

Education Reimagined

QEP Development Committee meeting

April 11, 2022

1:30 - 3 p.m.

Agenda

- **QEP Work group reports and discussion**
 - Assessment and student learning/success outcomes (*Fred Bloetscher*)
 - **Our GOAL for our first MEETING was:** to suggest Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Student Success Outcomes (SSOs) with realistic and measurable goals for the QEP
 - **Our next step is:** to refine SLOs and SSOs based on Development Committee feedback and Provide ideas for assessment (qualitative and quantitative) of SLOs and SSOs with Measures (content assessments; other assessment measurement tools) and Data needed (dashboards and reports)
 - Course Selection/Curriculum Grant Process (Brittanney)
 - **Our GOAL for our first MEETING was:** development of benchmarks (e.g. What are the standards/measures we will use to determine if a course meets criteria for redesign? How do we ensure equity, and that courses from varied departments, campuses, levels, and students are considered?)
 - **Our next step is:** to further develop and test a rubric to assess applications for course redesign and develop the initial course transformation application and supporting materials.
 - Faculty Development and Recognition (Brittanney)
 - **Our GOAL for our first MEETING was:** to suggest components of faculty development related to the QEP
 - **Our next step is:** to refine faculty development based on Development Committee feedback and suggest policies and procedures, including timelines and compensation, related to faculty development
 - Student Development and Recognition (Angel)
 - **Our GOAL for our first MEETING was:** *to develop suggestions for student development needs related to the QEP.*
 - **Our next steps are:** consider any additional feedback on the previous goal from this meeting, schedule another work group meeting to discuss the next goal
 - Marketing & Community Buy-In (Scott Silversten)
 - **Our GOAL for our first MEETING was:** to suggest timeline for elements associated with the marketing of the LA program and QEP.
 - **Our next step is:** to revise the timeline based on Development Committee feedback and to provide ideas for content for marketing and

collateral materials (swag), printed, electronic, etc. and suggest ways to engage the FAU community in preparation of the onsite visit (events).

- Overall feedback and other ideas
- Next steps

Attendance:

Name	Present (Yes or No)
Nicole Abreu	No
Molly Adam	Yes
Brittanney Adelman	Yes
Anthony Ambrosio	Yes
Louise Aurelien Buie	Yes
Jennifer Bebergal	Yes
Patrick Bernet	Yes
Fred Bloetscher	Yes
Ann Branaman	Yes
Guy Burns	No
Nori Carter	Yes
Donna Chamely-Wiik	Yes
Morgan Cooley	Yes
Kim Dunn	No
Stephanie Etter	Yes
Julie Golden-Botti	Yes
Terje Hill	Yes
Russ Ivy	No
Juan Izaguirre	No
Ying Liu	YES (2 p.m.)
Lily MacDonald	No

Jay Mireles-James	No
Angel Nevin	Yes
Bianca Nightengale-Lee	Yes
Kristy Padron	Yes
Daniel Raviv	Yes
Evonne Rezler	Yes
Sadie Shank	Yes
Scott Silversten	No
Maxwell Simonson	No
Vanessa Stubbs	Yes
Deb Szabo	Yes

QEP Development Committee meeting - Report
Assessment and student learning/success outcomes

Reported by: Fred Bloetscher

Feedback included by: Kristy Padron, Nori Carter

The GOAL for our first MEETING was: to suggest Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Student Success Outcomes (SSOs) with realistic and measurable goals for the QEP

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):

- **Knowledge**
- **Communication**
- **Critical Thinking**
- **Diversity**

Assessment of each of the four SLOs will be a standard requirement for all new (first-time) LA classes (and a stipend will be provided upon submission of the SLO assessment). After the first semester, faculty will be required to assess each of the 4 SLOs at least once every four semesters in which the course is taught (no less than one every semester and each SLO a minimum of once every two years). There will be a standardized assignment, criterion for success, and rubric to evaluate outcomes on each measure, which may be determined by the faculty member in consultation with the LA program office. Sample assignments and rubrics will be provided

- **Knowledge:** The student in an LA course will demonstrate **content/discipline-based learning** gains based on a standardized assessment or rubric to evaluate their content knowledge or skills.
 - Assessment Method: These outcomes/gains will be compared to students in the same course without LAs (if applicable) or before inclusion of the LAs (prior semesters).
 - Criterion for Success: Students in LA courses will demonstrate higher gains in knowledge or skills than students in the course without LAs (if applicable).
 - Can be done with pre- and post-tests in LA and non-LA sections to determine changes in learning gains or another method determined by the faculty member in consultation with the LA program.

