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Executive Summary

The Mountain View College Quality Enhancement Plan is designed to improve student writing through the creation of an institutional structure that contains innovative instructional interventions and writing opportunities outside of a classroom environment. The plan’s primary goals are to: (1) Develop students’ skills in mastering writing principles, (2) Increase writing within the academic disciplines, and (3) Nurture a college-wide culture of writing.

Aside the first year’s pilot activities, the 2016-2017 report covers the fifth year of activities and the fourth full academic year that the QEP has been implemented. The report includes assessment results from Goal 1 and updates on activities supporting Goals 2 and 3. It also summarizes the results of an intensive review of the commitments made in the original QEP document and proposals for moving forward into the second period of the college’s writing initiative.

The 2016-2017 year was a period of adjustments and review of the core elements of the 2012 SACS-COC-approved plan. Following the departure of the Committee’s administrative co-chair in January 2017, the Steering Committee set out to secure a replacement. With the President’s approval, Dr. Lori Doddy, the new Vice President of Instruction, assumed the position as the administrative co-chair of the QEP. Additionally, the Steering Committee proposed expansion of the Committee membership to include representatives from the Offices of Public Information and Marketing and Professional Development. One new position was added to boost representation from the Academic Center for Writing.

Increasing numbers of MVC students requested assistance of Writing Center staff, pushing staff to the limit of their capacity each week. Nevertheless, under the direction of Luke Story, Writing Center specialists expanded the number of instructional support videos, handouts, and workshops.

The Advising Committee approved new Writing-Intensive and Writing-Enhanced courses, expanding even further the number of academic disciplines represented in the QEP curriculum. At the same time, however, given a conflict between the Honors Scholar criteria, the General Committee approved a Steering Committee proposal to remove ENGL 1301 sections in general from the QEP curriculum, limiting ENGL 1301 representation to only those sections that reflected in elevated requirements for “honors” recognition.

The “Culture of Writing Festival” conducted its fifth year, campus-wide program, focusing primarily on the initiatives of the QEP, opportunities for student writing, and services supporting student academic writing.

Much of the year’s work focused on assessment of the total QEP initiative. The Steering Committee convened a day-long “retreat” during which members examined the full 2012 document and developed a proposed budget for the first year beyond the original commitments for the first five years.
QEP Faculty, Courses, and QEP Goals

In the fall of 2016, Mountain View College offered 156 sections of WIC (Writing Intensive) or WEC (Writing Enhanced) courses. While the fall semester began with 19 instructors—down from the 46 in the previous year, the number increased to 30 in the spring (see the list of instructors for both semesters in Appendix A). The apparent decline in the number from the 46 noted in the 2015-2016 Annual Report is due to the decision to no longer include the ENGL 1301 sections formerly listed as the Writing-Intensive courses.

The QEP Committee decided to eliminate ENGL 1301 sections from the schedule of WICS courses because of an insurmountable conflict with the Mountain View College “Honors Scholar Program.” The Honors Scholar program requires that students successfully complete a separate “Honors Project” in addition to completing all other required learning work for the course with an “A” average. The conflict is with the SACS-COC-approved 2012 QEP Plan that awards “honors” credit to any student in a WICS course who completes the course with an “A” grade without having to complete an additional “Honors Project,” as is required of all other non-WICS courses. In other words, students completing any ENGL 1301 course with a grade of “A” would automatically be awarded honors credit, making ENGL 1301 classes exempt from the “Honors Scholar Program” requirements of the additional “Honors Project.”

Even with the elimination of the ENGL 1301 composition courses, we, nevertheless, increased our QEP faculty. The QEP Committee attributes the increase in WICS/WECS faculty to the increased awareness initiatives around the campus, and the faculty sessions held for both full-time and adjunct faculty during each full semester’s Return Week activities. Additionally, when new faculty are hired at Mountain View College, the QEP co-chair personally delivers a QEP Welcome Packet.

Goal One: To Develop Students’ Skills in Mastering Writing Principles

The QEP Assessment Committee reviewed student artifacts culled electronically through the new collection system using the “Assignments” and “QEP Rubric” functions in eCampus/Blackboard, the college’s online course management system. The Assessment Committee convened in spring, 2017 to review the random sampling of WICS/WECS student submissions. Of the 111 essays reviewed, 61 papers passed, or 54%, while 50 papers failed, or 46%. The two primary factors among the seven assessment criteria were failures in “correctness” and “critical thinking.”

Problems with basic sentence grammar, carelessness in editing, and confusing word choices are frequent issues in many of the papers failed for “correctness.” These are persistent problems for so many of our students who have now been declared “college eligible” according to new lower statewide standards of the TSI readiness test in reading and writing as mandated by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and now codified by state law.

English faculty members have struggled for more than a decade to address failures in correctness. Beginning in 2003, English instructors began reviewing various commercial products provided by
publishers. The English Department chose a program designed to provide students with diagnostics and remedial training through exercises identified in the diagnostics as student grammar and other composition issues. After several years of use, however, the English Department faculty abandoned the product, unable to identify any clear transference of student success on the product’s exercises to improvements in their essays. After the decision not to renew the contract with the commercial developers, English faculty members were free to explore other options.

Students’ use of the Academic Center for Writing has been perhaps the most successful resource, providing students timely review and recommendations for improvement in the development and revisions of their academic papers, not just for English classes, but across all disciplines. Retention rates of students from fall, 2016, to fall, 2017 show some of the most positive impacts on students’ use of the Writing Center. Those who sought consultation on their compositions showed a 62% retention rate over that year, while the retention rates of those students who attended workshops reflect an even higher percentage at 67%.

As positive as these rates may appear, however, they are down from two years earlier when the number of students seeking assistance was considerably lower, and the higher standards for college eligibility meant that fewer weaker students were enrolled in transfer college courses. Between fall, 2014, and fall, 2015, the retention rate for those seeking consultations on essays was 78%, and the retention rate for those attending workshops was even higher at 81%.

In 2016-2017, the QEP Committee took specific action to address student problems with correctness and critical thinking. The Committee added Dr. Camille Raspante as Chair of the Assessment Committee. Members of the QEP instructors are now using a new student diagnostic approach with pre-testing and post-testing assessments of correctness issues and increasing the weight of correctness of compositions in the final grade assignments for courses. English Professor Markay Rister has trained several WICS and WECS instructors in the use of an instructor-developed assessment instrument that they began employing in their classes. Along with an EDUC instructor Ron Stein, Dr. Raspante has taken the lead in developing and facilitating critical thinking workshops for both students and staff. To augment their efforts, staff of the Academic Center for Writing have created additional short video segments and began offering full workshops on critical thinking and the evaluation of outside sources for written assignments.

