

**QEP Goals and Enabling Objectives
2008-09 Summary of Outcomes
(QEP pages. 21-24)**

Disclaimer: Goals for the QEP are flexible, and the QEP has been developed with the understanding that the college environment will change, and that all planning must be responsive to change. It is also understood that goals may change as the QEP progresses, for there are many unknowns associated with bold initiatives seeking to permeate the culture of an institution that is a product of traditional American university and community college origins. (QEP, Page 21)

Goal 1: Faculty and student/academic support staff will become more effective in incorporating student involvement activities to enhance student learning.

Enabling Objectives

	Enabling Objective	2008-09 Outcome	5TH Year Reflections
1	All faculty members and student/academic support staff will annually participate in at least one workshop or training session focusing on student involvement in the teaching/learning process. <i>(Baseline: Objective will be initiated for Fall 2004.)</i>	Presentations/workshops presented by QEP Coordinator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2008 Faculty In-Service: Report on QEP progress and distribution of QEP Fall newsletter. • Spring 2009 Faculty In-Service: Presentation on lessons learned at SACS/COC annual conference. • Summer 2009 Staff: Report on QEP Progress • Adjunct faculty fall orientation included a QEP update. 	Years 1-3: Faculty and Staff fall and spring In-Service was the avenue by which the campus community had the opportunity to hear about the progress of the QEP. Several staff members (i.e. Admissions and Records, FA, Business Office, etc.) were unable to attend because of registration responsibilities. Years 4-5: Faculty In-Service continued in the Fall and Spring. To accommodate the Staff a separate In-Service was conducted in June. This gave all Staff an opportunity to hear about the QEP progress.
2	All newly employed regular faculty members will attend an intensive orientation program prior to, or within the first month, of initial appointment, with the program concentrating on student involvement and student learning as related to the college mission. Full-time faculty, with guidance from academic deans and department heads, will be responsible for appropriate and reasonable documentation of student involvement initiatives and resultant learning using the master syllabus as a guide. <i>(Baseline: Objective will be initiated for new faculty in 2004.)</i>	Orientation is conducted formally and informally by VPAA and the Deans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QEP overview • Introduced to the need to document student involvement and assessment of learning outcomes • Introduced to the QEP Coordinator's responsibility of maintaining archival records of "student involvement in learning." • Detail orientation is provided by appropriate Dean or Department Heads. • Discipline-related colleague (mentor) assigned. 	Years 1-5: New faculty seemed to integrate well into the College community. Because divisions are not very large, new faculty are not lost in the crowd. Deans and "veteran" faculty members have proven themselves to be sensitive to the needs of new faculty. These orientations have proven themselves to be excellent avenues through which to introduce new faculty to the QEP.
3	Adjunct faculty will participate in an orientation to CISCC's commitment to QEP. Adjunct faculty, with guidance from academic deans and department heads, are responsible for appropriate and reasonable documentation of student involvement initiatives and resultant learning outcomes, using the master syllabus as a guide. <i>(Baseline: Initial evaluation will begin in 2004.)</i>	Adjunct faculty orientation is conducted each year at which time they are introduced to the QEP. Deans and Department Heads mentor adjunct faculty in how to document student involvement initiatives and the documentation of student involvement initiatives.	Years 1-5: Those who attend the orientation benefit. It is an ongoing struggle to find times when all adjunct faculty members are available. Deans, Department Heads and Coordinators make every effort to support the adjunct faculty. Adjuncts are included in peer evaluations.
4	Staff and administration will participate in annual	Update session presented to the President's Cabinet at the end of the	Years 1-5: The value of the QEP may be in the fact that it is a

