Call for QEP Topic Proposals

The members of the Quality Enhancement Plan Development Committee (QEPDC) invite the faculty, staff, and students of ASU to submit collaborative topic proposals for Angelo State University’s Quality Enhancement Plan. An abstract of the proposal is to be submitted electronically to June Moore (june.moore@angelo.edu) by 5:00 pm December 3, 2010. Formal QEP Topic Proposals are to be submitted to Ms. Moore by 5:00 pm March 4, 2011. A template for the abstract and a template for the formal proposal are attached as separate documents. To ensure a blind review, it is very important that proposal teams utilize these templates and instructions when submitting their documents. Our current plan is to announce a QEP topic by May 6, 2011.

Eligibility

Given that the development of the QEP is to be a faculty-led process with broad participation, all full- and part-time faculty (including department heads and directors), staff, and students are eligible and encouraged to participate in this process. Reaffirmation Leadership Team members, academic deans, and senior administrators are not eligible, but may serve as resources to proposal teams. Full disclosure of assistance from any Reaffirmation Leadership Team member or any QEPDC member will be required; and may require the resource person to recuse him/herself from the review process. Any QEPDC member who chooses to submit a proposal must recuse him/herself from the review process until such point that his/her proposal is no longer being considered.

Proposal Teams

In order to foster collaboration, proposal teams must include at least one full-time faculty member, one staff member, and one student (graduate or undergraduate). The team is to be chaired by a full-time faculty member. Teams are limited to four members. Division of labor within each team is left to the discretion of the team.

Topic Proposal Review Sub-committee

The Topic Proposal Review Sub-committee consists of eleven members of the QEPDC. Members include the Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan, the Undergraduate College
Representatives to the QEPDC, the Faculty Senate Representative to the QEPDC, the Student Government Representative to the QEPDC, the Staff Senate Representative to the QEPDC (who will also represent his/her administrative division), and one representative from each of the other two administrative divisions. The three administrative divisions are: Finance and Administration; Strategy, Planning and Policy; Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. (Currently, the Staff Senate Representative to the QEPDC is from the Finance and Administration Division.)

**Topic Selection Process**

*Review of Abstracts*
The Topic Proposal Review Sub-committee will blindly review each abstract submitted by the deadline of December 3, 2010. By December 10, 2010 the sub-committee will inform the proposing team’s faculty chair of its decision to accept, accept with recommendations, or not accept each submitted abstract. Proposal teams whose abstracts are deemed acceptable or acceptable with recommendations are eligible to submit a formal QEP Topic Proposal by the deadline of March 4, 2011.

*Review of QEP Topic Proposals*
The Topic Review Sub-committee will blindly review each eligible QEP Topic Proposal submitted by the deadline of March 4, 2011. This review will result in a recommendation to the larger QEPDC for deliberation. The QEPDC will then make a recommendation to Reaffirmation Leadership Team, who has final authority on all reaffirmation matters. Our current plan is so announce the selected topic by May 6, 2011.

**Topic Selection Criteria**
The Topic Proposal Review Sub-committee will evaluate each proposal by using the attached *QEP Topic Evaluation Rubric*. This rubric was adapted from various documents pertaining to the final evaluation of an institution’s QEP. The five criteria used to evaluate QEP topic proposals are:

**Criterion 1: Institutional/Student Needs.** ASU’s QEP must align with institutional needs, that is, a key issue(s) expressed in the pertinent planning documents and professional literature.

**Criterion 2: Student Learning Outcomes.** ASU’s QEP must include clearly defined learning outcomes (SLO’s). These outcomes must tie directly to the institutional needs expressed in Criterion 1.

**Criterion 3: Learning Environment/Activities.** ASU’s QEP-related learning environment/activities must result in measurable student learning.

**Criterion 4: Learning Assessment.** ASU’s QEP must include direct measures of the stated SLO’s.
**Criterion 5: Viability.** ASU’s QEP must be implemented and completed by 2018. A viable budget and operational plan must be developed and aligned with institutional/student needs and priorities.

**Proposal Awards**

$100* – per team member for an *approved* abstract and an *acceptable* topic proposal  
Plus  
$100* – per team member for an *exceptional* topic proposal  
Plus  
$300* – per team member for the topic proposal selected as the basis of ASU’s QEP Topic  
Plus  
The faculty chair, staff member, and student whose proposal is selected will be added to QEPDC so that they can continue to be involved in this important project.

*Students will be receive non-cash awards. Employee awards will be issued as a bonus to the June 1 check and are subject to all ASU policies, taxes, and other deductions.*

**Important Note**

It is important to note that *Topic Selection* is the first of ten steps in developing our QEP. Significant research and refinement will take place before the document is submitted in early 2013. By the time we get to *Step Nine – Preparing the QEP for Submission*, the selected topic proposal likely will have been modified significantly. This is not unlike the process that many of us experienced as we wrote our theses, dissertations, or other significant writing projects. Here’s what SACSCOC has to say about the process.

Developing a QEP is a recursive rather than a linear process, much like any other important, deliberative, and reflective planning and writing project. An institution should expect the focus and framework for the QEP to shift and evolve as the research, writing, talking, and campus participation occur. Over time, the focus will become sharper, the outline more certain, and the goals better defined. These considerations and reconsiderations are instrumental in the development of greater confidence in the QEP. In fact, a substantial amount of ambiguity is to be expected during the creative phase of the development process. *(Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation, 2010)*