### Goal Two: To Increase Writing Within Core Academic Disciplines

The purpose of Goal Two is to increase writing within the disciplines. Primary in the assessment of this is the number of instructors participating in QEP Writing-Intensive Courses (WICS) and Writing-Enhanced Courses (WECS). As noted earlier, this increased from the 2014-15 year. However, WICS and WECS instructors decreased from 46 faculty members in 2016 to 30 instructors in by spring, 2017. The decrease is due, however, to the decision of the QEP Committee to eliminate all ENGL 1301 courses and their instructors from the list of WICS faculty members because of the conflict between the criteria for
designating MVC Honors Scholars and the criteria mandated for all WICS courses. The addition of Megatronics sections, dance, and electronics courses increased the number of disciplines represented over 2015.

| Fall 2014 WICS/WECS Faculty = 21 | Fall 2015 WICS/WECS Faculty = 46 | Fall 2016 WICS/WECS Faculty = 30 |

An important addition to our QEP and to the solicitation of new faculty support has been the addition of English Professor Richard Leebert as Chair of the Advisory Committee, charged with increasing WICS/WECS course sections and overseeing compliance with the recurring two-year faculty recertification process. Richard comes to MVC with a career in law and is an integral supporter for our new critical thinking initiatives.

In addition to the emphases in “Writing in Unusual Places,” “Consequential Writing,” and “The Family Involvement Model,” themes that the QEP Committee promoted in the first three formal years of the project, “Engagement” was the theme for 2016-2017. The focus was a “push” by the Advisory Committee to recruit new QEP faculty members and to facilitate their certification.

During the 2016-17 academic year, the QEP Committee continued to offer fifteen staff and faculty development workshops on a rotating basis. To assist with schedules, these workshops were primarily held each Wednesday afternoon and featured faculty and Academic Center for Writing staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP 2016-17 Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Writing Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Curriculum – Way To Incorporate Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jean Baker, Director of Library Services, and a member the QEP Steering Committee, continued to expand professional development readings through the library’s QEP LibGuide, which contains links to scholarly articles supporting all three goals of the QEP. Three members of the library team now assist in identifying articles on QEP/Writing-related subjects and post announcements each month through the QEP Update and campus-wide announcements by email.

**Goal Three: To Nurture A Culture Of Writing**

The purpose of Goal Three is to nurture a culture of writing at Mountain View College. Leading this initiative was the Culture of Writing festival (“Celebrating Voice”) held in March, 2017. Led by QEP
Steering Committee member Darius Frasure, students were led through workshops and presentations identifying the range of student support for writing offered by the QEP Committee and the Academic Center for Writing. Presentations were facilitated for students, staff, and faculty members. Up from the 89 participants in the 2016 festival, more than 100 students, staff, and instructors attended the morning and afternoon workshops.

Staff in the Academic Center for Writing continued their sponsorship of the MVC student writing club, the “Kevin Williams Writing Lounge,” that produces much of our student publications.

Also key this year to ‘nurturing a culture of writing’ was the publication of the MVC writing journal *The Lion’s Roar* and the MVC student newspaper *The Lion’s Pride*. With contributions from students and staff, both publications featured articles in French, English, and Spanish.

Lastly, eight QEP posters were distributed around the campus, and over 2,500 QEP folders were printed to help connect the ‘branding’ of the QEP (The Pen Is Our Power) with the “Ink Spot,” the Academic Center For Writing (also called *The Ink Spot*).

**Approaching the QEP Impact Report: A Period of Assessment, Reflection, and Renewal**

Anticipating the preparation of our QEP Impact report due in 2018, the Committee decided to conduct a thorough review of the original 2012 approved QEP document. To initiate the review process, Dr. Grimes and Dean Marsh went through the complete text, noting as they went, all commitments the college made in the facilitation of the initiative, the three broad goals and their discrete objectives, and the institutionalization of the whole project.

The review was helpful. It was clear that, as the project evolved, the QEP Committee addressed all objectives of the three goals, modifying, as necessary from time, policies and procedures to accomplish them, and dreaming and imagining new, inventive and innovative solutions for enhancing student learning and staff development.

In addition to the two major state-mandated changes that forced 1) a redefinition of our original student cohort, and 2) adjustments to accommodate students traditionally less skilled who would be entering our transfer classes, another factor threatened to intimidate the level of products and services we could provide for our students; that was the impending completion of the U. S. Department of Education Title V grant in September 2016. Funds from the Title V grant had covered many of the initial expenses of the project, including the creation and staffing of the Academic Center for Writing, professional development funds for the new WICS/WECS faculty members, program design and development, including printing of QEP materials, some marketing initiatives, and stipends for Committee chairs. With the completion of the Title V grant, those expenses had to shift to the annual operational budget of the college. As members of the QEP Steering Committee anticipated this shift in institutional support, its review of funding sources came into question, prompting the Faculty Co-Chair’s solicitation of clarification of funding going forward to the President and the Vice President of Business.
Services. The responses to each query were forthcoming and clearly explained, much to the reassurance of the Committee as a whole, and the QEP Steering Committee met to develop a budget for programming, staff stipends, and other necessary expenditures defined in the original 2012 institutional commitments.

Satisfied that funding questions had been resolved with the submission and approval of the sixth-year budget (see Appendices E and F), the Steering Committee set aside May 15th, 2017 for a full-day retreat on campus to review every program item in the 2012 document. Administrative co-chair Dr. Lori Doddy, along with Dr. Geoff Grimes, the faculty co-chair, opened the retreat, and the committee began its programmatic review based upon an analysis of the QEP charges that Dr. Grimes had abstracted from the original document. Committees organized and committed to addressing each issue for reporting back to the full QEP Committee in the fall of 2017.

At the end of the fifth year, clearly, the QEP initiative was successful in ways that we had never fully anticipated. For examples:

**Student success, persistence, and retention attributed to the Academic Center for Writing.**
While we knew the potential of the Academic Center for Writing to help our students with all aspects of their academic writing, we could never have anticipated the degree to which the full faculty—well beyond just the WICS and WECS instructors—would embrace its services and how many students would continue to return to take advantage of the help it provides.

