

**University of Louisville**  
**5<sup>th</sup> Year Interim Report to SACS**  
**QEP Impact Report Committee November 27, 2012**  
**Agenda**

- I. Welcome
  - a. In attendance: MacDonald, VanZyl, Payette, Bays, Newton, Detmering, Taylor-Archer, Kaelin
  
- II. Where we are
  - a. Progress on draft of QEP Report since last meeting
    - i. Current draft is 10 pages and incorporates last month's feedback. Also, we had Marie, Henry and Pete read and work on language. Some things were cut out, including some quotes as suggested by committee.
    - ii. We have received feedback from stakeholders and the Task Group as well. Ideally, we will create a mature draft by December and it will go to the executive committee and Provost 12/18. We may get the Provost's feedback sooner. In January we will circulate the final draft to the Board of Trustees and in March it will be submitted to SACS.
    - iii. We do not have a meeting scheduled for December. Instead, we will communicate via email, and then have a lunch meeting in January 2013—maybe the week of January 14<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. Webinar from SACS
    - i. Payette presented the PowerPoint from the webinar with SACS and discussed common problems they have found with QEP reports. VanZyl asked about “not collecting and/or using data to assess impact or student learning” and all committee members shared their interpretations. It was suggested to potentially re-read the report through this lens and then strengthen it.
  - ii.
  
- III. Questions for today & feedback summary from Task Group
  - a. Opened up to committee for thoughts, comments and questions on this particular draft:
    - i. Taylor-Archer: Regarding last slide on PowerPoint, is it throughout that we have learned from the process? Payette explained that SACS has asked institutions to add section on a “synthesis on what we have learned,” fundamental and powerful lessons learned are in this section.
    - ii. Detmering: What do they mean by institution? We don't say much about what we have learned about our students. MacDonald says we do say we have learned a new way about thinking about student learning. Bays: change at this institution occurs slowly over time—is that something we need to be more direct about stating? Payette—one of the things Dale said about the October draft is to foreground section 4 when you are sharing it with stakeholders. Use the term “we” and write as an institutional document meant to help the whole.

- iii. QEP Phase two plans (Detmering): a few seemed a little vague or unclear (3, 5, 7) (“closing the loop” “developing a plan to develop”) Bays: TG group she was with brought up the same items. TG talked about clustering them and giving it more of a structure. Detmering thinks 4 is a good one because it is concrete. Payette says this is not normally part of a QEP because most are 5 years, but ours has this addition since it is 10 years. Payette is reluctant to be specific and then down the road need to back track and change things, but this section does need work. Detmering says if the intention is to vague, then maybe it isn’t an issue at all. Payette asked the group if it makes more sense to cluster rather than use numbers and write in narrative form? Bays wonders if we should label this section differently--QEP Phase 2 Plans or something similar. Group consensus seemed to be in favor of changing to a narrative form in order to omit the chance of people wondering if it is a prioritized list. VanZyl explained that institutions don’t learn—individuals and groups learn and that is reflected at the institution.
- iv. Payette directs committee to the back of their agendas. The only options SACS has when they read the report are dictated there.
- v. Detmering: how does it work with ours being 10 years? Payette explained that SACS will not ask for another report, but when we go up for reaccreditation in 2017, it will be obvious how CT has been infused and the university needs to continue i2a but in a different vein (take it to the next level)
- vi. Payette: new person (David Powers) in charge of transfer students and now forming partnership with them and ULTRA. Starting with identifying the touch points with the transfer students. Connie Schumake wants us to focus on online (potentially Toni’s).
- vii. Bays: Is Section 4 another area we need to restate that our project is based on a 10-year plan?
- viii. Taylor-Archer asked about any additional feedback from TG. Bays explained on page 4 with the table on Gen Ed data, there were questions about the table because of different time periods, etc. There aren’t really comments about the data that is in the table. Dale suggested that Mason (in charge of gen ed assessment) plus Katie Hunt and Ann Larson and Cheryl and Bays get together to talk about Gen Ed data to figure out what we can say about the data at this time. They are meeting Dec 11 to discuss and the table may come out since it has been a point of question from many different groups. It may turn into a narrative instead. VanZyl believes taking the table out might be the best option. Pg 3 under 2a, the third sentence—is that something to point out as an interpretation? The data is more misleading than it is clarifying according to VanZyl. Bays suggested maybe going back to how it was and include profile of our students.
- ix. Bays explained the CAAP table on that same page there are still some questions about the data and what we can really say and do we have any baseline data? The table was pulled out, then put in, and may be pulled out again. Maybe with the CAAP data in particular, highlight what the seniors

have done because they will have had more time to be impacted by i2a. VanZyl said most sensitive data will be related to seniors due to transfer students—has an impact on that data. Highlight seniors as best indicator, but also note the other data, like freshmen. We have to be careful not to say that our CAAPS scores went up due to i2a, there may have been some correlation, but no causation. Taylor-Archer thinks this table is a clear visual. It was suggested to put it into a bar graph instead.

- x. In Section 3, critical thinking components just kind of show up but are not explained or clarified. Narrative text that was removed prior might need to be put inserted again.
- xi. Detmering—it is easy to get lost in the data and lose sight of what is the most important of the assessments. Gale and Dale commented that it is very dense and very, by necessity, concentrated. Every sentence is meant to be meaningful because we are so limited. Dale pointed out that the way it is formatted (section 3, Roman numeral 1, a, etc.) with sub formats, you can get lost and forget what section, etc. you are reading. Use textual cues or eliminate some subsections and condense? Bays explained that another comment received from key stakeholders on pg 5 about co-curricular and student affairs—talking about impact on learning and learning environment. These are great projects but small, so do they go into the final? Do they mess up the flow? It is the nice to know, not the need to know. There is a section later on (pg. 8) where we talk about the campus environment. Should we move it to the “learning environment”?

#### IV. Next steps:

- a. Edits on this draft by Cathy and Patty
- b. No December meeting & lunch meeting on January 14
- c. Steering Committee for Interim Report meets December 18