

**YOU HAVE SELECTED YOUR QEP TOPIC.... NOW WHAT?**

Steven M. Sheeley, Ph.D.  
Senior Vice President  
SACSCOC  
Summer Institute 2019 - Dallas, TX




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Standard 7.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)**

- Has a **topic** identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes
- Has **broad-based support** of institutional constituencies
- Focuses on **improving** specific student learning outcomes and/or student success
- Commits **resources** to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP
- Includes a plan to **assess** achievement




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Reaffirmation Timeline**

<p><b>Track A - UG</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Orientation (December - @30 mos)</li> <li>■ Compliance Certification (March - @8 mos) - <i>QEP option</i></li> <li>■ Off-Site Review (April - @6 mos)</li> <li>■ Focused Report/QEP due (6 weeks prior to On-Site visit)</li> <li>■ On-Site Visit (mid-September to mid-November)</li> <li>■ SACSCOC Board review (June)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Track B - GR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Orientation (December - @26 mos)</li> <li>■ Compliance Certification (September - @5 mos) - <i>QEP option</i></li> <li>■ Off-Site Review (November - @3 mos)</li> <li>■ Focused Report/QEP due (6 weeks prior to On-Site visit)</li> <li>■ On-Site Visit (mid-January to mid-April)</li> <li>■ SACSCOC Board review (December)</li> </ul>
---	---




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### QEP Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee Option

- Institutional *option* to provide QEP information for the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee to review and comment
- Non-binding comments that don't remain part of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee's Preliminary Report forwarded to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee
- Short (2-4 pages) narratives under Standard 7.2
  - Summarize QEP topic and its relationship to institutional planning process
  - Describe focus of the QEP on enhancing specific student learning outcomes and/or student success




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Questions to Consider

- When do you start?
  - Track A - about 30 months between Orientation and On-Site visit
  - Track B - about 26 months between Orientation and On-Site visit
- Are you interested in the Off-Site option? If so, that shortens the timeline for preliminary planning
- QEP document must be ready to submit with any other documents (i.e. Focused Report) six (6) weeks before the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee's visit begins
- Who will you nominate to be the QEP Lead Evaluator on the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee?




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Before You Write....

- Assemble (or re-assemble) your QEP development team
- Plan to engage appropriate and important institutional constituencies
  - Not required to get approval/support from every constituent group
  - Institutions sometimes miss important stakeholders
- Consider starting with the end in mind
  - QEP Impact Report (FYIR)
  - What is being enhanced related to student learning outcomes and/or student success?
  - How will you know?




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Consider Your "Audience"

- Stakeholders
  - Internal - Faculty, Staff, Administration, Students, Board Members
  - External - Partners, Donors, Media, Alumni, Parents
- Implementation team(s)
- On-Site Reaffirmation Committee
- SACSCOC Board of Trustees
- Fifth-Year Interim Committee




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Quality Enhancement *Plan*

- "Bits and Bytes," rather than "stone"
- Living document and process, open to improvement and appropriate changes throughout the life of the plan
- Action research
  - Hypothesis about improving student learning outcomes and/or student success
  - Strategies proposed based on sound practice
  - May or may not work when implemented in your context
- Maintain focus on the desired improvements in outcomes




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Answer The "Questions"

- Organization and Presentation
  - Writing with audience(s) in mind
  - Page limits (75/25)
- Standard 7.2 asks five (5) questions
  - Topic
  - Support
  - Improvement
  - Resources
  - Assessment
- Introductory material important for context, but not the heart of the document




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Broad-based Support

- Assent and approval not required for every institutional constituency
- How are stakeholders involved and informed...both in development and implementation phases?
- Are the appropriate stakeholders appropriately involved? Some may be external to the institution
- How will students be involved and engaged in the planning and implementation of the plan, particularly given their transitory nature over the plan's multiple years?
- Has the institution identified and engaged appropriate - and often necessary - community partners?




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Focus On Improvement

- Consistent with SACSCOC philosophy
- Improvement model
  - Clear understanding about current state of achievement (baseline data in context)
  - Clearly articulated idea(s) about "success" (targets)
- Understanding and articulation of student learning outcomes and/or student success goals/outputs are foundational to the argument
- Careful not to focus on strategies to be implemented; plan success measured by improvement in student behaviors




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Commits Resources

- What will this plan **cost** your institution?
  - Human resources
  - Fiscal resources
- Are resources being reallocated or coming from new sources?
- What group of people will be responsible for evaluating the need for additional resources as the plan is implemented?
- Peer reviewers will expect to see budget projections for the entire five years of the plan (in addition to resources committed during the planning process)
- Plan needs to be fairly confident about the first two years of implementation




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Assessing Achievement

- Quality Enhancement Plans often have multiple "moving parts"
- Assessment plans often fall into the trap of paying more attention to assessing strategies than desired outcomes/outputs
- Primary question: did your student learning outcomes/student success outputs improve?
- Direct assessments designed to elicit data about student behavior
- Appropriate indirect assessments may also provide useful, actionable data
- Data is gathered, analyzed, and used to improve/adjust the plan
- Analysis of data will usually result in conversation about effectiveness of strategies being implemented




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Preparing For The On-Site Committee

- Have you scheduled an Advisory Visit with your SACSCOC VP?
  - Focused Report
  - QEP draft
  - Logistics
- QEP document needs to be complete in time to mail to Committee members six weeks in advance of the visit – if you're using a third-party service, there may be some lead time for flash drive production
- Document should be as complete/"final" as you can make it...like a manuscript submitted for publication




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### QEP Lead Evaluator

- QEP Policy has important information (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Quality%20Enhancement%20Plan.pdf>)
- Submit at least two names and pertinent information to SACSCOC VP by deadline in advance of the visit
  - Make initial contact with both to determine willingness and availability
  - Note first choice
  - Subject to SACSCOC Conflict of Interest policies
  - Content expertise
- All Committee members have review/writing assignments related to QEP; Lead evaluator coordinates the review and report




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### During the Committee Visit

- Be prepared to make a short (30 minutes) presentation to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee...often the schedule calls for another 30 minutes of initial discussion following that presentation
- Be prepared for significant discussions with the Committee members on the second day of the visit
- Formal "recommendations" made when the Committee cannot determine that the institution has demonstrated compliance with every aspect of the standard
- Consultative "suggestions" are almost always a part of the Exit Conference on the final day of the visit
- Significant goal of the Committee to proffer advice that will help the institution be as successful as possible throughout the implementation of the QEP - it's about the students




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Fifth-Year Interim Review: Impact Report

- QEP Impact Report is part of FYIR
- Maximum of ten (10) pages
- What impact did your plan implementation have on your student learning/success?
- When/if you modify the plan throughout its implementation
  - Keep records
  - What data and analysis triggered the modification?




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---




---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---