellor’s Teaching Scholars, and university-sponsored programs like GSW’s TILT-themed FLC’s, coordinated by an Experiential Learning Director and Ad Hoc TILT Steering Committee, and fully funded via Academic Affairs and other channels. Indicatively, several of our authors (at both GSW and Middle Georgia State) were Governor’s Teaching Fellows and/or Chancellor’s Learning Scholars; their experiences, in turn, were the conduits for sharing ideas like TILT with their colleagues; and most of the work included in this volume derives directly from these programs.

As faculty members who have benefited tremendously from these initiatives, we would be remiss to not thank Jeffrey Galle, Denise Domizi, Cynthia Alby, and so many others who have, through their work in these programs, helped establish a richly

networked, mutually beneficial, and extraordinarily positive USG Faculty Community across the state. The outcomes of these programs are myriad, and not limited to student success. They also include increased faculty development, more engagement and relationship-building, and an overall enhanced sense of pedagogic initiative and collegiality on campus. Looking forward, one way to sustain the momentum of these programs is through continued institutional-level support of FLC's. At GSW, for example, Orton Grissett (2023, p. 15) noted that "Prior to 2021, GSW had an established teaching circle program in place where faculty members lead colleagues from across disciplines to engage in teaching activities, including flipped classrooms, high impact practices, and TILT, for a modest stipend," and this program has played an important, and enduring, role in accustoming faculty to sharing, exploring and implementing new pedagogy with the support of colleagues.

### **Acknowledging and Contextualizing Uneven Results**

The implementation of TILTed assignments and other transparent practices produced mixed results throughout this volume. TILT is obviously no universal panacea, and it may not work for all populations, in all conditions. Both Cotter et al. (2023) and Jacobs (2023) saw no significant findings, and while Dave (2023) saw promising survey results regarding student attitudes towards his course, he saw no significant improvement in student performance. On the other hand, LeJeune (2023) saw meaningful differences in performance on two kinds of TILTed multiple-choice questions (but not a third), and Wengier and Dubuisson (2023) also reported positive findings in their survey results. What is one to make of this?

Cotter et al. (2023, p. 60) offer an especially detailed discussion of complicating factors when assessing TILT's impact. To mention but one, they cite the factor of student motivation, where "the degree of transparency in instructions may matter less to students with performance or grade-oriented goals, particularly those who simply aim to pass the class," and therefore "examining the intersection of transparency and student motivation may give insight into how students are likely to respond following transparent instruction" (p. 60). Student motivation is but one complicating factor among many, and given its theoretical richness, we encourage the reader to revisit this section.

At the same time, it is notable that Jacobs (2023), Dave (2023), and Wengier and Dubuisson (2023) each suffer the same "small-n" problem, which must factor at least somewhat in interpreting their results, and is also indicative of the challenge facing professors at smaller regional universities seeking evidence-based solutions. Professors at these schools typically do not have space or funding for labs with more controlled conditions and reliable subject participation—nor, one might add, would they have time to run such experiments while teaching a 4-4 or 5-5 load. To the contrary, classes (especially upper division ones) are often small; and even where they are large (usually lower division ones), course enrollment and attendance can be volatile and unpredictable, making it hard to establish reliable conditions for systematic, to say nothing of "controlled" or "experimental" information gathering. By the end of any term, a great many students—many of whom might offer especially important insights into what works, what doesn't, and why—have already withdrawn, or simply disappeared.

Consider in this context Dr. Jacobs's (2023) biology intervention at GSW. At GSW, introductory biology is a gateway course both for stem majors and the nursing program, and thus one of the school's most highly enrolled. The course has a high DFW rate (as high as 65% to 71% in 2017-18), also making it a "crossroad" course for students' career trajectory. Due to this, the course has seen a range of interventions aimed at increasing student success, including a new, supplemental "Recitation section"—a mandatory, "zero credit, co-requisite course"—attached to the lecture and lab components (p. 69), and counting for 10% of Jacobs's lecture grade. But as Jacobs (2023, p. 71) reports, "One problem I observed...was a lack of attendance and participation in the recitation sections where the TILT assignment was implemented," which "contributed to the small sample size from fall 2021," and "got progressively worse as the semester went on."

This issue is hardly atypical—students not only at small regional colleges like GSW, but even larger research institutions like the University of Kansas (Holstead, 2022) are skipping (or missing) classes at an alarming rate. This makes implementing effective interventions, let alone conducting serious classroom experiments, especially difficult, and is likely to compromise the effectiveness of any positive intervention like TILT. On its face, one might suggest that the impact of TILT and similar initiatives is more likely to blossom when combined with a host of other reinforcing factors, including access to writing centers and/or other outside class tutoring, as well as additional high-impact practices in the classroom. TILT is never implemented in a vacuum.

