SACS Working Group Meeting

Present: Mary Lynn Manns, Jane Fernandes, Lisa Friedenberg, Bruce Larson, Susan Reiser, Jessica Dunsmore, Nancy Yeager and Annis Lytle

Absent: Amy Lanou (at study abroad)

Handouts: Draft of a revised “student experience model” for the QEP dated 6-10-11

Checklist of things that the compliance team will review while on campus

Update from Jessica on the compliance standards: Most documents have been sent to Bruce. There are a few issues with 3.4.11, 3.10.1, 2.11.1, 3.10.5, and perhaps a few others. We will need to have the 2011 financial audit to be reaffirmed.

Update from Lisa on assessment: She has 62 of 66 reports at the moment. Three of the remaining four will be done next week.

We will submit a complete draft of the Compliance Report to the Chancellor by June 30th.

Update from Mary Lynn on the QEP project: Mary Lynn went over a Draft of a revised “student experience model” for the QEP dated 6-10-11. She has been in contact with other people from some of the colleges and universities with critical thinking QEPs. She spoke with a colleague at Huntingdon College in Montgomery, Alabama about their QEP project, which was similar to ours and was viewed very positively by the SACS visiting team. Their QEP had the acronym PACT (Point, Analysis, Counter-arguments and Thesis).

Mary Lynn asked for feedback on the revised primary and secondary hypotheses. Bruce and Lisa suggested that the primary hypothesis be revised so that it was similar in form to the secondary hypothesis.

Mary Lynn said that she has been working on the implementation plan with Jessica and Susan. At present there are three phases: 0 (2011-12) with a pilot, 1 (2012-14) with inquire, apply, and reflect experiences, and 2 (in process) with the addition of connect experiences; each phase will have appropriate activities and assessments. During this discussion, the distinction was made between assessing persons via a multiple choice CAT exam and assessing products via an AAC&U rubric.

Jane shared some of the concerns she has had expressed to her about the version of the QEP presented at the May faculty meeting. These concerns are being taken seriously by all concerned in the development of the QEP and have resulted in meaningful modifications in the drafts prepared for the SACS Working Group and other parties.
Lisa suggested we add a paragraph at the start of the document to draw attention to the academic nature of the QEP project. Group discussion indicated that this might then be followed by the present, or similar, discussions of Inquire-Apply-Reflect the IAR model), with a following paragraph developing the Connect part of the model. This seems consistent with the phases mentioned previously—0, 1, and 2—and enables the further development of the Connect experience. Bruce suggested that Connect experiences could come in any one of the IAR experiences or it could be a separate experience.

Susan outlined her research on critical thinking to the group. She has found support for a critical thinking QEP.

Jane thinks adding more explanation around the IAR student experience components would help. In relation to this, Jessica and Lisa suggested sending a QEP update to the faculty so they might know how things have developed over the summer. Mary Lynn will work on this.

Jane will give a report to Senior Staff on the SACS reaffirmation process on July 6. This may hasten completion of compliance reporting.

The next SACS Working Group Meeting is scheduled for June 24 from 10:00 to 11:30 am.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.