

QEP STEERING COMMITTEE

Thursday, December 11, 2008

Attending: Mary Bantell, Adolfo Benavides, David Billeaux, Kent Byus, Ann Degaish, David Gris , J. Carlos Huerta, Yolanda Keys, Frank Lucido, Gerardo Moreno, Jim Needham, Robert Nelsen, Nancy Nelson, Blair Sterba-Boatwright, Susan Wolff-Murphy, Robert Wooster

R. Nelsen mentioned that eventually we need to put our QEP in WEAVE Online. He handed out the UTD GEMS Assessment Plan: Goals, Objectives, Measures, and Outcomes as an example of the different measures accepted by SACS. Variety is important: grades, student learning outcomes, attendance, programmatic outcomes, etc.

Sterba-Boatwright reviewed his handout on possible math FYI programs.

1. Bridge Programs
2. Professionalization (of instructors)
3. Diagnostics
4. Intervention
5. Curricular/Structural Changes

Wolff-Murphy mentioned that all programs sound promising, they directly impact student learning and change student environment, creative with technology and fairly cost effective. Sterba-Boatwright mentioned the only costly thing is hiring more instructors. R. Nelsen likes the one-hour courses, it is student friendly. Assessment and placement will be a challenge.

N. Nelson commented that the CEDER Conference, focusing on Professional Learning Communities, will be held here January 30-31, 2009.

Wolff-Murphy reviewed materials collected from the SACS Annual Conference in San Antonio last week.

TIMELINE

The timeline was revised. March 2 – 5, 2010 is SACS campus visit.

Three areas of defining a QEP:

1. Start talking about topic, topic selection. We’ve completed that: FYI Theme
2. Development stages, develop plan for implementation, submit and approve in 2010, then start implementing for 5 years.
3. Report to SACS, successes, failures, changes

Finalize intervention in January 2009 and start talking about implementation, assessments, outcomes and budget.

Marketing plan – it can start too early with campus awareness.

We cannot fully implement changes before SACS come but can show ‘piloting.’

SACS compliance report will be mailed in September, but QEP does not need to be mailed until

January. We can use the fall semester to get feedback on implementation ideas. By spring semester, we can have a solid idea on the QEP.

Joseph Doan is working on QEP website.

MATRIX – FYI Program Goals

Key points of what topics have been discussed that represent the first year issues, inside and outside the classroom.

1. Learning Outcomes:
 - a. Improve student performance in:
 - i. MATH 0398 and MATH 0399
 - ii. Lower division math classes
 - iii. Engagement in READ 0399
 - iv. Core classes
 - v. Learning Communities
2. Engagement of students in the FYI experience
3. Health and wellness of FYI students
4. Support network for FYI parents
5. Working conditions for students

Huerta suggested find the things that have the biggest impact and do them first. Maybe have different stages of goal implementation. Use the matrix to stage the implementations by year to make it more manageable. Wooster added the need to improve awareness of academic expectations among students and families. Students need to realize that the first year of college is not grade 13. First six weeks of classes are spent teaching basics that should have been done in high school. Degaish commented that we try to give out this information at orientation but there is just too much to absorb during that one day. A convocation event could allow the president to set the tone.

Further discussion was made on the work ethic of today's students. Byus has talked with local business people and they would like to participate in a development of 'standards' for the working student. They would like to help their student worker. Plans are made to meet in January to discuss in detail.

Wolff-Murphy pointed out that we need to realistically start thinking about who can take on the responsibility of becoming the QEP coordinator, and if faculty members can get release time to assist. The budget was discussed. Wolff-Murphy mentioned that we may have to cut our focus down so we can afford it, or go to President's Cabinet to ask for more money. Billeaux mentioned that we different from other institutions – they have human resources and choices that we don't have. Here, everyone is short faculty and stuck.

Further discussion was made on lack of learning skills of incoming freshman. Wooster suggested a way to get faculty buy-in is to prepare packages to faculty on different learning skills and faculty can choose a style that works for them. Encourage student that university is different, it is not TAKS. Wolff-Murphy commented on providing professional development in the fall; give faculty a menu of options and then pilot in the spring. In the next fall, develop implementation.

Next meeting: Thursday, January 8, 2009, 2:30 – 4:30 p.m., UC Dolphin Room 306

Approved by Susan Wolff-Murphy for submission to Committee