

2106 Reaffirmation  
QEP Development Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, April 27, 2015  
JUB 100, Faculty Senate Chambers



---

**Members Present**

Rebecca Foote, Sheila Otto, Tom Brinthaup, Ronda Henderson, Ron Kates, Paula Calahan, Lisa Rogers, Barbara Draude, Jason Vance, Terri Tharp, Tim Graeff, Scott Handy, Mary Farone, Sharon Smith, Jimmy Hart, Patti Miller, Tyler Henson, Jamie Morgan, Carol Swayze, Robert Kalwinsky, Michelle Boyer-Pennington, Kathy Crisp, Lara Daniel, Dianna Rust

**Others Present**

Lexy Denton

---

**Call to Order**

Dianna Rust, committee chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Faculty Senate Chambers, JUB 100. Roll was taken upon arrival.

**Review of Subcommittee Progress and Planning**

**Research – Jason Vance**

The research team has identified specific terms that needed to be better defined for the purposes of this QEP. They include:

- 1) Academic Engagement – Academic engagement is a student's active learning experiences as demonstrated through quality of effort, physical and psychological involvement, and participation in productive learning activities.
- 2) Critical Reflection – Critical reflection is the meta-cognitive act through which a student reflects on a learning experience and evaluates both new information and the frames of reference through which the information acquires meaning.
- 3) Integrative Learning – Integrative and applied learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co.-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

The full presentation can be found at <http://mtsu.edu/QEP/docs/Research%20Presentation.pdf>.

**Student Learning Outcomes/Assessment – Michelle Boyer-Pennington**

Three primary SLOs have been recommended with three program goals. Student learning outcomes are:

- 1) Integrative/Reflective Thinking: Students will use integrative thinking and reflection to demonstrate the ability to make connections across multiple academic contexts and educational experiences.
- 2) Personal and Professional Development: Students will demonstrate an understanding of, and the ability to reflect on, the self, such as identifying their aptitudes, abilities, strengths and weaknesses, and interests and articulating their future goals, aspirations, and place in the world.
- 3) Effective Communication: Students will be able to effectively, precisely, and appropriately communicate.

Program goals and assessment measurement tools can be found in the complete presentation at

**Resources – Dianna Rust**

Budgetary needs have been grouped into four classifications with preliminary recommendations:

- 1) Support - includes administrative and technical
- 2) Faculty Development
- 3) Student – includes marketing and incentives
- 4) Assessments

Complete recommendations can be found at <http://mtsu.edu/QEP/docs/MT%20Engage%20Resource%20Committee%20update%20April%202015.pdf>.

### **Action Steps – Lara Daniel**

The Actions Steps subcommittee has divided into three small groups working on a student plan, marketing, and faculty development. Each team has developed a five-year operational timeline. They have also prepared the basic components for the program as well as a student incentive proposal. The items can be found at:

Student – <http://mtsu.edu/QEP/docs/Student%20Plan%20Timeline.pdf>

Marketing – <http://mtsu.edu/QEP/docs/Marketing%20Timeline.pdf>

Faculty Development – <http://mtsu.edu/QEP/docs/Faculty%20Development%20Timeline.pdf>

Components and Incentives - <http://mtsu.edu/QEP/docs/Action%20Steps%20Incentives.pdf>

### **Focus Group Summary – Tim Graeff**

MT Engage has intense appeal to the students, alumni and community members who were interviewed during the recent focus group sessions. Items to consider include:

- Students would like to have a special job fair just for them as an incentive;
- Alumni and community members expressed interest in becoming involved as classroom speakers and panel judges/interview board for the scholarship.
- Students would like help creating an 'about me' video either showing them working at some capacity in their fields or a short introductory clip.

### **Survey Review – Dianna Rust**

Students: 51% of students responded yes when asked if they would enroll in an MT Engage course if it were part of their course of study. Most of the negative respondents noted that the program did not seem relevant to them. Relevancy should be stressed in the marketing.

Faculty: Faculty from 40 departments responded, and 61% of respondents felt that MT Engage would have a significant impact on learning. Only 8% felt that they would be unwilling to participate.

### **Discussion**

Q: Initial concept papers included 'ePortfolio coaches'. What happened to them?

A: The term 'coach' has been changed to mentor. We would like to see some upperclassmen come back in a practicum type position to help the freshman and sophomores get started.

Q: This is a student opt-in program. Is there a way to force them into the courses? At-risk students may not apply and could be lost. Is there a way to have advisors steer students into certain classes?

A: We have thought about not labeling the courses in an overt manner so some students may take the courses unintentionally. We are also hoping to include courses, like U1010, which many undeclared students take and K sections, which prescribed students take, to catch a wider spectrum of students.

### **Next Steps**

Dianna reminded committee members that MT Engage is still a work in progress and input and suggestions are still being sought.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 a.m.