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Part I
- Why a QEP?
- What’s a QEP?
- Assessment Models
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  - Bridge Model
- QEP Rubrics
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- QEP Assessment Rubric
- QEP Lessons Learned
- Tools to Share
- Q&A - Closure
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Opening Group Activity

Introduction of Presenters

Table Introductions
- Each table has an assigned Table Leader
- Leader will start introductions
  - Name & Institution
  - QEP Interest/Responsibility?
- 10 minutes for introductions

Dr. Barbara H. Jones
dbhjones@bellsouth.net

D. J. Henry
djhenry@cfl.rr.com
Hot QEP Topics

- Popular Topics
  - Student Writing
  - Student Engagement
  - Student Success
  - Student Learning
  - Critical Thinking
  - Mathematics
  - Developmental Learning
  - On-line Education and Technology
  - Faculty and Staff Development
  - Student Retention
  - Others?

See Page 1 of Handouts for updated list

Elements of the QEP

- A brief descriptive title
- A topic that is creative and vital to the long-term improvement of student learning (and/or the learning environment.)
- A definition of student learning appropriate to the focus of the QEP
- A description of the importance of the QEP
- Evidence of analysis of goals, implementation and best practices related to the QEP’s topic or issues
- A visible implementation plan: timelines, leadership, resources, assessment schedule.
- A comprehensive assessment plan
Assessment Plan Basics

- There is an Assessment Plan!
  - Assessment Plan related to focus of QEP and implementation activities
- Clearly appropriate assessment processes
  - Baselines, benchmarking, pre-post measures, valued-added, control groups, & statistical analysis
- Multiple measures important
  - Appropriate & relevant assessment instruments
- Specific, well-defined goals related to QEP & leading to observable evidence
  - Specific student learning outcomes
- Link between QEP and other institutional and academic planning
  - Strategic plan, annual college plan, major initiatives, etc.
QEP Assessment Concept Models

Key Points Concerning QEP Assessment
Start with Assessment-End with Assessment

- Assessment isn’t an afterthought!
  - Build the assessment plan into the project
  - Assessment is dynamic – not static
  - Assessment is a great QEP planning tool
- Assessment begins with the Focus Statement
  - “The primary purpose (mission or goal) of the QEP is to
  ……”
- Evaluation design and assessment models are important to QEP development, implementation and assessment.
- The whole point of a QEP is to improve student learning in a significant and substantive way and validate difference in learning through assessment.
Examples of QEP Focus/Purpose/Goal Statements

- The purpose of (the QEP) is to enhance student engagement in reading and to improve student reading skills.
- The goal of (the QEP) is to improve student learning by supporting students in the development of effective problem-solving skills.
- The purpose of (the QEP) is to assist learners in the development and application of critical thinking skills across the curriculum, thereby improving their ability to think critically and solve problems in general education and occupational/technical programs.
- The goal of (the QEP) is to improve student learning through culturally diverse perspectives to prepare students for success in a global society.
- The primary focus of (the QEP) is the development of students who use higher-order thinking skills to explore, evaluate, expand and express ideas.
- The focus of (the QEP) is to enhance student learning in mathematics.

The Assessment Question
How will we know to what extent our intervention (plan) worked?

Logic Models
A great tool for developing, assessing and communicating the QEP.

- A logic model is a graphic representation that shows a logical relationship between inputs, outputs and outcomes.
- The model provides
  - A picture of a program
  - A simple description of program theory
  - Logical chain of connections
  - A series of “if-then” relationships
  - Core of program planning, monitoring, assessing and reporting
“Never invest in any idea you can’t illustrate with a crayon.”

Peter Lynch in *Beating the Street*.

### Logic Model Basics

**Inputs**
- Faculty
- Staff
- Money
- Time
- Technology
- Software
- Curriculum
- Labs

**Activities**
- Curriculum Design
- Attend Reading Conferences
- Pre-college testing
- Development advising
- Financial Aid
- Faculty learning Communities
- Tutoring
- Academic Support

**Outputs**
- # students enrolled
- # faculty trained
- # of redesigned courses
- Course enrollment
- Graduation rates
- Retention rates
- GPA’s
- Course completions

**Outcomes**
- 10% increase in reading scores pre-post test
- 20% increase in number of students who report they read for pleasure in past 6 weeks
- 25% increase in NCATE scores

