QEP STEERING COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, June 2, 2009

Attendees: David Billeaux, Adolfo Benavides, Ann DeGaish, Mark Hartlaub, J. Carlos Huerta, Gerry Moreno, Jim Needham, Robert Nelsen, Susan Wolff-Murphy, Chris Shupala, Sarah Sutton

Minutes from the May 7th meeting were approved.

**Convocation Materials**  
A black mesh laundry bag with the TAMU Convocation logo on it was passed around to the committee to show parts of what College Station does for freshman convocation. Also passed around was the TAMU convocation program that lists all freshmen, a magnet handed out to TAMU freshman with important dates, and a ‘save-the-date’ card given to TAMU freshman parents regarding convocation. A handout was given that lists the missions of other universities’ convocation. Some range from very formal to very informal. A FYI Convocation Planning Committee will be developed in early Fall to start planning our program and how it will fit into our culture.

**Draft FYI Organizational Chart**  
See handout. No objections were made.

**SACS COC Vice President, Gerald D. Lord, TAMUCC Visit – SACS Preliminary Review**  
Monday, June 15, 2009 - 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. – UC Bayview Room 320  
Agenda:  
Learning Communities History – C. Huerta  
Self-Study – P. Orser  
Powerpoint – D. Billeaux  
Assessment – B. Hardin  
As many steering committee members need to meet with him. Goals of his visit are to get him familiar with the steering committee and seek his approval of our QEP and its focus, and alignment with the assessment. The QEP Report will be reviewed by Dr. Lord.

**Budget Update**  
See handout. Reading coordinator was placed back into the proposed budget. This proposal will be presented at President’s Cabinet on June 4 for approval. R. Nelsen commented that this budget will need to be cut somewhere, or money will come out of other funding within the university. C. Huerta suggested submitting this and cut later, if needed.

**Assessment Plan**  
See handout.  
10.1) Assessment of FYI Student Learning Outcomes – Discussion:
- Each discipline can start with implementing the exemplary education outcomes (eeo).
- A. Benavides expressed that we need to identify the “who, when and how.” We can easily identify the “who and when,” but the how is a bit premature. A lot of planning needs to happen before identifying the “how.”
- A. Benavides questioned if we need to have more specific outcomes and standards. Disciplines will need to come up with the eeo’s then they can become more specific.
Disciplines need to start working on this, not next year when the summer stipends begin. By January 1, 09 we must have more specific standards. Planning elements need to happen fall 2009. Discussion was made on separating the planning element from the QEP implementation. However, the planning is a big part of faculty development, within the QEP.

- We don’t want to have too many outcomes because it will be too hard to manage all. If we don’t have control over a standard, we won’t be able to measure it.

10.2) Assessment of the FYI Interventions

- Database Placement Measure: two parts – specific math applications and how are we defining our at-risk students.
- Communities of Practice: separated by discipline, currently no measure or baseline
  - Barrier courses – team leaders will generate reports for analysis. Dates of when reports will be due are questionable. May need a different timeline to coincide with the annual report due to SACS.
  - Math – create a website
  - Reading – seminar instructors involvement
  - Learning Communities – broader goals, engage all students, S. Murphy will work on this area.
- Curriculum Redesign: separated by discipline, engagement surveys
  - Barrier courses – make changes by fall 2011, team leaders will report, will have a mid-year ‘check-in’ with the team leader to close the loop, many agreed to this concept, especially with a new program
  - Math – not tackling all redesign at one time, there is a four-year plan. Can we measure student’s attitude? B. Sterba-Boatwright may have a measure for this. Math does not mandate attendance, but may track it. Need to clarify. Ultimate intent is student learning and the current outcome reference TA performance only, rather than student. Include both measures.
  - Reading – need to come up with an educational outcome. We can ‘borrow’ an eeo, but currently not using the eeo.
  - Learning Communities – NSSE/or another survey? NSSE does ask students if they are being challenged. It may not be appropriate, if we score well in this area. Make take out challenging and just leave it to engaging, or focus on Honors students only. NSSE is every other year in the spring, last one administered this past spring.
- Supplemental Instruction – Math
- WAVE Experience

Qualifications of coordinators and team leaders will need to be determined for SACS reviewers. Disciplines will identify these people. We need to specify who will identify these people, i.e. the department chairs.

Discussion was made on whether or not enhancing student learning is the FYI focus or faculty development. R. Nelsen is concerned about this. G. Moreno commented that the QEP needs to benefit students or hopes that it benefits students. We are sure that these interventions will improve student learning. D. Billeaux mentioned that measures do not have to have an immediate outcome. Over the years of implementation, we can watch the data and if the
intended outcome does not happen, then we’ve learned something. We can use data as baselines. S. Murphy questioned if we need to have an assessment plan for each intervention, or just assessing the goals of our student learning outcomes? Discussion was made on removing those interventions that do not have direct student learning improvement, but keep them on a ‘check-list’ for the QEP. The number of assessment measures we have is unmanageable. We need to narrow it down to 5 – 8 measures. M. Hartlaub and A. Benavides will work on this before Dr. Lord’s visit.

C. Huerta has a “curriculum map” that will be sent to the steering committee and present it to Dr. Lord during his visit. This map ties in with the State’s eeo’s.

**Implementation Plan**

See handout. History has already identified their Team Leader: Peter Moore. Convocation Planning Team and WAVE Advisory Team will be added to the Fall 2009 time line. Team Leaders can submit proposal for funding, they don’t have to request $1000 even. Bridge events will be added to fall 2010. Team Leaders’ annual reports will be included in each summer session. It will be up to the discipline whether or not the Team Leader remains the same person or changes after the second year. J. Needham questioned the reading involvement in the implementation plan. The Reading Task Force will be added to Spring 2011. Ideas on creating a ‘reading/writing center’ is a possible. S. Murphy will make appropriate changes per discussions.

S. Murphy will be out of town for June and July but will reconvene meeting as a committee in August through the SACS visit in March 2010.

*Next Meeting: TBA, August, 2009*
*Approved by Susan Wolff Murphy for submission to Committee*