5B_QEP_2009_Outcomes

	<p>update sessions regarding QEP initiatives and student involvement strategies. Staff in academic affairs and student services will be responsible for appropriate and reasonable documentation of student involvement initiatives. <i>(Baseline: Objective will be initiated in Fall 2004.)</i></p>	<p>Spring 2009 semester by the QEP Coordinator, Ryan Thompson. Administrators and Staff participate in providing documentation of student involvement initiatives throughout the year via IAPs and SAPs. More than 100 workshops that are designed to increase student involvement are conducted throughout the years.</p>	<p>springboard for discussions. Even though we have often found it difficult to assess outcomes of workshops and presentations, the greater value of the every present need to document accomplishments has kept the dialogue alive on the campus. The term “assessment” is a commonly used term in the culture that has evolved over the past five (5) years.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETAL) and Faculty Development and Instructional Improvement Committee (FCIIC) will initiate professional development opportunities for faculty, with a special focus on applying best practices in student involvement to the teaching and learning process. <i>(Baseline: Objective will be initiated for the 2004-2005 academic year.)</i></p>	<p>Training and support for faculty, staff and students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire2Learn (D2L) – Web based learning management system • Wimba Live Classroom – Virtual classroom which provides online meeting rooms where teachers and students can interact in live. [CDB_WIMBA_022409] • Keystrokes – sessions to teach new technologies (i.e. Google Tools, Podcasating and RSS feeds, and Blogs and Wikis. 	<p>Years 1-5: Great progress in the College’s distance learning arena since the inception of the QEP. Five years ago the live interaction was limited to TV monitors and T1 connections at off campus sites. Students, faculty and staff now have access to online meeting rooms where instructors can interact live with groups or individual students by talking and listening—with or without a video camper—presenting documents, PowerPoints, video, and other prepared materials. WIMBA has archiving capabilities so lectures can be watched later. Through the new Keystrokes initiative, training is available for use of the newest technologies. These advancement have increased student engagement opportunities through distance learning.</p>

Years 1-5: It has proven to be very beneficial to have a QEP, because it has kept student learning through involvement at the forefront of discussions. Even though determining how to assess has often been a challenge, this dilemma has launched discussions that more than likely would not have taken place had the QEP assessment requirement not served as the springboard.

**QEP Goals and Enabling Objectives
2007-08 Summary of Outcomes
(QEP pages 21-24)**

Disclaimer: Goals for the QEP are flexible, and the QEP has been developed with the understanding that the college environment will change, and that all planning must be responsive to change. It is also understood that goals may change as the QEP progresses, for there are many unknowns associated with bold initiatives seeking to permeate the culture of an institution that is a product of traditional American university and community college origins. (QEP, Page 21)

Goal 2: Student involvement activities will increase in number and variety. Effectiveness of activities in enhancing student learning will be documented.

	Enabling Objective	2008-09 Outcome	5TH Year Reflections
1	Each academic department will annually document assessment of at least one initiative to enhance learning through student involvement activities. <i>(Baseline: Inventory begins 2004).</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business – Service-learning Pilot - Office Procedures class planned an event entitled “How To Get a Job and Keep It” which was present to 288 high school students. Zero withdrawals from the course. One student said, “...I believe this will be such a great time to make a lasting impact on so many lives. • Humanities – International Studies Abroad Program. –Chile. 80% came back speaking the language. Brown Bag lunches held for students to share experience. • Mathematics – Developmental Redesign expanded to include college level math courses • Nursing –Sciences – CSCC now offering an AAS in nursing online through the Regent’s Online Degree Program. • Science - Biology academic audit conducted • Social Sciences – Economics. Teacher visited Federal Reserve Bank in Nashville. Impacted 116 students in learning macroeconomics concepts and microeconomics. All students were tested on current and past banking trends and did well. • Applied Technology – Habitat of Humanity – hands- 	During the 5-year life of the QEP many faculty members have a stepped up with creative ideas. The outstanding project over the last two years has been the Developmental Redesign Project which has gotten national recognition for the College. For this particular initiative, it is believed that the QEP student involvement topic was an instrumental factor in driving this initiative to a successful development.