**Development of WICS/WECS Courses and Faculty Support.**
We never anticipated that we would eclipse our original goal of 50 sections of WICS and WECS sections by 300 percent by just the beginning of the fifth year, finishing the year with 156 sections.

**Imaginative Nurturing of the Culture of Writing across the Campus.**
The annual “Culture of Writing Festival,” made successful by the outstanding work of Committee Chair Darius Frasure, became the point around which students, especially, came to embrace writing creatively that would produce annual streams of writing that would never have happened without the imaginative support of faculty and staff sponsors as leaders. The festival created networks between students and area artists, writers, and representatives of the business community. The festivals offered workshops and breakout sessions for both professional and student development, addressing the writing process, the use of rubrics, and imaginative seminars on creative writing and publishing. From these sessions, students stepped up to the challenges of their sponsors and, among other initiatives, reinvented the student newspaper, *The Lion’s Pride*, dormant for more than 30 years! Students created a professional journal, *The Lion’s Roar*, featuring articles by students, faculty, and staff in many genres and in multiple languages!

**The Enhanced Application of Institutional Data.**
The work of the staff in our Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness has been essential to the decision-making processes for all our assessments of student learning, designing and implementing new student and staff development programming, and especially in redirecting the whole initiative toward a
revised student cohort. Most important, their representation on our Steering Committee in Dr. Barnard, our chief research associate, and the guidance of Dean Bergeron, Office Director, in helping us to navigate our way toward the drafting and submission of our SACS-COC reports, has helped to cultivate a deep respect for the use of institutional data in all our planning going forward.

A Final Thought and a Word of Appreciation.
So many people in the MVC community have contributed to the successes of our first five years. First, we are grateful for the enduring persistence of our committee members who have been faithful from the first charges, through the selection of the topic, and to its implementation in its first five years, and for the support of our senior administrative team members, who through the last eight years, have encouraged our faculty and staff to persevere in a good cause. In a special note of appreciation, we remember Kevin Williams, our first director of the Academic Center for Writing, whose untimely death only invigorated our commitment to keep his vision and enthusiasm alive. And we are most grateful to our QEP “Champion” and new Writing Center director, Luke Story, who is his own self-actualized and institutionalized QEP engine, filling in all the administrative cinques and gaps that keep us from sometimes falling into disarray.

And so many others have helped make it happen: Sarah Jones, Director of Student Advising, and her staff have helped place our students in our WICS and WECS courses and have provided helpful counseling and advice in approaching these heavier writing courses. Randy Clower, the college’s videographer, has created instructional video productions that have visualized our QEP for a national audience, attracting interest and commitment to the ideas and ideals enshrined in The Pen is Our Power.

In the last year approaching our Impact Statement, under the able leadership of Jill Lain and supported by an extraordinary team of talented artists and marketing specialists, the Office of Marketing and Public Information has become an essential instrument in helping us to communicate our work for both students and the college’s service area. And finally, a word of deep appreciation for our student leaders who have embraced writing in creative and imaginative ways that have helped to open doors for themselves and other students to scholarships and admission to some of our finest colleges and universities.

Out of our fifth year, the MVC QEP Committee emerged reinvigorated and committed to meeting the challenges of the next five years, only to be reminded by Dr. Robert Garza, President of Mountain View College, that our commitment to our QEP: The Pen is Our Power will not go away at the end of the second five years but will continue to be institutionalized as a major thrust of our continuing quest for excellence in meeting the evolving needs of our students and their learning.
APPENDIX A: The 2016-2017 MVC QEP Faculty

The 2016-2017 Mountain View College QEP Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2016 QEP Instructors</th>
<th>Spring 2017 QEP Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bell, Tanisha</td>
<td>1. Alfers, Kenneth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cline, John</td>
<td>2. Bell, Tanisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dixon, Taunya</td>
<td>3. Cline, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Farley-Parker, Elizabeth</td>
<td>4. Collier, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Frasure, Darius</td>
<td>5. Dixon, Taunya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hutchings, Sarah</td>
<td>7. Frasure, Darius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lackey, Tisha</td>
<td>10. Hosey, Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rister, Markay</td>
<td>15. Lackey, Tisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tarpley, Joyce</td>
<td>17. Martinez-Egger, Alma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Waldrop, Jessica</td>
<td>18. Morris, Donald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Norton, Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Pettengill, Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Reed-Shaw, R Deandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Rister, Markay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Shipley, Denise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Srivastava, Neeti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Sullivan, Cristina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Tarpley, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Waldrop, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Woodson, Hubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. York, Johnathon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: 2016 Culture of Writing Summary and Report

The 2016 Culture of Writing Festival: An Update
Engagement in the Culture with...

1. College and Community
   a. Website: https://www.mountainviewcollege.edu/QEP/lionsroar/Pages/default.aspx
   b. Literary Journal: https://www.mountainviewcollege.edu/QEP/lionsroar/Pages/about-us.aspx
   c. Newsletter: https://www.mountainviewcollege.edu/QEP/lionsprideonline/Pages/default.aspx

2. Faculty, Staff, and Administration
   a. Professional Development
      i. Culture of Writing Festival
         1. Info
            a. https://www.mountainviewcollege.edu/cwf/Pages/default.aspx
            b. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1N_JGHCF4jFx8HXqjdwa7CcNjSZ9nLw5zj68K8g5zJk/edit
         2. 89 Attendees for workshops in 2016 (One Day) vs. 245 in 2015--four day
         3. 15 Volunteers
         4. 16 responses to the call for workshop submissions--presentations from
            a. UNT Dallas
            b. UNT Denton
            c. El Centro College
            d. MVC
            e. Journeymen Ink
   b. Publishing
      i. Newsletter
         1. First edition published in 2015
         2. Fourth volume to be published in fall 2016
      ii. Literary Journal
         1. Published in 2015
         2. Received first innovation grant of $5,000

3. Students
   a. Student Writing Club (Kevin Williams Writing Lounge)
      i. Second year retaining high membership
   b. Paid Internship and Professional Writing Opportunities
      i. MVC
         1. Writing Center
         2. Literary Journal
3. Writing Festival (event planning)
4. College Newsletter
5. Work Study
   ii. The Wild Detectives Bookstore
   iii. Deep Vellum Publishing and Bookstore
   iv. Poets and Writers Magazine
   v. Big Thought
      1. Creative Solutions, Thriving Minds, and Daverse Works
         a. Dion'Te Cottman
         b. Britney Iwegbu
         c. Michael Lewis
   c. Performance/readings
      i. Daverse Lounge
      ii. African American Read in
      iii. Hispanic Heritage Read In
   d. Writing Contests:
      https://www.mountainviewcollege.edu/QEP/lionsroar/Pages/contests.aspx
      i. LFITCC
      ii. The Sandra Brown Excellence in Literary Fiction Scholarship (ELF)
         1. Young Hee Sommemoto--one of four finalists for the award