At the same time, however, experience suggests that even this may not be

sufficient. In addition to providing *access* to such services, evidence-based interventions may be necessary to ensure that students can and do effectively *utilize* these resources, including using writing centers and tutoring, taking advantage of recitation sections, and attending every class possible.

Problems surrounding attendance and resource utilization are compounded at small regional universities, where a large percentage of students are commuters and/or non-traditional students with family and work obligations. For these students, college is but one prong in a family-work-education matrix that drains their mental and physical bandwidth, and strains their ability to put their education first. The work begun by Wengier and Dubuisson (2023) is thus especially important, as both face-to-face and online students increasingly rely on asynchronous online resources to fill the gaps. On this point, universities looking forward must seriously grapple with whether or not a trend of increased flexibility in all facets of the university process—including a larger role for online and hybrid courses to accommodate student schedules—while attractive as short-term fixes to increase enrollment and retention, may also under serve students in the long run if they lose out on, or do not become accustomed to taking advantage of, essential resources best served on a brick-and-mortar plate. As the USG increases focus on "high-impact practices" and "experiential learning" in the classroom, this tension may become more acute.

### **Transparency as a Philosophy**

Perhaps the most important takeaway of this volume is the positive impact of TILT on faculty initiative and sense of purpose in the classroom, often manifested as a broader

philosophy of transparency. On campus, faculty are continually encouraged to implement innovative or “high-impact” practices in their classroom, and such talk can feel abstract, unrealistic, gimmicky, or impossible. But the classic formulation of TILT (see Winkelmes et al., 2016; Winkelmes, 2019) is straightforward—a structuring of course assignments to include “Purpose,” “Task,” and “Criteria” sections—that has proven easy to implement across disciplines. And even where immediate, measurable progress in student performance is lacking, TILting assignments may nonetheless have a range of downstream benefits for communication, relationships, and attitudes. As Cotter et al. (2023, p. 61) remind us, “evidence suggests that students often appreciate transparency,” and therefore “incorporating transparency may lead to retention by creating positive attitudes in students, such as the perception that professors are caring and oriented toward student success.”

Several of our articles highlight the overlap of TILT with other (in some cases highly) influential philosophical approaches, including the “progressive” or “student-centered” educational ideas of John Dewey (Crosby & Short, 2023; Dewey, 1938, 2011), and the “visible learning” approach of John Hattie (Dave, 2023; Hattie, 2009, 2015). Such theories, while philosophically interesting, can be hard to operationalize. But for authors like Crosby and Short (2023), Dave (2023), and Wengier and Dubuisson (2023), TILT has offered a credible and easy-to-implement means of translating these ideas into everyday practices that include, but move beyond, regular course assignments—things like course syllabi, assignment feedback, and an overall shift towards enhanced faculty-student communication.

The experience of Crosby and Short (2023) is indicative of how TILT aids these transitions: “During our initial years as classroom teachers,” they write, “building relationships with students was not a top priority...Our motives and intentions were genuine...but we lacked the confidence, time, and assurance required to move towards a deeper relationship with our students truly understanding who they were as learners” (p. 43). But “After years of teaching, we espouse progressive education over a more traditional approach,” and “We began our focus on student-centered teaching with a focus on the Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT) method” (p. 44). For Crosby and Short (2023), Dave (2023), and Wengier and Dubuisson (2023, p. 105; see Carpenter et al., 2021), transparency is a “guiding philosophy” with especially effective links between theory and practice.

Looking forward, one possible concern of the research gathered here is that the concept of TILT is being stretched to the point of being unrecognizable. Absent a clear definition—perhaps the assignment-based format of TILT—research into TILT may become muddled, and results hard to compare. This is an important problem, which we must acknowledge. In future research, the solution may lie in a clearer delineation between what, specifically, is “TILT,” and what flows more generally from a philosophy of “transparency,” concepts that we have allowed to flow together throughout. Perhaps more important, though, is for researchers to be clear and precise about their research methods and the nature of their interventions. We have tried to do that here.

Generally speaking, we believe that the expansion of TILT (or transparent) philosophy to incorporate myriad aspects of any course—assignments, syllabi, tests, and



feedback—is a healthy development; and that attuning professors to *all* the ways in which different course elements can be more transparent may be TILT’s greatest strategic accomplishment. The same reasoning applies at the university level, where, as Orton Grissett (2023, p. 15) writes, “Though most applications of TILT focus on classroom elements, it is just as important to think of transparency (or lack thereof) in terms of the wider range of challenges and interactions that students face on campus and in college. For example, students (particularly first-generation students) have difficulty navigating the registration process, financial aid, or starting a new registered student organization (RSO),” and “may not be familiar with office locations, how to accurately complete paperwork (or even where to find the paperwork)[.]” The classroom is not the only university setting where students can feel confused or overwhelmed, and an expansion of TILT (or transparency as a “guiding philosophy”) to “institution-wide” (Winkelmes et al., 2019) communication with students (and faculty) may also increase student success through a variety of channels.

