# Faculty Learning Communities

To Enhance Undergraduate Education:

With an Initial Focus on Information, Communication, and Technology Literacy
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Executive Summary and Introduction

This Revised QEP of the University of Miami was developed in response to Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of the report of the SACS Reaffirmation Committee. The QEP plan below deals directly with the revisions recommended by the Committee and does not repeat those aspects of the initial QEP that the committee accepted as submitted. The initial QEP accompanies this report. The QEP focuses on the University’s nine undergraduate schools: 1) Arts and Sciences, 2) Business Administration, 3) Communication, 4) Education, 5) the Frost School of Music, 6) Engineering, 7) Nursing and Health Sciences, 8) the Rosensteil School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, and 9) Architecture. The Revised QEP reflects collaboration and consultation with members of the QEP Implementation Committee, leadership of the Faculty Senate, the deans of the nine undergraduate schools, professional staff from the Otto G. Richter Library, and professional staff from the office of Instructional Advancement.

Following the recommendation in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee, the Revised University of Miami QEP proposes to enhance undergraduate learning through the creation of a program of Faculty Learning Communities (FLC). For the five-year initial period of the plan, the FLCs will be topic-centered and focus on Information, Communication, and Technology (ICT) Literacy. The ultimate outcome of the Revised QEP is an ongoing program of FLCs that will give faculty members the knowledge, skills, and pedagogical support to improve their teaching and enhance the learning environment at the University. We will use ICT Literacy for the first phase because the QEP development process revealed effective use of digital technology and information literacy concepts to be important to the University community both for improving teaching and for preparing students for their futures (original QEP, pp. 13-14, 20-22). The FLCs are foundational to the improvement of teaching and learning. Participants in the FLCs will apply what they learn to their teaching, coursework, and student assignments. The QEP calls for between forty and fifty faculty members from across the University to participate in an FLC during the plan’s first phase. We are prepared to increase that number up to ninety faculty as interest and experience warrant. The University will assess the impact of the FLCs and the new and revised coursework that emerges from them. At the end of the first phase of the QEP, the University intends to expand the focus of the FLCs and make them a persisting component in faculty development.
Elaboration

The initial version of the University’s QEP focused primarily on enhancing undergraduate students’ learning outcomes in the areas of new media and oral communication. It proposed the formation of Faculty Teaching Fellowships as a way to achieve that goal. As the On-Site Narrative indicates, on the basis of its campus visit, the Reaffirmation Committee suggested that, in fact, (1) the QEP’s basic focus was actually on faculty development through intentional learning communities and that the focus on information literacy was a means to that broader end. The committee further observed that (2) the initial QEP lacked sufficient specificity in the selection and assessment of the proposed Faculty Teaching Fellowships and new or revised courses and that it said little about the QEP beyond the initial period. In their on-campus commentary, Committee members suggested that (3) the dual focus on new media and oral communication might be too broad and that we might consider a narrower focus for the first phase of the plan.

The Revised QEP affirms and responds directly to the Committee’s observations and suggestions. It (1) recognizes that faculty development is necessarily prior to and foundational for enhancing students’ learning and gives faculty development pride of place in the plan. It (2) replaces the Faculty Teaching Fellowships with a more developed and refined program of Faculty Learning Communities. And (3) it narrows the substantive focus of the initial FLCs to digital technology and information literacy concepts, both of which were basic to our original plan.

In shifting from Faculty Teaching Fellowships to Faculty Learning Communities, the University will benefit from and be guided by the experience and expertise of the Faculty Learning Community program of our own Miller School of Medicine and its director, Dr. Richard Tiberius (See Attachment). We also will draw on the exemplary work done on Faculty Learning Communities at Miami University, Ohio, a national leader in this area (www.muohio.edu/flc/). Miami University has developed several successful models of Faculty Learning Communities as well as effective instruments for assessing them. The Miller School FLC program is part of the FLC Consortium centered at Miami University, Ohio.

As our original QEP proposal indicated (original QEP, p. 19), a survey of University of Miami faculty taken in Fall of 2007 suggests that teaching at UM consists predominantly of lectures, even in relatively small classes. An ongoing program of FLCs can underscore that teaching is intellectual work fundamental to the University’s educational mission and that it requires continual adaptation, innovation, and improvement. FLCs can reinforce and promulgate a culture of teaching among our faculty. The collaboration between our nine undergraduate schools and the Miller School of Medicine will help us generate a university-wide process for faculty development and the improvement of teaching. It thereby will
strengthen and improve educational discourse and coherence across the institution.