4. Community
   a. Promotion of writing contests
   b. Promotion of/Partnership with Local University Writing programs
      i. TCU
         1. Literary Journal
         2. Degree Portfolio/scholarship
      ii. UNT Denton
         1. Mayborn
   c. Creation of Internships through strategic negotiation
      i. The Wild Detectives Bookstore
      ii. Deep Vellum Publishing and Bookstore
      iii. Poets and Writers Magazine
         1. Internships
         2. Conferences
            a. Dion'Te Cottman, Prof. Frasure, and Steve Nichols attended and Presented at the Austin Inspire conference
   iv. Big Thought
      1. Creative Solutions, Thriving Minds, and Daverse Works
         a. Dion'Te Cottman
         b. Britney Iwegbu
         c. Michael Lewis
APPENDIX C: Queries Addressing Funding for the QEP

A Response to Queries from the QEP Committee Addressing Funding for the QEP

To: Dr. Garza, Dr. Doddy & Cathy Edwards
Fr: Sharon Davis
Date: March 22, 2017
Re: QEP Budget Related Concerns as expressed in email received 3/21/17

Below are my responses regarding budget related concerns expressed by the QEP Chair, Dr. Geoff Grimes. Please feel free to include my responses in whatever final document/response that will be provided to Dr. Grimes.

Chapter 3

7. We are committed to a $500 prize each year (page 38).
I have not been made aware of a request for $500. This cannot be honored with institutional funds, as it would have to be counted against student’s financial aid, but could possibly be done with foundation funds for this year, if requested. Unfortunately, nothing can be done about prior years.

12. Are faculty still eligible to apply for up to $1,500 each academic year for professional development and travel to attend conferences (page 39)?
Yes. The professional development department recently changed guidelines. The current maximum that may be requested is $1,500 if you are presenting at a conference and agree to conduct a workshop on campus, upon your return.

14. Do we still have $400 for each new (certified) WICS instructors and $200 for each new (certified) WECS instructor (page 39)?
Yes, funding will be provided for the development of new WICS and WECS courses, for the current and future years.

Chapter 5

1. Have we completed a formative evaluation each academic year designed to monitor if planned allocations are adequate and if current allocations are used efficiently (item 1 on page 59)?
This has not been done by the VPBS. It may have occurred with the Title V grant manager.
2. In its first three years, has the QEP continued to be a funding priority for Mountain View College? Cite the evidence (Item 3 on page 59).

Yes the QEP continued to be a funding priority for MVC in its first three years, and the years succeeding the first three. This is evidenced by the QEP (including the writing center) expending funds of $161,497 in year one (2012-2013), $213,529 in year two (2013-2014), and $250,795 in year three (2014-2015). All of this funding was provided by college operating funds. In 2015-2016, MVC spent $263,772 on QEP efforts, from the college operating budget. Current year budget for the writing center is $283,333. These amounts do not include what was spent from the grant by either MVC and/or UNT Dallas.

3. We need to review the $1.07 million six-year budget and identify the new sources of revenue now that the Title V grant with its cost extension into this past September is now expired (page 59).

Please see response to question 2, above. This is the amount spent from college operations. Additionally, the college has expended over $3M from a Title V grant. The source of revenue is the college allocation which comes from tuition, taxes, and state reimbursement.

4. We need to review the funding of $400 each for new WICS instructor professional development support for ten faculty per year until the QEP goal of 50 WICS per semester is achieved (page 59).

Funding has been provided for instructors that developed WIC courses, in the past. The number of WIC courses developed and whether or not professional development was provided will have to be answered by someone on the QEP committee.

5. Review the key provision for funding on page 59. The new QEP related cost will be faculty stipends, faculty release time, and a part-time support staff position to assist the administrative lead in QEP duties. The need for this part-time position will be assessed each academic year when the budget is formatively evaluated. All other costs are either within the existing college budget or currently funded through a grant-based activity.

I cannot comment on whether or not an assessment for the part-time position occurred each academic year or not. However, all costs associated with the QEP, previously absorbed by the grant have been/are currently funded via the college operating budget.

6. Review the continued use of InSite software and the shift in funding from the now expired Title V grant to students at a cost of $15 per student (page 59).

I spoke with Luke Story and he informed me that neither faculty or students currently utilize this software. As a result, no shifting of costs to students has occurred.

7. Review the funding of $400 stipends to be paid to up to ten new WICS/WECS instructors, a new QEP cost. Is this stipend funded in the current budget (page 59)?
Yes. Please see response to question 14 under Chapter 3 and question 4 under Chapter 5.

8. Does current college policy still allow faculty to apply for up to $1,500 to attend conferences each academic year, the cost… currently allocated with the existing college budget [year 2012] (page 60).

See response to question 12 under Chapter 3.

9. Review the current budget supporting the annual writing festival each spring, an expected ongoing cost after year one (page 60).

The annual Writing Festival has been funded each year. Funding has been provided out of the Student Life budget. It is currently budgeted for FY2017 for $3,000.

10. Does the current budget for year 2016-17 and ongoing reflect the stipends of $30 per hour at 10 hours x five faculty members plus an annual $500 for an outside faculty evaluator supporting the evaluation of student papers each year? According to the QEP document, ‘This will be a new QEP-related cost (page 60)’.

The current budget can support these expenses. Ongoing budgets have not been built, however QEP will remain a funding priority for MVC.

11. Review Table 5.1/QEP Budget Detail Overview to determine if year five and six budget items in all categories are now reflected in the college budget (particularly for the budget allocations for the Academic Center for Writing and its personnel – page 60).

All items in years five and six will be funded, as needed. However, all items may not be reflected in the division for the Academic Center for Writing.

12. Compare (contrast) the actual expenditures with the budgeted expenditures for all items in Tables 5.2-5/QEP Budget[s]: Years 2012 – 2017 pages 61-65.

I am unable to do this. Divisional budgets are not kept in the same format as grant budgets. Also, there were many budget adjustments and changes made to the Title V grant over the course of five years. Keep in mind, the budget presented when the grant was written changed with the budget adjustments, and possible changes in grant and/or QEP priorities.