In closing, the authors would like to thank all who contributed to this volume to make it possible, including all of our contributors, the editors and reviewers at *Perspectives in Learning*, Dr. Mary-Ann Winkelmes, our GSW administration, and not least of all, our students. Through this process, it has been a privilege to better know our colleagues and their work, to strive together to help our students, and to better understand our institution. Between the lines of this essay there is great deal of sympathy, and empathy, for your work; and we hope this volume has made some of the day-to-day joys, and struggles, of your vocation, and ours, more transparent to others.

## References

- Board of Regents - University System of Georgia (BOR). (2022). *Semester Enrollment Report - Fall 2022*. USG Office of Research and Policy Analysis. [https://www.usg.edu/research/assets/research/documents/enrollment\\_reports/SER\\_Fall\\_2022.pdf](https://www.usg.edu/research/assets/research/documents/enrollment_reports/SER_Fall_2022.pdf)
- Butrymowicz, S. (2017, January 30). Most colleges enroll many students who aren’t prepared for higher education. *The Hechinger Report*. <https://hechingerreport.org/colleges-enroll-students-arent-prepared-higher-education/>
- Carpenter, R., O’Brien, S., Martin, T., Fox, H., Pinion, C., Hermes, S. S., ... & Humphrey, C. (2021). Faculty development for transparent learning & teaching: Perspectives from teacher-scholars. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 35(2), 58–64.
- Cotter, E. M., Battle, K. A., Holsendolph, C., Nguyen, J., & Smith, A. P. (2023). The impact of transparent instructions upon academic confidence and writing performance. *Perspectives in Learning*, 20(1), 49-66.
- Dave, A. (2023). Making composition I visible: ‘TILT-ing’ the course to better aim at student learning. *Perspectives in Learning*, 20(1), 90-103.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan.

- Dewey, J. (2011). *The child and the curriculum*. Martino Publishing. (Original work published 1902)
- Domizi, D. (2022). Implementing a system-wide faculty development program. In J. Galle & D. Domizi (Eds.), *Faculty learning communities: Chancellor's learning scholars for student success* (pp. 19-29). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Galle, J. (2022a). Chancellor's learning scholars: Pedagogy and faculty learning communities. In J. Galle & D. Domizi (Eds.), *Faculty learning communities: Chancellor's learning scholars for student success* (pp. 1-18). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Galle, J. (2022b). Representative reports: The products and outcomes of the first two years. In J. Galle & D. Domizi (Eds.), *Faculty learning communities: Chancellor's learning scholars for student success* (pp. 73-96). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Galle, J. W., & Domizi, D. P. (Eds.). (2021). *Campus conversations: Student success pedagogies in practice*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Galle, J. W., & Domizi, D. P. (Eds.). (2022). *Faculty learning communities: Chancellor's learning scholars for student success*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2-3), 1-19.
- Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts Performance Audit Division (GDAAP). (2021, November). *COVID-19's Impact on K-12 Education* (Performance Audit, Report No. 21-03).
- Georgia Institute of Technology (GTech). (n.d.). Student Achievement. <https://irp.gatech.edu/files/Achievement/student-achievement-public-disclosure.html>
- Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW). (2021). *Complete College Georgia – Campus Plan Update 2021*. <https://completega.org/georgia-southwestern-state-university>
- Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW). (2022, Fall). *Board of Regents Retention Rates for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen Cohort*. <https://www.gsw.edu/institutional-research/files/fall-22/retention-rates.pdf>
- Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2015). Teacher-ready research review: The applicability of visible learning to higher education. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(1), 79-91.
- Holstead, C. E. (2022, September 1). Why students are skipping class so often, and how to bring them back. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

