I. Laura Barrett called the meeting to order, welcomed everyone, and reminded the group that the deadline for the QEP draft is February 28th, but if committees are able to submit work earlier for the review of the steering committee, that would be appreciated.

II. Updates: The schedule for the pilot FY seminars appeared on the back of the agenda. The compensation for instructing a 13th credit would be an option of the following:
   a. $1500.00 of overload pay
   b. 1.5 credit hours toward a course release

Dean Barrett then asked the group for an indication of how many would prefer banked hours toward a course release and how many would prefer overload pay. Responses were mixed with some faculty saying they would take the banked credit hours but also recognizing that some departments would encourage the overload pay because of the limited number of faculty. During this discussion a question arose as to who would keep records of faculty members’ banked credit hours. Another question arose regarding the funding for the adjunct faculty replacing the faculty with course releases. Dean Barrett replied that the QEP director or FYE director would be an appropriate person to keep such records, but that adjunct faculty are paid from a different budget, so that should not be a problem. Marc Mascolo then mentioned that if staff members are expected to teach some of these courses, the payroll and human resources offices will face significant challenges providing them extra compensation for their extra work. Those challenges should be considered carefully during further planning.

III. Doug Frazier then described the proposed organizational structure of the QEP, stating that a QEP director would operate out of the office of the incoming FYE director and answer either to the FYE director or to the Provost. The QEP director would be responsible for training FYS faculty and
administering assessment of the QEP. The QEP director would collaborate with department heads with scheduling of the seminars, and the director would teach one class. The QEP director will have an advisory committee composed of diverse faculty, staff, and administrators across academic colleges. Much discussion then took place regarding whether the QEP director would be the same person as the FYE director. Since the FYE Director job ad does not specifically state that the FYE director will be the QEP director, John Kraft noted that the question cannot be answered until the search for the FYE position is completed. Members of the FYE director search committee voiced concerns that such information would influence the way they evaluated applicants for that job, so knowing the answer to the question would be crucial. Eventually committee members agreed that it is safe to say that it would be ideal that the FYE director and the QEP director be the same person. One committee member reminded the group that the responsibilities of the QEP director are outlined in the job ad for the FYE director, so there should be no worries about any change in the expectations of those applicants.

IV. Laura Barrett stated that the curriculum design subcommittee is working on a syllabus for the seminar, which is integral for the SLO/assessment committee to finish its task of composing a rubric. For the benefit of those subcommittees, Dean Barrett brought copies of other QEPs as models.

V. Dean Barrett then presented the full committee with several lingering questions regarding the QEP. The first question was what will happen to Armstrong’s existing AASU courses? Would it be possible for students to earn credit for the FYS and AASU courses. Greg Anderson expects the FYS courses to replace the AASU 1100 courses. A question arose about the need for AASU courses for at-risk students, such as those returning to school after suspension. Anderson noted that AASU 1101 is a two-credit course that could remain on the catalog for those students. That course is more study skills intensive. Currently the Armstrong catalog says students cannot earn credit for both AASU 1100 and AASU 1101, but there’s no Banner mechanism preventing it.

VI. Dean Barrett then posed the question as to how to treat students taking fewer than 12 credit hours. She mentioned that during Fall 2011, Armstrong had 108 students taking less than twelve credits in a given semester. That is too sizeable a cohort to ignore. That number includes learning support students. Melanie Mirande mentioned that students must take nine credit hours in order to live on campus. Probational students are often limited to six or nine hours, and they are students who must take this first-year seminar. The committee agreed that the university could still require those students to take the FYS, bit
if we do that, we’ll have to offer weekend and evening courses to accommodate students with those nontraditional schedules. Another committee member reminded the group that learning support students must take learning support courses first, so some provision must be made for those students because the FYS is not linked to 99 level courses. Beth Howells suggested implementing a 30 hour rule, like the Regents’ Exam rule, which would prevent students from registering if they have reached 30 credit hours without taking the FYS. Eventually the group agreed that students transferring to Armstrong with more than thirty hours are exempt from taking the FYS, which is consistent with current Armstrong regulations regarding other requirements, such as the Regents’ exam.

VII. Dean Barrett asked if the Liberty Center students should be included in the cohort required to take the FYS. During Fall 2011, Armstrong had 41 students (both part-time and full-time) at the Liberty Center. So far no plans for Liberty Center students have been written into the QEP. Several committee members asked how to teach those students about university resources and the library when they are not on the main campus. Melanie Mirande asserted that we’d have to be innovative with distance learning technologies. Eventually the committee agreed to table the issue of the Liberty Center students and not consider this cohort part of the 2013 implementation of the plan. But then John Kraft mentioned he wanted to explore the idea more before formally deciding to table this issue. The committee agreed that Kraft could explore away.

VIII. Greg Anderson asked how students in online courses will be accommodated. Dean Barrett stated that there is no provision for such students because no student can finish a degree program entirely online. Therefore, students will have to come to campus at some point, so we can require them to take the FYS. Anderson then stated that some students, by accruing transfer credits, AP credits, and online credits can finish the first semester, maybe the first year without ever stepping on campus. He recommended that the committee consider those students in some way, even if it means making a requirement exception for those students.

IX. Melanie Mirande, on behalf of the marketing committee, recommended that the QEP be named First Class. She then read and passed out a copy of a marketing statement describing First Class. She provided a marketing timeline and asserted that the marketing campaign will begin in April, 2012, in alignment with recruiting efforts, pre-registration and scheduling of Navigate sessions. Marc Mascolo asked the marketing committee to provide the budget committee with a report of necessary funds. Mirande said she could provide
that. Discussion then arose regarding some of the word choices in the marketing statement, which marketing committee members took note of. Mirande reported that the university marketing department is working on a First Class logo, which will be available in the near future.

Laura Barrett then asked all committee members to spread the word about the QEP. The meeting adjourned at 3:00.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Remler