

## **QEP Process Brief**

In response to the SACS recommendations for the ULM QEP, an addition to the QEP proposal is being developed. The most significant component of this development is the creation of a QEP process model. This model is seen as a strategy of implementation of the QEP, not a change in the key tenements of the QEP. Attached is an outline of the QEP process model. I will briefly explain the process and the purpose of each phase. The process model consists of four phases: selection, redesign, deployment and evaluation.

### **Phase 1 Preparation.**

The selection of courses to be redesigned has already been handled in the current QEP document. This phase is to prepare the course for redesign. There are two elements that must be clearly handled in order to later evaluate the success of redesigning a course. First, the learning objectives of the class must be clearly stated. The content experts that have developed the course are in the best position to determine what content should be in any courses and, in turn, define the learning objectives. Yet, to evaluate the success of a course by the University, the learning objectives must be stated. Next, assessment of the outcomes from the stated learning objectives must be performed. The ability to evaluate the course after redesign must have baseline measures to show success or failure of a redesign. Some, possibly many, courses may already have these measures in place and can begin the redesign of the course immediately.

### **Phase 2 Redesign.**

The redesign is the heart of the QEP. This step will be the most demanding for the content experts that will face the challenge of the redesign of a course. This process will involve the selection of the course format, the application of best practices, and the possible incorporation of new techniques and technologies. The QEP does not wish to dictate the format or techniques of redesign but rather to institute the magnitude and motivation of the course redesign that will be evaluated using the QEP redesign rubric. The rubric focuses heavily on aligning all facets of the course with the stated learning objectives. The belief is that by aligning the objectives student success in learning will be accomplished.

The QEP course rubric to be used in redesigning courses is attached. The rubric consists of 25 standards with each standard weighted from 1 to 3 based on the importance to the redesign. This is not a scaled rubric, whereas if a course complies with a standard, then the course meets the standard. There is no ranking of compliance to a standard, such as poor, adequate or exceptional; although feedback will be given to the redesign. The 25 standards are grouped into 9 categories to help with the compliance and course evaluation. Of the 25 standards, there are 14 essential standards that have a weight of 3. The maximum score a course could make is 59. For a course to “pass” the QEP rubric, it must acquire 50 points and comply with all 14 essential standards. The 50 point compliance was derived by simulating the current percentage value of the ULM QM online class evaluation, which is 85%. Thus, 85% of 59 total points is 50 points. One exception within the QEP rubric pertains to technology. A course will not be evaluated under the course technology category when a course or course format is not benefitted by the use of technology or when technology is a deterrent to content delivery. Under these circumstances, the total possible points for these courses are 51, and the essential standards are 13. Therefore, these courses will need to score only 44 (85% of 51) and the 13 other essential standards to pass the rubric.

**Phase 3 Deployment.**

After a class has successfully passed the QEP redesign rubric, the course will be taught using the new format. All assessment measures will be captured.

**Phase 4 Evaluation.**

The assessment measures are compared to determine success of redesign. This may continue the loop of redesign, deployment and evaluation until sufficient success is seen.

The above is not seen as a divergence from the QEP but simply a process to fulfill the QEP.

In the next step, I will be developing a complete explanation of the process to place it in the QEP document. The explanation will address the roles of the stakeholders of the redesign.