**Description of Faculty Learning Communities**

The website of the Miller School of Medicine follows the language of Miami University of Ohio and describes a Faculty Learning Community as follows:

> A faculty learning community is a group of 5 to 8 faculty members or staff who engage in regular meetings for the purpose of increasing their knowledge about teaching, their motivation to pursue innovations, and to become more reflective and scholarly in their approach to teaching. The learning communities are expected to maintain their engagement for a year, although they may dissolve when they have met their objectives.

> There are two categories of Learning Communities. One category comprises the cohort-based communities. These are aimed at enhancing the individual growth of the members in teaching, learning, career or personal development…. The second category, topic-based communities, are aimed at specific teaching and learning need, issue, or opportunity. ([http://edo.med.miami.edu/x47.xml](http://edo.med.miami.edu/x47.xml))

The Revised QEP will launch with a “topic-based” Faculty Learning Community centered on Information, Communication, and Technology Literacy (ICT) concepts and incorporating them in coursework. ICT Literacy matters to us for the substantive reasons discussed in our original QEP (pp. 8-11) and summarized briefly below, because the collaborative QEP process showed that effective use of digital technology and information literacy has broad significance in the University of Miami community, and because the University has a substantial support structure to enable it. By ICT, we mean the following:

> ICT literacy is the ability to appropriately use digital technology, communication tools, and/or networks to solve information problems in order to function in an information society. This includes having the ability to use technology as a tool to research, organize, and communicate information and having a fundamental understanding of the ethical/legal issues surrounding accessing and using information (The National Higher Education Information and Communication Technology Initiative, 2004).

In line with our original report, the Revised QEP emphasizes ICT Literacy because it will play an increasingly important role in how faculty teach and students learn. Technology, particularly the Internet, has given rise to the creation and dissemination of unprecedented amounts of information. ICT
Literacy enables both faculty and students to encounter and examine the world, and to acquire knowledge, outside the constraints of traditional methods of learning (Zoetewey & Staggers, 2003). A significant part of contemporary baccalaureate education is to help students become informed and critical, rather than credulous and naïve, about information presented in digital formats. In an era of information overload, “the uncertain quality and expanding quantity of information pose large challenges.” Students must learn both to manage, present, and assess this information for authenticity, value, and relevance (Hutchings, 2006; Brown, Murphy, & Nanny, 2003). This kind of learning depends on teachers who can adapt their teaching and ongoing learning to the changing conditions of knowledge. In precisely this way, the process of faculty development represented by the FLCs is foundational to enhanced education. For these reasons, the University’s Revised QEP inaugurates the FLCs with an initial focus on ICT Literacy concepts and skills.

In sum, the aims of the QEP/FLCs are:

1) To design, develop, and implement a framework for sustainable FLC programming and assessment at the University of Miami.

2) To help faculty acquire or increase their facility with ICT Literacy in order to improve their teaching, revise or devise a course, and enhance students’ learning.

3) To use the initial FLCs to provide a model for structured faculty collaboration and professional development that is supported and rewarded by the University.

4) To help strengthen and reshape faculty culture by disseminating the results of the FLCs through workshops, seminars, and collective events.

The Revised QEP operationally resembles our initial proposal, but it strengthens and centralizes the goal of faculty development and clarifies that faculty development is primary and fundamental to the improvement of student learning.

---

1 Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, Association of College and Research Libraries, 2000
Process & Procedure

University of Miami Faculty Learning Communities will be open to all faculty who meet the criteria for participation. For each QEP / FLC, a librarian faculty, a professional from Instructional Advancement and/ or the Libraries, and a technology specialist will serve as resource consultants. This will ensure the presence of experts in the areas of information literacy and technology in teaching. During the FLC, faculty members will be exposed to new information literacy and technology tools, techniques, and resources to incorporate into already existing courses or to include in the development of new courses.

FLCs will meet weekly for discussions and seminars, guided by a facilitator or co-facilitators. Virtual communities will be available 24/7 for online discussion through digital networking technology. We have planned on one FLC per year for the first phase and are prepared, beginning in year two, as faculty interest warrants, to add a second FLC.

