



## REVIEWING THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN AN EVALUATIVE FRAMEWORK

**NOTE TO THE EVALUATOR:** The framework presented below is intended to assist you in focusing and articulating 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.

**Standard 7.2:** The institution has a QEP that (a) has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes; (b) has broad-based support of institutional constituencies; (c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success; (d) commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP; and (e) includes a plan to assess achievement. (*Quality Enhancement Plan*)

INDICATOR	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE	EXCEPTIONAL
A: A <i>topic identified</i> through its <b>ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes</b>	The topic is <b>ill-defined and unclear</b> –or– the QEP has multiple topics. The QEP appears to have <b>little or no connection to ongoing institutional planning</b> and evaluation and may have been chosen by administrators without much, if any, input from other constituencies.	A core group of institutional representatives develop topic and plan. <b>Some attempt is made to tie topic/plan to prior institutional planning.</b>	<b>A clearly-defined topic is directly related to prior institutional planning</b> which had involved a broad-based effort. Plan then developed by key individuals and/or groups on campus.	<b>A clear and well-defined topic is directly related to – and arose out of – institutional planning processes.</b> Topic selection involved a wide range of constituents. Selection of topic determined by a representative process that considered institutional needs and viability of plan.
B: has <b>broad-based support</b> of institutional constituencies	No evidence of how appropriate institutional stake-holders involved in developing the plan <i>or have signaled their support for the plan.</i> QEP may ignore constituent groups important to its successful implementation.	Some evidence that <b>appropriate constituent groups were consulted</b> in process of developing the plan. Appropriate stake-holders generally agree that the QEP is worth implementing.	Process of identifying the topic and developing the QEP <b>engaged appropriate constituencies.</b> Stake-holders are informed and somewhat engaged in the implementation process.	QEP identifies important constituent groups engaged in developing and initiating the plan. Stake-holders are well-informed and appropriately engaged in the implementation and assessment of the plan.

**FIVE COMPONENTS OF QEP REVIEW FRAMEWORK:**

- A = Topic.** The institution identified a topic through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes.
- B = Broad-based support.** The topic has broad-based support of institutional constituencies.
- C = Focus.** The plan focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success.
- D = Resources.** The institution commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP.
- E = Assessment.** The institution has developed a plan to assess the achievement of its QEP.

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>WEAK</b>	<b>ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>EXCEPTIONAL</b>
<b>C: focuses on <i>improving specific student learning outcomes</i> and/or <i>student success</i></b>	Topic appears focused on <i>faculty and/or institutional administrative strategies</i> rather than <b>student learning</b> and/or <b>student success</b> . Little or no identification of <i>specific outcomes</i> directly related to student learning and/or success. Goals and outcomes/objectives are generic and difficult to measure. Baseline data and target for improvement is not present.	QEP is generally related to <b>student learning</b> and/or <b>student success</b> . Outcomes are stated in very general terms. Strategies may threaten to shift focus away from improving student learning and/or student success during implementation phase. Baseline data and targets for improvement may be present but not clearly related or demonstrably appropriate.	QEP is clearly <i>focused</i> on outcomes related to <b>student learning</b> and/or <b>student success</b> . Outcomes are <i>specific</i> and <i>measurable</i> . Baseline data is present, and targets for improvement are identified.	QEP is <i>focused</i> on important outcomes related to <b>student learning</b> and/or <b>student success</b> . Outcomes are <i>specific</i> and <i>measurable</i> . Baseline data is present and has been analyzed. Targets for improvement are appropriate.
<b>D: commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP</b>	QEP narrative <i>lacks information</i> about institutional resources available and committed to initiate, implement, and complete the plan. Budget <i>lacks sufficient detail</i> to determine “new” vs. “re-purposed” resources. Funding the plan may depend on future state appropriations or grant monies. Implementing the plan will probably stretch the institution beyond its demonstrated capacity.	QEP budget provides <i>minimal information</i> about financial resources committed for initiation of the plan. Narrative addresses human resources and re-allocation of resources. Implementing and completing the plan may stretch the institution beyond its demonstrated capacity.	QEP narrative and budget provide <i>sufficient information</i> to demonstrate institutional <b>capability</b> . Human and financial resources to support the first two years of the plan are firmly committed. The institution has an appropriate plan to fund the completion of the QEP.	Human and financial resources are <i>clearly identified</i> for all stages of implementing and completing the plan. Institutional stake-holders are involved in <b>ongoing planning and evaluation</b> to adjust the resources as the plan proceeds, if necessary.
<b>E: includes a plan to assess achievement</b>	Outcomes related to specific student learning and/or student success are <i>poorly stated or non-existent</i> . Timelines for assessing the QEP’s impact are missing. Assessments are <i>indirect</i> in nature. No group is clearly responsible to <b>analyze assessment data</b> .	Outcomes are related to student learning and/or student success, but <b>too general</b> . Some assessments are direct, but the balance leans toward <i>indirect assessments</i> . Institutional personnel responsible for analyzing and using assessment data are not <b>clearly identified or clearly overworked</b> .	Outcomes are <i>specific and clearly related</i> to student learning and/or student success. Assessments are <i>directly related to measurable outcomes</i> . Institutional personnel responsible for gathering and analyzing assessment data are <b>identified and appropriately supported</b> .	Outcomes are <i>specific, measurable, and clearly related</i> to student learning and/or student success. Assessments are appropriate and directly assess the outcomes. The plan includes both <b>formative and summative</b> assessments. Institutional personnel responsible for gathering and analyzing assessment data are identified and appropriately supported. A <i>timeline</i> for interim formative analysis and plan adjustments is outlined.

**FIVE COMPONENTS OF QEP REVIEW FRAMEWORK:**

- A = Topic.** The institution identified a topic through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes.
- B = Broad-based support.** The topic has broad-based support of institutional constituencies.
- C = Focus.** The plan focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success.
- D = Resources.** The institution commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP.
- E = Assessment.** The institution has developed a plan to assess the achievement of its QEP.