13. Account for the discrepancy in $149,882 budgeted for QEP activities for year 2016-17 with the decision to defund the QEP budget for the same year. While each of the budgeted items are intended to be covered by resources provided by existing budget, in fact, with the exceptions of those items related to staffing for the Academic Center for Writing, all other items “faculty QEP Chair, Faculty Stipends, Professional Development, Promotional/Student Activities, and Assessment Activities” are not covered in either the QEP account or in the Academic Center for Writing. This represents $19,250 defunded for QEP activities in year 2016-17. Why (page 65)?
These were not defunded. However, they are not reflected in the Academic Center for Writing divisional budget. These items will be funded by the VPBS when requested/needed. Please note, when the divisional budget for QEP was active, very few items were purchased/expensed. Purchases included: two camcorders with remote, dry erase board, pressboard folders, stackable trays, Nikon camera, a workshop, and a lighting kit. There is no record of the budget being used for anything else.
APPENDIX D: Approaching the MVC QEP Fifth - Year Report

Approaching the MVC QEP Fifth-Year Report:
Questions/Observations/Challenges regarding the
2012 QEP Approved Document

Action Required
The QEP Steering Committee must review the MVC 2012 SACS-approved Quality Enhancement Plan, document compliance with its charges, complete requirements still unattended, and clarify in our reports changes that have evolved over the first five years.

Background
Over the spring break, I completed a thorough reading of the SACS-reviewed “MVC Quality Enhancement Plan” document. It commits both the QEP Committee and the rest of the MVC community to principles, activities, and investments that support the initiative’s three goals: 1) to improve student writing, 2) to increase the amount of student writing, and 3) to nurture a culture of writing on the campus.

As approved in September 2012 by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Colleges, the Mountain View College’s QEP: “The Pen is Our Power” represents what the chair of the SACS visiting team characterized as “a national model.” He encouraged the QEP Committee and other college representatives to disseminate the plan nationwide through conference presentations, media, and publications.

Following a 2012-2013 “Pilot Year,” meant to establish some baseline data for going forward, the QEP Committee set out to implement the various elements of the plan. The QEP Steering Committee (referenced in the document as the “QEP Implementation Committee”) identified and staffed several QEP sub-committees in order to address each of the three goals, to establish QEP (student learning) outcomes for each, and to create resources and activities supporting those outcomes. The results of their work have been outstanding:

- Building upon an initial ten Writing-Intensive and Writing (QEP)-Enhanced course offerings, the Advisory Committee enlarged the QEP faculty, expanding QEP course offerings to include classes in every academic discipline of the college.
- Faculty in every department engaged their students in QEP activities, resulting in, among other accomplishments, naming the QEP itself and designing its logo.
- The services provided by the staff of the Academic Center for Writing grew exponentially in helping students to become more self-sufficient writers and helped to organize and sponsor the MVC student writers club and has funded its publications.
- Staff from the Office of Institutional Research conducted initial student data queries that helped us identify our initial student cohorts and have continued to provide timely data searches that have helped us to revise our activities and to document our progress. Institutional Research staff members serve on the QEP Steering Committee.
The Office of Student Life engaged student clubs and organizations in conducting QEP focus groups for gathering feedback and began funding presentations by outside experts on QEP-related topics to speak at college convocations. A student leader nominated by the Director of the Office of Student Life serves on the Steering Committee.

The Office of Student Advising committed to encouraging students to enroll in QEP course offerings, and a student advisor serves on the QEP Steering Committee.

Working together with the Core Curriculum and Gen/Ed Assessment Committee, the QEP Assessment Committee composed and secured the campus-wide approval of rubrics for evaluating student writing and, more broadly, for overall program review.

The Culture of Writing Committee began its annual “Culture of Writing Festival”—now in its fourth year—bringing to campus each spring Dallas/Fort Worth area writers, artists, musicians, and scholars to engage with MVC students and staff.

With the support and assistance of the Office of Professional Development, the Professional Development and College Engagement Committee created a robust and still expanding package of professional development options for faculty and staff and systems for record keeping and collecting feedback.

Through its Graphics Department, the Office of Public Information “branded” the QEP visually throughout the college and its service area in the community. A member of its staff serves on the Steering Committee to help promote QEP activities and information to the MVC service area.

Library staff began providing monthly references to QEP-related online articles and resources, extending the “literature review” as an active, ongoing component of staff development. The director of the library serves on the Steering Committee.

The QEP Assessment Committee established a partnership with a sister university and a faculty representative to assist with assessing student writing.

Finally, the Steering Committee approved a calendar for collecting and evaluating student papers, conducting surveys and reviewing their data, making recommendations, and implementing positive changes based on those suggestions.

Completing now the fifth formal year of the ten-year project, it is no exaggeration to say that every sector of the extended college community has been engaged, at some point, in supporting “The Pen is Our Power” writing initiative.

As might be anticipated, the process of implementing the QEP has been an evolving one, sometimes soaring with enthusiasm and explosive creativity while, at other times, more subdued, self-reflecting, restive, and a little uncertain. Changes in personnel have created confusion and disorientation. Key senior administrators have come and gone. Members of the faculty have floated in and out of QEP committee service, and two of the original three authors of the original QEP document have retired to other employment. Approaching the submission of a required fifth-year report to SACS, the QEP Committee has had to respond also to changes in the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s requirements in Developmental Studies. These changes significantly reduced the population of the QEP’s initial targeted student cohort and prompted a critical revision of the QEP’s “Focus Statement.” Once committed to “increasing the graduation rate of former Developmental Writing students,” we are now dedicated to “increasing the persistence rate from fall to fall of First-Time-In-College (FTIC), degree-seeking students.”
This redefinition of the QEP’s MVC student target population has necessitated a thorough review of the charges in the original document. That review has called into question a number of claims and commitments tied to the services of the original student cohort which now need to be reexamined and revised. Additionally, the review has opened new inquiries related significantly to the institutionalization of the overall QEP initiative.

**Charge:** The QEP Steering Committee should review each of the questions and observations introduced here that have been derived from a careful reading of the 2012 SACS/COC-approved QEP document. If we fail to do so, I fear that our Fifth-Year Report for SACS—due next spring—will be challenging and problematic. Where we can determine compliance with requirements that are still relevant to our project, we need to document and cite the evidence or supporting data (many of the questions raised below we have already addressed in college/committee-approved revisions). On the other hand, where we have been less attentive and, in a very few cases, have even failed, we need to determine why and make recommendations to complete or correct those elements that still need our attention.