The QEP/ FLC will contain the following weekly workshops to assist in the development of expertise in information, communication, and technology. The workshops and activities offered will include:

- Overview of Faculty Learning Communities
- Project Management Skills
- Developing Assessment Strategies and Tools
- ICT Literacy Components and Assessment
- Technology sessions in the development of new media and interactive digital technologies and concepts (podcasting, web development, blogs & wikis, Second Life, audio/ video editing)
- Using Course Management Systems (Blackboard) to Effectively Push Resources and Tools
- Digital Project Development Skills and Management
- Issues in Copyright, Intellectual Property Rights, and Digital Rights Management
- Issues in Scholarly Communication and Digital Scholarship
- Developing Presentation Skills
- Enhanced Pedagogy through Technology
In addition, the FLC program also will sponsor—for all interested UM faculty—at least four or five open seminars and/or workshops offered throughout the academic year by internal and external presenters. This open programming will promote the QEP/FLC program, expand the pool of interested faculty, and help catalyze faculty interest in teaching and professional development opportunities. It also will help bring the FLCs into the mainstream of the University’s professional culture.

**FLC Oversight**

Faculty Learning Communities will work with a QEP/FLC Advisory Committee appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Education and consisting of faculty with expertise in ICT and professional staff members with expertise in ICT. The committee will consult with Dr. Richard Tiberius of the Miller School of Medicine, who has extensive experience with FLCs. The committee will determine the membership and monitor the programmatic content, implementation, and assessment of the Faculty Learning Communities. The Advisory Committee also will have responsibility to assess the QEP/FLCs and the courses that emerge from them. The University’s Office of Accreditation and Assessment will assist in this effort as needed. Consultants will also be used when particular expertise is not readily available from the already existing resources.

FLCs will undergo regular assessment so that adjustments can be implemented over the five-year first phase of the plan. On the basis of what we learn during the first phase of the plan, the University will develop and implement a dedicated structure for an ongoing FLC program that will address a broad range of themes and topics defined and selected by faculty. The University’s intention is to make the FLCs a permanent and ongoing part of its faculty development activities. Responsibility for the administration, oversight, and persistence of the QEP/FLC program falls under the Office of Dean of Undergraduate Education, who will insure its continuation. We believe FLCs to be a valuable, contemporary, practical, and sustainable program to enhance the educational environment and pedagogical culture of the University.
Support & Resources

The QEP Faculty Learning Communities will be supported by the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Libraries, and the office of Instructional Advancement. The Program will be housed in the Richter Library and will have the following personnel, services, and resources:

- Program Director/ Facilitator(s)—Establishes the FLC program, monitors budget, develops guidelines in line with the strategic planning of the institution, enables learning for the QEP/ FLC, is an expert in the topic of the FLC or finds the appropriate expertise to work with the Community, works with QEP/ FLC Advisory Committee on assessment, works closely with all affiliated departments and committees, communicates activities and progress, facilitates communication in the Community, and provides leadership and direction when needed throughout the course of a specific FLC.

- Teaching and Learning Commons (TLC) at the Otto G. Richter Library—Consists of experts and infrastructure to support and address the needs of Faculty Learning Communities. The TLC contains Information, Research, and Instructional Services, Digital Media Services, the office of Instructional Advancement, and technical resources and support. Facilities include a Faculty Exploratory, a Digital Media Lab, and expanded Digital Media Services equipment—all of which enable practice, learning, communication, and implementation. The TLC will at times include external constituents that specifically contribute to a particular topic or cohort of an FLC. It will be the location of QEP programs for the broader University faculty. (See original QEP, pages 35-37, for a detailed description of the TLC.)

- Virtual communities also will be established for use by each FLC and supported and preserved with library technology.
Selection Process & Criteria

Faculty FLC participants will be selected on the basis of criteria adapted from the program established by Miami University, Ohio for Faculty Learning Communities (www.muohio.edu/flc/). The criteria will also include elements specifically related to the FLC topic. To participate in the FLC program, interested faculty will complete an application process managed by the QEP/FLC Advisory Committee.

In the fall semester of each academic year, the committee will offer information sessions and distribute FLC overview materials to University faculty. Applications will contain:

- Current CV
- A description of their present teaching responsibilities and examples of any innovative teaching activities.
- Samples of participation in collaborative activities, professional development, and technology in teaching.
- A description of the level of their interest in new media communication teaching projects and a sample of their work in this area, if available.
- A narrative outlining their experience and knowledge of ITC concepts.
- A narrative outlining their desire to participate in the FLC and how they can contribute to it.
- A description of the course and/or classwork assignments the applicant wishes to modify or devise.
- Support from their dean and department chair.

