

QEP Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes

12/19/2023, 10:30am

Attendees: Tim Redl, Hayden Bergman, Paul Fulbright, Veronica Costilla, Sam Weehunt, Cesar Garza, Stefany Records, Mik Yegiyon, Dr. Bordelon, Poonam Gulati, Travis Crone, Mike Connelly, Tammis Thomas, Divya Bhati

Introduction from Dr. Bordelon; this is a five-year process, and we look forward to engaging with you; appreciate your taking the time to be here today and your work moving forward with the QEP process

1. Scope of the Steering Committee
2. Selection of co-chairs
3. Overview of the reaffirmation & the QEP

What are the central components we need to be mindful of?

There are two reports we submit to SACSCOC – the compliance report (what we have done in the past) and the QEP (this is forward looking)

What is the Accreditation process?

Accreditation Process -Continuous Quality Improvement Process

1. Standards Established
2. Comprehensive Self-Study/ Self-Evaluation
3. Off-site Review /On-site Evaluation/SACSCOC BOT Evaluation (Commission Evaluation)
4. Judgment by SACSCOC
5. On-Going Compliance with standards
6. Fifth Year Midterm Report
7. Substantive Change



QEP is evaluated at the time of the on-site evaluation; you will all play a vital role in this visit

We are the Class of 2026 Reaffirmation; visit in March 2026

CLASS OF 2026 REAFFIRMATION

- Principle of Integrity
- Compliance Certification
- Quality Enhancement Plan
- The Off-Site Review
- The On-Site Review
- Review by the Commission’s Board of Trustees
- Announcement/Reaffirmation letter



Sections of the Principles of Accreditation; Section 7 includes the strategic plan and the QEP



**Principles of Accreditation-
Foundations for Quality
Enhancement**

- SECTION 1: The Principle of Integrity
- SECTION 2: Mission
- SECTION 3: Basic Eligibility Standard
- SECTION 4: Governing Board
- SECTION 5: Administration and Organization
- SECTION 6: Faculty
- SECTION 7: Institutional Planning and Effectiveness
- SECTION 8: Student Achievement
- SECTION 9: Educational Program Structure and Content
- SECTION 10: Educational Policies, Procedures, and Practices

We are Level III, aspiring to Level V

Content/Institution Levels

- Level I - Institutions accredited to award the associate degree as the highest degree
- Level II - Institutions accredited to award the baccalaureate degree as the highest degree
- Level III - Institutions accredited to award the master's degree as the highest degree (UHD)
- Level IV - Institutions accredited to award the specialist degree as the highest degree
- Level V - Institutions accredited to award doctoral degrees in three or fewer academic or professional disciplines as the highest degrees
- Level VI - Institutions accredited to award doctoral degrees in four or more academic or professional disciplines as the highest degrees

Dates for our onsite review are March 2-5, 2026. Compliance Report will be submitted September 18, 2025; Jan 2026 submit focus report and QEP

Two Primary Reports Required

Compliance Certification Report	Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snap-shot of past/present • Submitted September 8, 2025 • Reviewed by Off-Site Committee Nov 4-7 • Onsite review probably March 23-26 2026 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Plan for Future • Submitted 6 weeks prior to On-Site Visit • Reviewed by On-Site Committee (probably March 23-26 2026)

Preferred Advisory Visit Date: Dr. Geoffrey Klein
SACSCOC VP May 7-8, 2025

Question from Poonam: about selecting the plan; yes, we will talk about that a bit later in this meeting.

Looking to build a collaborative structure of reaffirmation (see slide)

Reaffirmation Committee Structure



Overview of QEP Standard 7.2; this is different from 10 years ago. The two standards from before were combined, and broken into sections A-E.

Overview of the QEP: Standard 7.2

The institution has a QEP that

1. has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes;
2. has broad-based support of institutional constituencies;
3. focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success;
4. commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP; and
5. includes a plan to assess achievement.

