
QEP Planning Team Members

Faculty

Richard Coronado	Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Dr. Jane De La Garza	Developmental Studies
Abel Duran Jr.	Business, Math, Science, and Technology
Pamela Fowler	Nursing and Allied Health
Oscar O. Hernandez	Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Wallace D. Johnson	Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Patricia Maserang	Business, Math, Science, and Technology
Curtis Roberson	Nursing and Allied Health
Stevan M. Schiefelbein	Developmental Studies
Edward Wagner	Faculty Senate, Developmental Studies

Administration and Staff

Brenda Balderas	Finance and Administrative Services
Luzelma G. Canales	Accountability and Management Services
Jose Cruz	Information Services and Planning
Mary Elizondo	Finance and Administrative Services
Dr. Ali Esmaeili	Bachelor Programs and University Relations
Cody Gregg	Information Services and Planning
Lee H. Grimes	Professional Development
Paul Hernandez Jr.	Student Services and Development
Kimberly McKay	Student Services and Development
Anahid Petrosian	Academic Affairs
William Serrata	Student Services and Development

Resource Personnel

Dr. Brenda Cole	Information Services and Planning
Jacque Gillispie	Information Services and Planning
Laura B. Talbot	Curriculum and Accreditation

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: March 23, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: J1-408

Agenda

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Review of existing data sources**
- 3. Presentation of Graduation Taskforce recommendations**
- 4. Discussion of process for selecting final topic**
- 5. SACS Summer Institute**
- 6. Next meeting date: April 13th, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.**



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, March 23, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building J, Room 1-408

RECORDER: Joy Ernst

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:45 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Abran Duran, Jr.

Dr. Ail Esmæili

Anahid Petrosian

Curtis Roberson

Edward Wagner

Helen Patricia Maserang

Dr. Jane De La Garza

Laura Talbot

Jose Cruz

Lee Hudson Grimes

Pamela Fowler

Paul Hernandez, Jr.

Richard Coronado

Wallace D Johnson

William Serrata

Materials Distributed:

-QEP Planning Binder

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:40 a.m.
2. Old Business - Laura Talbot reviewed the information from the last meeting with the committee members and stated that it included an orientation to and a presentation of QEP and STC's role as an institution. To recap, she informed the members that STC was charged with identifying what process the institution would follow to solicit ideas for a QEP topic. Ms. Talbot also stated that the role of the planning committee was to make the final recommendation for STC's QEP topic based on the assimilation of these ideas.
3. New Business – Ms. Talbot called attention to new business with the SWOT data provided by the office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. This data ranked the internal strengths and weaknesses of STC as well as opportunities and threats external to the institution. This information came from analyzed data compiled from surveys. William Serrata presented a second set of data from Achieving the Dream, a national movement within twenty-seven chosen community colleges in five states, with the Lumina Foundation operating as the chief financial partner. He informed the committee that the original focus of Achieving the Dream was to promote greater student success of African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans and the institutions chosen by the Foundation had largely ethnic-minority populations. Mr. Serrata stated that the goal of Lumina in Achieving the Dream was to implement a “change effort” by community colleges making data-driven decisions and instituting data-supported initiatives by incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data. He explained to the committee that the quantitative data for STC came from the annual Fact Books, but to establish qualitative data the institution set up twenty-seven focus groups made up of students, faculty, staff, independent school districts and community input. All the information was transcribed in the OIRE and the outcome was a listing of the top ten barriers to student success based on qualitative and quantitative data and resulted in specific

strategies to address these issues. He explained that task forces were created involving STC students, faculty, and staff to look at the three specific issues of advisement, accountability for student learning, and assessment and placement and make sure the recommendations were in line with the data through consensus building and focus groups. Mr. Serrata concluded by stating that the strategies addressing all of the identified priorities are data-based and derived from both qualitative and quantitative data, focus groups, and information from the three task forces.

Paul Hernandez, who heads the Graduation Task Force, presented his information to the committee members. He stated that the task force began by examining financial advising and the concept of case management, which would result in all students being assigned to one advisor from the beginning to the end of their time as a student at STC. He informed the committee that his task force looked at ways to help students graduate and improve graduation rates for the institution and concluded there were three focus areas. These focus areas are Student Services, Instruction, and Technology and how it is used to get information to the students. Mr. Hernandez also stated that the task force decided on three areas to be impacted by the proposed recommendations and they were the information students receive, the process in which they receive it, and the overall value that will be added for the student when the recommendations are institutionalized. He informed the committee that the task force was currently in the process of finalizing their recommendations.

Laura Talbot concluded the meeting by stating that the next committee meeting would focus on discussion and decision-making oriented toward the process STC will adopt to develop a QEP topic by the end of the next academic year. She stressed the importance of making these decisions regarding STC's process so that project-related activities could be incorporated into the 2007 fall semester. Ms. Talbot stated one way to expedite this decision making period at STC was for each committee member to research other institutions' processes as a guideline. She asked each member of the committee to research other institutions and bring to the next meeting a summary of the QEP topic selection process from another institution. She also asked the committee to review the data provided and identify possible QEP topics from that data.

4. Next Meeting Date: The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 13, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: April 13, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: J1-406

Agenda

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Review of existing data sources-CCSSE**
- 3. Review of Possible QEP Topics from existing Data**
- 4. Discussion of process for selecting final topic-Review of Other Colleges**
- 5. SACS Summer Institute Update**
- 6. Next meeting date: April 27th, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.**



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, April 13, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building J, Room 1-406

RECORDER: Laura B. Talbot

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:54 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dr. Ail Esmaili	Cody Gregg
Anahid Petrosian	Pamela Fowler
Curtis Roberson	Paul Hernandez, Jr.
Helen Patricia Maserang	Wallace D Johnson
Dr. Jane De La Garza	Jacque Gillispie
Laura Talbot	Luzelma G Canales
Stevan M Schiefelbein	Mary Elizondo
Juan Carlos Aguirre	

Materials Distributed:

