SACS Leadership Team Meeting

QEP Update

(November 2, 2011)

• Updates

• Document Drafting

• Next Steps:
  – Nov 22: Draft to Document Development Team
  – Dec 15: Draft ready for Compliance Team and SACS Leadership Team
• Unit Visits
• Senate Council & University Senate
• PR Brand Plan (10/27-11/29)
• QEP Structure (TOC)
  – Handout
CHAPTER SIX: Five-Year Action Plan

– Problem and Rationale (9/21)
– Purpose (9/21)
– Focus (9/21)
– Implementation Timeline (9/21)
– Administrative Structure (9/21)
– Resources (Physical, Human, Financial) (10/20)
– Assessment (10/20)
RECAP: Parts I, II, III, IV, & V (9/21/2011)
I. PROBLEM AND RATIONALE

(What and Why)

(Q) What do we mean by multimodal communication?

(A) at least two types or forms of communication (in our case – THREE types: written, oral, and visual)
Modes

Written (words/reading)

Oral (vocalized/hearing)

Visual (nonverbal/graphic/seeing)
Intrapersonal/Private-to-self (reflection, comprehension, analysis)

Interpersonal/One-to-one (form & maintain relationships—acquaintances, colleagues, friends, inmates)

Small Group/Few-to-few

Public/To-many (unified message to many—public speaking, mass, performance studies)
Channels

• Flat Print
  – (e.g., research paper, lab report, essay, news or opinion article, greeting card, billboard, letter, poster, flyer, brochure, speech transcript, photograph, diagram, chart, graph, illustration)

• Face-to-Face
  – (e.g., conversation, consultation, debate, small group discussion, group symposium or panel discussion, public speech)

• Digital
  – (e.g., television, cell/telephone, computer, internet)
PROBLEM AND RATIONALE (cont.)

(Q) Why Multimodal Communication Across the Curriculum?

(A) Five good reasons.

1. It’s what employers want.
2. We could do a better job.
3. It addresses the UKCore (Design Principle #3 and Learning Outcome #2)
4. GWR/CRM
5. We are among the trendsetters.
II. PURPOSE

Prepare University of Kentucky undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to employ effective integrated oral, written, and visual communication skills (as producers and critical consumers) as expected of professionals in their chosen fields.
III. FOCUS

Faculty Development
• To help design communication-based instruction, assignments, and assessment tools

Student Tutoring
• To help create and refine classroom communication projects (flat print, face-to-face, digital/online)
Faculty Development

1. Collaborate with CELT to Provide Consultations and Workshops

2. Faculty Fellows Program (3 cohorts; detailed selection process)
Student Tutoring

• Center and Lab Facilities
  – Begin with one “Center” with satellite labs from “partner” units across campus
  – If need warrants it, grow to three centers (north, central, south)

• Lab Staffing
  – Peer Tutors and Mentors
  – Graduate and Post doc Mentors

• Collaboration
  – Recruiting, training, supervising, and paying tutors and mentors
IV. IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

2013-2014
- Administrative staff hired
- Faculty Fellow (FF) Cohort #1 selected (Attend workshops, collect baseline data, do curriculum revision)
- Student Lab opens
- Student Tutors hired and trained

2014-2015
- FF Cohort #1 Implements MC
- FF Cohort #2 selected (Attend workshops, consulting, baseline data, curriculum revision)
- Lab tutoring Continues
- Additional Lab Funding if warranted

2015-2016
- FF Cohort #1 Collects assessment data
- FF Cohort #2 Implements MC
- FF Cohort #3 selected (Attend workshops, consulting, baseline data, curriculum revision)
- Additional Lab Funding if warranted
IV. TIMELINE (cont.)

2016-2017
- FF Cohort #2 Collects & Examines Assessment Data
- FF Cohort #3 Implements MC Workshops, Labs, & Tutoring Continues

2017-2018
- Cohort #3 Collects & Examines Assessment Data
- Prepare Impact Report for SACS
V. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE
(under the Provost’s Office)

• Program Director
  – Full time tenured faculty with appropriate expertise in both program administration and multimodal communication
  – Oversees all facets of the MCXC program, including development & extramural funding

• Interdisciplinary Advisory Board
  – 10-15 expert faculty and staff representing a broad cross-section of the UK campus who will provide input and direction for the program; staggered terms
V. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE (Continued)

• Assoc. Director/Student Services
  – Reports to director; maintains status in home unit
  – Annual Stipend or DOE adjustment: TBD

• Assoc. Director/Faculty Services
  – Reports to director; maintains faculty status in home unit
  – Annual Stipend or DOE adjustment: TBD

• Assoc. Director/Assessment
  – Reports to director
  – ½ time MCXC Assessment; ½ time Univ. Assessment
VI. RESOURCES

Overall 5 Year TOTAL: TBD
• Director
• Three Assoc. Directors
• Faculty Fellows
• Graduate Mentors
• Undergraduate Tutors
• Centers/Labs
• Workshops
VII. ASSESSMENT (3 LO’s)

1) Students will demonstrate competent communication (written, oral, and/or visual across multiple modes) as defined within individual disciplines, both as producers and consumers of information.

What are the students able to do?
Student Work (Faculty Fellows)

- Pre/Post Assignments (FF Data from Year 1 to Year 3)

Standardized Assessment Tests

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Collegiate Learning Assessment data
VII. ASSESSMENT (cont.)

2) Faculty Fellows will implement written, visual, and/or oral communication assignments and/or activities that reflect disciplinary definitions of competent communication.

What are faculty fellows able to do?
• Peer Evaluation of Faculty Fellow Teaching Portfolios:
  – Cohort #1 (by Advisory Board Peers)
  – Cohort #2 (by Cohort #1 Peers)
  – Cohort #3 (by Cohort #2 Peers)
• End-of-Semester: FF Student Survey
• Pre- and Post- FF Student work
VII. ASSESSMENT (cont.)

VIII. The MCXC program will respond effectively to faculty and student needs regarding teaching and learning about multiple modes of communication.

How well is the MCXC program working (holistic)?
1) Annual FF Surveys (Year 1, 2, and 3)
2) Student Evaluations (from classes)
3) Workshop and Center/Lab Usage (Track numbers and demographics of workshop and tutoring center/lab attendees)
4) Workshop and Center/Lab Client Evaluations (e.g., how helpful?)
Next Steps:

• Draft to committee: 11/22

• 11/29: Revision suggestions and finalize draft by 12/15/2011

• Expert Review and Consultation (Chris Anson & Deanna Dannels; NCSU)