

University of North Texas Health Science Center

Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Full Proposal Preparation Guidelines

1. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP): Definition and Development at UNTHSC

The University of North Texas Health Science Center has been accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, commonly referred to as “SACS,” since 1994. In order to have its accreditation continued without interruption, UNTHSC must by 2010 demonstrate compliance with various SACS “core requirements,” one of which mandates the development of an “acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan.”

In support of SACS Reaffirmation for Accreditation, UNTHSC must develop a Quality Enhancement Plan that meets the following criteria:

- Evidence of a broad-based institutional process for selection of QEP topic
- Focus on learning outcomes and/or environment supporting student learning
- Demonstrate Institutional capability to achieve QEP goals
- Broad-based involvement in development & implementation of QEP
- Identifiable goals and assessment plan
- Potential to impact all academic programs

More in-depth information about the QEP Program may be found on pp. 21-28 of the SACS Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation that can be accessed at <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/handbooks/Exhibit%2027.ReaffirmationOfAccreditation.pdf> or in the QEP Handbook located at <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/QEP%20Handbook.pdf>.

To meet the challenge of developing a QEP as part of the SACS reaffirmation process, UNTHSC has assembled the QEP Planning Team. This group of fourteen individuals, including faculty, administrators, students, and alumni, is charged with helping to identify the topic and recommend proposals for final QEP development.

In early 2008, the QEP Planning Team conducted an institution-wide survey, asking respondents to identify QEP themes that would enhance student learning outcomes. A list of 36 themes was compiled from which the QEP Team developed seven macro themes. Students, staff, and faculty were then invited to rank the seven themes and Critical Thinking and Faculty Teaching were ranked the highest. The QEP Team issued an RFA for pre-proposals and received nine pre-proposal submissions by the May 30, 2008 due date.

The QEP Planning Team has now examined all nine pre-proposals submitted; and—in light of the SACS-mandated criteria for QEPs—has identified the five most promising of these. Authors of these five pre-proposals are now invited to produce three full proposals. (Three pre-proposals were recommended to combine forces to develop one full proposal.)

This document presents guidelines for the preparation of full QEP proposals. It specifies the scope and structure for full proposals, describes the submission process, and details the criteria to be employed in their evaluation.

2. Proposal Scope and Structure

Cover Page

- Proposal Title
- Identifying Information: name, department for lead applicant
- Contact Information: telephone and e-mail address for lead applicant
- Identifying Information: name, department for all co-applicants
- Contact Information: telephone and e-mail address for lead all co-applicants

Section 1: Goals and Objectives

- Specific, well-defined goals and objectives, including student learning outcomes, related to the long-term improvement of student learning
- Clear and concise description of the critical issue(s) to be addressed
- Relationship between the focus of the plan and student learning

Section 2: Literature Review and Best Practices

- Evidence of consideration of best practices related to the proposal
- Comprehensive and clear analysis of the importance of the proposal for improving the learning environment
- Identification of the benefits to be derived from the proposal

Section 3: Methods

- Actions to be implemented
- Evidence of careful analysis of institutional context in designing actions capable of generating the desired student learning outcomes

Section 4: Timeline

- A logical calendaring of all actions to be implemented as part of the proposal

Section 5: Organizational Structure

- Clear lines of responsibility for implementation and sustainability
- Broad-based participation of multiple institutional constituencies
- Identification of qualified individuals to administer and oversee implementation of the proposal

Section 6: Resources & Budget Request

- Realistic allocation of sufficient human, financial, and physical resources to support the proposed activities
- Five-year budget, FY 2010 to 2014, using budget form on page 4

Section 7: Assessment

- Comprehensive evaluation plan for assessing success of the proposal, both process and outcome indicators
- Identification of relevant internal and external measures to evaluate the proposal, including baseline measures
- Identification of a system for evaluating the proposal and monitoring its progress
- Description of how the results of the evaluation will be used to improve student learning

3. Submission Process

Each proposal is limited to 15 pages, including the cover page and an appendix (if necessary) of no more than 10 pages. Left and right margins are to be 1 inch. The document must be single-spaced, employing a 12-point font.

Please submit each proposal, including appendix, if any, as a single, electronic document. The preferred form of submission is a PDF or Word attachment to an e-mail addressed to QEP@hsc.unt.edu. The deadline for submission of full proposals is 5:00 pm, Monday, September 1, 2008. The QEP Team will be accepting proposals until 5:00 pm, October 1, 2008.

4. Proposal Evaluation

The QEP Planning Team will assess full proposals in light of the above guidelines, determining the degree to which each proposal is successful in meeting all the challenges specified for each section. Reviewers will employ a five-level scale (“Strongly Agree,” “Mostly Agree,” “Neutral,” “Somewhat Disagree,” and “Strongly Disagree”) to indicate the degree to which each challenge is convincingly met. These evaluations and rankings will be an important component in the careful and thorough consideration of all full proposals, after which the QEP Planning Team will select the top proposal(s) to send to the UNTHSC Executive Team, who will make the final selection from among the top proposals. The Executive Team will decide to designate one or more proposals to be developed into the UNTHSC Quality Enhancement Plan. An announcement of the decision will be made on or before November 1, 2008. Once a selection is made, a QEP Development Team will be formed to prepare the QEP for submission and begin implementation.

Key Dates:

Full proposals due	September 1, 2008
Proposals accepted until	October 1, 2008
QEP Selection Announced	November 1, 2008
Quality Enhancement Plan Development	November 2008 – August 2009
Proposal Pre-Implementation (pre-implementation will precede final QEP approval by SACS)	September 2009
Proposal Implementation	Upon QEP approval in 2010
Final QEP Report Due	October 2014

Budget:

Category	Role and Percent Effort	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
1. Personnel		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
2. Equipment		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
3. Hourly Services		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
4. Consumable Supplies		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
5. Other Expenses		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
6. Total		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Justification: Budget requests to support salary and travel related to a QEP project must be carefully justified. If the project budget includes funds for purchasing equipment, document that such equipment is not available or accessible at UNTHSC.