

QEP Development Committee
Course selection/Curriculum Grant work group
Meeting 1
Friday, March 18, 2022 9 - 10:30 a.m.

CHARGE: *This work group will assist with development of policies, procedures, and data analysis needed to determine the selection of courses for redesign.*

Group Members:

- Brittanney Adelman, facilitator ([here](#))
- Russ Ivy, Senior Associate Provost ([here](#), [late](#))
- Evonne Rezler, Senior Associate Dean, College of Science ([here](#), [late](#))
- Ann Branaman, Chair and Professor, Sociology ([here](#))
- Julie Golden-Botti, Assistant Provost COCE ([Willie Freeman here](#))
- Stephanie Etter, Vice Provost for Academic Services, Broward College ([here](#))
- Vanessa Stubbs, Student ([absent](#))
- Fred Bloetscher, Associate Dean, Undergraduate studies COECS ([here](#), [late](#))

Observers/Notetakers:

- Jennifer Bebergal, Co-Lead QEP ([here](#))
- Angel Nevin, Assistant Director, QEP ([here](#))
- Guy Burns, Assistant Director SI and tutoring ([here](#))

GOAL for TODAY'S MEETING: Suggest benchmarks for course redesign. What are the standards/measures we will use to determine if a course meets criteria for redesign? What is the timeline to apply for course redesign?

AGENDA

- 1) Welcome and introductions
- 2) Reminder of importance of this work group
 - a) Review SACSCOC QEP Framework (in Canvas)
- 3) Our goal for the upcoming April 11 meeting
- 4) Review Evidence of Effectiveness and Data to Support Education Reimagined at FAU (breakout rooms by topic); keep notes in google doc
 - a) How do we prioritize courses for redesign
 - b) Suggest benchmarks for selection process
 - c) Suggest timeline for selection process
- 5) Discuss challenges and potential criteria for course selection
 - a) Breadth of courses across levels, campuses, colleges, mode of instruction
 - b) Student outcomes in current course structure
 - c) Equity outcomes
 - d) Large enrollment and Multi-section courses
- 6) Identify suggestions for QEP development committee
- 7) Next steps: Decide on a representative to share with QEP Development Committee at next meeting

3/18/2022 QEP Working Group Meeting Minutes [by Guy Burns]

[9:02am - Dr. Brittaney Adelman called the meeting to order]

- 1) Welcome and Introductions
 - a) Willie Freeman, Associate Executive Director ELearning
 - b) Stephanie Etter, Broward College
 - c) Ann Branaman, Chair Sociology
 - d) Jennifer Bebergal, Co-Lead, QEP
 - e) Angel Nevin, Assistant Director QEP/LA
 - f) Guy Burns, Assistant Director, CLASS

(Evonne Rezler, Russ Ivy, Fred Bloetscher arrived about 15 minutes late)

- 2) Reminder of importance of this work group
 - a) This is a very important work group designed to help find a balance between the investment dollars available and the outcomes of this aspect of the QEP.
 - b) Tasked with looking at designing outcomes relating to which courses should be selected for course redesign.
 - c) Review SACSCOC QEP Framework (in Canvas) *[omitted]*

- 3) Review Evidence of Effectiveness and Data to Support Education Reimagined at FAU
[breakout rooms by topic; notes kept by each group in google doc:

Meeting 1 CS - Breakout Sessions]

- a) Breakout Group 1: Success from Across the Country
 - i) Willie F.: Lowering the DFW rate
 - ii) Stephanie E.: Students felt greater connection to the school; connection goes a long way. This is secondary to reduction in DFW
 - iii) Ann B.: "1.6 times greater learning"
 - iv) Brittaney A.: Collaborative learning w/ LA is better than just collaborative learning alone.
 - v) B.A.: Having LA's keeps the faculty members engaged as well
- b) Breakout Group 2: Results from FAU
 - i) B.A.: Underrepresented minorities doing about 5% better (African American Males and females) in Calculus
 - ii) B.A.: The LA's themselves experience benefits

[9:51 AM: Ann Branaman, Stephanie Etter had to leave the meeting early for other meetings]

[9:57 AM: Evonne R. had to leave the meeting early for other meetings]

