QEP Team Meeting Minutes  
September 17, 2008, 4:00 p.m.

Peabody Boardroom  


Those absent: Irwin Bernstein, Paige Carmichael, Pat Daugherty, Art Dunning, David Knauft, Barb White  

Chair Rodney Mauricio called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Tim Burgess, Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and member of the SACS Leadership Team, read the charge to the committee and thanked everyone for agreeing to serve.  

Rodney then asked the team members to introduce themselves.  

Rodney used a power point presentation “What is this project and what is our role?” to provide the team with background information on SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools), including how our current reaffirmation process differs from previous ones, and the key characteristics of a QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan). Rodney stressed that the team has the opportunity for exercising creativity in the process of choosing a plan and that it is acceptable, although not desirable, for a good QEP plan to fail in delivering its desired outcomes. He stated that the team should be open and positive in its communication with the UGA community. Using the threat of the possibility of UGA’s not being reaffirmed would be ineffective; however, it is possible, and the team will make this clear, that SACS could reject UGA’s QEP and send the team “back to the drawing board,” which would be an embarrassing result.  

Rodney then reviewed the five characteristics of a successful QEP: 1. Includes a broad-based institutional process, 2. Focuses on learning outcomes, 3. Demonstrates institutional support in terms of resources, 4. Includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and implementation of the QEP, 5. Identifies goals of the plan and a means of assessing their achievement.  

Rodney pointed out that the team has a real opportunity to have a direct impact on student learning over the next seven to ten years as well as an opportunity to direct funds and other resources to the focus area. This latter point is one that is both an opportunity and a burden, since the team will be viewed as a group having control over certain financial resources.  

The QEP Team’s task is to “actively solicit input from the campus community, particularly faculty and students, and to document that process.” By the end of the current academic year, the team will decide on a focus topic, while thoroughly documenting the process used to make that decision. At that point, the team may dissolve itself, forming another committee which would have the responsibilities of developing, implementing, and assessing the success of the QEP.
Rodney stressed that the QEP Team won’t come up with a plan. Rather, the campus will tell the team what the plan is going to be.

Meetings will be open and widely advertised. When we meet in academic buildings, the faculty in those buildings will receive special invitations to attend.

We will use the Task Force on General Education report as a starting point. This and other resources are posted on Sakai, the web site the committee will use as a tool in its work. Rodney asked team members to read that report, look at the QEPs of other institutions, and think of a name for the team in preparation of the next meeting. Jere Morehead suggested that the words “student learning” be in the team’s name.

There was a discussion about optimal meeting times, and it was determined that we would probably continue alternating morning and afternoon times. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Wheeler

Attached: Power point presentation, Rodney Mauricio