		<p>on energy efficient construction experience. Students build a house from the ground up. Since beginning this program in 2007 the class has grown from 19 in the first class to 60 in the 2008 class.</p>																									
2	<p>The Office of Academic Affairs, with assistance of division deans, will collect and transfer annual inventories of institutional best practices as recorded during performance reviews to the Quality Enhancement Committee for distribution and archiving. <i>(Baseline: inventory begins 2005).</i></p>	<p>This is accomplished annually and archived with the QEP Coordinator.</p>	<p>The VPAA and the Deans have been supportive of this objective throughout the life of the QEP. This objective has gained strength over the past five years as the QEP has become enmeshed in the culture.</p>																								
3	<p>Appropriate administrative units (including the Library and Student Services departments) will annually develop IAPs and SAPs that document the impact on student learning resulting from at least one clearly described and significant student involvement activity. <i>(Baseline: UAP inventory beginning 2004).</i></p>	<p>This is an effort that continues to evolve. UAP on-line Access database was initially introduced in with the inception of the QEP with minimal success, because faculty indicated the database was too cumbersome. Converted to a single one page fill-in-the-blank spreadsheet format in 2006-07 to accommodate ease of access (IAP and SAP.) In 2007-08 there is evidence that departments continue to struggle with defining actions and assessing outcomes. This is definitely a work in progress. Maturity since inception is noted by progress remains slow and perceived a laborious by those expected to participate.</p>	<p>This has been one the hardest aspects of the QEP evolution. It has been a constant struggle to develop assessment methods above and beyond traditional grading. The terms rubric and matrix are becoming common terms in the culture. The College has a long way to go in the area of assessment, but progress has been made over the past five years. None of this would have occurred had there not been the requirement to develop and implement a QEP.</p>																								
4	<p>Results from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) will annually indicate that CISCC meets national benchmark comparison scores. CCSSE results will also be used as a basis for initiating new involvement strategies. <i>(Benchmark TBA—Initial administration 2005).</i></p>	<p>Overall (CCSSE pg. b1) – no statistically significant comparative difference in CISCC scores and Consortium and Cohort scores. It was noted that CISCC “Student Effort” and “Support for Learners” scores were slightly below on Cohort and Consortium Scores. A slight improved was noted over “Student Effort” prior year score.</p> <p>It is considered a positive to note that in over a three year period there appeared to be a conversion in how student perceived themselves as involved in the learning process. It is noted that students began to see themselves as receiving less support and putting forth more effort:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1096 1177 1688 1315"> <caption>Cleveland State Community College -- CCSSE</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Benchmark Table</th> <th>2006S</th> <th>2007S</th> <th>2008S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Student Effort</td> <td>48.2</td> <td>49.5</td> <td>50.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Support of Learners</td> <td>50.3</td> <td>49.3</td> <td>48.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>See chart in “5th Year Reflections” column.</p>	Benchmark Table	2006S	2007S	2008S	Student Effort	48.2	49.5	50.8	Support of Learners	50.3	49.3	48.4	<p>Page 5 of the QEP states: Student involvement can include many activities, but the central theme promotes the concept that students will be more involved in and assume more responsibility for their learning.</p> <p>The chart below illustrates this change:</p> <div data-bbox="1760 954 2440 1344"> <table border="1"> <caption>Cleveland State Community College CCSSE Year-to-Year Comparison</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Student Effort</th> <th>Support of Learners</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2006S</td> <td>48.2</td> <td>50.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007S</td> <td>49.5</td> <td>49.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008S</td> <td>50.8</td> <td>48.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div>	Year	Student Effort	Support of Learners	2006S	48.2	50.3	2007S	49.5	49.3	2008S	50.8	48.4
Benchmark Table	2006S	2007S	2008S																								
Student Effort	48.2	49.5	50.8																								
Support of Learners	50.3	49.3	48.4																								
Year	Student Effort	Support of Learners																									
2006S	48.2	50.3																									
2007S	49.5	49.3																									
2008S	50.8	48.4																									

QEP Goals and Enabling Objectives 2007-08 Summary of Outcomes (QEP pages 21-24)

Disclaimer: Goals for the QEP are flexible, and the QEP has been developed with the understanding that the college environment will change, and that all planning must be responsive to change. It is also understood that goals may change as the QEP progresses, for there are many unknowns associated with bold initiatives seeking to permeate the culture of an institution that is a product of traditional American university and community college origins. (QEP, Page 21)

Goal 3: Student learning will improve.

