QEP STEERING COMMITTEE
Thursday, February 12, 2009

Attending: Adolfo Benavides, David Billeaux, Margaret Dechant, David Grisé, Bridgette Hardin, Mark Hartlaub, J. Carlos Huerta, Yolanda Keys, Gerry Moreno, Robert Nelsen, Nancy Nelson, Paul Orser, Rita Sperry, Susan Wolff-Murphy

Meeting minutes from Jan. 29 were approved.

Proposed Interventions Overview (See handouts)

1. Basic Skills Learning Communities, S. Murphy
   Interventions: Placement, Contracted Behavior, Bridge Experience, Basic Skills Learning Communities, Curriculum Development, Professional Development for Faculty
   Comments:
   - It was agreed upon by the committee to pilot this Bridge Program on the “at-risk” population first. Judging on the success, then open it to all students in the future. Costs and logistics would be challenging. The Bridge Experience could be something as simple as each instructor gives a ‘bridge-type’ lesson in their first class of the semester. P. Orser mentioned there may be something the bridge experience could piggy-back on with Student Affairs at the beginning of the year events. Huerta mentioned the audience might be too broad, “keep it simple” with the at-risk students.
   - Example websites on curriculum development models from other colleges in the States are provided on the handout.
   - S. Murphy noted the comment by A. Benavides regarding using course grades as an assessment tool is not legitimate. He suggested using a course embedded measures or a rubric.
   - The Basic Skills Learning Communities can be named something different, cool name. However if the learning communities are embedded there may not need to have a label.

2. MATH, S. Murphy (for B. Sterba-Boatwright)
   Interventions: Curricular Changes, Professional Development, Student Interventions, Personnel Changes, Timeline
   Comments:
   - R. Nelsen mentioned that CALC I will be a bigger deal in the fall as the Mechanical Engineering program starts. Most students will fast track into CALC I.
   - The additional budget for professional development of math faculty should not raise negative comments from non-math faculty as this is what the QEP committee has identified as a problem and the need to be enhanced.
   - Getting buy-in from math faculty will be challenging, as well as additional instructors.

Over the next few weeks, S. Murphy will estimate the dollars with all interventions submitted.

R. Nelsen brought the GEMS pens for committee members. Red, green and blue.
FYI Flowchart Overview Packet, P. Orser (See handouts)

Many thanks were given to P. Orser and B. Hardin for their initiative on developing the FYI structure. This ‘architecture’ is a suggested structure.

HANDOUT I: Two charts demonstrated the relationship on academic performance and retention rates.

HANDOUT II: Investing in the FYI Experience: Can we afford NOT to? When asking for money to support FYI, the committee should not be too shy. Retaining more students will generate more income. FYI has the potential to make an economic difference. It can also be expanded to the community economic impact.

HANDOUT III: FYI Flowchart…..a “Back to the Future” approach

Input/Incoming Freshman:
- Build database of every variable about incoming freshman, develop a rich information system, understand who they are, not just A number and name.

Risk Assessment & Placement:
- Review and validate our assessment criteria, what is acceptable
- Jason Dubose, CSI, will get the academic risk diagnostics to P. Orser ASAP.
- Concern on placement – what learning community and why?

Curriculum Design:
- College is not 13th grade
- We need to be very careful on specifying specific outcomes, writing very good rubrics for understanding how we will know we are meeting goals – build course by course in learning communities, revisit what goes into learning communities to create synergy and light up faculty and students
- Get students involved as early as they can. D. Grise commented this may have unintended consequences
- Do we need learning communities both terms? Launch them properly in the fall, no need for spring.

Curriculum Delivery:
- How are classes, instructors, sections evaluated? Are instructors calibrating with other instructors in same subject.
- How effective the FRC is right now? Refocus as a Teaching and Learning Excellence operation. M. Hartlaub mentioned that the FRC was the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, which started as technological assistance. P. Orser would like to see it as “The Center for Coastal Studies for Teaching;” a pedagogical research center that had real fellows and real prestige. C. Huerta mentioned that there is a lot of pressure in one person being “the” teaching fellow, representing all areas. With R. Wooster’s proposal within the Improving Teaching Interventions, presented on Jan 29, that it was so disciplined-based. S. Murphy commented on what F. Lucido said last meeting that Deans are reluctant to give up faculty to run this type of center.
- R. Nelsen is working on Promotion and Tenure Policy with the Faculty Senate and Deans, one of the new criteria from Systems is student success in classes and student success in subsequent classes. Could be tied to measurements and retention rates.
Academic Support:
- Seminar instructors are critical. They know what is going on with students, and how to pass along the information to their students. A caution from R. Sperry, the seminar leaders are already doing too much, the flowchart places a lot of responsibility on seminar leaders. G. Moreno likes the terminology ‘point-guards’ to describe the seminar leaders, they direct students to the correct person. B. Hardin commented that the seminar leader has to be competent enough to make decisions to point students in the right direction. “Professionalizing the Seminar Leaders.”
- B. Hardin shared that point #3 was derived from the idea that if the learning communities was just in the fall semester, than the freed up time in the spring could be used as supplemental instruction and academic advising.

Output/Measures of Success:
- All proposed changes need to be evaluated in terms of their potential effectiveness in contributing to the goal of more students meeting the stated learning objectives of first term courses. P. Orser mentioned that this is not about dropping the courses to meet the students but rather raising the students to meet the courses.
- If we have a Provost committed to a program like this, we will have the ability to find human time and resources.

General Comments about Flowchart:
- A. Benavides commented that in the College of Business, a professor can become tenured through publications. Service and teaching involvement are taken for granted. There will be no objection from every faculty member with this program unless in the college and university’s promotion and tenure policy that teaching actually matters. R. Nelsen guarantees that this issue will be in the P&T Policy.
- Discussions were made on the need to have buy-in from the faculty who will not be directly affected by the FYI. The faculty who do not teach freshman courses will still need to support and be excited about FYI. Marketing Team is working on this strategy.
- A. Benavides pointed out that we do need to get students engaged early. However, in the College of Business, they may not be exposed to business classes until their third/fourth semester. Perhaps there is an opportunity to develop innovative courses to broaden students’ horizons by becoming flexible with the core curriculum. For example, within a triad, coupling a history in political science with a business government in society. This might get potential business majors engaged earlier as well as faculty members engaged. R. Nelsen suggested going to each department in each college and ask if there is a course that faculty would like to see exist.
- G. Moreno commented that involvement and engagement are needed and the flowchart shows this.
- N. Nelson likes the organization of chart, we really need to consider the FRC, faculty development and become discipline specific.
- The committee approved and adopted the ‘architecture’ of the flow chart.

Mission Statement Revision, S. Murphy (See handout)

- S. Murphy reviewed the revised mission statement including an FYI Center/Program. Interventions, Learning Goals and Environment/Program Goals were removed from the statement listed below.
- Each component/intervention needs to be placed in WEAVE with a measurable outcome, not necessarily a learning outcome. There will be one FYI WEAVE report, but there needs to be separate elements and outcomes.

NEXT MEETING = COOKIES & SWEET TREATS!!
Intervention approvals, assessment review and budgets will be discussed at the next meeting. Groups will connect interventions of certain goals and budgets. Decisions will be made on what interventions will go into the flowchart.

Next meeting: Thursday, February 26, 2009, 2:30 – 4:30 p.m., UC Islander Room 316
Approved by Susan Wolff-Murphy for submission to Committee