Criteria for selection – The application should demonstrate:

- High level of school and departmental support.
- Examples, if any, of previous exposure and experience with interactive digital technology, networking technology, and technology in the classroom, so that the committee can assess the applicant’s skill level in these areas.
- A commitment to faculty development.
- A high level of interest in the program.
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- An openness to collegiality and the exchange of new ideas and teaching and learning strategies.
- Potential contributions to the community.
- A high level of interest in developing, implementing, and sustaining innovative techniques to enhance teaching and learning.

Final selection will also include an individual interview with the QEP/FLC Advisory Committee. The committee will select at least eight participants based on the criteria noted above. Examples of applicants’ uses of web technology and technology in the classroom will be evaluated by committee experts. Applicants’ familiarity with technology in a classroom setting will be useful at the outset but is not essential. The FLC will help faculty to develop skills in this area and determine the best methods to incorporate technology and new media for successful project development in coursework.

Faculty members selected for the FLC will receive a course release and a $1500 research and educational fund. Their contribution will be to participate fully in the FLC in weekly discussions and workshops and in virtual communities. They also will incorporate ICT literacy concepts into an existing or new course, and teach the enhanced course at least three times during the QEP first phase or over five years after their FLC is concluded. At the University of Miami, FLC membership will be an acknowledgement of excellent, innovative, and effective teaching. There will be appropriate opportunities for recognition by the University for the creative pedagogical work of FLC members.

The University anticipates a faculty knowledge base in information literacy and technology that ranges from novice to proficient. So there is no assumption that participation will be limited to faculty with ICT experience. If it advisable to have two FLCs at different levels of experience and competence, we are prepared to take that step. Sessions on incorporating ICT components in the teaching curriculum will be included in the FLC curriculum, and there will be discussion regarding curriculum development. The FLC programming will focus on 1) achieving competence in FLC participation, 2) project development, and 3) the incorporation of ICT Literacy skills and technology in coursework. As we explain below, these goals will be assessed through faculty and student progress in the ETS iSkills™ exam, participant surveys, and changes in syllabi and course materials.
Assessment

To evaluate the QEP, we will assess both the effectiveness of the FLCs and the courses that derive from them. For both faculty and students, to gain a concrete sense of knowledge gained in ICT Literacy, we will use the iSkills™ test developed by the Educational Testing Service. This well-established and broadly credible test will help us discover how much faculty are gaining from their learning communities and measure learning outcomes, including critical thinking, in the courses that are shaped by the FLC. The iSkills™ test provides individual overall scaled scores that identify individual performance in comparison to other test takers and also provides performance feedback to identify mastery of skill or where improvement is needed. A benefit of the iSkills™ test is that it is offered at two levels, a “Core Assessment” and an “Advanced Assessment,” so we can be sure the assessment is appropriate to the faculty’s and students’ level of fluency with ICT concepts.

The ICT Literacy iSkills™ assessment components (ETS, 2003) are:

- Define – Using digital tools to identify and represent an information need.
- Access – Collecting and/or retrieving information in digital environments.
- Manage – Using digital tools to apply an existing organizational or classification scheme for information.
- Integrate – Interpreting and representing information, such as by using digital tools to synthesize, summarize, compare, and contrast information from multiple sources.
- Evaluate – Judging the degree to which digital information satisfies the needs of an information problem, including determining authority, bias, and timeliness of materials.
- Create – Adapting, applying, designing, or constructing information in digital environments.
- Communicate – Disseminating information relevant to a particular audience in an effective digital format.

To assess the effectiveness of the FLCs and the courses, we also will use survey questionnaires based on the FLC materials developed at Miami University, Ohio and, where appropriate, the comparative examination of syllabi. The assessment protocols for Faculty Learning Communities and the new or revised courses are detailed below. The Office of Accreditation and Assessment will collect and
archive all assessment tools so that we can study the long-range effectiveness of the FLC and the QEP/FLC affected coursework.

**QEP/FLC Assessment: Faculty**

- Faculty participants in the FLCs will take the iSkills™ test both before and after the FLC. The results will indicate the adjustments necessary to increase the effectiveness of the program.

