QEP Town Hall Meeting

March 4, 2015

12:30 pm

SC 150

Attendance: Jim Colbert, Shelley Grund, Leslie Glover, Marie Nix, Kim Shannon, Mark Pilgrim, Beth Taylor, Lei Zhang.

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. People (Staff/ faculty/ Students)
2. Low Tuition
3. Small size
4. UNI 101 and Advanced Advising
5. Small student/faculty ration
6. Close interactions with faculty and students

Weaknesses

1. Budget issues
2. Personnel stretched thin
3. Space limitations
4. Student recruitment
5. Student backgrounds
6. New president (unknown)
7. Lack of funding
8. Lack of integration of disciplines

Opportunities

1. New president
2. Regional growth
3. Building bridges
4. Advertising
5. Grants
6. “Go to School” program

Threats

1. Funding/budget issues
2. Enrollment/recruiting
3. Online learning from competitors
4. Politics

Discussion followed:

1. We need reference points to be successful performing a “SWOT” exercise
2. Choosing the next QEP should be a faculty/staff driven process – we need stakeholders’ involvement.
3. The current EYE Program is wonderful – maybe we could just improve it for this next QEP
	1. SACSCOC discourages using existing programs for new QEP
	2. The current program was designed to cover very broad topics and many learning outcomes. Next program should be more limited in topics/learning outcomes.
4. UNI 101 has made an impact on students. Incoming freshmen are not prepared for college.
5. The current EYE program has mainly juniors and seniors participating, and these are usually Lander’s top students.
	1. The strongest components of the current QEP are Internships and course imbedded projects, and has been more “career minded.”
	2. The current program has not seen a lot of Study Abroad or Service Learning interest
6. The next QEP needs to target broad groups within the Lander population and must impact learning. It can connect with the EYE program in some way.
7. Suggestion: make the next QEP have a Student Success and Retention focus.
	1. Interpersonal and college skill development
	2. Have a Freshman/Sophomore focus
	3. Format: “Learning/Living Community” – cohorts of majors, dorm groups, etc. with common interests.
	4. Early connection with the student will show benefits
8. Data on choice of majors has shown that populations change through the Freshman to Senior progression.

Adjourned at 1:45pm