

Quality Enhancement Plan
Meeting II
March 8, 2006

The Quality Enhancement Plan Committee met on March 8, 2006 at 3:00 p.m. in ITV rooms 204 and 504. Members attending were Cindy Coufal, Chairman; Annette Bever; Karen Gragg; Marian Grona; Joe Johnston; Donnie Kirk; Rita Lee; Michael Ruhl; and Dennis Taylor.

The meeting was called to order by chairman, Cindy Coufal. Minutes from February 22nd were distributed. After reviewing the minutes, Michael Ruhl made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Motion was seconded by Dennis Taylor. Motion passed.

Discussion was held on the Topic Proposal progress. Cindy Coufal stated that she has had positive feedback from colleagues. Michael Ruhl suggested there may be a need to devise a way to stimulate ideas, possibly have a QEP writing day? Although that is a great idea, Cindy stated that at this point in the semester time is of the essence, no time to dismiss class. Karen Gragg questioned the timeline for the submitted proposals. Cindy expressed that her plans are for the committee to identify three proposals by the end of finals week in May. Then over the summer she will work with the three writers of the final proposals to have the three proposals ready to present to the Leadership Committee. We will continue at a steady pace, but not in a panic situation. Until the March 31st deadline, we do not know where we stand.

A sample QEP topic evaluation rubric was presented by Cindy Coufal. A lengthy discussion and brainstorming session followed. Michael suggested using the sample form with a numeric range, keep it simple, 1-5. Donnie Kirk explained that the form for the most part looks objective; he likes the aspect of after writing an evaluation of each one, having a vote. Cindy Coufal stated that is what she had envisioned, using the rubric to flush out the ones that are truly viable and then using a vote to decide. Dennis Taylor commented that if we allow the rubric to flush out, we don't have to pick the top one, in any order – just pick the top three submitted. If they follow this rubric that goes along with the guidelines set up of what a QEP is supposed to be and we accurately score it, that will speak for itself. If we have a tie, then vote on the tie. Annette Bever raised the question of clarification of the use of the rubric. Joe Johnston also expressed his concern of the use of the rubric form without a paper trail. It is a good measurement tool, but we need a check list or form to give explanation of how the measurement was conceived. Dennis made a motion to accept the current rubric form as presented with changes for pros and cons. Michael seconded the motion. Motion passed.

The next meeting will be held on at 3:00 pm on March 22nd.