- QEP Planning Binder
- Agenda
- Committee Minutes from March 23, 2007

1. Call to Order and Introductions- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 9:10 a.m.
2. Review of Existing Data Sources -CCSSE - Jacque Gillispie provided an overview of the data from the first year of STC's participation in the CCSSE. Ms. Gillispie provided the results on 4 benchmarks in comparison to other Achieving the Dream Schools, other Hispanic Serving institutions and all large institutions. She also provided frequency data for two of the 4 benchmark areas. Luzelma Canales mentioned that the gaps between student and faculty perceptions could be used to target for improvement. Juan Carlos Aguirre asked if non-credit students had been surveyed for the CCSSE and Jacque Gillespie clarified that the CCSSE was intended for credit students. Luzelma Canales stated that non-credit students enrolled in parallel courses would have been captured in the data. Ms. Gillispie stated that STC ranked above the national average in all of the recorded data areas, but information pertaining to STC specifically could be used as an assessment tool for QEP topic areas. As an example, she pointed out that the CCSSE data revealed 71% of STC students stated they had never participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course and that this was an area that could be considered for impact by the QEP topic. Also based on information from the data, she presented the area of tutoring in a learning community forum as another possibility for impact in topic discussions and instructed the committee members to utilize this data as a tool to help support and assess proposed actions and to consider how this data could relate to a potential QEP topic. Wallace Johnson stated that it is important that the committee not look at STC's information alone while determining the QEP topic and that CCSSE data is a useful tool to create targets and strategies. He also informed the committee members that while doing the CCSSE research, Dr. McClenney and her colleagues found certain colleges that had very high scores on the benchmarks. When those colleges were looked at more closely they were found

to be either a heavily Hispanic-serving or historically black colleges. Further research done in Florida community colleges with the same traits and high marks revealed what the research team described as a “compensatory effect.” Mr. Johnson went on to explain that this meant these populations of students begin college with disadvantaged backgrounds that seem to make not only the students try harder to keep pace, but the faculty try harder to help them keep pace. He also stated that another part of this effect is called the “survivor effect.” Because CCSSE surveys are administered in the spring semester, there is speculation that the “survivors” of the fall semester are the individuals responding to the surveys. He concluded by stating that there was consideration for a pilot subgroup, which would include STC, to administer surveys during the fall semester to help eliminate this effect.

3. Review of Possible QEP Topics from Existing Data – Laura Talbot asked that each committee member look at and incorporate the CCSSE data into their own list of QEP topics and email her the information by Friday, April 20th, so a master list of possible QEP topics based upon a review of the data could be compiled for next meeting.

4. Discussion of Process for Selecting Final Topic and Review of Other Colleges – As a starting point for STC in determining its QEP topic, Ms. Talbot suggested reviewing the processes other colleges have developed and followed. She presented information emailed to her by Ed Wagner for the University of Louisville which made a college-wide call for proposals of QEP based on SACS criteria. The University also used information from surveys of scholars and alumni, and 14 focus groups to categorize all the material into four major themes. A subcommittee was developed for each theme to integrate the information and produce one idea to submit for approval. The email also included information on the QEP from Surrey Community College. Wallace Johnson presented information on Wallace State Community College which used a strategic planning process to adapt a learning-college theme. Pat Maserang introduced an approach by Cleveland State Community College of making the QEP committee a permanent part of the college with its own mission statement. She stated that this college focused on several student-learning models and used fall-to-fall data, retention rates, and developmental studies as indicators of how students learn. The data analysis revealed that the college fell short in the areas of student success and retention based on the learning models for student learning. Committees were formed to narrow the information down to produce a final topic. Stevan Schiefelbein stated that University of Texas at Dallas set up an active website to solicit faculty input for that university’s QEP. Dr. Jane de la Garza provided the committee with information about Rollins College where the QEP was to enhance student learning by developing an institutional culture of local and global citizenship and literature, then divided the plan into five major initiatives. She stated that a possibility for STC might be to also include different initiatives to fit with the needs of STC since the college has an international component which stems from articulation agreements with institutions in Mexico. Laura Talbot informed the committee that the purpose for the research into other colleges and universities was to get ideas of processes used and then to decide how to use data STC already has available to incorporate any additional activities to generate topic ideas. Ms. Talbot also explained that the next step for the committee would be to decide how to narrow those generated ideas down into a QEP topic and initiate any outside activities needed to do this. She stated that while one theme can be used for the QEP topic, that theme can encompass various projects STC could implement in its pursuit. Ms. Talbot mentioned the opportunity Professional Development Day in October 2007 would present to implement focus groups for faculty and staff. Curtis Roberson stated to the committee the importance of identifying the customers of STC in this process as the students, faculty, and both the local and international communities. He also stated that since the SWAT done with the faculty provided a top-down managerial perspective of the institution, there should also be a bottom-up perspective from the students. Ms. Canales informed the committee that Royal Loresco was currently conducting a follow-up to the 27-focus-group barrier study done two years ago with 22

focus groups on all five campuses. The data analysis expected to be completed in May and would provide the student-perspective data on college success and barriers to that initiative.

Laura Talbot concluded the session by stating that the committee needed to give the college community as a whole the opportunity for input, specifically on QEP. She asked for committee members to email her a flow-chart or bulleted points of a process model by Friday, April 20th which would map out how to gather initial topics, how to interrelate the topics with data, and how that would result in a final topic to present to PDC in May. This information would be compiled and used in the next meeting to formulate and finalize the committee's process. She also asked for an email from the committee members listing the topic they would choose based on the data that has been presented thus far.

5. Next Meeting Date - The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 27, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: June 8th, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: J1-414

Agenda

- 1. Review and Approval of Minutes from April 13th, 2007**
- 2. Review and Discussion of Proposed QEP Process Diagram**
- 3. Review of Initial QEP Topic List**

Next meeting date: TBA.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, April 27, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building J, Room 1-414

RECORDER: Laura B. Talbot

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:03 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dr. Ail Esmaili	Cody Gregg
Anahid Petrosian	Lee Hudson Grimes
Helen Patricia Maserang	Wallace D Johnson
Jacque Gillispie	Ed Wagner
Laura Talbot	Luzelma G Canales
Stevan M Schiefelbein	Mary Elizondo
Richard Coronado	Brenda Cole

Materials Distributed:

- QEP Planning Binder
- Agenda
- Committee Minutes from April 13, 2007

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 9:05 a.m.
2. Review and Approval of Minutes from April 13th, 2007 Meeting Committee members were asked to review the minutes from the last meeting and comment on any corrections or revisions that needed to be made.
3. Review and Discussion of Proposed QEP Process Diagram – Ms. Talbot stated that the agenda for this meeting was to finalize the process for selecting a QEP topic and called attention to the QEP Topic Input Process chart included in the provided materials. She informed the committee that she met with Lee Grimes, Anahid Petrosian, Wally Johnson, and Luzelma Canales on Thursday, April 26th, to review charts previously submitted by committee members and as a group they incorporated the ideas into a process STC could use for selecting a QEP topic. Ms. Talbot stated the subcommittee determined the constituents from which to solicit information were existing data, websites, professional development focus groups, student learning focus groups, STC board members, and a QEP brochure with a tear-off feedback card. All of these areas would serve as the initial feedback process and would need to be completed by the end of October 2007. Ms. Talbot described the process the committee would follow after receiving the initial feedback as compiling, categorizing, and analyzing the data to group similar ideas and themes together. She stated that in December 2007 the top themes would be used to compare against existing data sources to assure they are supported and that, in turn, would continue to help narrow down a QEP topic. She explained that those final data-supported topics would go back to the stakeholders for validation via email vote. Ms. Talbot stated that the final part of the process would be for the QEP Planning Team to present a topic recommendation to the Planning and Development Council with a deadline of March or April of 2008.