### A QEP Logic Model Example

**QEP Focus:** Statement of problem or condition related to student learning.

**Processes**
- What will we invest?
- What will we do?
- Who will we reach?

**Outputs**
- What difference will we make?

**Inputs**
- Faculty
- Staff
- Money
- Time
- Technology
- Software
- Curriculum
- Labs

**Activities**
- Curriculum Design
- Attend Reading Conferences
- Pre-college testing
- Development advising
- Financial Aid
- Faculty learning Communities
- Tutoring
- Academic Support

**Outcomes**
- # students enrolled
- # faculty trained
- # of redesigned courses
- Course enrollment
- Graduation rates
- Retention rates
- GPA’s
- Course completions

**Outcomes**
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation

10/24/2009
What are the problems or conditions addressed by the QEP?

- poor reading skills
- poor learning in specific courses
- little independent reading
- low retention rates
- poor test performance
- high failure rates

What difference will the QEP make once implemented?

- better reading skills
- improved learning in specific courses
- more independent reading
- retention rate up
- test performance up
- failure rates reduced

How do we bridge the gap?

Implementation Plan

- better reading skills
- improved learning in specific courses
- more independent reading
- retention rate up
- test performance up
- failure rates reduced
QEP Background
2.12 Quality Enhancement Plan
(Focus-Involvement-Capability-Assessment)

The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that
(1) includes a broad-based institutional process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment,
(2) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution,
(3) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation and completion of the QEP,
(4) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP, and
(5) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement.

Source: 2007 Principles of Accreditation

A Brief History of the QEP Rubrics

1. Focus Rubric
2. Involvement Rubric
3. Capability Rubric
4. Assessment Rubric
IV. Assessment:
The institution has developed means for assessing the success of the QEP including the development of relevant internal and external measures to evaluate the Plan with an internal system for evaluating the QEP and monitoring its progress.

The Plan describes how the results of the evaluations of the QEP will be used to improve student learning (and/or the learning environment.)
The Assessment Rubric

A. Evaluation Design
B. Formative and Summative Assessment
C. Specific Learning Outcome Assessment
D. Resources

A. Evaluation Design

- There is a comprehensive and coherent assessment strategy.
- The assessment plan includes objectives, outputs and outcomes for QEP implementation processes, program outputs and student learning outcomes.
- QEP objectives, outputs and outcomes, if achieved, will lead to evidence of improved student learning and/or an improved student learning environment.
- QEP topic is related to and integrated with other institutional plans (strategic/long range, academic, system, etc.)
**Objective 4:** Students will show improvement in mathematics knowledge, skills and competences based on an end-of-course assessment in targeted courses using a common course examination.

**Outcome 4a. MATH 0097**
Students enrolled in MATH 0097 will show an average gain of 5% per year on the Common Course Examination compared to the 2005-06 baseline average of 65.4. (2012 Target – 83.5%)

**Outcome 4b. MATH 0099**
Students enrolled in MATH 0099 will show an average gain of 5% per year on the Common Course Examination compared to the 2005-06 baseline average of 64.0. (2012 Target – 81.7%)

**Outcome 4c. MATH 1111**
Students enrolled in MATH 1111 (College Algebra) will show an average gain of 5% per year on the Common Course Examination compared to the 2005-06 baseline average of 66.3. (2012 Target – 84.6%)
**EXAMPLE**

- Faculty will integrate problem-based and problem-solving experiences in the courses and programs.
  - 90% of full-time faculty trained in PBL
  - Faculty improve knowledge & attitudes toward PBL
  - Increase faculty integrating PBL by 10% per year
  - 75% redesigned to integrate PBL experiences

- Students will solve ill-defined, real-world problems by applying systematic problem-solving techniques.
  - 80% of students perform at or above average in problem solving using faculty-developed rubric
  - Improve student performance on CAT
  - 75% in college success course self-score problem solving rubric consistent with faculty score
  - Improve student performance on common exams in redesigned courses
  - First-time students persistence increase by 5%
  - Developmental students persistence rate increase by 10%

**Assessment Timeline**

**Date** | **Assessment Task**
--- | ---
March 2008 | Administer CAT for baseline
March 2009 | Administer CAT to student cohort, compared to baseline
"The focus on critical thinking as the QEP topic is congruent with the College’s strategic plan (Strategic Goals 2006 - 2010 of ... Community College), as well as annual planning initiatives (Annual Planning Initiatives of 2008 - 2009). These provide the foundation for the College’s QEP. The strategic goals are as follows:

- **Communication**: Provide strategic communication to all constituents.
- **Access**: Promote access and success for a diverse population.
- **Leadership**: Develop and encourage innovative and visionary leaders for the College and the community.
- **Learning Environment**: Focus on learning as the chief priority and driving force of the College’s efforts.

