

Minutes - QEP Steering Committee
Randolph Hall, President's Board Room/Randolph Hall 206
April 29, 2015, 9:00am/April 30, 2015, 1:00pm

Attendees:

Lynn Cherry - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (co-chair)
Karin Roof - Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning (co-chair)
Zipora Ancrum - Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning (taking minutes) (*ex-officio*)
Mark Berry - Marketing and Communications
Burton Callicott - Addlestone Library
Cara Dombroski - Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning (*ex-officio*)
Jasmine Gil (attending on behalf of Zach Sturman) (absent April 29th)
Kevin Keenan - School of Humanities and Social Sciences
Robert Mignone - School of Sciences and Mathematics
Mindy Miley - Academic Experience
Rene Mueller - School of Business
Ashleigh Parr - Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning (*ex-officio*)
Susan Payment - Student Affairs
Monica Scott - Business Affairs
Antonio Tillis - School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs (absent April 30th)

1. Opening Remarks

- Committee was thanked for their service and reminded that their obligation doesn't end once the topic has been chosen; the Committee is charged with overseeing the writing and submission of the QEP.
- All of the proposals had great value and merit, but the committee's role is to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each to present to the Reaffirmation Leadership Team for final decision.
- Proposal authors may not become the QEP director.
- Focus should be on the potential of the proposal as each one has strengths and weaknesses that can be addressed over the next year.
- In reviewing the feedback comments from the Committee, while the work of Halsey and TLT are appreciated and valued, the topics were not a good fit for a QEP at this time.

2. *Developing an Advising Curriculum*

- SACSCOC Core Requirement (CR) 2.12 notes that if facets of a previous QEP will be included in the new QEP, the new QEP should be derived from an assessment of the institution's previous QEP. Advising was a component of the last QEP (FYE).
- SACSCOC standard CR 2.8 regarding faculty, which details the basic functions of the faculty to include student advising, is also relevant.
- This proposal would help faculty broaden their advising skills and could help with student retention.
- Proposal implies that a lot of training is necessary for advisors (and students) to understand general education; could imply a curricular issue that should be addressed. SACSCOC is very clear that a student should be able to self-advise.
- Proposal goals need to better incorporate student learning; proposal seems to address basic functions of advising, doesn't seem to be an enhancement.
- Current assessment data is needed to support this topic.
- "Deluxe budget" is expensive, may not reach a lot of students, and has potential hidden costs.

3. *Sustainability Literacy as a Bridge to Addressing 21st Century Problems*

- Topic may impact many across campus including graduate students and programs; could provide national recognition for the College.
 - Topic is tied to the College's Strategic Plan.
 - Sustainability literacy survey was previously administered and could serve as baseline data; measures other than surveys would also need to be incorporated.
 - Proposal is too broad and would require major revisions.
 - Faculty "buy-in" may be difficult.
 - Curricular components could be problematic; internal approval process for curricular changes is timely and difficult; introducing a new Ph.D. program may be difficult in the five-year implementation period.
 - Current (vacant) line may already exist to serve as a liaison/educator for faculty.
-

(Continuation meeting on April 30, 2015)

1. Opening Remarks

- After the last proposal is discussed, the Committee will make recommendations on the three proposals for the leadership team.
- OIEP will compile the recommendations into a draft report, which will be circulated through the Committee to finalize.

2. *Broadening Access to Student Success through Undergraduate Research and Creative Engagement with Faculty*

- Strong support for undergraduate research; proposal is linked to the Strategic Plan; the most academic of all the proposals.
- May potentially reach only a subset of students.
- Potential impact on the tenure and promotion (T&P) process: would it require changes to the existing T&P process? Would these activities be acknowledged in the T&P process as research?
- Undergraduate research may provide a consistent "end-product" (i.e.; a research paper), which may facilitate assessment endeavors.
- Proposal may not require as much of a cultural change.
- For broad-based involvement, would have to ensure there was participation from each academic school and would require faculty incentives.
- SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard (CS) 3.3.1.4, addressing research within its mission, is relevant.
- This is a manageable project and may be the path of least resistance.

3. Recommendations for Leadership Team

- *Developing an Advising Curriculum* - would require an institutional commitment to the resources ("deluxe package"); need to include transfer center; need to have training for faculty.
- *Sustainability Literacy as a Bridge to Addressing 21st Century Problems* - scope is too broad; curricular portions would need to be redone; would require institutional support to gain faculty acceptance.
- *Broadening Access to Student Success through Undergraduate Research and Creative Engagement with Faculty* - would require incentives for faculty; would be a manageable project that requires the least cultural change.