This will take some time—much more time than we can address in a single meeting, or even in meetings between now and the end of the semester. I’m sure, as we come together, we will raise even further points for reflection and discussion. I am committed, as I know we all are, to work through this review, however, in order to recast and realign our words with our deeds that continue to best serve our students’ learning.

I have never been prouder in my 50-year teaching career than I was on the morning of 2012 September 29th when the chair of the visiting team for SACS, addressing our QEP document, announced—after a verrry long pause—“No Recommendations!” The room, filled with so many of us who had labored so long and so hard, simply exploded in streams of tears and over-whelming joy! If our 2012 QEP document represents a “national model,” it is because, I believe, it represents the highest challenges to an institution and to each of us who has helped to shape its vision. It is an ideal, a standard that will become, with adjustments we must make now, nothing less than a monument in the future to what we have done and to what we can still do in the future to serve our students. They demand nothing less of us.

Respectfully submitted,

Geoff Grimes, Faculty Co-Chair
The MVC QEP Committee

March 13, 2017
Questions/Observations/Challenges
regarding the 2012 QEP Approved Document

Summary

1) Where are we in the process of “Completion by Design”? (page 2)
2) Review the original “broad mission statement”: To increase the graduation rate of developmental writing students (page 2)

Chapter 1 – Topic Development

1) What is the ethnic percentage now? (page 4)
2) We need to update the names of the college president and chancellor. (page 5)
3) We need to update the number of degrees and certificates we offer. (page 5)
4) Identify what suggestions identified in the chart on page 13 we have implemented in the QEP.
5) Review/revise the original Vision Statement (see page 14) (later renamed as the QEP’s “Focus Statement; see the note on page 16).
6) Review/revise the restatement of the QEP goal found underlined at the bottom of page 15: “To increase the graduation rates of students who begin in Developmental Writing courses.”

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

1) Identify scores now used on the TSI entrance exam for placement in ENGL 1301/transfer courses and the alternative mechanisms for entry into the same. (page 17)
2) Contrast the decline in the number/percentage of Developmental Writing students against the increase we saw in 2011. (last line on page 18)
3) We might encourage disciplines to adopt increased writing assignments in all sections of discipline-oriented courses. (page 28, Alan Holyoak discussion of biology courses) [Note: This would entail modifying departmental syllabi to include QEP SLO’s.]
We need periodic public presidential endorsement of writing throughout the college community. (page29: “The college itself must actively promote the importance of written communication as a foundational factor in everyone’s success, whether in the academic ranks, the administration, the offices of student life, or in the professional support positions.”)
4) Clarify “A QEP Core Value”: “While increased writing is needed in non-English disciplines, the QEP should champion curriculum enhancement through writing, not a curriculum and/or content change.” (page 30)

Chapter 3 – Action Steps

1) Does the QEP still serve the goal of student success? (page 34)
2) Is the purpose of the MVC QEP still “to develop an institutional structure for addressing student writing needs”? (page 34)
3) Are we continuing to provide “Enhanced InSite” software (by Cengage) for WICS/WECS instructors? (page 36) If so, we need to provide staff development training.
4) Is MVC Advising still assigning advisors to specific cohorts? (page 37)
5) Are MVC advisors currently advising FTIC students to take at least three WICS courses? (page 37)
6) We are committed to producing a “Writing Honors” pen for graduates to wear at graduation. What is the cost and source? (page 38)
7) We are committed to a $500 prize each year. (page 38)
8) Review the three Goal 2 outcomes in the table. (page 38)
9) Review WECS course requirements. (page 39)
10) Have we developed a “Writing Certification Plan for Administrators”? (page 39)
11) Did we develop “baseline data for Outcomes 3.2 and 3.3” as stipulated in Table 3.5? (page 39)
12) Are faculty still “eligible to apply for up to $1,500 each academic year for professional development and travel to attend conferences”? (page 39)
13) Is the QEP still “a funding priority for professional development”? (page 39)
14) Do we still have $400 for each new (certified) WICS instructors and $200 for each new (certified) WECS instructor? (page 39)
15) Are faculty and staff still required to complete 30 hours of professional development activities each year? (page 39)
16) Has the QEP Committee developed and offered periodically each of the professional development workshops included in Table 3.6? (page 40)
17) Have each of our writing specialists in the Academic Center for Writing been certified according to the certification plan defined in Appendix D? (page 40)
18) Have we created and maintained for students the online Writers Gallery referenced on page 41?
19) Have we continued to offer a community-wide writing competition as defined on page 40 with two categories: “one for MVC enrollees and one for local high school students” with prizes and awards presented each spring? (page 41)
20) We need to report the discontinuation of the Common Book project. (page 42)
21) Review the completion of activities defined in the “Implementation Timeline for years 2012-2017” alluded to on page 43.
22) Note that no faculty member received release time to oversee the implementation of the MVC QEP in 2013, 2014, 2015, or 2016 as specified in the “Implementation Timeline.” (See Table 3.8). (page 44 ff.)

Chapter 4 – Assessment

1) Review the role(s) of “The QEP Writing Rubric” in assessing student writing achievement (see Table 4.3, page 52)
2) Review the mandated stipend to be paid to each member of the Writing Assessment Team (page 53).
3) Determine the results to the two questions regarding “Goal One Process.” (page 53)
4) We need to facilitate the “Faculty Perception Survey” again to determine 1) if the percentage of students writing five or more papers in a class has increased since the inception of the QEP in 2012, 2) if instructors are placing more weight on writing when determining their students final course grades, and 3) if MVC is increasing the number of WICS and WECS courses each academic year. (page 54)
5) Review the four steps of the assessment of Goal 2. (page 55)
6) Do Goal Three activities achieve the ends of the three questions at the bottom of page 56? To what degree?
7) For Table 4.6/Step One, what “new QEP items” have we included in “the employee/student opinion and graduation surveys . . . distributed each academic year”? (page 57)

8) Is not the reference to the “QEP implementation committee” in Table 4.6/Step Two, a reference (here and throughout the document) a reference to the “QEP Steering Committee”? (page 57)

9) For Table 4.6/Step Three, list the “enhanced professional development opportunities, writing contests, or other initiatives that may generate excitement for writing.” (page 57)

10) For Table 4.6/Step Four, what QEP-related “additional professional development opportunities” has the Office of Professional Development provided?

11) Identify examples of recommendations that have derived from the assessment/planning cycle illustrated in the progressive stages of the flow chart on page 57.