Feedback: Can this be done for multiple terms for sections selected for pre- and post tests? This would give validity if repeated, or see where anomalies or differences may emerge, and it would be interesting to explore differences.

Feedback: How faculty are required to assess the SLOs sounds confusing and contradictory. Clarify who any stipends are for.

Feedback (Tony): Use %'s of meeting certain standards. Must be some level of specificity on what exactly we are measuring here. Allow faculty to play with performance criteria.

Feedback (Fred): Offer the same class with and without LA support. Concurrent offering with/without. Can be used as faculty incentive.

Feedback (Dani) - really belongs in Faculty Development: think about redesigning in a way to focus on the most important element of the course. What we teach is important but also HOW we teach it is important. Students say they do not see connections between what they are learning and why it is important and how it's related to their intuition. Don't measure things that are irrelevant.

Feedback (Bianca): Are we looking at the student experience? Consider more qualitative data collection.

- **Communication:** The student in an LA course will convey understanding of group work in appropriate formats, venues, and delivery modes.
 - Assessment Method: Faculty members will determine the method in which students will convey their understanding (orally, written, digital or media, etc.) and rate their communication skill on a rubric.
 - Criterion for Success: Students in LA courses will convey understanding of group work through at least one standard communication format at a minimum standard of "meets expectations" on a communication rubric.

Feedback: "Convey understanding" – can this be an action verb like "demonstrate competency" or use more measurable terms? "Appropriate formats" – is "multiple formats" more explicit and tangible?

- **Critical Thinking:** The student in an LA course will apply **critical thinking skills** to evaluate information, problem solve, and/or develop new projects.
 - Assessment Method: Faculty members will determine the method in which students will apply these critical thinking skills through group work and rate their critical thinking skills on a rubric.
 - Criterion for Success: Students in LA courses will apply critical thinking skills during group work at a minimum standard of "meets expectations" on a critical thinking rubric.

Feedback: Will all LA-designated courses require group work that the faculty would assess? Or, is this a program-based SLO where the faculty member would not be doing the assessing and the LA program office would be? Also, in looking at the Academic Learning Compact descriptions, the group application is on Communication related to team/collaborative communication. Would any group-related assessment be better under communication?

- **Diversity:** The student in an LA course will demonstrate openness to new perspectives and diversity of others, interact respectfully and appropriately with students in their groups, and demonstrate professionalism by working inclusively and co-creating an environment where each perspective is considered for the purpose of making progress toward common goals.
 - Assessment Method: This will be assessed by student written descriptions and ratings of their work group as measured on a rubric.
 - Criterion for Success: Students in LA courses will describe their appropriate interactions with group members at a minimum standard of “meets expectations” on a diversity and inclusion rubric.

Feedback: suggest careful phrasing considering current climate and HB 233. Some suggestions could be: students in an LA course will discuss and consider varying and diverse approaches, civilly communicate with students in their groups, and demonstrate professionalism by working inclusively and co-creating an environment where each perspective is considered for the purpose of making progress towards common goals.

Feedback: For the assessment method, will these ratings be student’s self-ratings with them using a rubric? I have seen students in groups measure each other fairly—those that disagreed had a method to dispute (happened minimally).

Student Success Outcomes (SSOs):

- **Retention and Graduation**
- **Completion of IFP and Gateway courses**
- **Equity**
- **Career/workforce competencies**
- **Inclusion and Belonging/Mattering**

Assessment of the SSOs will be completed by the LA program office. Faculty teaching LA courses will be asked to have students in their courses complete surveys or assignments to measure SSOs as needed (particularly surrounding **Career/Workforce competencies** and **Inclusion and Belonging/Mattering**).