- An FLC participant survey will illustrate the FLC participants’ ability to help their students achieve the student learning outcomes outlined in their syllabus and the effectiveness of the FLC. A sample survey follows:

---

**UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI SAMPLE FACULTY QEP PARTICIPATION SURVEY**

You have recently participated in a QEP/FLC developed through processes introduced by the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan related to developing Faculty Learning Communities to enhance student learning through the use of ICT Literacy concepts.

**ICT Literacy** is the ability to appropriately use digital technology, communication tools and/or networks to solve information problems and think critically about information. ICT Literacy also includes the ability to use technology as a tool to research, evaluate, organize and communicate information and a fundamental understanding of the ethical/legal issues surrounding the access and use of information.

**Directions Part A:** Estimate the impact of the QEP FLC on you with respect to each of the following program components. Indicate a number between 1 and 5, with 1 indicating the lowest impact and 5 the highest.

- Retreats and Seminars
- Support from the Teaching and Learning Commons
- Collegiality and learning from other community participants
- Technology workshops
- Information Literacy workshops
- Community discussions and Virtual community participation
Directions Part B: Answer each of the questions with a rating of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest achievement score and 5 being the highest, as it relates to your FLC experience and the development achieved:

- As a result of your participation in the QEP Faculty Learning Community, you were able to create a well-integrated course containing ICT Literacy for your students.

- As a result of your participation in the QEP Faculty Learning Community, you were able to create learning outcomes for your students related to ICT Literacy.

- As a result of your participation in the QEP Faculty Learning Community you were able to achieve a positive result in student learning regarding ICT Literacy.

- As a result of your participation in the QEP Faculty Learning Community, your students appeared more motivated or more interested in your course content.

Along with faculty and student participant surveys and the iSkills™ exam, in cases of revised courses, the University will compare and contrast the pre-FLC syllabi and course materials with the post-FLC syllabi and course materials. All participants’ post-FLC syllabi and course materials should demonstrate but not be limited to the following:

- Command of the new ICT concepts and materials used in the course.

- The faculty members’ ability to integrate new ICT-based pedagogy in the course content.

- The ICT guidelines and project assignments developed for the course as a result of participating in the QEP/FLC.

- The faculty members’ ability to evaluate/assess students’ use of the methods and materials in the post-FLC course.

- The faculty members’ ability to assist their students to synthesize and integrate new information and ideas.

- The faculty members’ ability to help their students learn and effectively use ICT Literacy components.

QEP/FLC Assessment: Students
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- Students will take the iSkills™ test once prior to participation in the post-FLC course and a second time after the coursework is completed. The information will indicate the adjustments necessary to increase the effectiveness of the program.

- A post-course student survey will illustrate the students’ perceptions of how their new course worked and thereby help assess the overall effectiveness of the QEP/FLC program. A sample survey follows:

---

**UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI**
**SAMPLE STUDENT QEP PARTICIPATION SURVEY**

You have recently participated in a QEP/FLC affected course developed through processes introduced by the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan related to Faculty Learning Communities to enhance student learning through the use of ICT Literacy concepts.

**ICT Literacy** is the ability to appropriately use digital technology, communication tools and/or networks to solve information problems and think critically about information. ICT Literacy also includes the ability to use technology as a tool to research, evaluate, organize and communicate information and a fundamental understanding of the ethical/legal issues surrounding the access and use of information.

**Directions:** Answer each of the questions with a rating of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest, as it relates to your experience in the QEP course and what you feel you achieved:

Rate on a scale of 1 to 5:

- How much did you learn about ICT Literacy components?
- How much did your ability in ICT Literacy skills improve as a result of this course?
- How much did your capacity to use information technology in your coursework improve by taking this course?
- How much did your ability to research, evaluate, organize, and communicate improve as a result of this course?
- How interactive was this course?
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- How much did the new media project help you pull ICT Literacy skills together?
- How much did the course content motivate and interest you?
- How effective was the instructor?
- How well did the instructor provide you with opportunities to build your skills in ICT Literacy components?
- How likely are you to recommend this course to a friend?
Schedule

QEP/FLC cycles will begin in the spring and continue into the fall, when the FLC participants will have course relief to devote to their project.

Fall 2008:
- Instructional Advancement will implement a beta FLC to test logistics prior to actual QEP FLC implementation in the spring.
- The Dean of Undergraduate Education will appoint the FLC Advisory Committee to solicit and review applications for the QEP/FLC. The Committee will offer information sessions for faculty.
- The QEP FLC Program Director, Facilitator(s), and the TLC will work to develop programming, materials, technical infrastructure, and scheduling

Spring 2009 (Cycle I):
- Implementation of the FLC through the use of ICT Literacy Concepts begins (one or two communities – 8 to 10 participants each – TBD)
- Programming and development occurs throughout the FLC
- At the end of the spring semester FLC participants develop and present a seminar for University faculty outlining the progress of the FLC.

