QEP STEERING COMMITTEE  
Thursday, April 23, 2009

Attending: Mary Bantell, Adolfo Benavides, David Billeaux, Margaret Dechant, David Grisé, Bridgette Hardin, Mark Hartlaub, J. Carlos Huerta, Frank Lucido, Gerry Moreno, Robert Nelsen, Blair Sterba-Boatwright, Sarah Sutton, Susan Wolff-Murphy

Meeting minutes from Mar. 26 were approved.

**Show and Tell**
S. Murphy passed around a luggage tag from the University of Kentucky’s QEP campaign, “Knowledge is Success.”
D. Billeaux passed around a hand-held electronic fan with laser words from Sam Houston State’s Academic Advising Center.
M. Collins has a FYI logo draft. He is conducting focus groups with students to get feedback. M. Collins will be asked to present at the next May 7th meeting. Discussion on FY Islander vs. FY Islanders is still being made.

**Vision and Mission Statement Discussion**
- Discussion on FY Islander vs. FY Islanders was made and decided upon FY Islanders.
- “Unprepared” changed to “underprepared.”
- Concern for omitting the advanced students was expressed. The word “all” will be added to the line: “The First Year Islanders program will improve the learning experience for all first year students;” and “Redesigning the curriculum to meet the needs of all students in barrier, developmental education, learning community courses and learning strategies for advanced students.”
- Change to “Increasing supplemental instruction.” (omit in math) Leaving the statement vague can allow for the program to grow to other areas, when monies become available, possibly from other grant efforts.
- Last point focuses on at-risk students and leaves out the advanced students. This program needs to create an experience for all students. Change to “Establishing an FYI experience for all students including a bridge and learning community specifically designed for at-risk students.
- S. Murphy will bring revised statements to the next meeting for approval.

**QEP Timeline Discussion**
S. Murphy is making presentations to different administration groups on campus. Endorsements have been given by the Provost’s Council and Faculty Senate. The Provost thanks all committee members for their service. President’s Cabinet did not object to the FYI plan. Student Government Association is also supporting the plan. B. Sterba-Boatwright will forward the Executive Summary to the Chairs’ Council. A presentation may be made at the Faculty/Staff Spring Meeting on May 6. A. Benavides suggested sending a draft executive summary to all faculty and staff before the Fall Faculty Meeting. A. Benavides mentioned about the need to start presenting to the external community. M. Bantell suggested Del Mar needs to be included. The Office of Community Relations will be consulted on which leaders should be included. A. Benavides suggested potential employers, school districts, the College of Business Advisory Council. F. Lucido has a College of Education Advisory Council Meeting on May 7. M. Bantell commented on the topic of bringing in nursing faculty to teaching in the learning communities and is concerned with the loading of faculty. C. Huerta suggested that this could be accomplished with co-curricular activities. Future conversations about connecting majors in learning communities will be made, but nothing is assigned right now.

**Assessment Plan Draft Discussion**
(See Handout)
M. Hartlaub commented that goals will become more strict and specific. A. Benavides commented that this is a ‘work in progress.’ R. Nelsen threw his boot at A. Benavides. A main conclusion based on various input, is that the improvement in the drop-out/retention rate should not be used as matrix or assessment but as a desirable outcome. Next meeting, a revised assessment chart will be brought including a column identifying a goal (i.e., by 2010, x% of TAs will complete training), another column for identify the measurement for attaining goal (i.e., indirect measure – a questionnaire to measure the effectiveness of the training) and last column for post-measurement, how we are closing the loop. Every class will have course objectives that are measured already through project/test grades. B. Hardin
reminded that we can show an aggregate trend, not just individual test scores. R. Nelsen suggested asking for a new column with the mission statement bullets for consistency. A. Benavides shared concerns of what are we going to measure, how are we going to measure it, and who will conduct the assessment? R. Nelsen mentioned there has to be a QEP Assessment Coordinator. This position needs to be built into the budget. This is a huge task for one person and everyone is so stretched. B. Sterba-Boatwright commented that there is no time to reflect on collected data, let alone assessing the data. S. Murphy questioned if some of the assessment can overlap with the Core Curriculum, the EEOs, and the department goals. There is already language and data assessment, it doesn’t have to be completely separate. M. Hartlaub will know how much work will be generated after he talks more with intervention coordinators for their exact plans. Not all interventions have to be connected to student learning outcome. A. Benavides mentioned that indirect measures, such as surveys, can also be used. A budget needs to be firmed. The budget will need to be evaluated each year, as certain interventions develop throughout the year. There is $145K allocated for the QEP first year. B. Sterba-Boatwright suggested that perhaps resources other than the QEP to provide assessment assistance like through the PIE office? There is a need for an assessment office on campus.

B. Sterba-Boatwright motioned to approve that the QEP Steering Committee recommends that the university hire an assessment officer to provide services to all areas on campus, not just the QEP. C. Huerta seconded, all in favor.

In the current budget, the QEP can build in ¼ time of a faculty member to coordinate the assessment plan. R. Wooster strongly suggests that in order to have effective assessment is not to have someone direct you however someone who can coordinate would be more meaningful. R. Nelsen suggested attaching this position to the Faculty Renaissance Center. All agreed that the FRC needs to have an overhaul, with faculty buy-in, and then perhaps placing the assessment position in there would be effective. A. Benavides is going to ask intervention coordinators to define the components of the assessment: what is the goal, timeframe, how it is going to be measures (assignment, tests, survey), who and when the assessment, and how often. Then we can firm the budget with this information. A Brainstorming conversation was had between Drs. Orser, Hardin and Murphy is regards to how to identify “Team Leaders” and perhaps the FYI could model after a grant proposal type process: Individual presents proposal of what he/she wants to do as a team leader and then a committee grants the funds. There would be an accountability of team leaders as they will report on changes and implementations. The department chair must be involved in decision making of a team leader.

Timeline for Biology, History, Political Science FYI Plans (Draft)
(See Handout)
C. Huerta reviewed the handout. Within the next academic year, team leaders must be identified and get a buy-in from all faculty. In summer 2010, team leaders will get summer stipends and start planning and attending conferences. Fall 2011 interventions in place. Assessment is made annually to change/update interventions. The first team leaders will have a two-year term, and then individual programs can decide if they need to rotate the position. Disciplines will decide the requirements of the team leader. The team leader program will continue until the program is no longer needed. This is a portable model and can be adjusted as barrier courses change. The timeline of Math implementation will be discussed at next minutes.

Next meeting: Thursday, May 7, 2:30 – 4:30 p.m., UC Tejas Room 106C
Approved by Susan Wolff Murphy for submission to Committee