- The QEP is a clear, succinct project, only 100 pages long
- QEP evaluator is chosen by the university; when the onsite team is here in March 2026, they will have a QEP evaluator that is chosen by us; we make the recommendation of 1-3 people to SACSCOC; we cannot be in contact with the person we have chosen. We CAN have contact with them to see if they would be willing to serve, but not beyond that.
 - Wendy: Who would be a candidate? Someone who is faculty at another institution, has demonstrated research in the same topic; who has presented at conferences
- We need to be mindful of what assessment data we are using to evaluate; need to demonstrate the topic is responding to the needs of the institution

Scope of QEP – this steering committee leads the process; you will be leading working groups; you will also be providing communication of work; MUST record minutes from each meeting

The committee will review proposal applications; there is a QEP rubric to evaluate the QEP of the institution; we recommend using the rubric when evaluating proposals

Recommendation of working groups

QEP Sub-committees

Development Phase:

- Assessment Sub-Committee
- Awareness and Marketing Sub-Committee
- Budget Advisory Sub-Committee
- Curricular and Co-Curricular Sub-Committee
- Research, Literature Review, Best Practices and Writing Sub-Committee
- Student Advisory Sub-Committee

Implementation Phase: [Implementation Team and Director of QEP](#)

Tammis: who is on the student committee? Veronica will help get other students engaged, and oversee the subcommittee

4. QEP Proposal Process
 - a. Call for proposal January 8, 2024 with the deadline for submission February 12

We will use a form to receive proposals

We will offer two open sessions to help individuals craft their proposals

Proposal will be 3-5 pages

The selected proposals will give presentations to the steering committee (in February); March meeting will be the time to decide and recommend topics to the leadership team

5. QEP Proposal Review Process

- a. Guidance on the application of SACSCOC QEP rubric to identify strengths and weakness of each proposal.
 - b. Discussion and clarification on assessments related to the QEP proposal topics and the QEP Budget.
 - c. The QEP proposal authors will present and answer questions at the February 23 Steering Committee meeting.
 - d. March 1, Steering Committee to finalize top 2 or 3 proposals for recommendations to the Reaffirmation Leadership Team.
 - e. March 8 Reaffirmation Leadership Team meeting to select the final QEP topic from the recommended.
 - f. March 18 announcement of the next QEP.
6. QEP future meetings- calendar invite will be sent by the provost office (1 hour meetings; include work for each meeting and ahead of)
- a. January 12, 11:30am
 - b. January 26, 2:30pm
 - c. Monday, Feb 12 at 1pm
 - d. February 23, 9:00-11am; *this is a 2 hr meeting to review proposals*
 - e. March 1, 2pm; *finalizing the top proposals; one hour*
 - f. *Tim and Stefany can determine future meeting dates*

Note: this committee takes precedence over other committees; this committee is very important

Today we need to decide on the co-chairs of the QEP Steering Committee; Tim nominated as QEP Co-chair; Stefany Records nominated as staff co-chair.

Others will be asked to chair the working groups

Emily and Divya will share draft of form for committee member feedback

We need a staff person assigned to take notes; we can also record the meetings.

The meetings will be hybrid like today.

Dr. Bordelon: on the SACSCOC website, there is a list of QEP examples; we will share these when we send out the proposal call out

First action item: feedback on form

Travis: has anyone asked the President what he is interested in? Bordelon: the QEP process is something that the President does not determine on his own; we have to get proposals from faculty; the President is aware of what happened in the past. Travis's point is that if we know what the President is interested in, then we can frame that with the faculty. Dr. Bordelon will ask, but the theme of student success is of interest to him.

Divya: the standard of QEP is for broad-based support, and everything is centered on student success

Tim: does the person who submits the “winning” proposal take on a leadership role? Divya – yes, they typically become the Director of the QEP; Tim – should we put this expectation in the call for proposals?
Poonam: yes, there has to be great buy-in from the institution.

As we go through this process, we will ask members to present to various groups.

Paul: To Tim’s point, would that expectation of leadership have a chilling effect to the number of submissions? Feel like we should broadcast to a broad net to solicit ideas; and by the way, this does NOT necessarily mean you would take leadership. WE will take all the ideas and then figure out what the leadership looks like.

Poonam: agreed; the past two QEPs were not led by the proposers.

Divya: yes, good point; the QEP determines that someone must be hired, but it doesn’t have to be the proposing person.

Divya – reminder about the sub-committees; these are chaired by members of the steering committee; would include 5-7 additional faculty and staff. Tim: yes, I can see that with these subcommittees working, this would not be a burden to the proposing author.

Tim: when do we staff the subcommittees? Perhaps later at meeting on Jan 26 meeting during proposal review.

Email qep@uhd.edu

Make these open sessions on M/W or Th/Fri; after the start of classes; one am, one pm

Next steps:

Send meeting invitations for decided dates

Establish agendas for upcoming meetings