- Jacobs, A. (2023). Can TILT be used to teach study tactics? A case study in a biology classroom. *Perspectives in Learning, 20*(1), 67-74.
- Koricich, A., Tandberg, D., Bishop, B., & Weeden, D. (2020). Doing the same (or more) with less: The challenges regional public universities face in serving rural populations. *New Directions in Higher Education, 190*, 59-70.
- LeJeune, J. (2023). A multiple-choice study: The impact of transparent question design on student performance. *Perspectives in Learning, 20*(1), 75-90.
- Ma, P.-W. W., & Shea, M. (2021). First-generation college students' perceived barriers and career outcome expectations: Exploring contextual and cognitive factors. *Journal of Career Development, 48*(2), 91-104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845319827650>
- McCray, Vanessa. (2022, November 28). How some Georgia colleges defy trend toward enrollment drops. *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. <https://www.ajc.com/education/how-some-georgia-colleges-defy-trend-toward-enrollment-drops/UHKSHJKEJJDYDNQWJUHWAMJ2KM/>
- Nix, A. N., Jones, T. B., & Hu, S. (2021). Advising academically underprepared students in the 'college for all' era. *The Review of Higher Education, 45*(2), 211-238.
- Orton Grissett, J. (2023). Institutionalizing transparency across an institution. *Perspectives in Learning, 20*(1), 13-24.
- Palmer, D. L., Bachhofer, C., Brown, A., Kaus, A., McKie, M. A., & Sexton, T. (2023). Facilitating TILTING as a Faculty Community. *Perspectives in Learning, 20*(1), 25-41.
- Perin, D., & Holschuh, J. P. (2019). Teaching academically underprepared postsecondary students. *Review of Research in Education, 49*(1), 363-393.
- Stebbleton, M. J., & Soria, K. M. (2012). Breaking down barriers: Academic obstacles of first-generation students at research universities. *Learning Assistance Review, 17*(2), 7-20. <https://hdl.handle.net/11299/150031>
- University of Georgia Office of Instruction (UGA). (2022). *Complete College Georgia Plan 2021-2022 update*. Accessed at: [https://ovpi.uga.edu/\\_resources/documents/UGA\\_Complete\\_College\\_Georgia\\_2022\\_Report.pdf](https://ovpi.uga.edu/_resources/documents/UGA_Complete_College_Georgia_2022_Report.pdf)
- University System of Georgia (USG). (2022, November 8). *University System of Georgia enrollment at 334, 459 for fall 2022* [Press release]. [https://www.usg.edu/news/release/university\\_system\\_of\\_georgia\\_enrollment\\_at\\_334459\\_for\\_fall\\_2022#:~:text=Total%20enrollment%20for%20Fall%202022,Fall%202022%20Semester%20Enrollment%20Report.](https://www.usg.edu/news/release/university_system_of_georgia_enrollment_at_334459_for_fall_2022#:~:text=Total%20enrollment%20for%20Fall%202022,Fall%202022%20Semester%20Enrollment%20Report.)

- University System of Georgia (USG). (n.d.) "Guiding Principles." <https://www.usg.edu/consolidation/>
- Unverferth, A. R., Talbert-Johnson, C., & Bogard, T. (2012). Perceived barriers for first-generation students: Reforms to level the terrain. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 21(4), 238-252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105678791202100402>
- Wengier, S. & Dubuisson, L. (2023). Promoting student success with TILT in asynchronous online classes. *Perspectives in Learning*, 20(1), 104-119.
- Winkelmes, M.-A. (2013a). Transparency in learning and teaching. *NEA Higher Education Advocate*, 30(1), 6-9.
- Winkelmes, M.-A. (2013b). Transparency in teaching: Faculty share data and improve students' learning. *Liberal Education*, 99(2), 48-55.
- Winkelmes, M.-A. (2019). How to use the transparency framework. In M.-A. Winkelmes, A. Boye, & S. Tapp (Eds.), *Transparent design in higher education teaching and leadership: A guide to implementing the transparency framework institution-wide to improve learning and retention* (1st ed., pp. 36-54). Stylus Publishing.
- Winkelmes, M.-A., Bernacki, M., Butler, J., Zochowski, M., Golanics, J., & Weavil, K. H. (2016). A teaching intervention that increases underserved college students' success. *Peer Review*, 18(1/2), 31-36.
- Winkelmes, M.-A., Boye, A., & Tapp, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Transparent design in higher education teaching and leadership: A guide to implementing the transparency framework institution-wide to improve learning and retention*. Stylus Publishing.
- Yadusky, K. L. A. (2018). *Succeeding against the odds: Exploring the experiences of academically underprepared college students who successfully transition from pre-curriculum studies to full enrollment in curriculum courses* (Publication No. 1100-7243) [Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University]. ProQuest Dissertations.

---

JOHN LEJEUNE is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Georgia Southwestern State University. His primary research interests include political theory and the philosophy of education.

JUDY ORTON GRISSETT is an Associate Professor of Psychology and the Director of Experiential Learning at Georgia Southwestern State University. Her primary research interests include scholarship of teaching and learning related to high impact practices and open educational resources.