Feedback: Should SSOs also have a schedule for consistent assessment?

- **Retention and Graduation:** Students in LA courses will demonstrate higher retention within their major/progression toward degree (if core major course), institutional retention, and graduation rates (4-year for FTIC students; 2-year for Florida AA transfers) than students not in LA courses.
 - Assessment Method: This will be assessed by IEA data reports and dashboards.
 - Criterion for Success: Students in LA courses will have higher retention rates (major and institutional) and graduation rates than students in non-LA sections of the same or comparable courses by an amount that is determined to be

statistically significant. Could include comparison of outcomes with LAs vs semesters pre-LA model implementation.

- **Completion of IFP and Gateway courses:** Students in LA courses will demonstrate higher rates of completion of gateway courses (as measured by DFW rates) than students not in LA courses (or as compared to the DFW rate prior to implementation of the LA model).
 - Assessment Method: This will be assessed by IEA data reports and dashboards.
 - Criterion for Success: Intellectual Foundations Program or IFP (defined here as FAU general education/core curriculum courses) and “Gateway courses” (defined here as prerequisite courses for a particular degree program) that have DFW rates greater than or equal to 20% will see a decrease in DFW rates of at least 2 percentage points or 20% of that rate, whichever is greater
 - e.g.: a gateway course with a 21% DFW rate could drop to 19% to meet this metric, a course with 35% DFW would drop 7 percentage points or to a 28% DFW rate to meet this metric

Feedback: Should IFP also be referenced in description? Is the intent to have to meet the criterion for success for BOTH IFP and Gateway courses? This is currently written where both would have to be met to meet the criterion for success. Technical writing question...Does courses also relate to IFP, too?: IFP courses and Gateway courses. If yes, would parenthesis only be on “Gateway”?

- **Equity:** Students from historically underrepresented backgrounds will demonstrate significant gains in the above measures (retention, progression toward degree, graduation rates, and overall course DFW rates) as compared to majority students.
 - Assessment Method: This will be assessed by IEA data reports and dashboards.
 - Criterion for Success: Students who identify as Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, or American Indian/Alaska native or students who are underrepresented historically in that course or degree program will have greater percentage gains than majority students by at least 5% in areas of retention, progression toward degree, graduation rates, and overall course DFW rates OR will have statistically significant higher outcomes than students of the same background not in an LA section of the course.

Feedback: Might want to see if there are visible improvements from pre-test across multiple semesters. Check if “majority students” is the correct term for those not in an underrepresented background.

Feedback: greater percentage gains “than majority students” In LA class(es) or non-LA class(es)? Asking because the statement after “OR” specifically compares to students NOT in an LA section.

Feedback (Donna): Learn how to use data to evaluate courses :) as part of faculty development

Career/Workforce competencies: Students in LA courses will describe how they developed at least 2 NACE career competencies; LAs will describe how they developed at least 5 NACE career competencies.

- Assessment Method: This will be assessed by student written descriptions of how they have developed these skills in the LA course or as an LA measured on a career competency rubric.
- Criterion for Success: LAs and students in LA courses will describe how their experience in the LA position or LA course has developed NACE competencies at a minimum standard of “meets expectations” on a career competency rubric.
- **Inclusion and Belonging/Mattering:** Students who take at least one LA course during the semester will rate improved feelings of inclusion and belonging as compared to prior to taking an LA course.
 - Assessment Method: This will be assessed through a survey that asks varied questions to determine feelings of inclusivity and belonging/mattering.
 - Criterion for Success: Students who have taken a course with LAs will rate feelings of inclusion and belonging on an average of 4.0 or higher on a 5 point Likert scale.

Feedback: Any measurement used to assess student feelings of inclusivity should be a widely used instrument with established (strong) validity.

Feedback: Clarifying question...only students who have taken their first LA course would be assessed, correct? For example, if they take another class that is designated as LA and take the survey, they would be filtered out of the results.

