

## Evaluating the Quality Enhancement Plan\*

Bob Smallwood  
University of Alabama

SACS Summer Institute  
July, 2008  
Orlando

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Presentation Objectives

- I. Background Experiences as a QEP Consultant Evaluator
- II. How the QEP Evaluation Process Has Changed and Improved...Subsequent Conclusions and Recommendations
- III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement
- IV. Variety of Assessment Approaches to Address the Impact of the Quality Enhancement Initiative on Student Learning

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### I. Background Experiences as a QEP Consultant Evaluator

- QEP Consultant Evaluator – Five On-site Teams since 2002
- Institutional Effectiveness Evaluator – Two On-site Teams Since 2002

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**II. How the QEP Evaluation Process Has Changed and Improved\***

**2002: Two Invited QEP Consultants Collaborated in Evaluating QEP, Making Recommendations, Offering Suggestions**

**2003 & 2004: Growing Involvement of Onsite Team members in the evaluation of QEP focus, capability, assessment and involvement**

**2005 & 2006: Onsite Team Chair Much More Assertive in Setting the Direction for the Evaluation of the QEP (e.g., pre-visit assignments, greater consistency in the expression of recommendations & suggestions)**

\* Views of the author and not necessarily the SACS-COC

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**II. How the QEP Evaluation Process Has Changed and Improved\***

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

- **Choosing Your QEP Consultant Evaluator**
  - QEP Theme/Topic Expert
  - Planning and/or Assessment Experience
  - SACS and/or Accreditation Experience
- **Detail How You Will Know Student Learning Has Been Enhanced**
  - Multiple Assessment Measures (direct and indirect)
  - Empirically Sound Research Designs

\* Views of the author and not necessarily the SACS-COC

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement**

**Changes to the Principles of Accreditation  
1/25/07**

Core Requirement 2.12 Revised Wording

The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that:

- (1) Includes a broad-based institutional process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment,
- (2) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the university,
- (3) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP,
- (4) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP, and
- (5) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement

Criteria: **Broad-Based Involvement of the Community**

*"The institution demonstrates that all aspects of its community were involved in the development of the Plan"*

- The institution describes the methods used for the development of the QEP (first we did this,...then we did this,...then we did this,...etc.) (Chronology)
- The institution demonstrates that all aspects of its community (faculty, staff, students, board members, and administrators) were involved in the development of the QEP (involvement by Constituent Category...here's how faculty were involved; here's how students were involved, etc.)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement

Criteria: **Focus**

*"The institution identifies a significant issue(s) related to student learning and justifies its use for the Quality Enhancement Plan"*

- The institution provides a clear and concise description of the critical issues to be addressed.
- The institution describes the relationship between the focus of the plan and student learning.
- The institution provides relevant goals and objectives to improve student learning.
- The institution provides a comprehensive and clear analysis of the crucial importance of the Plan for improving the learning environment
- The institution identifies the benefits to be derived from the QEP

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement

Criteria: **Institutional Capability for the Initiation and Continuation of the Plan**

*"The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to implement, sustain, and complete the Quality Enhancement Plan"*

- The institution provides a time line for implementing and completing the QEP.
- The institution assigned qualified individuals to administer and oversee its implementation.
- The institution provides evidence of sufficient financial and physical resources to implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.
- The institution has allocated sufficient academic resources and systems to implement and sustain the outcomes of the Plan
- The institution established appropriate administrative processes for maintaining the progress of its quality improvements.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement

Criteria: **Institutional Capability for the Initiation and Continuation of the Plan**

*"The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to implement, sustain, and complete the Quality Enhancement Plan"*

- The institution provides a time line for implementing and completing the QEP.
- The institution assigned qualified individuals to administer and oversee its implementation.
- The institution provides evidence of sufficient financial and physical resources to implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.
- The institution has allocated sufficient academic resources and systems to implement and sustain the outcomes of the Plan
- The institution established appropriate administrative processes for maintaining the progress of its quality improvements.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement

Criteria: **Assessment of the Plan**

*"The institution demonstrates that it has the means for determining the success of its Quality enhancement Plan"*

- The institution has developed the means for assessing the success of its QEP
- The institution has identified relevant internal and external measures to evaluate the Plan.
- The institution has developed an internal system for evaluating the QEP and monitoring its progress.
- The institution has described how the results of the evaluation of the QEP will be used to improve student learning.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### IV. Assessment Approaches to Address the Impact of the Quality Enhancement Initiative on Student Learning

#### Potential Assessment Approaches

- A. Course Based Approaches
- B. Individual Projects-Based Approaches
- C. Summative Performance-Based Approaches
- D. Collaborative-Based Approaches
- E. Interviews and Survey-Based Approaches
- F. Archival-Based Approaches

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Potential Assessment Approaches**

**A. Course Based Approaches**

- 1. Objective Tests
- 2. Essay Tests
- 3. Course Embedded Questions and Assignments
- 4. Classroom Assessment Techniques

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Potential Assessment Approaches**

**A. Course Based Approaches**

**B. Individual Projects-Based Approaches**

- 1. Written Products
- 2. Graphic Displays

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Potential Assessment Approaches**

**A. Course Based Approaches**

**B. Individual Projects-Based Approaches**

**C. Summative Performance-Based Approaches**

- 1. Standardized Tests
- 2. Locally Developed Examinations
- 3. Capstone Experiences
- 4. Internships and Practicum
- 5. Portfolios

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Potential Assessment Approaches**

- A. Course Based Approaches**
- B. Individual Projects-Based Approaches**
- C. Summative Performance-Based Approaches**
- D. Collaborative-Based Approaches**
  - 1. Research Teams or Group Projects
  - 2. On-line Chat rooms

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Potential Assessment Approaches**

- A. Course Based Approaches**
- B. Individual Projects-Based Approaches**
- C. Summative Performance-Based Approaches**
- D. Collaborative-Based Approaches**
- E. Interviews and Survey-Based Approaches**
  - 1. Attitude Measures
  - 2. Satisfaction Surveys
  - 3. Performance Reviews
  - 4. Exit Interviews
  - 5. Focus Groups
  - 6. External Examiners

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Potential Assessment Approaches**

- A. Course Based Approaches**
- B. Individual Projects-Based Approaches**
- C. Summative Performance-Based Approaches**
- D. Collaborative-Based Approaches**
- E. Interviews and Survey-Based Approaches**
- F. Archival-Based Approaches**
  - 1. Transcript Analysis
  - 2. Syllabus Analysis
  - 3. Library Use or Web Hits

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# Presentation Objectives

- I. Background Experiences as a QEP Consultant Evaluator
- II. How the QEP Evaluation Process Has Changed and Improved...Subsequent Conclusions and Recommendations
- III. Criteria for Evaluating Focus, Capability, Assessment and Involvement
- IV. Variety of Assessment Approaches to Address the Impact of the Quality Enhancement Initiative on Student Learning

---

---

---

---

---

---

---