

Title III Advisory Committee
MINUTES
December 13, 2006
11:00 am -12:00 p.m.
RT 1701

Members Present: Gitanjali Kaul (Chair), David Baggs, William Beasley, David Bowditch, Jeffrey Chen, Theresa LaGrange, Elizabeth Lehfeltd, Jull Oakley-Jeppe, Janice Taylor-Heard, Nelson Pole, Janet Stimple, Rosemary Sutton, Michael Walton, and Debra Sudy (Clerk)

- I. **Welcome and Introduction** G. Kaul welcomed committee members and members provided introductions. G. Kaul gave an overview on grant award: The day we are informed of the award is the day the grant begins so we are a little behind but we will catch up. As an overview, the grant is for a 5-year period funded at about \$400,000 per year to start learning communities and other things related to that. We will hire an advisor for students and D. Bowditch will help with the job description for that. There will be a student data warehouse that faculty can use with an emphasis on providing data to help with retention and J. Chen will help with that. W. Beasley wrote pieces of the grant and maybe will offer to help with the faculty workshop and other pieces. There will be six smart classrooms installed over a five year period. G. Kaul noted that there is a new procedure in place called *expanded authority* and this will provide flexibility in authorizing small changes to the grant as long as the scope of the grant is unchanged noting that there are a few other constraints. A grant budget handout was provided.

Two items will be the focus for today's meeting: the call for RFP's for learning communities and for the Director of Learning Communities. A grant activity handout with relevant information has been provided along with a draft RFP and Director (internal search). Of interest is also a handout of the 2006 Title III Grantees which lists all grants awarded this year. It is interesting to note that only 3 universities were funded and all others are community colleges. G. Kaul stated that she believes receiving the grant was a matter of demonstrating need and we have that here.

RFP: Several committee members responded and some comments are incorporated in the RFP. Others comments were brought for discussion as a group. N. Pole comments on the rationale for doing learning communities was a good point and was added (*Faculty can collaborate with colleagues in other disciplines and work with highly motivated students.*) General Education revisions are still in the draft stage and so the emphasis is to include existing classes. N. Pole added that it should be as an independent effort and not as part of the General Education revision process. R. Sutton stated to strengthen that we should state that the General Education taskforce approves. T. LaGrange suggested stating that it was out of PCLE and then reinforced with endorsement by the Gen Ed taskforce – but did not originate there.

J. Taylor-Heard asked whether this committee was an umbrella committee to those learning communities already in existence on campus and where does Gen Ed fit in? G. Kaul responded that if we can help those learning communities we will help them – we have momentum and people want to be involved. E. Lehfeltd added that this will be an open process and everyone will have the opportunity to apply. R. Sutton added that learning communities have many meanings across campus and not all mean the same thing. G. Kaul suggested that the focus is academic. We need 132 students per year – 60 each semester to fulfill needs of the grant. That is not a lot – let's see the interest out there and maybe we can expand the focus.

It was suggested to change Faculty *Rewards* to *Incentives*. J. Taylor-Heard stated that it is hoped that more faculty will teach the Intro to University Life course. It was suggested to delete the last sentence in *Team Stipends* and change the order of the compensation list on the individual stipends. R. Sutton noted that the concern was that all faculty might not be comfortable negotiating this. It was noted that *Resources for Class Activities* would not be

available from grant funds but may be provided by the Provost's office or with other sources of funding. G. Kaul noted that subcommittees would be formed and more on this will be discussed in other meetings; one would develop the faculty workshop.

Comments on the *Questions* portion: differentiate between team and individual applications. J. Ford asked how would faculty know how to answer these by January and suggested other questions that simplified the list. At this point we are looking for interest as the actual work would not happen until next summer. N. Pole commented that UCC is concerned about changing the syllabi and that the Gen Ed course objectives are narrowly approved. G. Kaul responded that the purpose of the grant is to take existing courses and existing syllabi' content in certain sequence so that all faculty could contribute. R. Sutton suggested adding the question *How do you plan to keep existing content but adapt it to a learning community.*

T. LaGrange suggested individuals who are interested could have a separate form to fill out instead of the full application and the information could be used to put individuals in contact with others. N. Pole added that this is a great way of getting faculty together and is a tremendous opportunity. Suggested addition: *what courses are appropriate to link with yours.* J. Chen asked whether there would be a call every year for proposals. N. Pole suggested changing the graphic to include a humanities course to make clear the possibilities.

G. Kaul stated that she received comments from G. Lupone that he would like to see information literacy included in the learning communities and gave several ways this would be possible. J. Taylor-Heard responded that this is a part of the Intro to University Life course. G. Kaul suggested having a librarian associated with a cluster so that every learning community cluster would have a librarian.

Distribution of the RFP: It was suggested to send the RFP through USPS, campus mailbag, email and have responses due by January 29th. E. Lehfeldt suggested sending an email to the deans and asking them to send to chairs for distribution to the faculty would be better than campus mailbag and send out reminder emails in January.

C. Hollinger asked whether there was a listing of existing learning communities and suggested a personal contact with these groups.

N. Pole noted that fall schedules are currently due in Spring semester but if these would be additional sections then there wouldn't be pressure to get them in.

Director of Learning Communities: Internal Search. It was suggested that this could be a split role between two faculty part-time or a full time position. The suggested application deadline is January 29th.

J. Chen suggested sending the RFP and the Director search information together. It was suggested that the starting date for the faculty member be flexible. N. Pole suggested that it be made clear that the Director could teach a learning community course. L. Lehfeldt suggested to consider adding that the faculty member be one who as recently taught a Gen Ed course.

G. Kaul stated that she would be in touch with committee members via email.

Next Meeting: January 29, 2007, 2 pm, RT 1701