Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Planning Committee
Monday, September 20, 2010 - 1:30-3:30 p.m.


Updates
- Friday’s draft of our plan will not be entirely complete (there will be some notes for items that will need to be further developed), but will give folks a sense of what our QEP entails
- Please read the draft as a naïve audience:
  - Is our rationale for having chosen our topic and activities clear?
  - Would the plan make sense to a first-time reader?
  - Does it read well so that folks will be interested in participating and able to see where they fit? (More of a rhetorical issue, than a change in actual activities issue)
  - Are we presenting our case in a persuasive and clear way?
- If you are unable to meet our September 28th feedback deadline, please be sure to review the draft through October and provide your feedback later
- Veronique Tran (from the University of Houston) will review our revised draft as an external consultant in October
- Linda Blockus (at the University of Missouri) and Mary Crowe (at UNC Greensboro) have both agreed to serve as a lead evaluator for our on-site review team
  - Our SACS liaison will now select one of them

OSCAR Dilemma
- The new name for our office is the Office of Student Scholarship, Creative Activities, and Research, but is still abbreviated by OSCAR

Draft Budget
- Direct expenditures are higher in years one and five because of the printing costs for our QEP report and for our 5-year report
- Concerns that the costs for the Celebration of Student Scholarship are too low
  - A higher number will show how important this event is to raising awareness and celebrating student scholarship
  - How much would it cost to hold this event at the Mason Inn?
- Concerns that the costs for outreach are too low, particularly if they’re absorbing additional costs for the Celebration of Student Scholarship (note: the Celebration line only includes costs for the event itself)
- We need to create an “Outreach & Dissemination Support” budget category
  - This line should include the database and website/content management
- Concerns that the costs for “Faculty Development Activities” and “Faculty Awards” are not increasing over the five years
  - Faculty Development does not increase as it focuses on sending faculty to relevant conferences or bringing speakers to campus
  - Amount for Scholarship Development Grants increases to account for greater involvement across the five years
“Faculty Awards” includes a set number of awards each year, but this will be changed to allow for more awards as we move through implementation.

- Our budget narrative needs to be clear about why there are rising costs and why there are stable costs, along with a detailed justification of both of these points.
  - This should also include some sense of promise that these activities will be expanding.
- We need to mention student travel in the narrative for the URSP.
- We’ll want to cross-reference items in the budget narrative back to the activities chapter so that our audience clearly understands what each item entails.
- We should reformat the chart to make totals more clear.
- The university allocation for the QEP budget is $566,000 in year 1, $770,000 in year 2, and $970,000 in years 3-5.
- We need to keep two different pie charts – one that includes resources flowing to the QEP from all sources and another that includes only new resources.
  - Both pie charts are based on our total five year budget – we’ll need to be clear about this.
- How will funds for the Scholarship Development Grants be awarded?
  - The QEP Leadership Council will need to refine criteria before fall 2011.
- The budget narrative for URSP Director needs to indicate that the QEP is covering 100% of the salary.

Assessment
- Concerns that this matrix doesn’t reflect the size of the budget for each of the activities.
- For SLO2 in the table, reword to say “discover how the students can engage…”
- Is it possible to move faculty development and student travel above OSCAR in the bottom row?
- This will be the least developed section in Friday’s draft document.