The “Learning Environment” strategic goal provides the basis for annual initiatives developed by the Planning Team as well as for the selection of critical thinking as the QEP topic. One of the 2008-09 Planning Initiatives that specifically relates to improving learning is that College will “enhance academic opportunities for students through the incorporation of critical thinking activities in all college courses.”

---

**Group Activity**

- **TASK:**

- **RESOURCES:**

B. Formative & Summative Assessment

Formative—that which seeks to 
*improve implementation and increase success along the way*

Summative—that which seeks to 
*prove whether strategies have been effective*

- Formative assessment included with procedures focused on improving the QEP’s implementation.
- Clear evidence that formative assessment results will be used to modify the implementation plan as needed to achieve objectives, outputs and outcomes.
- Summative assessment included to determine the overall success of the QEP.
Assessment

Formative

Implementation (Efficiency Measures)

Outcomes (Effectiveness Measures)

early stages

Summative

Final Report

later stages

QEP Timeline

Fall 2008
Comprehensive exams administered for baseline

Spring 2009
Rubric developed and piloted

Fall 2009
Comprehensive exams administered for baseline

Spring 2010
External formative assessment

Fall 2010
Comprehensive exams administered for second cohort

Spring 2011
External formative assessment

Fall 2011
Comprehensive exams administered for target groups

Spring 2012
Subject area exams

Fall 2012
NCSSE administered to cohort

Spring 2013
External formative assessment

Fall 2013
Summative assessment & 5-Yr SACS Report on QEP

Spring 2014

Date | Assessment Task
--- | ---
July 2009 | External evaluator conducts first formative assessment of QEP
July 2010 | Annual formative assessment conducted
C. Specific Learning Outcome Assessment

- There are clear, specific and measurable statements of student learning outcomes.
- Assessment of student learning is described and based on documenting improvements in student learning outcomes.
- Appropriate and specific instruments that directly measure student learning outcomes are identified.
- Baseline and/or control group data has been collected and/or a clear plan is in place to obtain this data.

What is a Student Learning Outcome?

A student learning outcome describes/identifies the measurable knowledge, skills, behaviors and/or values/attitudes of the learner as the result of the learner’s engagement in a learning activity.
**QEP Student Learning Outcomes**

- 60% of students tested will score above the national mean on the CAAP.
- 80% of English 1101 students will achieve an average score of 3.5 or higher on the reading rubric.
- 10% improvement in students’ critical thinking skills as measured by the Critical Assessment of Thinking Test (CAT).
- 12% improvement in students’ critical thinking skills as measured by CTS rubrics.
- Average scores on the math common exams will increase from 67 to 79 for students in targeted courses.
Group Activity 2

- TASK:

- RESOURCES:

D. Assessment Resources

- There is evidence of relationship between goals, objectives and learning outcomes to implementation activities and identified resources.

- Staff and financial resources needed to support evaluation and assessment activities are identified, included in the budget and adequate.

- Administrative assessment processes are presented in a multi-year timeline with clearly defined responsibilities identified.
Assessment Resources

- Identify and secure adequate resources (money, time, etc.) necessary for assessment, including:
  - Cost of assessment instruments
  - External evaluator-annual
  - Data collection and analysis
  - Staff assignments
  - Software
  - Where is it in the budget?
### QEP Implementation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Primary Tasks</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outputs, Outcomes &amp; Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Budget Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009 - Spring 2010, Year One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLE 6: QEP SUMMARY BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Director</td>
<td>18,450</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>18,450</td>
<td>18,450</td>
<td>$167,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS Teams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(09) CT Trainers for PASS Teams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Teaching course stipends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td>18,450</td>
<td>85,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>30,450</td>
<td>18,450</td>
<td>$278,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fac. Prof. Development WS</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Travel for PASS Teams</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal PD&amp;T</strong></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(08) Printing QEP</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(08) QEP laptops &amp; tech for teams</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supplies for Teams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Printing for final report</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supplies</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Supplies</strong></td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Assessments</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(08) Marketing QEP</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Formative Assessment Evaluator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Other</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$18,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other</strong></td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$18,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QEP Tools

