



QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN GUIDELINES

INDICATORS OF AN ACCEPTABLE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN

NOTE TO THE EVALUATOR: The guidelines presented below are intended to assist you in focusing and developing your professional judgment. The component parts of the matrix are not summative nor are they necessarily of equal weight. You will need to evaluate and weigh the issues when arriving at a judgment about the institution's compliance with the requirement.

CR 2.12: *The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. (Quality Enhancement Plan)*

INDICATOR	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE	EXCEPTIONAL
<u>1.A.</u> An institutional process	No evidence provided of process used for developing QEP topic, etc., or a top-down approach used and only narrow involvement of university staff, faculty.	A core group of institutional representatives develop topic and plan. Some attempt is made to tie topic/plan to prior institutional planning.	Topic is directly related to prior institutional planning which had involved a broad-based effort. Plan then developed by key individuals/groups on campus.	Plan is directly related to institutional planning efforts. Topic selection involved process that generated information and specific ideas from a wide range of constituents. Selection of topic determined by representative process that considered institutional needs and viability of plan.
<u>1.B.</u> Key issues identified that emerge from institutional <i>assessment</i>	No evidence of relationship of QEP to institutional data/analysis/assessment. Plan seems to be an isolated topic unrelated to institutional needs and/or never tied to those needs.	General institutional needs addressed, but no clear linkage to QEP topic in terms of how needs would be addressed by successful QEP implementation.	A direct relationship established between QEP topic and institutional needs. QEP may indirectly affect needs.	A direct and strong relationship of QEP topic to institutional needs; clear how accomplishment of QEP would directly improve institutional/student performance.
<u>2.A.</u> Focus on learning outcomes and accomplishing the mission of the institution	Plan focuses only on establishing processes and strategies with no clear identification of outcomes directly related to mission. If outcomes present, they are not related directly to improving student learning.	Some outcomes focus on student leaning, but many represent process/strategies with no clear outcomes identified. Those that address student learning may not be clearly related to institutional mission and needs.	Outcomes are generally related to student learning and reasonably address the accomplishment of mission-specific goals.	Detailed student learning outcomes tied directly to institutional needs.
<u>2.B.</u> Focus on the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution	No relationship of QEP activities/processes to the support of student learning. Student learning left undefined or poorly defined.	Activities of QEP to some extent are related to improvement of student learning; no relationship established institutional needs.	Activities of QEP focus, generally, on the improvement of student learning, with some that may not be directly tied to that effort.	A clear relationship between activities of QEP and the improvement of student learning, all tied to established institutional needs.

FIVE COMPONENTS OF QEP REVIEW FRAMEWORK:

1 = An Institutional Process. The institution uses an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment.

2 = Focus of the Plan. The institution identifies a significant issue that (i) focuses on learning outcomes and/or environment supporting student learning and (ii) accomplishes the mission of the institution. *Cross-referenced to Component 5.*

3 = Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan. The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.

4 = Broad-Based Involvement of Institutional Constituencies. The institution demonstrates the involvement of its constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the Plan.

5 = Assessment of the Plan. The institution identifies goals and a plan to assess the achievement of those goals. *Cross-referenced to Component 2.*

CS 3.3.2: The institution has developed a *Quality Enhancement Plan* that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the *QEP*; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the *QEP*; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (*Quality Enhancement Plan*)

INDICATOR	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE	EXCEPTIONAL
<u>3.A.</u> Capability to <i>initiate</i> the plan	No attention given to personnel, budget, other support needed to implement and complete the plan.	While some basic information on budgetary, personnel and other needs are presented, some or all of that support is “soft” and not committed-to by the institution. Often vague details about personnel, organizational control, and budget needs.	Yearly, overall, budget, with basic descriptions of personnel needs including organizational structure needed to carry out the plan.	Very detailed budget information, institutional commitment of funds clearly indicated. If individuals are not yet identified, detailed job descriptions provided that indicate the specific skills and abilities needed for key personnel. Organizational structure shows clear reporting responsibilities and oversight structures.
<u>3.B.</u> Capability to <i>implement</i> and <i>complete</i> the plan	No timetable is provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment processes.	Sketchy timetable is provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment processes.	Detailed timetable is provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment processes.	Very detailed timetable is provided for year by year activities including specific actions, budgetary expenditures and assessment processes. Timetable indicates clearly that QEP can be realistically implemented and completed in five years.
<u>4.A.</u> Broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the <i>development of the plan</i>	QEP developed by one individual or small group of individuals not representative of key constituencies.	QEP developed by one individual or small group; some attention given to obtaining input from others on campus, but no real involvement.	Process used to develop plan involved representative of key constituencies.	Process used ensured input from all relevant constituencies in developing the plan.
<u>4.B.</u> Broad-based involvement institutional constituencies in the proposed <i>implementation of the plan</i>	No indication of how relevant constituencies will be involved in implementation.	Implementation of plan will involve some representative of key constituencies , but carried out by only a few individuals or a single group on campus.	All relevant constituencies involved in implementation, either directly or indirectly.	All relevant constituencies have direct involvement in implementation.
<u>5.A.</u> Identified goals for the quality enhancement plan	Goals not present or those stated are not goals but, rather, processes that will be implemented.	Goals include mix of process and expected accomplishments.	Goals deal with expected accomplishments.	Goals are clearly stated , lead to specific, measurable outcomes.
<u>5.B.</u> A plan to assess the achievement of the goals of the quality enhancement plan	Assessment plan not present or is not clear in determining expected outcomes and means of assessment.	Assessment plan present; outcomes are often processes that are to be implemented. Assessment of goals not directly related to outcomes.	Assessment plan is based on clear outcomes; assessment methods related to outcomes.	Assessment is based on clear outcomes, assessment methods related to outcomes, and are direct measures of those outcomes.
Overall Evaluation of Acceptability of the Quality Enhancement Plan	When looked at as a whole, the plan clearly does not meet the requirements for an acceptable QEP. While one or more of the components may be acceptable, those that are not acceptable make the overall plan inappropriate.		While there may be weaknesses in one or more of the components, overall the plan is acceptable due to the strength of a number of the components.	All components of the plan are acceptable or exceptional; no weaknesses.

FIVE COMPONENTS OF QEP REVIEW FRAMEWORK:

1 = **An Institutional Process.** The institution uses an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment.

2 = **Focus of the Plan.** The institution identifies a significant issue that (i) focuses on learning outcomes and/or environment supporting student learning and (ii) accomplishes the mission of the institution. *Cross-referenced to Component 5.*

3 = **Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan.** The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.

4 = **Broad-Based Involvement of Institutional Constituencies.** The institution demonstrates the involvement of its constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the Plan.

5 = **Assessment of the Plan.** The institution identifies goals and a plan to assess the achievement of those goals. *Cross-referenced to Component 2.*