Luzelma Canales stated that it would be possible for the committee to have more than one topic for recommendation depending on the research outcomes and that when the subcommittee met on Thursday the ideas for developing the chart came from the three major criteria that had to be met. These criteria are having broad-based institutional input, addressing the institution's mission, and directly focusing on student learning. Brenda Cole voiced how important it would be to get faculty input on the kind of data that is being shared because it would be easy to confuse learning and non-learning issues. Because of this possibility, she stressed the need for focus group leaders to be extremely keyed into learning issues or else the data could be irrelevant to the goals of this team. Per continued committee discussion, the decision was made to add a step to the flowchart for the QEP Planning Team to submit a formal, finalized report to the President's cabinet and the cabinet would then decide where the report would go to be initiated in the college. Ms. Canales also suggested that a lead be appointed for each of the input areas so action plans could be established. Brenda Cole was appointed to Existing Data and Jacque Gillispie and Cody Gregg agreed to work on Website Solicitation. Lee Grimes volunteered to head the College-Wide Professional Development Focus Groups area with Anahid Petrosian and Jose Cruz. The Student Learning Focus Groups area will be headed by Wally Johnson with Ed Wagner, Alma Castro, and Richard Coronado as team members. The Feedback Card area will be lead by Laura Talbot with the help of Lee Grimes and Luzelma Canales. Ms. Talbot asked the committee to prepare for the next meeting by developing ideas for the team's communication plan. It was suggested that articles run in *Staying Connected* as well as including inserts in the publication, developing a QEP related theme for the fall Professional Development Day, possibly developing a newsletter specifically for informing the college community on the QEP process, and making a QEP presentation at the department and division meetings in the fall. Ms. Talbot also asked committee members to consider team names and web site information to keep everyone well informed with on-going communication. She expressed the importance of the planning team and the process they were involved in being an identity in the college community. She also asked that the five sub-team leads start meeting with their own team members so there would be beginning recommendations presented at the next meeting from each of the input areas.

4. Review of Initial QEP Topic List – No discussion was held on this matter.
5. Next Meeting Date - TBA.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: June 8th, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Review and Approval of Minutes from April 27th, 2007**
- 2. Review and Discussion of Revisions to the QEP Process Diagram**
- 3. Sub-group reports**
- 4. Communication Plan Discussion**

Next meeting date: TBA.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, June 8, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 102

RECORDER: Laura B. Talbot

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:43 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dr. Ail Esmacili

Lee Hudson Grimes

Helen Patricia Maserang

Jacque Gillispie

Laura Talbot

Stevan M Schiefelbein

Jane De Le Garza

Mary Elizondo

Paul Hernandez, Jr.

Richard Coronado

Jose Cruz

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda

-Committee Minutes from April 27, 2007

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:40 a.m.
2. Review and Approval of Minutes from April 27th, 2007 Meeting Committee members were asked to review the minutes from the last meeting sent via email and comment on any corrections or revisions that needed to be made.
3. Review and Discussion of Revisions to the QEP Process Diagram – Laura Talbot explained that the changes made in writing to the QEP Process Diagram were done to reflect revisions made since the original timeline was planned. She responded to a question regarding the reduction of the number of top themes from ten to five by stating this was done on Jose Cruz’ suggestion. Mr. Cruz stated that too much information could hinder the voting process and if each theme were to have a list of strategies accompany it, it would be necessary to keep the information as concise as possible. Ms. Talbot also stated that five was only an expectation but can be altered as necessary by the committee based on the information from the data collection.
4. Sub-group Reports – Jose Cruz presented results of his subcommittee meeting for the September 2007 Professional Development Day and stated that the focus of the meeting had been reviewing a timeline and deciding what needed to be accomplished by the time the actual QEP project was implemented. He stated that the recommendation had been made for doing focus groups at the September Professional Development Day by randomly selecting faculty and staff via computer to participate. This would consist of up to six groups with a plan to invite as many as 40 individuals per group with the expectation of 20 individuals actually participating. Mr. Cruz explained that two focus groups would be held during each of the three afternoon break-out sessions, five of which

would be attended by the randomly selected faculty and staff and one group open to anyone interested in participating. He stated that he was in the process of developing a plan to initiate a dialog session in the focus groups. This plan would include a series of specific questions and an orientation to QEP before the groups of 20 would break down into groups of five to develop a list of themes justified by the SACS criteria. He explained that once all six focus groups had met, the themes would be compiled and the most common ones would then be presented to the QEP Planning Team and all faculty and staff to validate. He listed the overall timeline recommendations as follows: 1) Collect the themes from the fall Professional Development Day focus groups, 2) Continue looking at the SWAT and other compiled data, 3) Prioritize the themes based on occurrence from all of the focus groups, 4) Select a list of themes, 5) Submit that list at the spring Professional Development Day through Dr. Reed's address and distribution of voting ballots, 6) Use data from the ballots to validate and document broad-based participation. This anticipated timeline would allow the committee to be in a position to select a topic by February 2008. Laura Talbot announced to the committee that Wallace Johnson should be in contact with the Student Learning and Community Focus Groups sub-group members in the next week to set up a meeting.

5. Communication Plan Discussion - Laura Talbot began the discussion by giving the committee information regarding the Website Solicitation subcommittee. She informed the group that the idea was to have a website specifically for the QEP to communicate to the institution what the QEP is, the ongoing activities of the committee, and to present an opportunity for ideas to be submitted electronically. As an example, Ms. Talbot presented information from the UT Dallas website and asked the committee for input and suggestions for including any additional information on the website to be constructed for STC. A running timeline for posting progress made toward the reaffirmation date of 2010 was suggested as well as using language emphasizing the focus on impacting student learning so it separates QEP from SACS compliance issues. It was suggested that pictures of each QEP Planning Team member be posted on a link on the website so the concept of QEP would be associated with the idea of a college-wide initiative. Lastly, there was an idea to send out a weekly newsletter listing the ideas for QEP that had been submitted to create a sense of input from the college and community and possibly hosting a raffle for those who opt out of making submissions anonymously. Ms. Talbot continued the discussion on the communication plan by stressing the importance of the committee members being willing to do a presentation on QEP at their individual departmental meetings in the fall or at any other opportunity using a presentation she is finalizing and will be sending out to committee members. It will also include a form to be filled out listing the date, time, and group the presentation was made to so the information can be documented as campus-wide communication in the final proposal. She also called attention to the initial draft for the first QEP newsletter and an article to be submitted to *Staying Connected* written by Dr. Ali Esmali and Cody Gregg. Both establish a baseline for information on accreditation and QEP. Ms. Talbot stated that once the committee approves the final draft, then the Public Relations Department will approve it and will send it out via general email.
6. Next Meeting Date - The next meeting was set for Friday, June 29th at 8:30 am in Building F, Room 102.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: June 29th, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Review and Approval of Minutes from June 8th, 2007**
- 2. Sub-group reports**
- 3. Review of QEP Road Show Presentation**

Next meeting date: TBA.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, June 29, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 102