**We can have assessments that measure things like critical thinking and student inclusion and belonging and career competencies as program-wide pre- post-course surveys for all courses - so program based, not course based - then measure overall effectiveness of the LA program in doing these things AND can break it down by course to see which courses have most success in these areas. We will also build elements into the LA evaluation process to measure their growth in both SLO and SSO areas.*

Feedback: Most SLOs and SSOs focus on “the student in an LA course”. Would both the SLOs and SSOs be able to apply to the Learning Assistant’s as well? Or, based on the last meeting, does a different or additional set of SLOs and SSOs need to be created for LA’s that focuses more on research projects and/or opportunities; presentations/publications with faculty; and teaching as a career?

- **FEEDBACK on SLOs and SSOs**
 - **Items to discuss:**

- Are these appropriate and do they measure the most important things?
 - Are there things we are not measuring that we should (*for example, feedback was that all outcomes except one reference students enrolled in the LA course - not the LAs themselves. Should we adjust to meet both students in course and LAs?*)
 - *Some of the specific details are to be determined in the next phase (what types of measures will we use).*
 - *Are there ones we should eliminate from this plan?*
-
- **The next step for this workgroup is:** to refine SLOs and SSOs based on Development Committee feedback and **Provide ideas for assessment (qualitative and quantitative) of SLOs and SSOs with Measures (content assessments; other assessment measurement tools) and Data needed (dashboards and reports)**

QEP Development Committee meeting - Report Course Selection/Curriculum Grant Process

Reported by: Brittanney Adelman

Feedback included by: Jennifer Bebergal, Julie Golden-Botti

The GOAL for our first MEETING was: development of benchmarks (e.g. standards/ measures we will use to determine if a course meets criteria for redesign; how we will ensure equity, and that courses from varied departments, campuses, levels, and students are considered)

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Sub-Category</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Score A</u>	<u>Score B</u>
<i>For Score A, 3 points if that student type is significantly impacted; 1 point if that student type is partially impacted; 0 points if relatively no students of that type are impacted. For Score B, rate the breadth of impact per semester: 5 points if impacts more than 300 students of that type; 3 points if more than 200 students; 2 points if more than 100 students; 1 point if more than 50 students; 0 if impacts fewer than 50 students per semester of that type</i>				
Students Impacted: Type and Breadth	FTIC			
	Transfer students			
	Broward or Jupiter students			
	Non-STEM students			
	Online students			
<i>For Score A, 3 points if that course type is impacted; 0 if not that course type. For Score B, rate the breadth of impact per semester: 5 points if impacts more than 300 students; 3 points if more than 200 students; 2 points if more than 100 students; 1 point if more than 50 students; 0 if impacts fewer than 50 students per semester</i>				
Courses Impacted: type and breadth	IFP (general education)			
	Major gateway (prerequisite)			
	Required Major course			
<i>For Score A, 3 points if that metric is significantly impacted; 1 point if that metric is mildly impacted; 0 if no impact on that metric. For Score B, rate the breadth of impact per semester: 5 points if impacts more than 300 students; 3 points if more than 200 students; 2 points if more than 100 students; 1 point if more than 50 students; 0 if impacts fewer than 50 students per semester</i>				
Impact on Metrics	Retention (FTIC) and APR			
	4-year Graduation Rates			
	Transfer Graduation Rates			
	Ability to progress to subsequent course			
<i>For DFW rates, use the average score over the past 4 semesters (can exclude summers). Score A, 5 points if that course has average DFW rate of 40% or higher; 3 points if DFW rate of 30-39%; 2 points if DFW rate is 20-29%; 0 points if DFW is under 20%; Score B should address any identities or intersection of identities that have made students in that course disadvantaged. If the difference in DFW rate for two populations is 15% or greater - 5 points; 4 points if difference is 10-14%; 3 points if 7-9.9%; 2 points if 5-6.99%; 1 points if difference in outcomes is 3-4.99%.</i>				

Course DFW rate	Overall DFW and DFW for Historically disadvantaged students			
<i>Reviewers can award up to 3 additional points in Score A for justification of impact on equity and inclusivity and 3 additional points in Score B for justification and rationale based on circumstances not outlined in this rubric.</i>				
Impact on Equity & Inclusivity or Special Circumstances not addressed previously	Proposal makes a case for additional rationale based on diversity, equity, and inclusion			

