

University of Louisville
5th Year Interim Report to SACS
QEP Impact Report Committee October 30, 2012
Agenda

- I. Welcome
 - a. **In attendance: Mordean Taylor-Archer, Patty Payette, Cathy Bays, Karen Newton, Julia Dietrich, Allan Attaway, Rob Detmering**

- II. Where we are
 - a. Progress on draft of QEP Report since last meeting
 - i. Last time group saw the report, it was 28 pages. Connie, Bob, Dale and Gale have had time to review it and help to pare it down. The Task Group was able to weigh in yesterday and today is the QEP Committee's chance. It is now 13.5 pages. November is time to get it to 10 pages so that in December it can be vetted by those in executive roles. Took committee's feedback to heart from September meeting with paring it down to where it is now.
 - ii. Task group comments summary located in materials members have in front of them.
 - b. Font size and structure clarification
 - i. Payette had checked in with Robin Hoffman from SACS, our representative, about formatting reports. Using same protocol as if we are submitting the report to SACS electronically. 11-point font standard, but spacing is not specified. Planning to single space at this time. One inch margins. Executive summary needs to be formatted the same way. Payette caught Newton up to date on SACS changes referenced at last month's meeting with regard to formatting of report.

- III. Questions for today
 - a. Clarification for Taylor-Archer: executive summary does not count as one of the pages in the 10 page report. In Section I: can we reduce some of the explanation of the quality enhancement plan if it is already referenced in the executive report? Virginia Hosono pointed out at Task Group that SACS now asks for a succinct list rather than description so Payette is already looking at the paragraph to see how we can condense and reformat—Schumake thinks we can potentially cut it in half, but must mention 10 year plan. Taylor-Archer asks if we want to write in 3rd person or not—need to address style and passive voice and be consistent.
 - b. Newton suggested having someone who is completely removed from i2a to go through and help condense. Potentially someone who is skilled in writing grant proposals. Maybe from the writing center—ask Bronwyn Williams?
 - c. Regarding page nine and its reference to impact, Attaway says quotes are nice, but how much value does that really add? Statistics will speak a lot louder than the quotes. Detmering agrees and says they didn't add a substantial value. Bays explained she was working on balancing quantitative with qualitative, but now she is hearing that quantitative outweighs qualitative. "Nice to know not need to

know.” Video will have students’ voices. General consensus to remove all quotes, which will likely save almost a page.

- d. Pg. 8 removed NSSE FSSE comparisons except when relating to the CUE. What is important? NSSE is primary indirect measure. As an institution we administered FSSE and saw differences. How valuable is that comparison if we only gave the assessment once? Pulled it out regarding CT so do we pull it out for CUE? Detmering says it didn’t stand out to him, so if we are going to pull data, that might be where we do it... Dietrich says data is important, so rather than pulling from data, can we pull from faculty development programs? Results speak for themselves.
- e. Payette passes out exemplary reports (i.e. Texas Tech).
- f. Newton suggests cutting about a third of a page under faculty development programs (pg. 3) that could be cut that is potentially redundant. Don’t run the risk of losing track of the things we cut.
- g. Cunningham says we need to keep information under faculty development programs because we have to illustrate what we said we would do, what we changed and why we changed it. Payette suggests reducing text where bullets are—could potentially change first two paragraphs. Bays—focus on symmetry—this is the only section with 3 paragraphs not one. So, how do we condense it down?
- h. Transitions between sections: Dale says we don’t need to trouble about transitions. Thoughts? Combine Outcome Conclusion and Overall Summary on pg. 10—can we combine into one concluding paragraph?
- i. Remove sentence with asterisk below table on page 9.
- j. Bays suggests moving strong statement to the beginning (referencing moving pg. 10 overall student learning summary to pg. 4)
- k. Payette reminds group we must be able to say **why** something is significant.
- l. Newton suggests moving other conclusions on page 10 to the beginning as well. Bays will check and see what makes sense.
- m. Remove final sentence on pg 10 above addressing community issues outcome conclusion. (about edna presenting)
- n. Bays pgs 4 & 5 about Gen Ed—lots of talk about revising this section. How do we make this a strong meaningful section? Dietrich thinks General Education is the strongest evidence for QEP and this section has the detail that shows we have engaged what it means to bring it into the classroom. Dietrich says this is the heart of the report. Others agree. Can we just change some words? Cunningham volunteered. Bays asked Dietrich to write one or two sentences as an intro to explain the impact and strength of what has happened over the past 2 years. Dietrich agreed.
- o. Bays asks the group if we should use more or less tables? Potentially mix up bar graphs and line graphs? Important table is page 7 with NSSE data according to Bays. Are all the tables important? Cunningham suggests not being too wordy in descriptions of tables. Table on page 5—Bays will play with table.
- p. Taylor-Archer asked for clarification on pg. 8—Bays explained.
- q. Newton asked if assumption is made that participation in CUE will increase critical thinking abilities in students. Bays said no, it is just part of the original

QEP and an opportunity for students to pull a lot of things together, including critical thinking skills.

- r. Payette suggests looking at report for flow as well without repetition or redundancy.
- s. November is month to get it down to 10 page format. Volunteer editors will take a look at it during this time as well. Next time committee sees it, we anticipate it being within 10 pages, and our goal will be to figure out how to we improve what we have?
- t. Bottom of page 9 quotes should potentially be left in according to Newton because they explain “so what.” Payette suggests bringing it back to goal #2 on first page. Regarding quotes—maybe reference anecdotal data available if need be.
- u. CE?

IV. Next steps

- a. Payette and Bays to incorporate feedback from QEP Committee and Task Group.
- b. Marie Kendall Brown, Henry Cunningham and Pete Walton agreed to do editing of next version.
- c. Payette will ask Bronwyn Williams about outside reader.
- d. New draft available before next meeting on November 27.