- Box.net site info at To be entered
- QEP Development Tool
- QEP Implementation Table
- Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Guide

The QEP Life Span
18 months & counting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Timeline (Months)</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Dialogue</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Focus selected, purpose defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Design</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Activities developed, resource needs identified, implementation plan detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Writing</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>Published QEP document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Review</td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>External SACS review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Implementation</td>
<td>19-?</td>
<td>This is where the work begins!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Post-QEP</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>That was fun! Let’s do another QEP!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promoting the QEP to the onsite SACS Team……

1. Open-Book Test!
   Make sure your folks have read and marked up and highlighted and tabbed the QEP, especially the parts they are responsible for or involved in. Hopefully, they’ll read it within a few days of the onsite visit. It is okay to respond to a question by saying “On page 46, we outlined the way faculty will ….(whatever).”

2. Sell the QEP!
The people who meet with the SACS QEP reviewers need to understand they are “selling” the QEP. When the visitors ask a question, respond to it directly – with additional data or explanation or description as needed.

Don’t be shy – this is not an inquisition by the SACS reviewers but a conversation! If you are afraid to talk, the conversation fails!

3. Important Talking Points: Say it, hear it, write it, report it!
   If you don’t say it, the team won’t hear it, they won’t write it down and they won’t report it.

4. Respond to mistaken impressions
   Often the SACS team will miss something or have something mistaken. When that happens, respond with the correct information. Nicely, of course!

5. Remember, the SACS team members aren’t necessarily experts!
   At XC, one of the visitors asked why a certain outcome target was at 25%. One of the QEP faculty asked what he wanted it changed to. That was not a good question and brought on an awkward moment. The SACS reviewer just wanted to know why it was set at 25%, not that he wanted it changed!

6. Keep working after you mail it off!
   It is a good idea to have a folder ready for the onsite visit that contains work accomplished between the time the QEP was mailed and the date of the onsite visit. Drafts of rubrics, training materials, anything that shows it is already a working project. Keep one foot on the gas, one foot on the pedal while waiting for the onsite team’s review.

Wrap-Up and Evaluation
"And this is exactly where our QEP went wrong!"

Evaluation’s most important purpose is not to prove, but to improve. (Platt)

Barbara H. Jones
dbhjones@bellsouth.net
901-485-2860 (cell)

D. J. Henry
djhenry@cfl.rr.com

Thank You
EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES OF QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLANS
DEVELOPED BY THE 2008 REAFFIRMATION CLASS,
TRACK A, UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS

Listed below are the undergraduate institutions that submitted Quality Enhancement Plans (QEP) reviewed by the Commission for reaffirmation in June 2008. For each institution, the list includes the title of the QEP and the link to the summary. The summaries are provided as information only; the list does not reflect the quality of the QEP as reviewed by the Commission. For additional information about each of the institutions, please access the “Membership Directory” which can be found at the Commission’s Web site: www.sacscoc.org.

Track A: Undergraduate Institutions

Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Kentucky
Integrating Education and Experience: Improving the College Work Program

Ashland Community and Technical College, Ashland, Kentucky
Enriching Lives through Enhanced Reading

Baptist College of Florida, Graceville, Florida
Enhancing the Written Communication Skills of Students

Beacon College, Leesburg, Florida
Enhancing Critical Thinking for Students with Learning Disabilities

Big Sandy Community and Technical College, Prestonsburg, Kentucky
Genesis Project: Improving Student Engagement and Success through Support for Learners

Bossier Parish Community College, Bossier City, Louisiana
Enhancing Student Learning and Engagement in High-Risk Mathematics

Central Carolina Community College, Sanford, North Carolina
BASICS: Building All Students’ Intrinsic Communication Skills

Chipola College, Marianna, Florida
Learning to Persist

Coastal Carolina Community College, Jacksonville, North Carolina
Student Engagement to Enhance Student Success

Delgado Community College, New Orleans, Louisiana
Going the Distance: Improving Distance Learning in a Climate of Recovery, Regeneration, and Transformation

Dyersburg State Community College, Dyersburg, Tennessee
Soar with Math Excellence: A Plan to Enhance Student Learning in Basic and Intermediate Algebra

