QEP Development Committee Meeting
Minutes
3/5/2014

Attendees: Kathy Austin, Stefanie Borst, Todd Chambers, Caleb Cox, Gary Elbow, Kathleen Gillis, Amy Heard, Grace Hernandez, Jennifer Hughes, Lisa James, Erin Justyna, Susan Lang, Paige Lehmann, Dylan Lewis, Justin Louder, Jonathan Marks, Jobi Martinez, Elizabeth McDaniel, Courtney Meyers, Pham Nhung, Catherine Parsoneault, David Roach, Gary Smith, Sara Spurgeon, Aliza Wong

I. Call to Order: Gary Smith called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 am. The goal of the meeting is to develop 5 task forces to develop the QEP, to discuss project management, and to review the proposed timeline.

II. Approval of Minutes and Introduction of New Members: Minutes from the previous QEP Development Committee meeting are approved by the committee as distributed. Smith brings attention to three students who have been added to the committee and requests each committee member to introduce themselves.

III. QEP Timeline Update: Catherine Parsoneault brings attention to the Committee Roster handout and notes that this information is on Texas Tech’s QEP website. She notes that information from each meeting is uploaded to this website along with other information on the background and history of Texas Tech’s current and previous QEPs. Parsoneault then speaks about the Components of an Exceptional QEP document and the QEP Proposed Timeline. As stated in the Components document, she discusses the criteria required for a QEP to be evaluated as exceptional by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. She also states that a detailed budget for our 5-year plan must be created and maintained. Parsoneault then reviews the Proposed Timeline and mentions several important dates. She also summarizes the SACSCOC accreditation process stating we must provide documentation of compliance with 95 standards and have made good progress, having received over 90% of initial draft responses.

IV. Work Plan: Task Forces: Smith explains that 5 task forces will be created based on 5 QEP areas: Rationale for Topic, Literature Review, Identification of TTU Resources, Constituent Identification, and Student Learning Outcomes. Parsoneault states, in regards to the Literature Review task force, that not all resources across campus are knowledgeable of each other. Additionally, she
states that a major criticism of institution’s QEPs is that their projects are too broad and try to accomplish too many things with no clear plan for execution. Smith elaborates on the Constituent Identification task force stating that in addition to Texas Tech students, faculty, and staff, alumni and business leaders of the Texas Tech community must be identified. Parsoneault elaborates on the QEP topic selection stating that the focus is on maintaining quality enhancement of student learning and that it is important to identify relevant constituents. Smith and Parsoneault discuss key elements for the Student Learning Outcomes task force. Parsoneault states that research has been done looking into other institution’s QEPs with student learning outcomes (SLOs) relevant to our topic. Most institutions have between 3-5 SLOs and it is extremely difficult to continually prove that an institution is sustaining them. This QEP document must be around 100 pages, which makes it critical to not include excess information.

V. CAAP Responses: Justin Louder summarizes the CAAP assessment, which was given to approximately 1600 undergraduate students campus-wide. We are interested in data from freshmen and senior undergraduate students but have only received data from sophomores and juniors tested, which is summarized on the CAAP document. Louder summarizes this data for the committee, stating that the majority of students believe their curriculum did prepare them for an increasingly global society. However, data also suggested that students felt more connected to their hometowns, state, and university. Louder states that data for freshman and seniors will be given to the committee when it becomes available.

VI. College and Department Quick Survey: Kathy Austin summarizes the quick survey that was administered to deans and department chairs. She states that data from the survey is purely self-report and that there is much room for improvement. This data provides us with a general level of climate and can be used as a base for future research. Austin notes that different data would result from surveying faculty.

VII. Next Meeting & Adjournment: The next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 13, at 3:00pm. Before the closing of the meeting, committee members volunteered for each of the 5 task forces, which will each have a chair. A list of all task force members will be distributed to the committee when complete.