

QEP Leadership Meeting June 21, 2010 Minutes

Members Present: Karen Downey, Johanna Hume, Manuela Imthurn, Rhonda Boone, Drew Nelson, Cammy Guiggisberg, Jerrod Butcher, Linda Matteson

Not Present: Chris Chance, Bill Lewis, Julia Theato, Dwight Rhodes

I. Community survey

We received 173 responses from the community surveys. 68% said reading was very important, 66% academic honesty, 38% campus mentors, 64.75% technology. These results mimic the responses from faculty and students. (173 represents close to a 2% response rate.)

The drawing for the laptop was held. Drew Nelson drew Brenda Price's name. *Cammy will call Ms. Price. Lynn has the laptop.

II. Blackboard

Karen, Chris and Johanna are course designers for the QEP online meeting room on Blackboard. The Discussion board has already been in use, and the committee members are encouraged to continue using this space.

III. Technology v. study skills as QEP

a. Split

The last QEP meeting showed that committee members were split between technology and study skills as a topic. Johanna posted a list from Allison Tate showing numerous study skills seminars/workshops.

Drew noted that many topics can be folded into QEP. One prong could be "Study skills is an important topic to many; let's start working on this outside of QEP."

b. Hybrid courses/Pilot program

Drew mentioned that Lady of the Lake has a scholarship program to redesign courses. Proposals are taken to address specific issues each year/each time period. The QEP could incorporate this into the pilot program for hybrid courses. A committee could look for "premier" courses which could be helpful in terms of enacting student engagement. Reading and study skills could also be integrated into these pilot hybrid programs.

The college could apply for grant money in this area.

c. Support for technology

The committee discussed grading online. Manuela suggested this be done immediately. Other members noted that the majority of classes do not have grades online. Nursing is very different. Training will take some time with Blackboard and/or Excel, but perhaps it could be done sooner than 2 years. Manuela noted that given the lack of technology (like gradebooks), technology should be the QEP instead of study skills.

Cammy noted her support for technology as a QEP, particularly e-mailing (communicating with students) and online grading. She thought this was particularly essential with adjunct faculty.

Drew noted that although ACC is behind in terms of online grading, we are not behind in terms of smart classrooms, internet classes, etc.

d. Miscellaneous

Cammy asked if Dena could help with targeting students who need study skills help. Drew thinks this may also be a good way to push earlier assessments within course design.

Drew mentioned the HEOA which deals with federal requirements regarding textbook information. The site is: <http://dltj.org/article/textbook-disclosure-rules/>.

Drew briefly discussed HB 2504 (attached), -which mandates that syllabi, instructor qualifications, textbooks, and departmental budgets must be online fall 2010. Online grading is not included.

Cammy asked where technology fees go. She believes students should have free paper up to a certain maximum in the cyber labs on campus.

IV. Vote on Topic

The committee voted unanimously for technology as ACC's QEP topic.

V. Writing QEP

Linda Matteson will be writing the QEP.

VI. Software and other resources

It was noted that Bruce Glover had a spread sheet of everything their college did from day one of their QEP. Project Manager (Microsoft Office) can be used so that documentation can be shown to the visiting committee. GANTT (timeline charts) are good to show.

Entrensic's Informer may be another helpful tool. This is a report writing software using drag and drop and is useful for tracking students.

*Karen asked Bill Lewis to look into the Project Manager Program.

Drew mentioned CIRTLL and the University of Wisconsin. This program uses technology to promote good teaching. Merlot is connected to a grant for course redesign. The University of North Texas is involved in social science/humanities course redesign. Central Florida is another in the consortium.

Bill Cranford and Marjorie Nash have agreed to help with the literature review. Manuela will look through our online teaching certification class for resources that Dena already has made available.

Drew mentioned a book *New Directions for Institutional Research* by James O. Nichols, University of Mississippi, which discusses systematic effectiveness and planning charts. Drew will get this book for everyone on the committee.

VII. Marketing

The Marketing Department will hold an ice cream social on July 7 or 8. This could also be the kick-off for QEP. This is for staff, not students. **It was decided that a flyer should be made up for the QEP. **It was also suggested that the Board of Regents be invited.

VIII. Writing and researching the QEP

a. Writing

**Drew said that the committee needs to make the QEP into a statement. This should be close to what is in the surveys. For example, "The QEP's focus is increasing students' academic engagement and improving faculty skills, engagement, communication, and accountability." Each word is one of the goals. Each goal needs to be benchmarked and needs to show improvement, assessment, etc.

Possible goal 1: Communication and accountability. This could include training faculty, e-mail priority, and Blackboard. This might be the pilot year prior to our SACS visit.

Possible goal 2: Grades, redesign projects. In this stage it seems likely that the college will need to hire a specialist. This will show SACS that QEP will work within the budget process and will have institution-wide support. This person would be an instructional technologist. Dena has a design background, but the college will need someone in digital media and someone who can help with the design of courses.

Writing the QEP can be started in terms of what we've done already such as: community survey, faculty survey, student survey, committee meetings, etc.

These summaries need to include: when, where, why, how, results: These need to be detailed summaries. They should link to a table (charts provided by IE). Drew suggested that scatter charts would be useful as well.

*Johanna will write up the faculty survey process and results.

*Community will be done by Cammy.

*Linda needs to be sent everything as well so she can "catch up" on the process.

*Karen will do the overall summary and will check on dates/deadlines for QEP in general.

*Jerrod will do student survey.

b. Research/Literature Review

Drew suggested that resources be split among committee members. There is no need for every member to read every resource. Instead, **each member could be given several items to research and then would be responsible for writing an annotated bibliography on the source. In addition, each source should be given a rating. These can be posted to Blackboard and discussed/investigated further.

IX. Miscellaneous

Johanna noted that the presenter at the fall workshop will be speaking on generational differences. It was suggested that members of the committee take her to lunch after her presentation.

Fall workshop will also be a good time to insert a QEP “commercial.”

X. Next meeting

If members will post to Blackboard and will discuss, then the next meeting is TBA. Blackboard should be able to take the place of some face-to-face meetings. However, if the majority of members aren't participating, a meeting will be necessary soon.

Members who have files to post to Blackboard should send them to Karen via Blackboard Mail.

*Johanna will rearrange and retitle the Blackboard discussion board.

*Denotes that a specific task was assigned.

**Denotes that a specific task was discussed but not assigned to an individual.