1. Please review the six topic areas listed above and indicate the extent to which you think implementation of a QEP focusing on each of them would promote our students’ success, however you personally define it, at Gordon State College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>This project would not promote student success</th>
<th>This project would be of some value in promoting student success</th>
<th>This project would be very beneficial to promoting student success</th>
<th>This project would make a major contribution to our students’ success</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyond “Grit:” Instilling the Dispositions for Academic Success</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
<td>20.75%</td>
<td>26.42%</td>
<td>39.62%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading across the Curriculum</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
<td>45.28%</td>
<td>33.96%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Things First: Mathematical and Communication skills (Area A English and math core requirements)</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
<td>18.87%</td>
<td>39.62%</td>
<td>30.19%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Our reaffirmation of accreditation is contingent on participation in our QEP by a large proportion of our faculty. For each of the topic areas, how likely are you to be willing to participate in any or all of the research, planning, implementation, and evaluation of a QEP focusing on the topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>I would not be interested in participating in the project</th>
<th>I would participate only because it’s important for accreditation</th>
<th>I Would be somewhat interested in working with the project</th>
<th>I Would be very enthusiastic about the project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyond “Grit:” Instilling the Dispositions for Academic Success</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
<td>20.75%</td>
<td>37.74%</td>
<td>26.42%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading across the Curriculum</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>36.54%</td>
<td>28.85%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Things First: Mathematical and Communication skills (Area A English and math core requirements)</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>34.62%</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GSC QEP Timeline

Spring 2015 – Explore potential QEP focus and designate and charge QEP chair and committee
Summer 2015 - Finalize QEP focus and develop plan for QEP preparation
Fall 2015 - Engage the campus in planning the QEP

Spring 2016 - Prepare QEP draft

May 2016 - Submit the names of 2 QEP Lead Evaluators to Commission Staff
Summer 2016 - Complete QEP and submit to SACSCOC by July 1
Fall 2017 - Begin implementation of QEP
The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is the component of the reaffirmation process that reflects and affirms the commitment of the Commission on Colleges to enhancing the quality of higher education in the region and to focusing attention on student learning. The QEP describes a carefully designed course of action that addresses a well-defined and focused topic or issue related to enhancing student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. The QEP should be embedded within the institution’s ongoing integrated institution-wide planning and evaluation process and may very well evolve from this existing process or from other processes related to the institution’s internal reaffirmation review. Developing a QEP as a part of the reaffirmation process is an opportunity for the institution to enhance overall institutional quality and effectiveness by focusing on an issue or issues the institution considers important to improving student learning. The on-site evaluators will expect the Quality Enhancement Plan to present a clear and comprehensive analysis of the crucial importance to the institution of the selected topic. Responding to this reaffirmation requirement may also provide an impetus for focusing critical and creative energy. Narratives in the Compliance Certification focus on the past and the present; the QEP, however, looks to the future.

Core Requirement 2.12 requires, among other things, an institution to develop a plan for increasing the effectiveness of some aspect of its educational program relating to student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution.

Comprehensive Standard 3.3.2 mandates that the institution demonstrate institutional capability for completion of the QEP, involve institutional constituencies in both planning and implementation of the QEP, and establish goals and an assessment plan. These requirements launch a process that can move an institution into a future characterized by the development and/or modification of creative, engaging, and meaningful learning experiences for students.

Leadership for Institutional Development of the QEP

The institution’s Leadership Team is charged with providing oversight for both the development of the Compliance Certification and the development of the Quality Enhancement Plan. Since the QEP addresses enhancing student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning, faculty typically play a primary role in this phase of the reaffirmation process. Many institutions charge a QEP Steering Committee with the task of drafting a document for review. Steering Committees frequently establish sub-committees that focus on particular aspects of the development process; for example, one group might conduct the literature review, another flesh
out the strategies for professional development, a third develop the assessment plan, a fourth
detail the budget, and yet another work on a marketing plan.

**Institutional Support.** The development of a QEP that successfully addresses the quality of
student learning requires significant commitment from the institutional community. Recently
reaffirmed institutions note that they wish that they had realized earlier just how many people
need to be involved in the development and implementation of their QEPs and the hours required
for connecting with people. An institution’s support of the Quality Enhancement Plan should be
evident through:

- Consensus among key constituency groups that the QEP, rather than being merely a
  requirement for reaffirmation of accreditation, can result in significant, even transforming,
  improvements in the quality of student learning
- Broad-based institutional participation of all appropriate campus constituencies in the
  identification of the topic or issue to be addressed by the QEP
- Careful review of research and best practices related to the topic or issue
- Allocation of adequate human and financial resources to develop, implement, and sustain the
  QEP
- Implementation strategies that include a clear timeline and assignment of responsibilities
- A structure established for evaluating the extent to which the goals set for the plan are attained

Review committees expect an institution to demonstrate its commitment to the QEP by providing
a realistic operational plan for implementing, maintaining, and completing the project.

**Developing the Quality Enhancement Plan: Suggested Steps**

**Step One: Selecting a Topic**
**Step Two: Defining the Student Learning Outcomes**
**Step Three: Researching the Topic**
**Step Four: Identifying the Actions to be Implemented**
**Step Five: Establishing the Timeline for Implementation**
**Step Six: Organizing for Success**
**Step Seven: Identifying Necessary Resources**
**Step Eight: Assessing the Success of the QEP**
**Step Nine: Preparing the QEP for Submission**