

Columbus State University

Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal

Focus: To produce students who demonstrate the ability to creatively solve real-world problems

An Institutional Process: Plan is directly related to institutional planning effort. 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.

The QEP Dialogue phase was launched in late April 2014 by circulating a general survey (adapted from the 2006-11 QEP) about needs/weaknesses in the student learning environment. Based on needs/weaknesses revealed in the survey, and supported by data collected in 2012 strategic planning, the Leadership Team met in May and July, producing a proposed slate of four potential QEP topics.

The QEP Workgroup, formed in August, adopted a multi-pronged approach to collecting feedback from students, faculty, staff, trustees, and alumni. The Workgroup brought the slate of four topic ideas to a series of 17 departmental and organizational meetings for face-to-face discussion in September. An online survey supplemented in-person feedback.

Evidence from each step in the process was collected in the form of survey results and notes from members of the Workgroup. Nearly 400 people across the CSU community participated in the April-November Dialogue phase of the QEP process. A summary of fall events:

1. Face-to-face conversations at regularly scheduled meetings of 17 campus departments and faculty/student organizations (September)
2. Face-to-face open forums (4 total) for faculty and students on both Main and RiverPark campuses (October)
3. Face-to-face conversations at the regularly scheduled meetings of the CSU Board of Trustees and the CSU Alumni Association (October, November)
4. Online surveys circulated to faculty, students, and staff (3 separate surveys in April, September, and October)

Key issues identified

After compiling the ideas and concepts that resonated most strongly throughout the Dialogue phase, the Workgroup has identified areas that gathered broad support across campus groups:

- ★ a need to connect academic learning with creative, real-world problem solving
- ★ a need to offer coherence and meaning to learning beyond disciplinary borders
- ★ a need to nurture curiosity and self-direction within and outside of the classroom
- ★ a need to build on strong foundations in several areas: international/global awareness, sustainability, ethics and professionalism, community engagement
- ★ a need to support first-year students “learning to learn”
- ★ a need to support faculty development in three areas: interactive teaching and learning, experiential teaching and learning, and student-faculty research and creative activity

Key issues identified that emerge from institutional assessment: A direct and strong relationship of QEP topic to institutional needs; clear how accomplishment of QEP would directly improve institutional/student performance.

Strategic Planning Key Weaknesses Identified in 2012 SWOT Analysis

- Lack of coherence and communication across campuses
- Lack of adequate resources to support research
- Lack of on-campus engagement

CSU’s QEP Focus directly aligns with its 2013-18 Mission and Strategic Plan:

- Increase funding and support for faculty and student research and creative endeavors that bring regional, national, and international attention to CSU [1.1.1]
- Increase the value of degrees by adding resources and support for graduates leaving the university and entering the job market or applying to graduate schools [1.1.3]
- Increase professional development in alternative pedagogical approaches that address the needs of millennial learners [1.2.1]
- Increase student participation in internships, co-ops, research and creative endeavors, and service learning programs [1.3.1]
- Balance instructional, service, and research loads to enhance faculty productivity [2.2]

<p>Focus on learning outcomes and accomplishing the mission of the institution: Detailed student learning outcomes tied directly to institutional needs.</p>	<p>Focus on the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution: A clear relationship between activities of QEP and the improvement of student learning, all tied to established institutional needs.</p>
---	---

SACSCOC recommended timeline

Phase 1 (Dialogue)	May through October 2014
Phase 2 (Topic Selection)	October through December 2014
Phase 3 (Focus Statement)	January through February 2015
Phase 4 (Design)	March through October 2015
Phase 5 (Present)	November 2015 through January 2016
Phases 6-8 (Implement)	2016 – 2021

Interested in contributing ideas or working on the Design Team?

Contact Susan Hrach or Stephanie da Silva

Dialogue Workgroup

LIB	Paula Adams
COLS	Stephanie da Silva
RES LIFE	Jonathan Lucia
STUDENT AFFAIRS	Dan Rose
UNIV REL	Christa Mitchell
UITS	Zane Everitt
SERV LEAD	Stuart Rayfield
COEHP	Brian Tyo Greg Blalock Tamara Condrey
COA	Chris McCullough
TCOBCS	Rodrigo Obando Robin Snipes
Students	Cedricia Thomas (grad) Victoria Hargrove (undergrad)

Leadership Team

President	Tim Mescon
Provost's Office	Tom Hackett and Tina Butcher
Student Affairs	Gina Sheeks
Counseling Center	Dan Rose
Enrollment Services	Susan Lovell and Kristin Williams
University Advancement	Gena Stone
Center for International Ed	Neal McCrillis
Residence Life	Jonathan Lucia
Institutional Research	Jill Massas
Foundation Trustee	Spence Sealy
Interdisciplinary Programs	Cindy Ticknor
College Representatives	Robin Snipes (DATCOB) Michele McCrillis (COA) Carmen Skaggs (COLS) Brian Tyo (COEHP) Paula Adams (LIB)
Faculty Center	Susan Hrach