RECORDER: Laura B. Talbot

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:29 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Stevan M Schiefelbein
Lee Hudson Grimes
Curtis Roberson
Wallace Johnson
Cody Gregg
Ed Wagner, Jr.
Helen Pat Maserang

Jane De Le Garza
Laura Talbot
Paul Hernandez, Jr.
Richard Coronado
William Serrata
Luzelma Canales

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda
-Committee Minutes from June 8, 2007

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:35 a.m.
2. Review and Approval of Minutes from June 8th, 2007 Meeting - Committee members were asked to review the minutes from the last meeting and comment on any corrections or revisions that needed to be made.
3. Sub-group Reports – Laura Talbot updated the committee members on the QEP website status and recent communication processes. She stated that the website for QEP was progressing as pictures of planning team members were being taken to post on the site with their names and contact information. She informed the committee that the Public Relations Department had approved the distribution of a QEP newsletter via general email and that email would go out as soon as the planning team membership link is completed. She also informed the members that the QEP newsletter had been distributed at a Professional Development Staff Academy on June 15th and that she made a brief presentation during the luncheon to approximately 160 staff employees. Ms. Talbot stated that she also presented the QEP material at the AA Roundup on June 28th and distributed the newsletter to approximately 30 people in attendance. Lastly, she explained that there is a QEP article ready for the summer publication of *Staying Connected* which will also run again in the fall so all faculty will have the opportunity to see the information. Wallace Johnson reported to the committee on the progress for Student Learning Focus Groups. He stated that the members of his sub-group submitted questions and from those questions common themes were derived and yielded the following six areas for attention: Motivation, Behaviors, Valuable Learning Experiences, Holistic View of College, and Interactions & Relationships with Faculty, Staff, and Administration. He stated that the number of focus groups on each campus will be dependent on the number of students enrolled and will be set up for the beginning of the fall 2007 semester.

4. Review of QEP Presentation - Laura Talbot reminded the committee of the importance in each member taking the initiative to present the provided QEP information in faculty and departmental meetings, other committee meetings, and at any time possible so as to meet the goal for campus-wide awareness of the QEP project. She reviewed the QEP presentation slides with the committee and asked for any member to provide feedback or comments.
5. Next Meeting Date - The next meeting date and time is to be announced.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: August 10th, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Review and Approval of Minutes from June 29th, 2007**
- 2. SACS Summer Institute Report**
- 3. QEP Kick-off Event Status**
- 4. Student Focus Groups Status**
- 5. Website Status**
- 6. Communication Activities**

Next meeting date: TBA.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, August 10, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 102

RECORDER: Laura B. Talbot

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:40 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane De La Garza

Steven M Schiefelbein

Lee Hudson Grimes

Laura Talbot

Ed Wagner, Jr.

Wesley Jennings

Helen Pat Maserang

Jacque Gillispie

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda

-Committee Minutes from June 29, 2007

-SACS Summer Institute Summaries

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:38 a.m.
2. Review and Approval of Minutes from June 29th, 2007 Meeting - Committee members were asked to review the minutes from the last meeting and comment on any corrections or revisions that needed to be made. No corrections were noted.
3. SACS Summer Institute Report – Laura Talbot informed the committee members that she, Lee Hudson Grimes, Jacque Gillispie, Curtis Roberson, Wallace Johnson, Jose Cruz, Luzelma Canales, and Dr. Ali Esmaeili were QEP Planning Team committee members who attended the SACS Summer Institute in Louisville, KY, July 22nd – 25th, where the focus was on assessment of student learning with one day of the conference devoted to QEP. Jacque Gillispie, and Lee Grimes summarized the workshops they attended for the committee members. Those who attended were to summarize the highlights from the individual breakout sessions they elected to attend and provide those summaries for the remaining committee members. Ms. Talbot summarized one of the last session of the conference relating specifically to the QEP where five Vice Presidents from SACS provided information on what should be considered for each area of the evaluation process for the QEP.
4. QEP Kick-Off Event Status - Ms. Talbot stated that the College-Wide Professional Development Day on September 21st would be the QEP kick-off event for STC. Jacque Gillispie, Wesley Jennings, Jose Cruz, and Lee Hudson Grimes agreed to begin the process of randomly selecting 200 full-time faculty and staff to participate in the focus groups, then randomly assigning 40 of those 200 individuals to each of the five focus groups by the next QEP meeting on August 31st.

Once the faculty and staff are selected and assigned, Ms. Talbot agree to draft a letter of invitation and explanation to send out to the 200 participants. An announcement would be made during the fall Professional Development Day activities that a sixth focus group is open to any others wanting to participate. Two committee members would need to be assigned as facilitators for each group, there would be one individual to facilitate and one individual to scribe. Lee Grimes, Jacque Gillispie and Wesley Jennings agreed to meet next week to finalize the questions for the focus groups and to include Alma, the Qualitative Researcher, and Jose Cruz. These finalized questions will be distributed to the group facilitators to have in advance of the facilitator training during the September 14th QEP Planning Team meeting.

5. Student Focus Groups Status – The committee agreed that the questions and format used in the student focus groups would need to be similar to those used for the faculty and staff focus groups during College-Wide Professional Development Day. Ms Talbot asked that the student focus groups need to start taking place in September and end no later than the beginning weeks of October. Ms. Talbot requested that by the August 31st QEP meeting that the schedule be created detailing the dates and times student focus groups will take place, and that needs for facilitators for these student groups be identified and the marketing plan for student recruitment be considered as auxiliary funds can be made available for pizza and/or snacks.
6. Website Status – The website is currently under construction and is expected to be accessible in the next couple of weeks.
7. Communication Activities – Ms. Talbot stated that she will be working with OIRE to develop a survey to distribute for community input. She explained that she will be requesting a list of Workforce Program’s advisory committee member names to send this survey to and would try to attend those meetings to present the QEP information and distribute surveys as well. A tri-fold brochure with information about QEP and a tear-off section to have ideas mailed in would also be developed. A one-page QEP newsletter had been requested to go in as an insert in the next August issue of *Staying Connected* and a QEP article by Cody Gregg and Dr. Ali Esmaili will be included in the September issue.
8. Next Meeting Date - The next meeting will be on Friday, August 31st, at 8:30 a.m.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: August 31st, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-210

Agenda

- 1. Review and Approval of Minutes from August 10th, 2007**
- 2. Update on QEP Kick-Off Event**
- 3. Assignment of Group facilitators**
- 4. Review of Stakeholder Dialogue Questions**
- 5. Review of Student Learning Definitions**
- 6. Update on Student Focus Groups**

Next meeting date: September 14, 2007 (Facilitator Training).