12) Check the Institutional Effectiveness College Report Card for evidence that employee/survey results related to the QEP have indeed been included for years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 (see “Reporting Assessment Results” on page 57). If not, can the “Report Cards” be revised to include the QEP results as “addenda”?

Chapter 5 – Budget and Sustainability

1) Have we completed a “formative evaluation each academic year designed to monitor if planned allocations are adequate and if current allocations are used efficiently”? (Item 1 on page 59)

2) In its first three years, has “the QEP [continued] to be a funding priority for Mountain View College”? Cite the evidence. (Item 3 on page 59)

3) We need to review the $1.07 million six-year budget and identify the new sources of revenue now that the Title V grant with its cost extension into this past September is now expired. (page 59)

4) We need to review the funding of $400 each for new WICS instructor professional development support for “ten faculty per year until the QEP goal of 50 WICS per semester is achieved.” (page 59)

5) Personnel: Review the key provision for funding on page 59: “The new QEP-related cost will be faculty stipends, faculty release time, and a part-time support staff position to assist the administrative lead in QEP duties. The need for this part-time position will be assessed each academic year when the budget is formatively evaluated. All other costs are either within the existing college budget or currently funded through a grant-based activity.”

6) Software/Supplies: Review the continued use of InSite software and the shift in funding from the now expired Title V grant to students at a cost of $15 per student. (page 59)

7) Professional Development: Review the funding of the $400 stipends to be paid to up ten new WICS/WECS instructors, a “new QEP-related cost.” Is this stipend funded in the current budget? (page 59)

8) Promotion: Does current “college policy [still] allow faculty to apply for up to $1,500 to attend conferences each academic year, the cost . . . currently allocated with the existing college budget [year 2012]?” (page 60)

9) Review the current budget supporting the annual writing festival each spring, an “expected ongoing cost after year one.” (page 60)

10) Assessment: Does the current budget for year 2016-17 and ongoing reflect the stipends of $30 per hour x 10 hours x five faculty members plus an annual $500 for an outside faculty evaluator supporting the evaluation of student papers each year? According to the QEP document, “This will be a new QEP-related cost.” (page 60)
11) Review Table 5.1/QEP Budget Detail Overview to determine if year five and six budget items in all categories are now reflected in the college budget (particularly for the budget allocations for the Academic Center for Writing and its personnel). (page 60)

12) Compare (contrast) the actual expenditures with the budgeted expenditures for all items in Tables 5.2-5/QEP Budget[s]: Years 2012-2017. (pages 61-65)

13) Account for the discrepancy in $149,882 budgeted for QEP activities for year 2016-17 with the decision to defund the QEP budget for the same year. While each of the budgeted items are intended to be covered by “resources provided by existing budget,” in fact, with the exceptions of those items related to staffing for the Academic Center for Writing, all other items—“Faculty QEP Chair,” “Faculty Stipends,” “Professional Development,” “Promotional/Student Activities,” and “Assessment Activities”—are not covered in the either the “QEP Account #1106-____ or in the “Academic Center for Writing Account #1106-____. This represents $19,250 defunded for QEP activities in year 2016-17. Why? (page 65)

14) Has the “external evaluator for the federally-funded initiative Title V Co-Op with UNT-Dallas . . . [collected and reported] reliable data on the status of baseline measures and other indicators of project outcomes—Data . . . collected as a base of evidence for any formative adjustments and summative judgments.” (Dr. Quentin Wright quotation in the block, page 65)

15) Will the approved QEP Budget 2017-2018 be funded? If not, then why? If so, at what levels? (Table 5.7, page 66)

16) Has MVC “developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) proposed broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement”? (Comprehensive Standard 3.3.2 within the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, p. 25) (page 66)

17) Has the QEP Committee institutionalized “Writers Honors” as “part of an ongoing effort to expand and redefine the college’s current honors program”? (page 67)

18) What evidence can we offer to demonstrate that “The Pen is Our Power” MVC QEP “embodies the college’s mission of empowering people and transforming communities”? (page 67)

Appendices

1) Resubmit the same “Faculty Perception Survey” as found in Appendix D and compare the results of faculty responses regarding the place of writing in courses. (page 77)

2) Resubmit the same “MVC Faculty Assessment of Student Writing Surveys” and compare the responses to those reflected in the same assessment found in Appendix D. (pages 78-80)

3) Distribute Appendix F—“English Honors Courses”—to each English instructor. (pages 84-85)

4) Augment the listings of professional development options in Appendix G—“Trainings for Instructors of Writing Intensive and QEP Enhanced Courses.” (page 86)

5) Review and revise (if necessary) Appendix H—“Writing Specialists Certification Plan.” (page 87)

-end-
APPENDIX E: The Proposed 2017-2018 QEP Budget

The Proposed 2017-2018 Budget for the MVC Quality Enhancement Plan

Submitted by the QEP Steering Committee
May 15, 2017 | 3:00 p.m. | W110

Finding: The SACS/COC-approved budget allocations for year 2017-2018 QEP programs, personnel, and promotion are woefully inadequate to address suggestions of the SACS/COC visiting team in its 2013 report to the college and to meet the initiative’s three goals: 1) to improve student writing, 2) to increase the amount of student writing across the disciplines, and 3) to nurture a culture of writing at Mountain View College.

Recommendation: The QEP Steering Committee urges the acceptance and full funding of its May 15th 2017 budget proposal. Funding this proposal as submitted will contribute to the college’s mission to “empower people and to transform communities” in supporting student learning by

1) “optimizing academic excellence, human, physical, and fiscal resources,”

2) “promoting college readiness and learning pathways with the objective of increasing the number of students achieving their educational and life goals,” and

3) “accommodating 21st century learners by adopting innovations that promote greater student success and involvement.”

Background: The QEP Steering Committee met in an executive session for seven hours on May 15th to review the SACS/COC-approved 2017-2018 budget in the 2012 submission of the Quality Enhancement Plan: “The Pen is Our Power.” That budget—projected five years from the 2012-2013 pilot year—anticipated the completion of funding originally provided primarily by a Title V Cooperative Grant with only supplemental support from institutional resources. Following a cost-extension period that ended in September 2016, all funding for future QEP expenditures beginning in 2015-2016—according to the 2012 document—would be “provided by [the] existing budget” (61-68).

