

**QEP Leadership Committee
March 8, 2010 Minutes**

Core Members Present: Bill Lewis, Dwight Rhodes, Chris Chance, Karen Downey, Johanna Hume

Not Present: Manuela Imthurn, Julia Theato

Resource Members Present: Pat Sanger, Nikki Thompson

I. Membership

Alternates at this point are: Judy Hafner, Rhonda Boone, Jason Nichols, and Jerrod Butcher. Bill Cranford and Marjorie Nash have agreed to help with literature review. Susan Butler has agreed to be a resource member.

Chris Chance is going to talk with Mohammed Mozaffari about being a core member of the committee and representing adjunct faculty.

Manuela has just had back surgery, but she expects to be back to work sometime after spring break. She would like to stay on the committee as a core member.

II. Initial Discussion

Pat reminded the committee that all surveys must go through the Institutional Effectiveness Department.

Reading Topic: Pat expressed reservations that the developmental reading department was too small to be a good QEP. The committee stated that a reading QEP would be much broader and affect reading "across the curriculum" if chosen.

Pat also mentioned that the QEPs developed by other colleges within recent years are more representative of SACS' intention for the QEP than those developed early on.

He also emphasized that the leadership committee should not be focused on budgetary concerns at all. SACS insists on the institution having funds available for the QEP, and the college and board will be supportive of whatever QEP is chosen.

III. Student Ambassadors

Johanna reported on her meeting with the student ambassadors. She noted that the students were initially most interested in the mentoring program with little interest in reading as a QEP. They did agree that academic integrity would be a fine QEP as well. In addition, the student advisor, Cammy Guggisberg, came up with a new QEP based upon increased use of Blackboard for all classes. The students were enthusiastic about this topic and were unanimous in their belief that it was a significant issue. The committee is now including technology as an example/possible QEP topic. Finally, the students were excited about volunteering to come to the QEP meetings and about helping with publicity and implementation. Julia Theato has been chosen to represent the group.

IV. Possible QEP Topics

Reading: Although the committee agrees that this is not a focused QEP topic at this point, it will still be included on the survey. It is a significant issue to the college as a whole, and individuals may have good ideas about how to make this a focused program.

Academic integrity: It was noted that the earlier Achieve the Dream meeting data did not address this topic. Pat mentioned that the college climate has changed in the last couple years regarding turnitin.com, Blackboard issues, plagiarism, etc. This may well be a valid topic with sufficient internal data to justify it. Stephanie Stockstill will have more information about this.

Mentoring: Pat had some helpful information on how to make this topic manageable and focused. He said the QEP could use specific peer groups which can be tracked. A control group would probably not be necessary or feasible. A peer or target group could be first semester students or students who are repeating a gatekeeper class for example. Assessment could be based upon persistence (semester to semester), retention (year to year) and/or number of classes passed.

Technology: It was once again emphasized that the possible need for new personnel should not affect the committee's assessment of this possible topic. The issue of adjunct faculty was raised in terms of technology and Blackboard training. Pat mentioned that many other colleges require this of their adjuncts, and it could be incorporated into the QEP.

The possibility of combining the topics of mentoring and technology was discussed. For instance, a "college coach" would be assigned to an at-risk student initially by telephone for introduction purposes and thereafter communication would be had via Blackboard.

V. Surveys

Pat and Nikki wanted to know how we'll be assessing survey results and the input we receive. The committee will definitely be considering new proposals and topics. We are not insistent that one of the four examples be the final QEP.

Pat stated that a student survey would need at least 300 students in order to give valid results. It was decided that the student survey would be taken at the same time that instructor evaluations are administered, which, according to Pat, is in April. This method will target a large number of students who will be likely to complete the surveys.

Regarding the student survey itself, Nikki suggested looking at the CCSSE data. The committee agreed that the original draft survey would be repeating a lot of the CCSSE work, which is already available. The students will be asked to give their thoughts on problems/issues at the college and suggest possible QEPs. The four topics will be included in the survey, but the descriptions will be brief and succinct.

The faculty, staff, administration, community, alumni, workforce, etc. survey will be available online through Survey Monkey. Charzetta will be asked to have a link on the ACC homepage. This survey will not differ significantly from the student survey. It will ask for input on topics/issues, possible new QEPs and will list the four possible topics that we have at this point. The committee's thinking at this point is that there will be two comparable surveys: one for students, which will be taken along with faculty evaluations, and one for everyone else, which will be taken online.

The committee decided that radio announcements on KACC will be used to solicit survey responses. In addition, informational postcards with the ACC survey link will be distributed to: The Board (Kiwans, Rotary, Lions Club, schools, other community

groups and businesses), Regan Metoyer (ACC Alumni Association and Upward Bound), Wendy Del Bello (ACC Foundation), and advisory groups (for certificate programs). John Bethscheider and/or Drew Nelson will be asked to discuss this with Rodney Albright in terms of keeping the board members informed.

Pat and Nikki stated that they need the basics for the surveys before spring break. Karen is writing up new paragraphs on reading and academic honesty. Johanna is writing up mentoring and technology.

VI. Future Discussion

Specific dates for surveys, as well as how input will be collected and analyzed, still need to be discussed.