

Minutes
SACSCOC Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
February 17, 2023
12:00 pm in C-205

Members present for meeting included: Dr. Paul Fowler, Amanda Dunlap, Angela Greaud, Dr. Brandon Borill, Felicia “Nikki” May, Mark Richards, Dr. Paul Fowler, Dean Todd Dozier, Traquana Smith, Victoria Throop, Cassie Jobe-Ganuchau, Dr. Rob Jones, Dr. Billy Fontenot, Dr. Symantha Jones, Mae Simoneaux, Michelle Richard, and Debbie Seilhan as recorder.

Absent: Dr. John Hamlin, Dr. Nancee Sorenson, Bettina Trumps, Chad Jones,

Dr. Rob Jones made a motion to accept the minutes of 2/10/2023. Cassie Ganuchau seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Dr. Fontenot opened the meeting and brought up the topic of the timeline that was in the minutes of 2/10. Dr. Fontenot pointed out that by 2/24 something from the committees should be in the QEP document. March 1 is the due date for talking points for advisors. The training needs to be before March 27. Also, by March 10, 80% of the document will be completed and will just need editing.

QEP Logos

Logos were prepared by Travis and the committee looked at each of them from the screen. Discussion ensued. Logo #8 was preferred by the committee. Dr. Fowler said that administration also liked #8. Travis did amend #8, putting the paw in the middle between the words “On Track” instead of as the “O” in the beginning. The majority did vote unanimously before the meeting adjourned.

Advising and Advising Talking Points

The advising subcommittee met with Dr. Hamlin. They were several questions that were answered, and important points were made.

1. If a student does not require the corequisites, can they take the support class if they are unsure?
The answer is yes. They can take the classes. There was discussion about financial aid not paying for that course if it wasn't required. Students will need to be aware of the financial aid implication and possibly another option of tutoring.
2. Ms. Ganuchau discussed with the committee that sections designated with “T” and a number are Pathways only cohort blocked schedule. T1-T4 will be for Pathways only sections. T with a letter following it are going to be the corequisites matched up with their corresponding college bearing course.
3. Students can take 3,6,9, 12 or 15 hours. She said the Pathways Committee met today and discussed the pros and cons and which number would be best for which population of students. We need to explain to the students why we are doing this. They are still building this at this time.

Brent Swann brought up the point that if a student would drop one of the classes, they would have to drop both because they are linked. In terms of financial aid, that may affect their percent threshold. Students would have to understand this point when they are being advised. The advising points should have this information. Advisors should all use the same common language when advising, the same language that is in the QEP.

Students who are non-pathways can adjust their schedule. This means that they can possibly swap, but these courses are linked together. We would like for them to come back and talk to their advisor instead of swapping it themselves and causing issues. Advisors will show the students later how to schedule their classes. Dr. Fontenot pulled up the schedule to show how these courses would look with the letter T and the numbered and lettered sections. Cassie said that we should have the talking points completed next week.

Dr. Jones asked how advising effectiveness would be assessed—tracked and measured—because it is part of the QEP. Dr. Fowler said that advising would be assessed by success in the courses. However, Dr. Jones stated that the assessment of advising for co-reqs needs something more than the measurements that already exist for advising, Dr. Fowler replied that the QEP is not about advising, but Dr. Jones stated that advising was stressed when the co-req QEP topic was pitched to the faculty. Dr. Fowler replied that the Board of Regents wants student success to be assessed. Dr. Jones agreed, but he restated that advising is part of the QEP, and its effectiveness in that context should be measured as well. Cassie Ganucheau stated that it will be the advisors' job to sell the co-req tracks to the students. She then asked if perhaps a survey could be given to students after advising sessions to track and measure advising's effectiveness. Dr. Jones agreed that a survey could be one good tool for measuring user experience. Dr. Fowler said that four questions on an already existing student survey ask about their advising experience, and Cassie said that a more extensive and formal survey could be created. Dr. Fowler said that it should be created soon so the committee can see it.

Standards

Dr. Fowler highlighted the standards we must respond to and showed the committee the ones that they have completed and the ones that they haven't completed. He discussed different ways we could be found noncompliant. Some of the standards can become extremely technical. Dr. Fowler's report is due March 1. He ran a systems analysis and found one issue he had to email New York about to find out if they can help him fix it. All the other links are working the way they are supposed to. After we submit it, SASCO will look at it at the end of April, and we will get back a report mid-May. If they find we are non-compliant on certain things, we have a chance to respond to what the reviewers said. Then when we do that, we have a deadline in August 21, 2023, to complete a focus report, a second iteration of this, and the QEP will go in at the same time.

QEP Summary Document

Dr. Fowler reported that we have been asked to submit a QEP summary of four pages that is not required. This is something that is new. Anything that the offsite committee says about the QEP is nonbinding, and it will be removed when it goes to the onsite committee. The only people who can rule on 7.2 is the onsite committee. What Dr. Crosby has asked of us to do is write a short narrative summarizing the QEP topic, its relationship to institutional planning, and the second piece is a short narrative describing the focus on the QEP on student learning outcomes and student learning or student success. Dr. Fowler put up the document for everyone to see, even though it's not completed. How was this developed from institutional planning? That began inadvertently over 18 months ago but was accelerated when we joined with ATD (Achieving the Dream). We had to examine some of these metrics and reports constructed for cabinet and campus. It showed we had some issues. Then we planned a follow up with Faculty Senate. Then the vote took place here on the focus of the QEP. Dr. Fowler basically took what Dr. Fontenot and Cassie did and added the assessment plan. Direct and indirect assessment are used in addition to institutional data.

Dr. Robert Jones made the motion to adjourn, and it was seconded by Cassie Ganuchau. Meeting adjourned.