DEFINITIONS

- FTIC: first-year, first-time in college students who will impact our retention/APR
- (NOTE: students in courses beyond first-year may be coded as FTIC for graduation rates, but will be counted in that metric)
- Transfer: Student enrolling with an AA degree from a Florida State College
- Broward or Jupiter students: Students with primary campus as non-Boca, not fully online
- Online student: Any course where the modality is at least 80% online; students pay the distance learning fee
- Non-STEM students: Any students who are majoring in disciplines outside of a traditional STEM discipline

Feedback (Angel): Possibly add the online class modality in addition to the impact on online students.

Feedback (Julie): 76 code data can be easily defined in online courses that are taken by both in-person students and '76 coded' online solely students.

Feedback (Bianca): DEI is sometimes an amorphous concept. Be sure to be clear on indicators- what exactly is equity. What strategies embody equity. Bianca is happy to be included in crystalizing definitions and ties.

- **FEEDBACK on Course Selection Criteria**
 - **Items to discuss:**
 - Are these categories appropriate and do they measure the most important things/tell the course's story?
 - Are there things we are not measuring that we should?
 - Are there things we should eliminate?
 - Are there suggestions on the weights of these categories?

The next step for this workgroup is: to further develop and test a rubric to assess applications for course redesign and develop the initial course transformation application and supporting materials.

QEP Development Committee meeting - Report
Faculty Development and Recognition

Reported by: Brittanney Adelman

Feedback included by: Daniel Raviv, Terje Hill

The GOAL for our first MEETING was: to suggest components of faculty development related to the QEP

Faculty Development Component	Sub-components	Action Item Related to Redesign
What is the LA model?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Examples of current successful LA courses at FAU and across the country ● Faculty videos of how they used to teach, how they teach with LAs ● LA Alliance videos. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create account with LAA (LA Alliance) ● Learn about the LA model ● Summary of General Program Elements (GPEs) https://sites.google.com/view/laa-resources/generalized-program-elements ● Investigate LA Model Implementation Guide https://sites.google.com/view/laa-resources/program-management/starting-your-program/implementation-guide ● Readings: Learn about results from other LA models
What is the role of the LA: what are LAs allowed to do and not allowed to do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Examples of LAs in action ● In person class visit and/or videos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What does an LA do? https://sites.google.com/view/laa-resources/home/what-does-a-learning-assistant-do ● Start thinking about how you would use LAs
What are effective active learning strategies and how do I incorporate them into my course?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How do I do it? What does/can it look like? ● Flipped classroom model and other models. ● Creating active learning materials: Appropriate citing and copyrights (partner with Library) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Readings: effective active learning ● Find several examples of effective active learning strategies that have been used in your subject area.

<p>Starting to map out my new course</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-implementation tips. • Is there a minimum requirement for time spent on LA activities to be considered an LA course? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAQs • Identify current student and course level challenges. • How can you use LAs and course redesign to combat these challenges? • Outline the best ideas you can think of for combatting student/course challenges – these may be more than just LAs and the addition of collaborative group work; could be related to content/structure/delivery, etc.
<p>Thinking about Logistics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do I use the LAs? What are effective uses of LAs? • How many LAs can I have? • How do I/can I use or arrange the classroom space? • How do I create groups? • How do I get students to work together effectively? • How do we incentivize students to do pre-class work (come prepared) and in class work? • How do we effectively weight activities in class? • How do we tie in best practices related to pedagogy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create an active learning activity. For this activity, describe how you envision using LAs and collaborative group work in your class? How many LAs do you need? Be intentional about how LAs will use their time. How will you use or set-up your classroom for the activity? • Can you think of any action items or best practices you can use to help promote students working together effectively? Is there incentive for them to do so? What is that incentive? • After creating your activity, think about the types of deliverables you expect from students and possible weight structure for activities/assignments in this class.
<p>How to assess effectiveness of the LA model in my course</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share SLOs and SSOs for QEP. • Share sample rubrics and sample assessment plans. • Build your continual assessment and improvement plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you measure success? At the end of this course what do you anticipate students will be able to do? • Considering the activity you just designed, how do you assess its effectiveness? • What baseline data can you provide in your course to be able to measure student growth?
<p>What do weekly prep meetings look like?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes for weekly prep meetings and examples of effective weekly prep meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You are responsible for mentoring your LAs too! Think about (and write down) the types of questions you would ask your LAs during weekly prep. • Outline a sample structure for your weekly prep meeting. Are you doing this alone or with other LAs and LA faculty?

