QEP Town Hall Meeting

March 6, 2015

1:00 pm

SC 150

Attendance: Jim Colbert, Shelley Grund, Dan Pardieck, Tom Nelson, Robert Kelley, Andre Lubecke, Dave Slimmer, Olgethea Louden, Rodney Jones, Randy Bouknight, Joe Franks, Susan Wood, Vivian Gaylord, Jennifer Mathis, Sadie Erwin, Jason Lee

Dr. Colbert, QEP Committee Chair gave a brief power point presentation giving the background, data collected from the survey, and the 5 key elements to address for QEP in SACSCOC Standards 2.12 and 3.3.2. Dr. Colbert also explained how the QEP Process is broken into a two-step process.

The two-step process is:

1. Select a Topic – Deadline October 2015
2. Design a Program (submit a QEP) – Deadline Jan-April 2017

Dr. Colbert then distributed a summary of the Data from the Survey.

The Response rate was presented as 295 participants. Of these, 85 were faculty, 51 staff members, and 159 students. Comments were not distributed but will become public in the future.

Dr. Colbert then led the group to do a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis. Everyone was given 4 pieces of paper and asked to write 1-3 items for each category. A summary is below.

Strengths

1. New President
2. Creative/Dedicated faculty and staff
3. Small class size
4. Successful Eye Program
5. Faculty’s vision of graduate
6. Diversity of programs

Weaknesses

1. Resources – Financial
2. Communication between faculty and staff
3. Student preparation and retention

Opportunities

1. New leadership and mission
2. Community collaborations
3. Dedicated students
4. General education program which could address all topics

Threats

1. New President
2. Retention
3. Academic and financial issues

Discussion followed:

1. Financial resources cannot be fixed by the group. Approach the new president on how to fund it.
2. General Education focus
	1. QEP = developing/redesigning general education program
	2. Long term vision on delivering general education
	3. This could be exciting for both faculty and staff across the curriculum
	4. Done in phases
	5. Major resource required is time for faculty and staff
3. The current QEP (EYE Program) was designed with too many learning outcomes and experiential learning opportunities. The next one should be more specific/focused.
4. General Education focus could be restricted to one or two competencies
5. What was discussed at the previous meetings:
	1. 1st year experience – how to impact low achieving students
	2. Enhanced advising
	3. UNI 101 – learning outcomes
6. Success in college is important – skills development & Course development
7. Tracking students after graduation is difficult. Would require self-reporting. We’ve improved in collecting in-coming student data to know where they came from.
8. If we give the students the best education we can what difference does it make what they do with it?
	1. Accountability
	2. Return on investment
9. What do we count as successful as an institution?
	1. A student can think better
	2. We’ve improved all topics for students
10. We are approaching a new era of expectations for Higher Education.
	1. Graduates need to be employable
11. Students are self-centered, how do we make them more civic minded?
12. The EYE Program is excellent
13. The Graduates need to pay their loans off
14. Career Services are important. Placement issues are difficult because there are so many variables. The new president’s focus will be placement and careers.
15. Helping students transfer to other majors to become more successful will improve retention
16. Students need to be realistic. UNI 101 personality testing feedback helped students with “Self-Knowledge”
17. Students and parents want to know how much degree for a job will cost in time and money
18. QEP process could include a “White Paper” written on a proposed topic.
	1. Topic selected will have to be voted upon by the faculty and board of trustees, etc.
19. General Education assessment data has not be seen by the faculty

Adjourned at 2:00 pm