REAL Council

Minutes

April 8, 2010, 1:30 p.m., Student Center 130

Attendees: Denise Martinez, Art Low, Melissa Becker, Tara Whitson, Marilyn Robitaille, Darla Doty, Benni Konvikca, Frank Ewell
By Phone: Coady Lapierre, Kim Rynearson

Handouts:
- Agenda

Discussion:
1. Tasks from last meeting
   - To attempt to get at something more “indicator” like, let’s begin by rehashing the ALE area SLOs to the QEP SLOs (just a mapping)
     - May help identify key words, behaviors, indicators
     - Office directors (and anyone who would like to pitch in) - work on linking your ALE area SLOs to the QEP SLOs
       - Marilyn and Darla took a stab at this; they will send out to the group
       - These were discussed by the group and did seem to help identify some “behaviors” to support the QEP SLOs.
       - In particular, change the rubric from content centered to student centered; “the student will show/use/etc…”
       - Can we embed the additional artifact in the reflection or keep them separate? Embedding is a good idea, but may overcomplicate the assessment
   - Literature – Art will work on literature references; start with revisiting the ones in our report;
     - Art located two of the AAC&U papers and forwarded them to the group
   - Definition of applied learning – All – research an “operational” definition of applied learning – still working on this
   - Assessment – Denise and Melissa will work with Gay Wakefield on defining “indicators” and looking at the QEP SLOs, prompts, and rubric in terms of lacking indicators.
     - Worked on aligning the rubric with Bloom’s taxonomy
       - Bloom’s handout with list of verbs/actions – Melissa please email to group
       - Our rubric ratings (high to low) correspond to Bloom levels (high to low)
     - Will need to develop a training module for faculty staff on how to do assessment
     - Will also need a training module on how to guide an experience
2. Call for Proposals for Fall 2010 – FY11 request for TSU and TAMU-CT
   - How many? Function of how much
   - How much?
• Need to clarify what the funds are paying for. Development? Delivery?
  • What about and experience for 1 student vs. an experience for 15 students?
  • What about if a different faculty member offers the same course/experience? Do we then have to pay them?
    • The development has already been done, but may need to be revisited
• Discussed flat rate vs. the ORG approach of varying amounts
  • Consensus was that the stratified approach would likely cause more problems than it solved and would be more difficult to manage; go with a flat rate
• Discussed range of $1500 - $2000
  • Consensus was $1500
  • This number is comparable to overload pay
• Payout schedule
3. Current pilots
  • Faculty/staff meeting to be scheduled. Time/date?
    • Last week of class; ~ dead day
  • Questions
    • All – send potential questions to ask the pilot faculty/staff to Denise by April 20.
  • Application form
    • All – review the template and send potential questions to Denise by April 20.
4. Other
  • Frank Ewell noted it would be nice if the QEP and Universal Design initiative were more integrated; Trina Geye is the contact for Universal Design
5. Adjourn – 3:00 pm
  • Next meeting Wednesday, April 14, 2 p.m. – need to work towards finalizing the call for proposals