Fall 2009:
- Implement QEP FLC affected course. Implementation includes iSkills testing of course participants if they have not already been tested to establish baseline ICT skill level.
- FLC continues with discussions of implementation needs. Assistance and adjustments are incorporated into courses.
- Call for new QEP FLC application packets are distributed to the faculty.
- Assessment activity – Faculty and student final participant surveys and iSkills test is taken at the end of the semester.

Spring 2010 (Cycle II):
- Any necessary adjustments to the FLC, assessment tools, etc. are implemented prior to the start of the Spring semester.
- Assessment activity – Second QEP FLC begins.
Dissemination of QEP / FLC Outcomes, Achievements, and Challenges

At the end of each QEP FLC cycle, the Office of the Provost will publicize faculty and student achievement on the QEP website. Examples will include students’ projects developed in QEP/ FLC courses, samples of revised syllabi, assignments, and projects. FLC members will participate in panel discussions open to the University community that present FLC activity, describe knowledge gained and affected coursework, and review broad data from survey findings. The same kinds of panel discussions will take place at the beginning of each selection cycle, to help engage new participants in campus meetings. FLC participants also will be asked to share the substance and results of their experience with their departments.

At the completion of the five-year initial phase of the QEP, a compilation of findings will be published for the University community.
## Revised QEP Budget

### Compensation and Benefits

#### Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty - Librarian (Information Literacy)</td>
<td>54,800</td>
<td>56,992</td>
<td>59,272</td>
<td>61,643</td>
<td>64,108</td>
<td>296,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff - Program Director</td>
<td>63,400</td>
<td>65,619</td>
<td>67,916</td>
<td>70,293</td>
<td>72,753</td>
<td>339,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC Course Relief</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workstudy Students</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Compensation</strong></td>
<td>176,200</td>
<td>224,611</td>
<td>229,187</td>
<td>233,935</td>
<td>238,861</td>
<td>1,102,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFB - Faculty</td>
<td>13,974</td>
<td>14,533</td>
<td>15,114</td>
<td>15,719</td>
<td>16,348</td>
<td>75,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFB - Staff</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>20,340</td>
<td>20,340</td>
<td>20,340</td>
<td>20,340</td>
<td>91,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Benefits</strong></td>
<td>24,144</td>
<td>34,873</td>
<td>35,454</td>
<td>36,059</td>
<td>36,688</td>
<td>167,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total - Compensation and Benefits**     | 200,344  | 259,484  | 264,642  | 269,994  | 275,549  | 1,270,013|

#### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Training</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Education Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>91,540</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>64,540</td>
<td>256,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>34,087</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>86,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Operations</strong></td>
<td>214,627</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>151,540</td>
<td>727,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Capital Renovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technology Infrastructure</td>
<td>19,352,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,352,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media Classroom</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Exploratory</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Renovations</strong></td>
<td>19,667,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,692,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                     | 20,081,971 | 366,484  | 391,642  | 422,794  | 427,089  | 21,689,980|

**Notes**

1. Growth rate assumption for faculty and staff compensation 4% and 3.5%, respectively
2. Represents Faculty Learning Community course relief (10 per year at $3,000 per in Year 1). For Years 2-5 a maximum of 20 per year at $3,000 per to account for the possibility of two groups
3. For Year 1, represents one graduate assistant; thereafter for Years 2-5, includes a 2nd graduate assistant
4. FY 2009 composite fringe benefit used for planning purposes.
5. Includes both internal and external training and programming
6. Represents a faculty research/education fund of $1,500 per FLC participant
7. Includes computers and smart classroom related equipment
8. Includes IT support and upgrades; web design and maintenance
9. Includes start-up for Librarian and Program Director; QEP assessment; and testing

The University of Miami is making a commitment of $21,689,980 over five years toward the successful adoption and implementation of the University’s Revised QEP. Of that amount, $2,337,980 is over and above the normal budget and explicitly dedicated to support and implement the QEP. The educational technology component of the University’s comprehensive classroom renovation was designed to support ICT Literacy, which is the focus of the first phase of the Revised QEP.
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