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, August 31st, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 210

RECORDER: Joy Ernst

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:35 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane De La Garza
Laura Talbot
Ed Wagner, Jr.
Helen Pat Maserang
Curtis Roberson
Mary Elizondo

Steven M Schiefelbein
Dr. Ali Esmaili
Wesley Jennings
Jacque Gillispie
Richard Coronado
Wallace Johnson

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda
-Committee Minutes from August 10, 2007

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:35 a.m.
2. Review and Approval of Minutes from August 10th, 2007 Meeting - Committee members were asked to review the minutes from the last meeting and comment on any corrections or revisions that needed to be made. No corrections were noted.
3. Update on QEP Kick-Off Event – Laura Talbot informed the committee members that the list of 200 randomly selected faculty and staff had been compiled by OIRE for the breakout session groups during Professional Development Day on September 21st. She explained that during an intermediate meeting held to determine the questions to be used in these groups, it was decided that instead of five groups of 40 people per group, the discussions would be more interactive and informative if there were ten groups of 20 people per group. A letter would be drafted to these 200 individuals once the room assignments had been made for the sessions, and the letter would request their participation and explain the process involved in their being selected. She said she would also send an email communication as follow-up to the letter. An announcement would be made during the morning session of the Professional Development program to explain the purpose of these breakout sessions and also invite anyone interested to participate in the open session.
4. Assignment of Group Facilitators - Committee members were asked to volunteer as facilitators and assistant facilitators for the ten breakout session groups. Group facilitators and their assistants from the QEP Planning Team who volunteered were as follows: Wallace Johnson with Curtis Roberson, Dr. Ali Esmaili with Mary Elizondo; Steven Schiefelbein with Helen Pat Maserang; Jacque Gillispie with Jane De La Garza; Richard Coronado with Ed Wagner, Jr.; Alma Castro with Wesley Jennings; and Jose Cruz, Luzelma Canales, Anahid Petrosian, and Laura Talbot as facilitators with assistants not yet assigned. Other potential facilitators from within the College

mentioned by the committee are Dr. Jean Swartz, Royal Loresco, Dr. Max Abbassi, Jennifer Atwood-Knecht, Brad Altemeyer, Rebecca Silva, and Sharon Rice.

5. Review of Stakeholder Dialogue Questions – Ms. Talbot reported that the group who met to discuss the breakout session questions felt that the sessions would be better described as Stakeholder Dialogues, rather than Focus Groups.. Luzelma Canales noted that during that session that the definition for Focus Group was not appropriate for this situation due to the size of the groups and the type of session being held. Alma Castro of OIRE helped compile a list of questions to use as a discussion guide in the Stakeholder Dialogues, with insight into areas to improve student learning as the ultimate outcome. The questions are intended to focus the discussion on identifying what those areas needing improvement are and what strategies need to be employed to accomplish this. Committee members were asked to read the questions and offer input, suggestions, and recommendations for change. After a group discussion, Ms. Talbot summarized the revisions made to the list of questions which would be emailed to all committee members for information. The revisions recommended by the committee to the questions are as follows:
 - The first question in group one “What area do we most shine in?” will now read, “In what areas do our students excel?”
 - The header question for group two “What are our weaknesses with regards to student learning?” will now read, “What challenges do we face with regards to student learning?”
 - The word “desperately” will be removed from the first question in the second group.
 - The order of the first and second questions in group three will be reversed.
6. Review of Student Learning Definitions – Ms. Talbot reported that the group which met to write the questions felt that because dialogue will concentrate on student learning, it is important to provide a definition of student learning to help focus the Stakeholder Dialogues on the actual process of student learning, rather than on other issues that may not directly relate to student learning. She directed the committee members to the list in the packet which included student learning definitions from the SACS handbook, faculty input, and various dictionaries. After discussion by the committee the following proposed definition was agreed upon. The committee’s proposed definition of student learning that will be emailed to the remaining QEP committee members for further input is as follows:

“Student learning is a personal, interactive process of gaining understanding through both study and experience that leads to the modification of attitudes and behaviors by the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and values. This process results in greater expertise and a more comprehensive understanding of the world” (Sources: Cascadia Community College website, Wikipedia).
7. Update on Student Focus Groups – Wallace Johnson presented information resulting from three Student Focus Groups subcommittee meetings. He stated that there would be one Student Focus Group on each of the five campuses with 12 students per group. These groups would run for one hour and twenty minutes with two faculty/staff facilitators per group. Mr. Johnson explained that the questions for the focus groups were divided into five clusters that highlighted motivation, successful behaviors, learning, goal orientation, and interactions. The schedule for these groups would begin after the facilitator training on September 14th and finishing by the early part of October. Ms. Talbot also asked for volunteers from the committee to assist Alma Castro in OIRE with the data analysis. These volunteers were Jacque Gillispie, Wesley Jennings, and Wallace Johnson.
8. Next Meeting Date - The next meeting will be on Friday, September 14th, at 8:30 a.m.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: September 14th, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Overview Facilitator Assignments**
- 2. Stakeholder Dialogue Facilitator Training**

Next meeting date: TBA.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: November 16th, 2007

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Review of Data Collected during Professional Development Day**
- 2. Review of Spring activities for the committee**

Next meeting date: TBA.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, November 16th, 2007

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 102

RECORDER: Joy Ernst

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:45 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jane De La Garza
Laura Talbot
Ed Wagner, Jr.
Helen Pat Maserang
Curtis Roberson
Mary Elizondo
Lee Hudson Grimes

Steven M Schiefelbein
Dr. Ali Esmaeili
Wesley Jennings
Jacque Gillispie
Cody Gregg
Alma Castro
Anahid Petrosian

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda
-Data Packet

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:36 a.m.
2. Review of Data Collected during Professional Development Day – Laura Talbot introduced Alma Castro to the committee as the qualitative researcher in charge of the analysis of data compiled from the breakout sessions of randomly selected faculty and staff during Professional Development Day on September 21st. Ms. Castro stated that she, Wesley Jennings, and Jacque Gillispie composed the data analysis team who would present the Dialogue Session Responses. Ms. Gillispie reported to the committee that during the session she conducted, the focus was mainly on the student/faculty interaction and not on any other factor related to student learning. Steve Schiefelbein stated that during the student focus group he facilitated at the Mid-Valley campus, the main focus was also on the student/faculty interaction, with the exception of the students being upset with the need to come to the Pecan campus for some classes. He stated that the student body was not widely represented due to the majority of the group being criminal justice majors. Ms. Castro presented the overview in a packet divided into Strengths, Weaknesses, and Changes, with the most common responses to focus group questions highlighted. Ms. Talbot directed the focus to the Challenges and the Changes, as this would be a combined area from which the QEP topic would originate. She stated that the adjunct faculty data were still outstanding because they were to submit written responses to the focus group questions. She also stated that paper surveys were still being returned from community members and advisory committee members, as well as the QEP pamphlet tear-offs being returned to the Curriculum and Accreditation office. The committee identified the following overarching student-learning themes after reviewing the data: Academic Preparation, Academic Advising & Process, Student Services, Learning Support, Teaching Effectiveness, Technology, Communication, Student Engagement, Professional Development, Cross-Training, and Customer Service. Ms. Talbot then asked for volunteers for a smaller sub-group to meet with the data research team to reconfigure the

data analysis information into these broader themes. Laura Talbot, Lee Hudson Grimes, Anahid Petrosian, Cody Gregg, and Curtis Roberson volunteered.