<p>How are we mindful about equity/inclusivity when considering curriculum?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can we build pieces of DEI throughout the curriculum? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can you use LAs and course redesign to address equity and inclusivity in your classroom? • Find an example of someone from a different identity than you as the instructor and either share a story of how they contributed to your discipline or provide an assignment for students related to that individual (could be a reading, video, discussion, etc.)
<p>What does LA Pedagogy cover?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review syllabus for LA pedagogy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a question that you would ask your LAs each week in weekly prep that ties to what the LAs are learning that week in pedagogy.
<p>How do we help our students thrive?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can we identify and positively impact student mental health issues? • How do we develop groups? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students who develop relationships within their LA groups have a greater likelihood of success. Create three short activities that you will do throughout the semester (one at the beginning of the semester, one a few weeks in, and one around the midterm) to help build a sense of community and cohesion amongst your groups.
<p>Faculty concerns/Open Forum <i>(Some of these can be covered in FAQs, but each cycle we may have new questions to address)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much time is involved in redesign and teaching the course with the LA model? • Content (how can we cover content while using effective active learning strategies)? • LA concerns: what if LA is sick or quits? • What if students hate the LA model and it negatively impacts student evaluations (SPOT)? • Can revising a course with the LA model be considered an “Indicator of excellence in instruction?” • How do we account for variability in student prior knowledge? • What resources are available to help develop documents for the course? What happens to resources that I develop? • How do we engage all students, including those who may be letting their group members do all the work (“free-loaders”)? • How do I get students to work together? • Can active learning be distracting? • What if you have it planned and it isn’t working? How do you manage the “disaster”? 	

Additional feedback: review and modify curriculum often, emphasize and improve pedagogy (Logistics)

Feedback: create a library of various LA activities (or lesson plans) by discipline for faculty. Library would contain links and ideas by discipline. Maybe faculty get a stipend for adding original ideas to the library and providing a write up or recording of lessons developed? This would be a unique FAU library and could also be helpful to new faculty to FAU and teaching in the LA model.

Feedback (Dani): Students learn differently than we did. Changing media choices for students to be involved in class content. Students state they do not open books unless they have to. Teaching pedagogy concerns/we teach the way we've learned- but that is not even close to the same anymore. Develop materials to connect students intuitively, visual ways, engaging ways.

Offer a 'stop-in' option to faculty to view how the courses are flowing with LAs. Finding champions for change will be hard.

Have videos in the repository that faculty and students can view. Possibly make an intro video that is mandatory/extra credit.

Feedback (Fred): Finding the faculty to do this is crucial. Some faculty are teaching the way they were taught 40 years ago and are resistant (significant barrier to teaching innovatively). What is the incentive to attract faculty who are genuinely going to redesign a course in a way that will be successful.

Feedback (Donna): Online modules that are self-paced vs. must be in-person for training. Establish flexibility for faculty to be engaged. Some faculty/disciplines are more akin to group work while others prefer individual work. Meaningfully target faculty depending on type of discipline.

Feedback (Bianca): COSI online modules, prepare resources 'at the ready'. How do we circumvent folks who can't conceptualize or see how it would work.

Feedback (Louise): highlighting the LA program (faculty & students) via a weekly announcement.

- **FEEDBACK on Faculty Development**

- **Items to discuss:**

- Are these appropriate topics and do they arm faculty the information needed for optimal success?
- Are there components missing?
 - *Some of the specific details are to be determined in the next phase (timelines, compensation, mode of delivery (learning community?)).*
- Are there topics we should eliminate from this plan?

