Agenda
First meeting of the QEP Topic Development Team (QEP-TDT)
May 11, 2011, 2 pm, UK Student Center 231

I. Introduction of Members: Please state your name and give your affiliation
Karen Badger, Social Work
Janet Eldred, Arts and Sciences (English)
Allison Elliott, Public Relations
Brandi Frisby, Communications and Information Studies (Instructional Communication)
Amy Gaffney, Communications and Information Studies (Instructional Communication)
Stacey Greenwell, UK Libraries
Morris Grubbs, Graduate School
Laura Hatfield, Community Engagement
Randolph Hollingsworth, Undergraduate Education
David Hulse, Business and Economics
Kathi Kern, Arts and Sciences (History)
Derek Lane, Communications and Information Studies (Instructional Communication)
Karin Lewis, Academic Enhancement
Cyndy Miller, Communications and Information Studies (Communication)
Roxanne Mountford, Arts and Sciences (Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Media)
Mark O'Bryan, Design
Marcia Rapchak, Communications and Information Studies (Instructional Communication and Library Information Science)
Jeff Rice, Arts and Sciences (Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Media)
Tara Rose, Assessment
Deanna Sellnow, Communications and Information Studies (Instructional Communication)
Jen Skaggs, Ex officio
II. Background summary – how did we get to this point? (Deanna and Dee)

III. Membership brainstorming

Membership discussion, e.g. does our member composition cover all bases needed? Who will comprise our student advisory group?

IV. Report from Dr. Lori Gonzalez, Dean, College of Health Sciences

Lessons learned from a QEP site visit

V. Next steps

From the SACS Handbook, “…After the institution has identified the topic for the QEP, the Leadership Team may wish to assign the day-to-day responsibility for its development to a select group representing those individuals who have the greatest knowledge about and interest in the ideas, content, processes, and methodologies to be developed in the QEP along with expertise in planning and assessment and in managing and allocating institutional resources. Since the QEP addresses enhancing student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning, faculty typically play a primary role in this phase of the reaffirmation process.

Many institutions charge a QEP Steering Committee with the task of drafting a document for review. Steering Committees frequently establish sub-committees that focus on particular aspects of the development process; for example, one group might conduct the literature review, another flesh out the strategies for professional development, a third develop the assessment plan, a fourth detail the budget, and yet another work on a marketing plan.”

Sub-committees:

1. “Grounders”: This group will focus on doing a comprehensive review of SACS and QEP Guidelines and will examine QEPs from other institutions, particularly those focused on a similar project)
2. “**Town Criers**”: This group will focus on getting the word out (again) and inviting inclusion from all groups/individuals across campus.

3. “**Builders**”: This group will focus on preparing what the actual program for MCXC will look like.

4. “**Assessors**”: This group will create a detailed plan for assessing students’ MCXC skills, as well as the success of the QEP overall.

5. “**Financers**”: This group will prepare an itemized 5-year budget for the QEP and a plan for making it sustainable after 5 years.

6. “**Promoters**”: This group will create and implement PR campaigns to get the campus community and stakeholder groups informed and excited about MCXC.

Discussion: Recommended team leaders. Is there a sub-committee that should be added? Are the goals of each group appropriate?

**VI. Next meeting date?**

Subcommittees should meet and discuss their plans and come to the next meeting prepared to report your discussions and plans. Team leaders, please summarize for your group.

**June 10 or 13?**