3. Review of Spring Committee Activities – Ms. Talbot reminded the committee that the original process design was to combine all data sources by spring and present the top 10 list of possible areas for QEP focus to the faculty for vote on Professional Development Day, Friday, February 15th, 2008. She stated that to present this finalized version, there would need to be several January meetings, as the goal was to present the top 10 themes with related data items under each.
4. Next Meeting Date - The committee sub-group and data research team will meet on Wednesday, December 12th, at 10 a.m.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: January 25, 2008

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Review of Final Data from Fall activities**
- 2. Review of February 15, 2008 Ballot for QEP topic selection**

Next meeting date: TBA.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, January 25, 2008

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 102

RECORDER: Joy A. Ernst

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:32 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven M Schiefelbein

Laura Talbot

Ed Wagner, Jr.

Jacque Gillispie

Curtis Roberson

Dalinda Gamboa (for Mary Elizondo)

Lee Hudson Grimes

Wallace Johnson

Dr. Ali Esmaili

Wesley Jennings

Richard Coronado

Oscar Hernandez

Alma Castro

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda

-Data Packet

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:37 a.m.
2. Review of Final Data from Fall Activities – Laura Talbot began discussion on the data collected from the fall breakout sessions with the faculty and staff. She stated reminded the Team members that the last QEP meeting was dedicated to finding the overarching themes within that data and since that meeting Alma Castro, Lee Grimes, Jackie Gillispie, Wesley Jennings, Anahid Petrosian and herself met several times to assign the data to those themes. She explained that a couple of the original themes had been combined due to their similarity and that the result was 10 final themes.
3. Review of February 15th, 2008 Ballot for QEP Topic Selection – Ms. Talbot informed the committee that the top 10 categories for the QEP vote were as follows: Academic Advising and Process, Academic Preparation (College Readiness), Communication, Customer Service / Cross-Training, Learning Support, Professional Development, Student Engagement, Student Services, Teaching Effectiveness, and Technology in the Classroom. She stated these categories would be presented in ballot form at the next Professional Development in February for faculty and staff to vote for the top five, and these top five would be determined from the tabulated ballots. Ms. Talbot stated that at the morning session of Professional Development, she would be doing a presentation on QEP and also describing the process the committee used to develop the top 10 categories to introduce the ballot. She then asked the committee for input and/or recommendations on the ballot and information page. Wesley Jennings recommended the ballot to be placed at the back of the packet to encourage the faculty and staff to review the supporting material before voting. It was also recommended that the ballot be printed in a separate color from the rest of the packet. The team members gave additional recommendations for the format and instructions for the ballot. Lee Grimes described the balloting and collection process, stating that the Professional Development staff would collect the ballots.

Jacque Gillespie stated that OIRE would scan and compile the results. Once the top five themes were tabulated, Ms. Talbot reminded the Team that the process was that then the Team would be responsible for looking at those top five and measuring them against the criteria for determining an acceptable QEP including reviewing data from Achieving the Dream, CCSSE, and the other data collected from the faculty/staff breakout sessions, advisory committee surveys, and the adjunct faculty surveys to determine which QEP theme is supported by institutional data. Ms. Talbot explained that approximately one week prior to the Professional Development day the 10 themes and the data explaining some of the related strategies would be emailed to the faculty and staff to begin to prepare individuals to vote. She also explained that the timeline had been revised in that it would now be April, not March, before the committee would be able to make a final decision on the QEP to present to the PDC in May.

4. Next Meeting Date - that the next meeting would be scheduled once the ballots had been tabulated from Professional Development Day on February 15th,

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: March 7th, 2008

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Review of ballot results for Top 5 Themes**
- 2. Review of Institutional Data related to Academic Preparation**
- 3. Review of Institutional Data Related to Teaching Effectiveness**
- 4. Discussion of Potential QEP Topics from Top Two Themes**

Next meeting date: April 4th, 2008, 8:30 a.m.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, March 7, 2008

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 102

RECORDER: Joy A. Ernst

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:54 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven M Schiefelbein

Laura Talbot

Wesley Jennings

Jacque Gillispie

Curtis Roberson

Mireya Olvera (for Mary Elizondo)

Wallace Johnson

Jose Cruz

William Serrata

Richard Coronado

Oscar Hernandez

Jane De La Garza

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda

-Data Packet

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:36 a.m.
2. Review of Ballot Results for Top 5 Themes – The ballot results for the top five QEP themes were compiled and distributed and are in order as follows: Academic Preparation, Teaching Effectiveness, Learning Support, Academic Advising and Process, Student Engagement, Student Services, Technology in the Classroom, Communication, Customer Service/Cross-Training, and Professional Development.
3. Review of Institutional Data Related to Academic Preparation – Laura Talbot asked the committee to identify areas of need and potential strategies to focus on throughout the meeting as Wesley Jennings presented the data on Academic Preparation. Mr. Jennings began with the Fall to Spring Retention by Remediation Status of Fall Cohorts data sheet, and stated it was derived by matching the fall cohort to spring enrollment to determine fall to spring retention, with all numbers based on THECB reports. He explained that the data included both students who had received any remediation at all and dual enrollment students, but the data excluded undeclared and non-degree seeking students. Laura Talbot noted that the part-time students who received remediation had the lowest retention rate. Jose Cruz stated that the report reflects a drop over time from 40% to 25% of the student population receiving remediation, but since this could be due to the dual enrollment population increasing, he requested the report be redone to exclude dual enrollment. William Serrata explained that the fall 2007 data showed the dual enrollment participation at approximately 5,800 students, leaving a student population of around 14,000, with 36% of this population receiving remediation. He stated there was still a drop in the percentage enrolled in remediation across time. Mr. Cruz stated policy changes over time regarding testing standards would also be reflected in the data. He requested that the report be redone to reflect undeclared as a third major along with

Technical and Academic after the dual enrollment population had been excluded. Mr. Jennings then moved to the data included in the Graduate Comparison With versus Without Developmental History and stated the percentage of graduates without developmental is going up over time, demonstrating an inverse relationship. Jackie Gillispie stated that full-time, first time in college fall cohort entering in fall 2003 and given three years to graduate had a 38% graduation rate for those not receiving remediation, but those receiving remediation and given four years to graduate did so at 30%. She said the graduation rate was 66% for part-time students who were allowed five years to graduate when not receiving remediation by the THECB, and 32% for those receiving remediation and given seven years. Mr. Serrata described College information relating to student success in that two-thirds of the students go through developmental studies, and once they are through the sequence they are as successful as college-ready students, but the problem lies in getting the students to complete the developmental sequence. He stated the most discouraging data stems from the students placed in the lowest level of developmental math.