Education Reimagined: Engaging Students through Peer-Assisted Learning

- 4) Discuss challenges and potential criteria for course selection
[breakout rooms by topic; notes kept by each group in google doc:
☰ Meeting 1 CS - Breakout Sessions]
- a) Group Discussion:
- i) Brittanney A.: Setting the scenario - Imagine we have 50 applicants for review and can only choose 6. We need to design a rubric. There may be factors that are more important than a direct score compared to another class (i.e.: Honors course, etc.).
 - ii) Jennifer B.: What levels of students should be reached/scope of QEP
 - (1) Russell I.: Should support as many students as possible. Should not focus on just a small group. Probably important to involve “all campuses”
 - (2) Brittanney A.: Looking to find a strategic approach.
 - iii) Jennifer B.: Assign weights to possible impacts / where do things fall on the ranking? Possibly focus on factors such as: IFP courses, things that impact DFW, faculty requirements/needs, “non-negotiables”.
 - iv) Willie F.: Some form of faculty education and information about what this is should happen before they apply.
 - (1) Russell I.: May not apply or may get rejected due to not knowing or understanding the rubric.
 - (2) Brittanney A.: A rubric is a good place to start for faculty but there is room for interpretation for what is needed at that particular time.
 - (3) Russell I.: Other things will be taken into consideration
 - v) Jennifer B.: A lot of money is involved so a strong rubric is important regarding insuring fairness
 - (1) Russell I.: Defend important decisions
 - vi) Russell I.: Is there a model or example of a rubric that we can look at. “Don’t reinvent the wheel”
- 5) Laundry List/Brain Dump:
- a) Retention, DFW, APR
 - b) Willie F.: **Distribution of impact** - Stem/not stem. What campuses? Not honing in on only one thing to assure university buy in. Ability to see what was done before.
 - c) Russell I.: Making sure that online students **feel more connected** to FAU
 - i) Willie F.: If we get them first and the feel like “I am an Owl, this is where I belong” then we hold on to those students
 - d) Jennifer B.: **Equity**. Can we start looking at if there are inequities in the course even if the DFW is not high.

Education Reimagined: Engaging Students through Peer-Assisted Learning

- i) Willie F.: Speaking to an instructor/authority figure in public can be a faux pas in some cultures. LA's may help create a more homogeneous higher education culture.
 - e) Fred B.: **Barriers** to degree progression
 - f) Brittanney A.: **FTIC, transfer students**, etc.
 - i) Russell I.: That's a good idea to consider, it's a "unique" population.
- 6) Challenges to consider moving forward:
 - a) Willie F.: A **new power dynamic** introduced to the classroom
 - i) Brittanney A.: Faculty are not losing/giving up control. You actually end up with more control.
 - b) Fred B.: **Engagement** between students in asynchronous versus synchronous online courses. Less engagement in asynchronous.
 - i) Jennifer B.: There can be more interaction in synchronous online with LA than even F2F
 - ii) Brittanney A.: Used LA's for both synchronous and asynchronous; ways to make engagement work. There is a lot of room to do really cool things.
 - iii) Angel N.: Make students **feel like they matter**. Give them **something to engage** with
 - c) Brittanney A.: Looking specifically for challenges looking at course selection.
 - d) Russel I.: Important to make sure that LA selection represents what we are trying to find with student groups (online student, other campuses, etc.)
 - i) Brittanney A.: Value added if LA has experience in that course
- 7) Closing Questions?
 - a) Fred B.: Where will things be captured?
 - i) Brittanney A.: Google Doc, it's all captured there
 - b) Russell I.: Where will it be?
 - i) Brittanney A.: It will get organized and sent out. Once the info is gathered it will be decided who will report in the April meeting.
- 8) Meeting Adjourned by Brittnney Addelmann 10:23 am

Angel's Notes:

In rubric, consider modality in weight (online student experience is different)

DFW is good, but are there courses that have good DFW rates (grades are good) but the students don't stay/are not retained.

Education Reimagined: Engaging Students through Peer-Assisted Learning

Is there an overwhelming number of faculty who want to be involved? Is this a stringent selection criteria?

Breadth and scope need specified.

Numerous suggestions to concentrate on sheer numbers of impact

University buy-in could lead to a need to branch into multi-campus support

Rubric will help standardize the selection criteria, hence backing up reasoning for funding

Need wide impact but doesn't need to impact all; probably important to impact all campuses.

(SACSCOC will test university buy-in)

Need to inform faculty about what we are doing and impacts before they apply - what are they signing up for? Orient them on rubric

Rubric - core guidance of what we will look at. To defend important decisions we make.

Are there examples of rubrics we could use?