	Enabling Objective	2008-09 Outcome	5th Year Reflections												
1	There will be no difference in the successful completion of college credit courses between students admitted to CISCC with academic deficiencies and those admitted without deficiencies. <i>(2003 Baseline: English/Writing - Developmental Students at 0.878 parity; Mathematics – Developmental Students at 0.971 parity. Data summary in Goals section.)</i>	<p>Developmental Math Students in Math Courses: Before redesign 71% completed with 2.41 GPA average. After redesign 76% completed with 2.89 GPA Average. [Redesign_Report_p2]</p> <p>Developmental Writing Students completing Comp I: Increased from 79% in NCCBP 2007 report to 85% in 2008 Report.</p>	Years 1-3: Devoted to developmental studies. Progression has gone from hiring tutors to the development of full labs in both writing and math. The Math Redesign Project was implemented in year 4 and has extended into the delivery of college level math course. The writing labs have been successful. A Developmental Writing Resign plan is in process.												
2	There will be no difference in retention and graduation rates of African-American students and white students. <i>(2003 Baseline: Graduation rate of African Americans is 13.64% and White rate is 26.14%; Retention rate of African Americans is 43.48% and White rate is 66.97%. Data summary in Appendix 3.)</i>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Retention Rate Fall-to-Fall (07F to 08F)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Graduation Rate (6-yr. 2002F Cohort) 2008</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">White</td> <td style="text-align: center;">60.18%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">33.33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">African American</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65.12%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">21.74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">All</td> <td style="text-align: center;">60.91%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">32.67%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Retention Rate Fall-to-Fall (07F to 08F)	Graduation Rate (6-yr. 2002F Cohort) 2008	White	60.18%	33.33%	African American	65.12%	21.74%	All	60.91%	32.67%	<p>Years 1-5: Accomplished African American</p> <p>Fall-to-Fall to Retention: 2003F to 2004F = 53.48% (Baseline) 2007F to 2008F = 65.12% Increase.....= 11.64%</p> <p>6 yr. graduation rate: 2003 = 13.64% (Baseline) 2008 = 21.74% Increase.....= 8.10%</p>
	Retention Rate Fall-to-Fall (07F to 08F)	Graduation Rate (6-yr. 2002F Cohort) 2008													
White	60.18%	33.33%													
African American	65.12%	21.74%													
All	60.91%	32.67%													
	Syllabi for credit courses will include expected learning outcomes and assessment and evaluation methods. <i>(Benchmark: Academic Affairs files, beginning Spring 2004. Master syllabus sample in Appendix 4).</i>	This is a requirement for all syllabi. Learning outcomes and assessments are submitted along with end-of-year evaluations. Archived in QEP Coordinator’s Office.	Faculty members are required to complete Learning Outcomes and/or IAPs to present at annual evaluations. These seem to be valuable tools in stimulating assessment thinking beyond the traditional grading system. The QEP has been a driving force behind this requirement and has proven to be effective.												
4	Fall-to-Fall retention rates for the freshman cohort will annually equal or exceed the Tennessee public community college average. <i>(Baseline: Fall 2002 to Fall 2003 – CISCC retention rate is 65.64%; state average is 62.69%. Data summary in Appendix 3.)</i>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Fall-to-Fall Retention 07F Cohort to 08F</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Cleveland State</th> <th style="text-align: center;">TBR Community Colleges</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">60.91%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">59.85%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Fall-to-Fall Retention 07F Cohort to 08F	Cleveland State	TBR Community Colleges		60.91%	59.85%	<p>Years 1-5: Exceeded State Average in baseline year and in year five.</p> <p>It is noted that both CSCC’s retention rate and the state average rate decreased by year five.</p>						
Fall-to-Fall Retention 07F Cohort to 08F	Cleveland State	TBR Community Colleges													
	60.91%	59.85%													