Mr. Jennings referred to the Developmental English Sequence Completion by Fall Cohort data and stated the TSI Complete status was new information now included in the bar graphs. He explained that this report reflected students who were TSI ready or college-ready in English, based on testing and placement scores. He stated that based on this report, the overall number of students completing the developmental sequence has gone up each year since the fall of 2003. He also stated this report reflects that students in developmental courses and declaring a technical major has gone down in past years. Ms. Talbot noted that the steady increase in the percentage of TSI Met in English did not coincide with the lower and dropping rate of the percentage passing college-level English. Mr. Cruz stated this could be an issue of students testing out and then never enrolling in college-level English. Mr. Serrata then stated the caveat of looking at only a two-year snapshot because the numbers actually increase if looked at further out than two years. Mr. Cruz noted an area of intervention could be derived from this area by keeping students from postponing courses and asked Wesley Jennings to extend the report by one more year. Ms. Talbot stated that the Developmental Math Sequence Completion by Fall Cohort data showed lower success rates in all aspects and requested another year be added to this report as well to see if the numbers increased at all. She stated Math was the least successful area based on data, with the developmental course completion in Math significantly lower than developmental course completion in English or Reading. Ms. Talbot also commented that when comparing English to Reading, a larger percentage of students who become TSI Met in Reading are doing so by completing the developmental sequence, but those who become TSI Met in Writing are doing so by testing. Jane De La Garza explained that writing was easier than reading and writing instructors complained that the scoring is inflated on the testing measurements because it accepts “grammatically correct nonsense.” She also stated that in her experience, students who can pass developmental math will eventually pass the reading, but a student who passes reading will not necessarily pass the math and cited possible problems with processing abilities to account for this difference. Jackie Gillispie stated developmental students ended up doing as well as those students who were not in developmental studies and highlighted the basic findings from the THECB as significantly fewer full-time or part-time students receiving remediation graduate or transfer.

4. Review of Institutional Data Related to Teaching Effectiveness – Ms. Talbot stated the data for Teaching Effectiveness was derived from the 2007 CCSSEE surveys which looked at items with significant differences in how students and faculty perceived issues. She stated this was a very broad topic and it was difficult to identify data that directly addressed it because the surveys were based on student and faculty perceptions. With the data also speaking to areas of Student Engagement inside and outside of the classroom, Luzelma Canales stated the data gives the committee an opportunity to look at gaps between students and faculty and devise ways to address and narrow or close those gaps. Wesley Jennings presented Progress in Math 85 for Students With and Without Supplemental Instruction data and stated this course was used because it is the only course being taught with

Supplemental Instruction that requires mandatory attendance. He explained that the data showed a significant difference between the mandatory and voluntary attendance to Supplemental Instruction, with better success rates for students in the mandatory attendance course.

5. Discussion of Potential QEP Topics from Top Two Themes – Laura Talbot asked the committee to look through the data already presented and data that will be compiled and emailed out before the next meeting to identify areas related to Academic Preparation and Teaching Effectiveness that could be greatly impacted and why those identified areas seem to be a need. She also asked committee members to propose recommendations and strategies to address each potential area identified. Ms. Talbot stated that after these two topics were addressed in the next meeting, the committee will move on to the other topics listed in the top five.
6. Next Meeting Date – The next meeting will be on Friday, March 28th, at 8:30 a.m.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: March 28th, 2008

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-102

Agenda

- 1. Review of Institutional Data related to Academic Preparation**
- 2. Review of Institutional Data Related to Teaching Effectiveness**
- 3. Discussion of Potential QEP Topics from Top Two Themes**

Next meeting date: April 11th, 2008, 8:30 a.m.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, March 28, 2008

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 102

RECORDER: Joy A. Ernst

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:44 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven M Schiefelbein
Laura Talbot
Wesley Jennings
Jacque Gillispie
Curtis Roberson
Mary Elizondo
Pat Maserang

Cody Gregg
Dr. Ali Esmaeili
Lee H Grimes
Richard Coronado
Ed Wagner, Jr.
Jane De La Garza

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda
-Data Packet

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:40 a.m.
2. Review of Institutional Data Related to Academic Preparation – In the previous meeting, Wesley Jennings had been asked to provide updated information on the fall to spring retention data that included undeclared majors and eliminated Dual Enrollment to display a better perspective on the traditional student body at STC. He stated that in doing this, the bar graphs displayed students going to school less than full-time had lower retention than other groups. Mr. Jennings stated that from 2003-2005, technical programs had better retention without remediation than academic programs without remediation, and this may be due to the time to complete technical programs being shorter than that to complete academic programs, but overall the data comparisons were basically static. Jackie Gillispie stated that retention from fall to spring for full-time students was independent of remediation, which is defined as a student having had at least one developmental course. She also stated that according to CCSSE data, the STC student population is 62% part-time and 38% full-time, but the part-time percentage includes dual enrollment students. Laura Talbot noted that the part-time students taking between 1-5 hours with remediation was the only group who had a significantly lower retention rate from fall to spring. Steve Schiefelbein commented that a large part of part-time students work and arrive on campus after tutoring hours are available, so students who need help are not able to get the services they need, whereas some colleges offer tutoring until 10p.m. and on Saturdays to accommodate students. Cody Gregg stated that the issue of not having the same student services available to them as to students attending class during the day is a consistent complaint from evening students. Ms. Gillispie stated that based on CCSSE data, part-time students give lower

scores than full-time students, so it is possible that needed services are not provided to those students. Yet she noted that just because a student does not return from a previous semester, it does not equate to a failure on the part of the College since the non-return could be for reasons that are considered a success from the student's perspective. She also explained that OIRE has information from the Student Information Form that questions the intent of the student at registration. Ms. Talbot stated that not all evening students fall into the part-time category, but without further information it would be difficult to determine if a student would not have come back naturally or if the student struggled while taking classes and quit. She informed the committee that the data so far for College Readiness, which was the number one theme per the ballot results, was complemented with additional data provided today of fall to spring retention without dual enrollment students. The committee then reviewed the course completion rates for each developmental area, English, Math, and Reading, and Mr. Jennings stated that adding in an extra year on the cohorts for English made no statistically significant difference, but he was still in the process of extending the data for one year for Math and Reading. He pointed out that in Fall 2003, 25% completed the developmental sequence, but 58% tested out as TSI Met. Jane De La Garza explained that students were encouraged to test as soon as possible so they would see the developmental program as an aide and not a hindrance to their education. Ms. Talbot noted that even though the percentage of TSI Met for Math steadily increased over that two year period, Math was still significantly lower for TSI Met than English or Reading. The committee was informed that The Academic Progress After Developmental Studies in English, Math, and Reading data were being redone to exclude "D" letter grades and to be extended by one more year to include Fall 2006. Ms. Gillispie stated that based on data from the THCB, full-time, first time in college students not receiving remediation and getting a degree or certification or transferring within three years was 35%. If students received remediation, the number was 30% within four years. She stated that part-time students in this category not receiving remediation was 66% within five years, and 32% within seven years for those who did receive remediation. Dr. Ali Esmaeili stated that based on data collected for his Taskforce on Strategies to Accelerate Successful Completion of the Developmental Sequence, the outcome showed a reversed expectation in that students who have not had developmental courses had better success in college-level courses than those students who do, but retention was better for students who had been in developmental courses than those who had not. Ms. Talbot stated that the function of this committee was to determine where the area is that resources could be directed and a plan developed to impact student learning based on the top five issues gleaned from the faculty and staff ballots. She then directed the committee to discussing the identified areas of focus if College Readiness was chosen as the QEP topic.