Gadsden State Community College, Gadsden, Alabama
Technology Engagement Across the Curriculum

Georgia Highlands College, Rome, Georgia
Information Competency Program

Germanna Community College, Locust Grove, Virginia
Quality Enhancement of Online Learning at GCC: Ready, Set, Go Online

Itawamba Community College, Fulton, Mississippi
Raising the Bar: Improving Student Writing through Early Intervention

Jones County Junior College, Ellisville, Mississippi
Creating a Task FORCE for Reading Apprenticeship

Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro, Kentucky
Critical Thinking for a Lifetime: The First Step

Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown, Virginia
Seeking the OX: Developing Critical Thinkers at LFCC

Lurleen B. Wallace Community College, Andalusia, Alabama
Learning to Learn: Improving Nursing Student Services

Mississippi Delta Community College, Moorhead, Mississippi
From Access to Success: Enhancing Student Learning in English

Mitchell Community College, Statesville, North Carolina
Math Rules: The Art of Contextualizing MAT 060

Motlow State Community College, Lynchburg, Tennessee
Internationalizing the Curriculum—Improving Learning through International Education: Preparing Students for Success in a Global Society

Nashville State Technical Community College, Nashville, Tennessee
Building Critical Thinkers Responsible for Life-long Learning

New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia
Improving Student Success through Engagement: Enhancing Student Learning in Developmental Math

Northeastern Technical College, Cheraw, South Carolina
Skills for Student Success

Patrick Henry Community College, Martinsville, Virginia
Launching Better Learners through Critical Thinking

Pensacola Junior College, Pensacola, Florida
‘Learning to Learn...Learning for Life STAR Initiative—Planning for Academic Success through STAR Advisors and a Student Learning Checkpoint System

Piedmont Technical College, Greenwood, South Carolina
Enriching Student Learning through Technology Readiness

Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Virginia
Experiential Learning Initiatives

Reinhardt College, Waleska, Georgia (Level II institution)
The Compass Project: Improving Reading and Writing in the First Year

Saint Catharine College, Saint Catharine, Kentucky
Read to Learn, Read to Lead, Read to Live

St. Petersburg College, St. Petersburg, Florida
Improving Students’ Critical Thinking

Southside Virginia Community College, Alberta, Virginia
A Quest for Quality in Online Instruction

Texas Lutheran University, Seguin, Texas
Engaging Students in a Culture of Scholarship: Enhancing Our Community of Learning for a Changing Student Body

Virginia Highlands Community College, Abingdon, Virginia
SOAR: Strengthening Orientation, Advising, and Retention

Walters State Community College, Morristown, Tennessee
SLATED for Success—Student Learning and Teaching Effectiveness Development

West Kentucky Community and Technical College, Paducah, Kentucky
Focus on Reading

Western Texas College, Snyder, Texas
Integrating Critical Thinking at the College Level
QEP Rubrics

I. Focus of the Plan Rubric
The focus of the QEP is on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution.

A. Student Learning
- Student learning is clearly defined in QEP focus/purpose statement.
- The relationship between the focus/purpose of the plan and student learning and/or the learning environment is clearly stated.
- Specific, relevant, measurable and appropriate goals/objectives/outcomes to improve student learning are identified.
- The goals/objectives/outcomes focus on an appropriate aspect of student learning that is likely to result in significant improvements in student learning.

B. Learning Environment
- An analysis of the plan documents its importance as relevant to various aspects of the overall institutional learning environment.
- Best practices and literature related to the topic or issue(s) are reviewed.
- The institutional context in which the QEP overall goals/objectives/outcomes will be applied is discussed.
- QEP discusses ways to establish a learning environment of meaningful learning experiences that will likely result in improved student learning.

C. Benefits
- The specific benefits of the QEP to the institution are identified.
- Consensus among constituency groups is evident.
- Improvements in quality of student learning are probable.
- The QEP focus/topic supports ongoing activity of the institution.

II. Involvement Rubric
The institution has engaged all appropriate campus constituencies (faculty, staff, students, board members, graduates and administrators) in identification of the topic and development of the plan. The institution has provided a clear, precise and thorough description of the methods used to identify the topic and develop the QEP.