5B_QEP_2009_Outcomes

5	Six-year graduation rates for the freshman cohort will annually equal or exceed the Tennessee public community college average. <i>(Baseline: CISCC graduation rate is 25.50%; state average is 23.83%. Data summary in Appendix 5.)</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>6 Year Retention</td> <td>Cleveland State</td> <td>TBR Community Colleges</td> </tr> <tr> <td>01F Cohort to 07F</td> <td>28.60%</td> <td>31.16%</td> </tr> </table>	6 Year Retention	Cleveland State	TBR Community Colleges	01F Cohort to 07F	28.60%	31.16%																
6 Year Retention	Cleveland State	TBR Community Colleges																						
01F Cohort to 07F	28.60%	31.16%																						
6	Scores for all graduating students on recognized tests of general education competencies will annually equal or exceed the national average among similar institutions. <i>(Baseline: ETS Academic Profile – 2003 – national average total score is 441. California Critical Thinking and Skills Test – 2003 – national mean score 13.559. Data summary in Appendix 6.)</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>California Critical Thinking Skills Test</td> <td>Cleveland State</td> <td>National</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>15.9</td> <td>14.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>15.9</td> <td>14.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>15.3</td> <td>14.7</td> </tr> </table>	California Critical Thinking Skills Test	Cleveland State	National	2006	15.9	14.7	2007	15.9	14.7	2008	15.3	14.7	Accomplished. Exceeded the national average each year. Baseline national mean in 2003=13.6 CSCC national mean in 5 th year of QEP = 15.3									
California Critical Thinking Skills Test	Cleveland State	National																						
2006	15.9	14.7																						
2007	15.9	14.7																						
2008	15.3	14.7																						
7	Proficiency scores on annual performance exit tests in eligible and scheduled major fields will annually meet or exceed the most recent institutional score of record. <i>(Baselines: Review 20% of eligible programs each year, completing curriculum assessments in five years, then cyclic; use national average for pass rate in Nursing; all other programs generate institutional score of record on first administration.)</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Nursing</td> <td>Cleveland State</td> <td>National</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>97.83</td> <td>88.11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>92.86</td> <td>85.47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>90.51</td> <td>82.62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industrial Technology Program Test</td> <td>Cleveland State Scores</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>64.0%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>65.0%</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Nursing	Cleveland State	National	2006	97.83	88.11	2007	92.86	85.47	2008	90.51	82.62	Industrial Technology Program Test	Cleveland State Scores		2003-04	64.0%		2007-08	65.0%		All benchmarks met during 5 year QEP cycle.
Nursing	Cleveland State	National																						
2006	97.83	88.11																						
2007	92.86	85.47																						
2008	90.51	82.62																						
Industrial Technology Program Test	Cleveland State Scores																							
2003-04	64.0%																							
2007-08	65.0%																							
8	Graduate placement rates in jobs related to the field of study will annually meet or exceed 90%. <i>(Baseline: 2003 job placement is 93%; summary of placement by program in Appendix 7.)</i>	2008 Calendar Year = 86%	Goal of 90% was not met in 2008 probably due to economic downturn.																					
9	Biennial employer surveys will document a minimum 90% overall satisfaction and an 80% satisfaction with critical thinking and problem-solving skills among CISCC alumni in the workforce. <i>(Baselines; 2003 results in Appendix 8, recorded by desired skill or attribute among majors or consortia of majors.)</i>	N/A in 2008-09																						

**QEP Goals and Enabling Objectives
2008-09 Summary of Outcomes
(QEP pages 21-24)**

Disclaimer: Goals for the QEP are flexible, and the QEP has been developed with the understanding that the college environment will change, and that all planning must be responsive to change. It is also understood that goals may change as the QEP progresses, for there are many unknowns associated with bold initiatives seeking to permeate the culture of an institution that is a product of traditional American university and community college origins. (QEP, Page 21)

Goal 4: Sufficient human and fiscal resources will be provided to meet anticipated QEP needs.