3. Review of Institutional Data Related to Teaching Effectiveness – No discussion took place on this topic during the meeting.
4. Discussion of Potential QEP Topics from Top Two Themes – The following list comprises the ideas and or strategies suggested by the committee, based on the discussion of potential QEP topics from the Academic Preparation/College Readiness theme:

Potential Issues to Target within College Readiness

- Developmental Math
- Part-Time students in Developmental
- Population of students placed in bottom level of all three developmental brackets
- Initiative for focus on gap between college readiness and testing scores based on Learning Outcomes

- Close gap in time between Developmental Math and completion enrollment in College level Math
- Underprepared students in Biology due to lack of prerequisites.
- Focus on recent high school graduates who test into top 3 levels of developmental (summer bridge)

Recommended Strategies

- Summer Bridge Program for students, (Junior & Seniors) prior to fall enrollment with focus on making TSI complete – for both developmental and college ready.
- Coordinate with high schools to reduce or eliminate costs by offering tutoring College Readiness Preparation
- Offer course to Seniors in high school for test preparation
- Aptitude testing with focus on undeclared majors
- High school summer campus to promote College-going culture
- Apply course content to life situations to encourage contextual/problem based learning
- Focus on high school graduates who test into 3rd level of all three developmental and offer summer bridge program for all aspects of college
- Focus on recent high school graduates who test into top 3 levels of developmental and create a summer bridge program for all aspects of the college with focus on making college ready.

5. Next Meeting Date – The next meeting will be on Friday, April 11th, at 8:30 a.m.

QEP Planning Team Meeting

Date: April 18th, 2008

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: F-210

Agenda

- 1. Review of Institutional Data related to remaining QEP themes (Teaching Effectiveness, Learning Support, Academic Advising and Process, and Student Engagement.**
- 2. Select Theme for the QEP**
- 3. Develop proposal recommendations**

Next meeting date: To be discussed at meeting.



South Texas College

QEP Planning Team

MINUTES

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Friday, April 18, 2008

MEETING PLACE: Pecan Campus Building F, Room 210

RECORDER: Joy A. Ernst

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:40 a.m.

QEP PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven M Schiefelbein
Laura Talbot
Wesley Jennings
Alma Castro
Curtis Roberson
Mary Elizondo
Pat Maserang
Paul Hernandez

Oscar Hernandez
Dr. Ali Esmaeili
Lee H Grimes
Richard Coronado
Wallace Johnson
Jane De La Garza
Carmen Gonzalez

Materials Distributed:

-Agenda
-Data Packet

1. Call to Order- The meeting was called to order by Laura Talbot at 8:38 a.m.
2. Review of Institutional Data Related to Remaining QEP Themes (Teaching Effectiveness, Learning Support, Academic Advising and Process, and Student Engagement) – Laura Talbot began the meeting by stating she had attended the Developmental Taskforce for Strategies for Accelerating Completion of Developmental Studies and Sequence and brought data from that meeting relating to the QEP. She said she included the chart for Course Repeater data in the meeting packet, which outlines the number of persons attempting a developmental course for a second, third and fourth time. She pointed out that the chart revealed a significantly higher number of repeaters in developmental math than developmental reading or writing, with Math 85 having higher repeater attempts than the other levels of developmental math. Wesley Jennings presented data requested in a previous meeting to extend the fall cohorts by one more year in the developmental sequence in looking at whether completing the developmental sequence made a difference in student success at the college level. He stated there were no significant findings for English or Reading, but adding another year onto the fall cohort for Math showed a significant difference in student success in college algebra for those students who had completed the developmental sequence. He suggested requiring students enrolled in Math 85 in the fall semester to enroll in the next level math the following semester, or combining the last two levels of developmental math into one course spanning across two semesters so the developmental sequence would be completed without the student creating a gap between math courses. Paul Hernandez stated that if the data identifies a real problem with a particular course, then Advising needs to target the student population with interventions and strategies for certain courses, such as Math 85, which is different from tracking students into particular programs based on

placement scores. He also said that schools are starting to develop strategies directly related to gatekeeper courses instead of broad, general advising. Pat Maserang stated that there was a problem with all students, not just those in developmental courses, who over-schedule classes and either aren't able to pass or have to drop due to work schedules and/or family obligations.

Alma Castro presented 2006 and 2007 CCSSE data comparing faculty and student responses for Student Engagement and stated there was a significant difference in the two perceptions. To bolster the Academic Advising and Process theme, she presented data from the Beacon Mentoring pilot which demonstrated mixed results with some areas yielding success while other areas did not. She stated that more will be known at the end of the semester and speculated that success could be linked to the advisors relationship and involvement with instructors. Paul Hernandez stated that while that issue was important, the most crucial element linked to the success in the pilot is whether or not the mentoring was linked to the Student Success Center, or Center for Learning Excellence. Laura Talbot stated the issue with the themes other than College Readiness is the lack of data which specifically track those themes. She added that areas of other themes could be incorporated into the main QEP, which has to be tied to specific learning outcomes and based on current data indicating a need.

Pat Maserang pointed out a correction to the 03/28/08 meeting minutes under the Potential Issues to Target Within College Readiness list. She clarified that although she did state students were underprepared in Biology and stated some students had not been told not to take multiple Biology courses, she did not state it was due to poor advising and requested the list included in the minutes be corrected to remove that indication.

3. Select Theme for the QEP – Laura Talbot recapped the previous discussions of the Planning Team by stating that while other themes are important, there are pieces of each one that can be pulled into the QEP, but College Readiness has been a main topic across several meetings regarding Developmental Math specifically. She then asked the committee for a consensus that Developmental Math be recommended as the QEP topic and an area where an impact can be made on student learning. The committee approved the recommendation by hand vote, with no objections voiced, to focus on Developmental Math as the QEP topic.
4. Develop Proposal Recommendations – Ms. Talbot then asked the committee if a recommendation should be made to define the focus to Math 85, or leave the recommendation open to success in the Developmental Math sequence, letting that area define the primary focus. After group discussion, the committee decided to make the recommendation to focus on success rates in Developmental Math with a focus on improving success in the lowest performing courses, with the following types of strategies incorporated into the plan:
 - Required CLE
 - Supplemental Instruction fee waiver or reduction
 - Possible course restructuring
 - Professional Development concentration for those faculty members
 - Mandatory Advising/Case Management
 - Remove stigma from Developmental courses with possible name change
5. Next Meeting Date – With the business of this committee being completed, Laura Talbot stated there would be no other meetings unless one was called for a necessary purpose.