A. QEP Topic Selection
- Methods used to identify the QEP topic are described; steps and activities related to topic selection are explained.
- Methods used to identify the QEP topic are adequate and based on input from diverse constituencies.
- Appropriate campus constituencies were involved in identification of QEP topic.

B. QEP Development/Design
- Methods used to develop/design the QEP are described with key steps and activities related to development of topic explained.
- Methods used to develop/design the QEP are adequate and reflect input from diverse constituencies.
- Appropriate campus constituencies were involved in development of the QEP.

C. Implementation Activities
- Methods to involve appropriate campus constituencies in implementation are explained in QEP.
- Implementation of plan includes a significant number and/or percent of faculty and staff as appropriate to focus.
- Implementation of plan will impact student learning and/or learning environment of a significant share of students.
- Plan implementation will involve diverse off-campus constituencies as described in QEP.

D. Administrative Processes for Assessing QEP
- Adequate involvement of administrative support personnel for assessing the QEP.
- Administrative assessment processes are presented in a multi-year timeline with clearly defined responsibilities identified.
III. Capability Rubric
The institution has provided evidence that it has sufficient resources and on-going commitment to implement, sustain and complete the QEP. The institution has provided that evidence in the form of a clear, precise and viable implementation plan that includes timelines and that addresses QEP leadership, resource allocation and an assessment schedule.

A. Human Resources
- Qualified individuals are assigned to manage and coordinate the QEP implementation.
- Appropriate individuals are assigned to QEP leadership roles in support of the implementation plan.
- Appropriate adjustments (workload, compensation) account for QEP duties of key leaders, faculty and others.

B. Financial and Physical Resources
- A budget is presented with adequate financial resources allocated to develop, sustain and complete the QEP.
- Budget presentation allows identification of new monies from existing funds used to support the QEP.
- Adequate physical resources are identified and allocated to develop, sustain and complete the QEP.
- Timing of resource needs is presented in a table or timeline.

C. Implementation Activities
- Adequate academic systems/resources are identified and designated to implement and sustain the plan.
- Implementation activities are outlined in a multi-year timeline.
- Implementation activities are likely to produce improvements in student learning.
- Implementation activities involve several areas of the institution.

D. Administrative Processes for Assessing QEP
- Adequate administrative processes are established for assessing the QEP.
- Administrative assessment processes are presented in a multi-year timeline.

IV. Assessment Rubric
The institution has developed means for assessing the success of its QEP including the identification of relevant internal and external measures to evaluate the Plan with an internal system for evaluating the QEP and monitoring its progress. The Plan describes how the results of the evaluation of the QEP will be used to improve student learning.

A. Evaluation Design
- There is a comprehensive and coherent assessment strategy.
- The assessment plan includes objectives, outputs and outcomes for QEP implementation processes, program outputs and student learning outcomes.
- QEP objectives, outputs and outcomes, if achieved, will lead to evidence of improved student learning and/or an improved student learning environment.
- QEP topic is related to and integrated with other institutional plans (strategic, long-range, academic system, etc.).

B. Formative and Summative Components
- Formative assessment included with procedures focused on improving the QEP’s implementation.
- Clear evidence that formative assessment results will be used to modify the implementation plan as needed to achieve objectives, outputs and outcomes.
- Summative assessment is included to determine the overall success of the QEP.

C. Specific Learning Outcomes Assessment
- There are clear, specific and measurable statements of student learning outcomes.
- Assessment of student learning is described and based on documenting improvements in student learning outcomes.
- Appropriate and specific instruments that are directly measure student learning outcomes are identified.
- Baseline and/or control group data has been collected and/or a clear plan is in place to obtain this data.

D. Resources
- There is evidence of relationship between goals, objectives and learning outcomes to implementation activities and identified resources.
- Staff and financial resources needed to support evaluation and assessment activities are identified, included in the budget, and adequate.
- Administrative assessment processes are presented in a multi-year timeline with clearly defined responsibilities identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Design</td>
<td>Formative and Summative Assessment</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1_______</td>
<td>B1_______</td>
<td>C1_______</td>
<td>D1_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2_______</td>
<td>B2_______</td>
<td>C2_______</td>
<td>D2_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3_______</td>
<td>B3_______</td>
<td>C3_______</td>
<td>D3_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4_______</td>
<td>C4_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BE** = Below Expectations  **ME** = Meets Expectations  **EE** = Exceeds Expectations

Notes: ____________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
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