- **The next step for this workgroup is:** to refine faculty development based on Development Committee feedback and **suggest policies and procedures, including timelines and compensation, related to faculty development.**

QEP Development Committee meeting - Report
Student Development and Recognition

Reported by: Angel Nevin

The **GOAL** for our first **MEETING** was: to develop suggestions for student development needs related to the QEP.

Pedagogy Class Topics	Considerations/Discussion points
<p>What are the top 6-8 topics to cover in first semester LAs pedagogy course?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom Discourse ● Questions and Questioning Strategies ● Assessment ● Instructional Values ● Metacognition ● Mindset ● Emotional Intelligence ● Empowerment ● Career Competencies ● Create a teaching philosophy ● *DEI and Implicit Bias will be woven into each topic
<p>What will pedagogy course look like?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Credit variable (0-2cr) ● Zero credit only ● *Mind finance, excess credits
<p>What can we recommend for returning LAs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership/Mentoring opportunities ● Perform evaluations ● Design a pedagogy topic activity/session ● Provide feedback to LA canvas course homework
<p>Overall, what elements should stay/be considered for the mandatory pedagogy class?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Don't use exams to assess knowledge- consider another way to assess. ● If we use peer-reviewed journal articles, spend time discussing the proper way to digest that type of media. ● Be sure to clearly define the time commitment for first-time LAs. ● Videos are a preferred method, then reflection.

- **FEEDBACK on Student Development**

- **Items to discuss:**
 - Are these topics arming LAs with the information needed for optimal success facilitating student collaboration?
 - Are there topics missing?
 - Are there topics we should eliminate from this plan?

Feedback: Can we add a piece on thriving for students, like we have for faculty dev?

Possibly add a module or overview on Mental Health.

- **The next step for this workgroup is:** Set policies and procedures related to student development (to include timelines, compensation, etc.). Pedagogy attendance policy/grading standards. Classroom site visit rubric development?

QEP Development Committee meeting - Report
Marketing & Community Buy-In

Reported by: Jennifer Bebergal

The GOAL for our first MEETING was: to suggest a timeline for elements associated with the marketing of the LA program and QEP.

Timeframe	Activity	Responsible	Comments
April 1 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present about QEP to communication network 	Jennifer/Brittanney	Ask folks to join group
By May 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crystal (Public Affairs) completes visual system Video and photos of LA in action (April 25) Submit work order for initial projects (“content-light” materials) such as t-shirts, swag, roll-up banners, teasers Create LA FAQs 	Scott/Crystal Scott/Jennifer Jennifer Jen/Brittanney/Angel	Need script, student volunteers, what to wear Need budget and decision on what to order (tactile)
By August 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website 	Jen/Brittanney/Angel	
2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development: graphics; can begin to develop content for materials 	Graphics: Scott/Laurie Content: Jen/Brittanney/Angel	
2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roll out/ Communication Plan 	All	Scott- draft what this may look like
August 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written QEP plan submitted to SACSCOC (work with Public Affairs on visual development and layout) 	Jen/Brittanney/Angel with Scott’s team	
Fall 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select “QEP Ambassadors” - students to tell the story of what it is like to be in an LA class; share “learning hacks” in their language/voice Tik Tok videos or similar social media to engage student audience Begin “kick-off events” (on each campus and online to excite and inform people about QEP) 		
Spring 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “QEP Ambassadors” - students and others (QEP faculty ambassadors?) Visual and electronic marketing (ground signs, banners, FAU homepage, Canvas pages, etc.) Events to spread word (office decorating, 		

	tabling events, etc.)		
April 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SACSCOC onsite visit April 2-4 		

- **FEEDBACK on Marketing & Community Buy-In**
 - **Items to discuss:**
 - Are these additional components we should consider in our marketing plan?
 - *Are there components we should eliminate from this plan?*

Feedback: Champion in each college

- **The next step for this workgroup is:** to revise the timeline based on Development Committee feedback and to provide ideas for content for marketing and collateral materials (swag), printed, electronic, etc. and suggest ways to engage the FAU community in preparation of the onsite visit (events).

Feedback (Louise): Are we going to actively look for faculty champions? Pps look based on each college.

Overall feedback on the way the Development Committee meetings are going: