

University of Louisville
5th Year Interim Report to SACS
QEP Impact Report Committee April 24, 2012
Agenda

Attendees: *R. Van Zyl, A. Attaway, P. Payette, K. Newton, R. Detmering, H. Cunningham, J. Dietrich, C. Bays, M. Taylor-Archer, L. Peters*

- I. Review meeting minutes
 - a. February
 - i. approved
 - b. March
 - i. approved

- II. Annual Report group work
 - a. 10 minutes spent reviewing Annual Reports (07-08, 08-09, 09-10)
 - b. Mordean asked if Annual Report for 2010-2011 will be available. Yes, we will visit this soon...
 - c. Patty explained the current draft pieces of our 5 year report are lengthy and are intended to be condensed to fit into the 10-page 5 year report.
 - d. Committee members were asked to go through the provided Annual Reports from previous years to pull out additional items to highlight in our final report.
 - e. When Mordean asked why we would add more concepts to an already too long report, Cathy explained that first draft is similar to a qualitative research study. You gather all of the data and then sift through to find what really impacts you that we may want to include. Do you see themes from year to year? It is a good idea to have outside eyes take a look to potentially highlight what i2a staff members overlook due to familiarity.

White Board Notes to capture themes from annual reports:

Attaway and Van Zyl:

- a) Scaffolding the implementation has worked well and wasn't in the original plan.
- b) Use of "trailblazers" to foster change
- c) Showcase/Celebrating early wins
- d) i2a Institute became part of the momentum, continuity to promote enthusiasm for the next year
- e) Tine Reimers—keeping them engaged and enlarge the conversation so it isn't always about Paul-Elder. Complementary ways to think about Critical Thinking.

- f) Most invigorating experience for faculty is seeing the impact on students (Van Zyl)

Newton and Detmering: (it is a “culture change”)

- a) Expansion beyond academic units
 - a. Make CT/i2a at U of L unavoidable, relevance—it is a life skill, give students practice.
- b) Concept of “community”
- c) Integrated experience
- d) “Transformational” for faculty and staff (educators)... “as I was helping students, I began using it in my work”
- e) Opportunity to use “pithy” student voices

Assessment group

- a) Evolution of idea: how did this unfold over time?
- b) CAAP and Gen Ed CT data
 - a. Need to address about the data
- c) Unit Reports and patterns related to critical thinking exemplars:
 - a. Kent School
 - b. Speed School
 - c. Nursing
- d) Highlighting Faculty and Staff Scholarship
- e) i2a—what is the “action” part of that?
- f) After students have experienced i2a, what is it that sets them apart from any other university in the country? What sets us apart? What is it that makes our graduates look more competitive, more ready for the world, than students from other universities?
- g) Next steps: highlight—what is the overlap between the CBL and the CUE? What is the relationship?
- h) Possibility of using “e portfolios” (Julia D.) Uploading and showcasing best work in university specified categories and reflections on why they chosen those individual projects. Each year (freshman, sophomore, etc.) students upload new projects and they are archived. University uses these for assessment. Students to take ownership.
- i) Student Impact Data
- j) Faculty: Learning Communities, SUN Grants, etc. but also university’s program review processes...addressing ideas to action (Program review committee—Connie?)
- k) “Changing culture of the institution” or “institutionalizing i2a”
- l) Community Engagement Partnership Report—attached to President’s scorecard—has an item about i2a—being integrated into corporate programs in University

III. Outline of report and timeline

- a. Draft is in no way complete.
- b. Bays walked through the draft with the committee, explaining what she had compiled so far and why.
- c. In groups, look at the report and come up with feedback—what should we cut back on? What should we have more of?

Feedback

a)

IV. Review and Discussion

a. Section IV of report

- i. Pg. 4:
 1. General Education: have a visual representation to go along with the paragraph
 2. NSSE: More narrative
- ii. Balance of visual and narrative
- iii. Pg. 5:
 1. 1st items describe students' ability. Are others relevant?
 - a. Text to explain relevance?
 - b. Change language?
- iv. SERP: pre/post?
- v. Are there specific measures we believe are stronger? Are all created equal? Foreground some items?
- vi. Logic behind ordering?
 1. Flow
- vii. Value of identifying i2a **initiated** assessments vs. those existing/mandated.
- viii. Make “compelling case” for impact on campus & students (#s mean nothing solo)
 1. Consider what is most compelling→what should be emphasized? What best makes our case?
 - a. Look at **everything** first
- ix. Pg. 8: Faculty/staff comparison
 1. Differences: also include statistically significant figures
 2. “Memorizing facts” sentence—what is optimal level of fact recollection?
 3. Synthesizing
 4. Community Engagement:
 - a. 1st community service: faculty ask ‘how important?’

b. On minds of faculty and students=good

x. CUE:

1. Why do faculty rate it so low at the upper-division?=new initiative/frame new conversation?

xi. Henry offered to “cut word fat” a.k.a. take out the extra words in the QEP Report draft to help condense it.

V. Debrief and next steps

a. Next meeting May 29: Discuss early draft as-is

Adjourned 4:27pm