



QEP Design Team Meeting
Friday, July 31, 2015
10:00 a.m.



In attendance: Jennifer Brown, Kyle Christensen, Shamim Khan, Kimberly McElveen, Jennifer Newbrey, Amanda Rees, Iris Saltiel, Stephanie da Silva, Susan Tomkiewicz

Title of QEP = We Solve It: Jennifer stated that they had spoken with the SACS consultant, Ed Rugg, and he helped them think about how to assess the students and how to show this change in problem solving. After a lot of feedback and discussion on the title of QEP, "We Solve It" or "Let's Solve It", it was decided that the title would be "We Solve It" because it is more definitive and active.

Student Learning Outcomes: Jennifer passed out the Real-World Problem-Solving rubrics that highlights the learning objectives and where they are coming from. The first page is an introduction to the rubric, which was sent to all faculty via email to solicit their feedback. The second page is the report that the students would complete at the end of their problem-solving activities. The next rubric will be used to measure the growth in problem-solving. This will be a universal rubric that will be used across all different disciplines and all courses in order for faculty to provide feedback. The last rubric is for the faculty to give feedback on how the students are improving. Jennifer stated that this rubric will be all digital and will be available on CougarView. She stated that she and Stephanie went back to the learning objectives that were generated in the first workshop and tried to align them better with this report. Stephanie stated that she emailed the department chairs to find out how they define "problem-solving" and didn't get much response. She also said that she and Jennifer would go to the next Chairs Assembly and talk to them directly and get their ideas. She suggested that someone from the Design team represent problem-solving or ask about problem-solving at each of the college meetings. The team discussed how to get the QEP out to faculty and Stephanie said she would ask the president to speak about it briefly at the university meeting on August 13. It was also suggested to take it to the Faculty Senate, the Deans' Council, the President's Cabinet and possibly the Saber. They also decided to submit a report to the QEP Leadership Team and the Board of Trustees Executive Committee. This report and rubric will pilot on D2L next spring.

Logo: Jennifer stated that they gave Joseph Melancon some ideas and images they saw on other websites to help him design a logo for QEP. Between the two different logos that were presented, everyone liked the "Discover, Design, Deliver without the wording underneath.

Student Focus Group: Jennifer stated that on June 24 she and Iris met with 18 students from the ROAR Orientation Team. The students were mainly juniors and represented a variety of disciplines. They were asked a series of questions but the one question that was most insightful from their perspective was, "If you could choose what programs were going to grow as part of the QEP, what would you like to see?" All 18 students expressed interest in having more opportunities for gaining experience in their field. Stephanie stated that in the original design with the Discover, it was linked strongly with internships. She said she didn't think this report and rubric are intuitively linked to an internship. After some discussion, Stephanie asked if everyone thought the QEP can help to fix this internship problem. Kimberly suggested meeting with the internship coordinators from each department and ask them what they foresee doing in the future regarding internships and how the QEP team could help them. Stephanie asked if this problem-solving report includes internships enough so that if somebody was overseeing internships they could have their students complete this report. Kimberly said she thought they could but she still feels the internship coordinators from each department should be a part of this process in the beginning. Jennifer

stated that the COEHP already has someone that oversees outreach in all the schools in the area. Jennifer said we have to tie this back to the QEP and that the main focus should be looking for opportunities for students to gain field experience. Stephanie asked if the issue of experiences in the community should be explicitly addressed by our QEP or is it good enough to put it out there generically and through our education process be inclusive. Kimberly stated that the Career Center is working to resolve some of these issues and that she didn't think the QEP needs to take it on. She said they have a full-time person that is dedicated to internships and career outreach.

Budget and Programs: Stephanie said they have been unable to get any feedback on the QEP budget, so she has no idea how much money we are working with. In the original budget there was a slot for an Outreach Officer and that person's job was to be a resource for students and community members who want connections. Stephanie asked the team if they thought this person would be a worthwhile expenditure to keep in the QEP budget as a five year commitment. Iris suggested using the money for the Outreach Director for faculty grants for experiences. It was agreed that that is a way to get faculty involved.

Stephanie discussed some of the programs that she and Jennifer came up with in terms of faculty incentives and programs that would be involved around this report and rubric. There are three tiers: The first one is "Large-Scale Problem-Solving Project Grants" that would supplement some of the money for research, supplies, equipment, etc. for faculty to carry out creative endeavors. There would be 5 grants per year at \$5,000 each to total \$25,000 and they can be up to a year in length. The second tier is "Course-Based Problem-Solving Stipends" that would only be used to pay faculty for the time and work that involves reworking a course project so that it fits the rubric. There would be 12 stipends a year for a total of \$18,000. The third tier would be the "Rubric Gratuities" to pay faculty \$10 for each report that they grade as an incentive to have students complete the report and then take the time to grade it. The amount for this budget is \$700. Iris mentioned that there wasn't any money in the budget for student research or for faculty overseeing student research. Jennifer explained the QEP they originally tried to design (\$400,000) was too much to manage for a university our size. Based on Ed Rugg's feedback, they streamlined and scaled it back to a more manageable level (\$250,000).

Regarding Tower Day, Stephanie said they need to come up with some faculty incentives to get them on board with doing the report and the rubric. She said the other thing would be maybe developing a celebration day, possibly combining it with the Writing Center's celebration of student writing, and thinking of creative ways of displaying the works that people have done. Amanda brought up the fact that Tower Day is only once a year, so the students in the fall won't be together in the spring to be able to present. Stephanie said they also talked about keeping Tower Day on a Tuesday and cancelling all classes but keeping labs. Some suggestions for Tower Day were: (1) having it each semester instead of once a year, (2) having all day simulcasts, (3) faculty participation.

D2L: Stephanie said this rubric will be electronically available and monitored and tracked in D2L. She said she had been talking with Amy Thornton to figure out the best way to do this. She also said there is a portfolio package available in D2L and Mark Flynn thought the USG had it at some of their schools, but Amy Thornton checked and it is not available within the USG system. Stephanie talked with Amy about creating a central course where everyone in school would be enrolled. Amy thought it would be easier to load this report and rubric in any course and that way the student can find it. Then at the end of each semester, the graded reports will be pulled out of that course and archived. This is something a graduate assistant will be able to do.

Additional Measures: ?

Website: <http://sacs.columbusstate.edu/qep.php>

Other: Stephanie stated that she had heard back from a couple of people regarding the report and rubric that was sent out to faculty. She said there was a lot of negative feedback about the word “creative” used in the report. She said she received negative feedback from the department chairs as well. She asked everyone if having the word “creative” adds anything to the report or if there is a benefit to having it in there. It was decided that if it was creating such resistance and in order to show that we are responding to feedback, to just remove the word. However, in order to remove it, we would need to take it to the Leadership Team for approval.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.