QEP PILOT PROJECT MEETING  
MARCH 21, 2012

Present: Dr. Doug Carr, Maria T. Gomez, Grace Haddox, David Henry, Dr. Ondrea Quiros, Mary Scott, Naomi Waissman, Vanessa Macias, Lisa Miller, Jessica Klein, Melinda Camarillo, Richard Southern

Handouts

1. Agenda
2. Individual Instructor’s Sample Rubric
3. QEP Sample Rubric #3
4. Performance Handout
5. Student Survey

Secretary: Maria T. Gomez

Introductory Remarks

Grace Haddox, QEP Director, opened the meeting by expressing appreciation to the faculty who were present and who were participating in El Paso Community College’s (EPCC’s) QEP Project. Grace mentioned that the QEP Pilot participants were the “movers and shakers” for the development of the QEP model and proposal.

Attendees were reminded of the Pre and Post Surveys which need to be conducted as part of the QEP Pilot assessment. Copies of the surveys were part of today’s handouts. Attendees were asked to label the survey as being “Pre” or “Post” before submitting it to Grace.

Grace then mentioned that she is planning a meeting to which she is referring as a “Shindig,” a “Powwow,” or a “Hoedown.” The purpose of the gathering is to invite disciplines, which collectively represent a direct contact with a large number of students, to initiate the development of their QEP projects. The “Shindig” date is in April 16 at the Transmountain Campus at 3:00 p.m... Grace asked for faculty members participating in the QEP Pilot to volunteer to attend the “Shindig.” At the meeting, volunteers will talk about their QEP Pilot Project and what it entails. Mary Scott and Naomi Weisman volunteered to talk about their projects at the “Shindig.”

QEP Assessment

Ondrea (Andi) Quiros, adjunct English Faculty, addressed the main purpose of today’s meeting – EPCC’s QEP Assessment. Through the assessment of the QEP Pilot Projects, a library on QEP assessment will be created. The QEP Assessment Library will collect Pilot information, assessment documents and assessment results. The Library collection will be used to house models for other QEP projects. Documentation of the effectiveness of the QEP assignments is vital to the QEP’s assessment component.

Andi continued with a slide presentation on why use rubrics as part of the assessment process. If faculty members are using the same QEP outcomes but different assignments to address those outcomes, how do we assess the outcomes in a uniform fashion? The answer is —with rubrics. Faculty will need to have
a general grading rubric for their QEP assignments. Andi shared an example of a general grading rubric she is using with her pilot project. The general grading rubric is unique to the instructor. Andi then brought attention to a handout entitled “Rubric #3.” “Rubric #3” is the uniform assessment rubric which will be used by all QEP Pilot participants. Students involved in the QEP Pilot Project will not see “Rubric 3.” It was clarified that the handout is called “Rubric #3” because the QEP Task Force reviewed a few rubrics and “Rubric #3” was selected.

Attendees then reviewed the QEP Student Learning Outcomes listed as part of the “Rubric #3” handout. Both Andi and Grace emphasized that QEP Pilot Project participants do not have to use all four SLOs. One SLO will suffice if that is the applicable one to the particular identified project. The application of “Rubric #3” will determine if the particular QEP’s goal was accomplished. Hopefully, the students will score a 2 or a 3 on the rubric’s scale. Because the pilot instructors will need to complete a rubric for each student, it was recommended that a SCANTRON be used to tabulate the overall class results.

Uniformity in assessment strategy is important as is keeping it simply and obvious.

Andi provided clarification on the Learning Assessment Rubric versus the Grading Rubric. Each instructor will have their own individual grading rubric. Each instructor will then use the uniform Learning Assessment Rubric.

Discussion was ongoing during this portion of the meeting. As the rubrics and SLOs were reviewed, discussion revealed a misinterpretation of one of the SLOs. As a result of the misinterpretation, a few pilot instructors were doing much more work with their QEP project than was necessary. The misinterpretation was noted and the SLO statement was rewritten to avoid future confusion. Additionally, an explanation of a “dummy number” was given. The “dummy number” will be used if the category rating does not apply.

The Pilot Project participants are the seed group. Their projects will be filed for reference by other disciplines which later, in the near future, be involved in selecting their own QEP project. The models identified by the Pilot group will guide the future groups in giving ideas for what they may want to do for their QEP.

**Lessons Learned Blurb**

Another request made of the QEP Pilot Project’s participants was that they do a blurb on “Lessons Learned.” That is, write what happened as a result of doing their QEP project. Their blurb could answer the question, “What would you do differently?” The blurb will provide information on actions to be taken as a result of the QEP Pilot Project assessment. One example that occurred today was the modification of one of the SLOs listed in the “Rubric #3” handout. If the project was successful, the blurb should indicate that information as well.

**Meeting Wrap-up and Reminders**

Participants requested a copy of Andi’s Assessment Plan, which she demonstration as part of today’s presentation, and the PowerPoint Presentation.

Grace asked the participants to send her some needed items at the end of the semester. These include
1. The grading rubric for their individual project
2. The Learning Assessment using their SLOs with their requirements.
3. A blurb about lessons learned identifying the challenges, changes which will be made as well as positive notes about the project.

Grace informed everyone that all information on the QEP Pilot Project will be imputed and housed in SharePoint for records management and reference purposes.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:15 p.m.