	Enabling Objective	2008-09 Outcome	5th Year Reflections
1	Each unit manager will indicate on the Unit Assessment Plan the budget account number that will be expected to support unit objectives and will discuss needed resources within the institution's annual budget review process during performance reviews and operational planning. <i>(Baseline: Initial evaluation will begin for FY 2005.)</i>	Completed. Budget constraints limited requests for additional funds.	<p><u>Year 1 (2004-05):</u> In spring 2005, 130 Unit Assessment Plans (UAP) were submitted electronically through an on-line Access data base. Though this process was good in concept, unit managers complained that they did not understand how to use the forms (even after training) and that the database was difficult to use. It became obvious that asking for assessment methods beyond traditional grading assessment was new to the culture and a cultural shift would be a slow process.</p> <p><u>Year 2 (2005-06):</u> In Spring 2006, only 25 UAPs submitted electronically. It became obvious that this process was not going to functionally thrive and that a simplified method was needed.</p> <p><u>Year 3 (2006-07):</u> In Spring 2007, the Access data base concept was abandoned in an effort to simplify the process. The Individual Assessment Plan (IAP) and the Summary Assessment Plan (SAP) were developed. Functional units preferred this method because it was a simple one page Excel document. Training was conducted. Participation was limited yet the term "assessment" was beginning to become a buzz word in the culture.</p> <p><u>Year 4 (2007-08):</u> In Spring 2008, participation improved. Deans required with the IAP or a Learning Outcomes form from the faculty. Non-academic unit managers required the forms. It was obvious that the</p>

			<p>“assessment” idea was becoming a part of the culture even though the collection method was still far from ideal. The new VPAA was in support of the IAP/SAP process.</p> <p>Year 5 (2008-09): Under the direction of a new VPAA deans and faculty improved participation. Though the process is still not ideal, Deans have made the process of collecting IAPs, SAPs or Learning Outcome forms a part of the end of the year review process. In the interest of supporting departmental efforts the focus has been on encouraging units to assess outside of traditional grading rather than focusing on the method of data collection. It appears that simplifying the process has improved participation. The VPAA and Deans are requiring submission of forms at the time of annual evaluations. This is definitely a work in process.</p>
2	<p>The Budget Review Committee and the President’s Cabinet will annually review QEP resource recommendations from unit managers, the Quality Enhancement Committee, and the Strategic Planning Committee. Budget items deemed reasonable and critical to QEP operations will receive priority funding consideration within institutional budget constraints. <i>(Baseline: Budget accounting will provide initial evidence of QEP funding for FY 2005).</i></p>	QEP appropriations continue.	During the 5 year period, QEP funding was adequate.
3	<p>The president will provide a physical location and staff assignment to ensure longevity of student involvement initiatives and to provide ongoing institutional accountability for student learning outcomes generated through the QEP. <i>(Baseline: Initial staff appointment and assignment of space for FY 2005.)</i></p>	Coordinator assigned and provide office space.	During the five year period, a physical location was provided. Each year a faculty member who was given release time served as the QEP Coordinator.

Implementation Plan Response
Year 4 – 2007-08

<i>In-Service Term</i>	<i>Planned Topics</i>	<i>Actual Topics</i>
Fall 2007	Myers Briggs Personality Inventory	Convocation August 20-22, 2007. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced Myers Briggs Personality Inventory session with Service Learning (Presenters: Hull and Jolly, Vanderbilt University.) • Breakout sessions: CISCC specific sessions • QEP presentation included CCSSE. Academic Audit (Presenter: Randy Schulte, CSTCC)
Spring 2008	Impact of Various Student Involvement Strategies	Convocation Jan. 8, 2008: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSP Math Resign • QEP – Surveys, Rubrics, and IAB • Library – “What’s up with info” • New Programs Update: Solar Energy and Bio Diesel initiatives • Keystrokes program • Division Breakout meetings