



QEP Steering Committee

Meeting Agenda

January 12, 2024, 11:30am

ACAD 701 or Zoom

Meeting attendees: Tim Redl, Stefany Records, Sam Weehunt, Cesar Garza, Tammis Thomas, Charlie Finch, Poonam Gulati, Wendy Burns-Ardolino, Mike Connelly, Divya Bhati, Mik Yegiyan

Unable to attend: Hayden Bergman, Dana Smith

Agenda

1. Approve minutes from December 19, 2023 meeting
2. Review Call for Proposals; timing for a reminder email between Jan 12/Feb 12
3. Review Form to receive proposal content
4. Familiarize committee members with the SACSCOC Evaluation Framework (Rubric); this rubric will be used to evaluate the proposals
5. Discuss approaches to gather feedback from campus on submitted proposals.
6. What is the functional plan for reviewing the proposals?
7. Dialogue around encouraging faculty and staff to submit proposals (Faculty Senate, committee meetings, other department/college meetings, etc.); who will present at what meeting?

Meeting Summary of the January 12 QEP Steering Committee

The committee discussed the language of the call for proposals message. Various clarifications were discussed. The concept of office hours was introduced to the committee as an option for individuals to discuss topic ideas and ask questions. The committee reviewed the electronic form to receive topic proposals and made various clarifications of language and updates. The committee reviewed the SACSCOC rubric that will be used to evaluate proposals; that rubric will also be used liberally to review topic proposals. The committee was assigned homework to further review the rubric. The committee discussed the timeline and process for reviewing topic proposals agreeing that the committee wants to review all submissions before sharing with the campus community for review.

Full Notes:

Agenda

1. Approve minutes from December 19, 2023 meeting

Any updates to the minutes? Any questions or corrections?

Mike Connelly moved to approve the minutes, Wendy Second; vote to approve unanimously

2. Review Call for Proposals; timing for a reminder email between Jan 12/Feb 12

The call was originally supposed to go out on Monday, but we delayed and announced at faculty retreat that the call would go out today. Tim, Stefany, Divya and Emily worked on the draft more. Thank you for your comments. Want to have the committee review the draft one last time before the draft goes out.

Chair went through the draft language.

We want to get ideas from these proposals, but there will be time to revise the plan before due.

Who will be at the office hours? Divya and Mik, and any steering committee member who is available to attend.

expectations #2 – do proposals need to figure this out before submitting? Response – there are three phases and we are in phase 1; clarification – the person submitting does not need to do a rigorous review to say this, but some preliminary language about needs is good.

Maybe we add “potential” to expectations? Addition to the draft about the “potential of these elements”

Since this is a proposal, the form feels like a grant application. Response – the proposal does need to touch on these items; Concern – particularly worried about question #8; knowing the various components is a hurdle.

Could we simplify the questions to be more accessible?

#4 in expectations is tough because we don't know the available funds; Response – this is more of a budget plan, don't need to confirm availability of funds

Maybe we need to clarify the expectations of the QEP

Clarify QEP topic proposal from the final QEP

Change office hours days; also add a hybrid option

3. Review Form to receive proposal content

Look at form; add “topic” language; we need to provide an example of the filled in form

UPDATE OFFICE HOURS IN FORM

Send a follow-up example of a completed form; on the website

Question 4 – someone who is not clued in to data wouldn't be able to actively address, but they do know that "DFW rates is a problem"; as long as they can allude to the reference of data

So how precious are we going to hold this rubric; some proposals may be more fleshed out than others, but really good ideas may get overlooked. Are we going to be open in the review? The consensus was yes, that we would have an open review of ideas with the rubric as a guide.

Suggested language: What are the challenges you want to focus on, and how would we use data to support the work; stressing the potential.

Further updates to form...

Change guiding questions to "questions to consider"

Does the QEP have to be curricular? Response: Could be curricular or co-curricular or a mix. This is where there was an issue before – putting the assessment into the curriculum in courses.

Yes, this is a standard that is frequently cited because institutions don't properly consider the assessment of the QEP.

Clarification that the timeline and development of the plan is incremental.

4. Familiarize committee members with the SACSCOC Evaluation Framework (Rubric); this rubric will be used to evaluate the proposals

Homework!

5. Discuss approaches to gather feedback from campus on submitted proposals.

Discuss once the proposals start to come in; are we going to ask for additional information as proposals come in? We will still have a holistic conversation about it.

6. What is the functional plan for reviewing the proposals?

First, committee sees proposal presentations and selects finalists. We need to also decide a plan for the campus to review proposals and provide feedback. Campus community would review the selected proposals and then provide feedback via a survey. Or we can send the proposals out earlier.

The committee decides the questions for the campus community.

We will plan on a follow-up reminder email to the faculty community, and that will have a sample completed form.

When we circulate to the community, let's take off names of submissions.

Worry about the timeline of sharing with community and consolidating for final recommendation. What is a way to accelerate faculty feedback? Share starting February 12 –

title and executive summary. Give contact information; way to give feedback. No, committee needs to review first.

7. Dialogue around encouraging faculty and staff to submit proposals (Faculty Senate, committee meetings, other department/college meetings, etc.); who will present at what meeting?

Move to adjourn: Wendy; second Mike

Next Meetings

- January 26, 2:30pm
 - How many proposals to date?
 - Determine questions to ask the campus?
 - Provide more concrete timeline
- Monday, Feb 12 at 1pm (deadline for submitting proposals)
- February 23, 9:00-11am; *this is a 2 hr meeting to review proposals*
- March 1, 2pm recommended