The MVC Business Office created two operational accounts to cover QEP-related programs and activities: 1) an “Academic Center for Writing” Account #11-06-403582, and 2) a “QEP” Account #11-06-403581.
Year 2015-2016

The “ACW” Account: Line items reflected in the “ACW” account are dedicated funds supporting the personnel and services provided to students who seek assistance from staff in the ACW. These budgeted items are reflected in the QEP budget as “QEP Administrative Lead and Support” (the salary of the ACW Director), and “Writing Center Tutors” (full-time and part-time tutors and writing specialists) (64). The total of these two items in 2015-2016 is $132,412. Additional funds for ACW operations, however, are also reflected in the “ACW” Account for year 2015-2016, but they are allocated specifically for ACW activities and expenses.

The “QEP” Account: According to the SACS/COC-approved document, the institution must also fund additional expense categories: “Faculty QEP Chair,” “Professional Development,” “Promotional/Student Activities,” and “Assessment Activities.” The total allocated for these three areas for 2015-2016 is $20,250, a figure not reflected in the budget assigned to the ACW account above—nor should it be; these expenditures are not supporting ACW personnel or operations.

Year 2016-2017

Assuming that the greatest costs would be accrued in the first three years of implementation, the budget reflects declining allocations in some of the funding categories in the post-Title V years, allegedly to be divided and assigned to various other area and departmental accounts. (For example, funding for outside speakers and support for the annual “QEP Writing Festival” would come from The Office of Student Life.)

The “ACW” Account: Items for the “ACW” account were reduced by $2,800 for “Writing Center Tutors” from $89,870 (in 2015-2016) to $87,000 (in 2016-2017) (64-65).

The “QEP” Account: Allocations for “Professional Development” declined by $1,000 from 2015-2016; from $12,000 in 2015-2016, to $11,000 in 2016-2017.

In fact, following the closure of the Title V grant in September 2017, all allocations for the “QEP” Account were scrubbed to “$0.00,” without explanation, but assuming, perhaps, that these allocations—as the 2012 QEP document declares—are “resources provided by exiting budget” (64-65).

Year 2017-2018

With the elimination of line item funding following the close of the Title V grant in September 2016, the QEP Committee had no assurances that the QEP was financially institutionalized, and the QEP Faculty Co-Chair posed serious questions to that effect. Gratefully, from clarifications submitted to the QEP Committee by Dr. Sharon Davis, Vice President for Business Services, we are assured that the baseline allocations approved by the Visiting Team in September 2012—as identified in the QEP document—will be funded, and she submitted to the QEP Committee her rapid response to our concerns.
THECB decisions to reduce (if not ultimately to eliminate) developmental studies courses and, rather, to mainstream weakly-prepared students, placing them into college-level reading, writing, and math courses when their test scores and high school transcript reflect only marginal academic abilities, compromises our initial purpose statement to “increase the graduation rate of former developmental studies students.” Our pool of developmental students enrolled in Writing-Intense and Writing-Enhanced courses has declined, severely enough to potentially compromise the first two goals of the QEP program.

In that context, we have agreed to change the focus statement and the group of students whom it serves in order to “increase the persistence rate from fall-to-fall of first-time-in-college, self-declared degree seeking students.” This change has increased both the number of students in our QEP student cohort (about 640 self-identified students), up from less than fifty QEP students currently enrolled in Developmental Writing courses who were enrolled this last semester in Writing-Intensive Courses.

In August 2016, President Garza approved the redefinition of our QEP student cohort identified above. With that approval, the QEP Committee has embarked on a long-term attempt to analyze and assess each of the elements of the SACS/COC-approved 2012 document. That review indicates to us a need to expand, not to curtail, new QEP Writing-Intensive and Writing-Enhanced courses and the professional development, training, and promotion of this newly reconfigured QEP initiative. The budget below reflects the commitment of the entire QEP Committee to step up its service in support of each of the three QEP Goals: 1) to improve student writing, 2) to increase the amount of student writing across the disciplines, and 3) to nurture a culture of writing at Mountain View College.
The Proposed 2017-2018 Budget for the MVC Quality Enhancement Plan

[Note: While the amounts differ considerably from the original budget, the following categories reflect those in the SACSCOC-approved budget for 2017-2018 in the original 2012 document.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Categories</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Faculty QEP Co-Chair</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. $1,500/release time for the QEP Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. $1,000 for each Standing Committee Chair (Assessment, Advisory/Engagement, Professional Development, Culture of Writing, Literature Review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Professional Development</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Travel for QEP single/team presentations to conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(over and above funding available from the Office of Professional Development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Funding for travel/expenses/stipends of outside experts who can address the new QEP student cohort and services to it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Faculty Stipends</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Development of additional WICS/WECS courses (20 new WICS sections/20 new WECS sections)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. “Champions” of the QEP (stipends for the development of non-transfer courses (ESL/ESOL/Developmental Studies courses) that support and incorporate the elements of the QEP as preparation for entry into mainstream WICS/WECS courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Workshop development/video production/web development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) QEP activities director (Director of the Academic Center for Writing—in addition to the salary as the director of the ACW, justified, given the expansion of QEP activities and additional WICS/WECS courses and the augmentation of supervisory responsibilities of both new ACW full-time and part-time staff and expansion of services to the increasing numbers of MVC students—more than 6,000 in 2016-17, up from 1,800 served in 2013-14, the first year of the QEP initiative)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Promotional/Student Activities $40,000
   a. Expansion of the Culture of Writing Festivals and campus initiatives to nurture a culture of writing throughout the college
   b. Branding the QEP across the campus and in the MVC service area through additional signage
   c. Printing, supplies, and QEP promotional paraphernalia, fixtures, and other elements
   d. Recognition activities for students and WICS/WECS faculty, including annual student and staff banquet, publications including The Lion’s Roar and The Lion’s Pride (the student newspaper and journal) awards, scholarships, student experiential learning activities including travel/lodging/registration expenses

6) Assessment $3,500
   a. Faculty stipends for Assessment Committee student artifact evaluation ($3,000)
   b. External expert artifact evaluator ($500)

Total $98,000

Prepared by the QEP Steering Committee
Presented by Geoffrey Grimes, Ph.D., Co-Chair, The QEP Committee
APPENDIX F: The Approved 2017-2018 QEP Budget

The Approved 2017-2018 Budget for the MVC Quality Enhancement Plan

Program $17,000.00

Professional Development $5,000.00

c. Travel for QEP single/team presentations to conferences
   (over and above funding available from the
   Office of Professional Development) $3,000.00
d. Funding for travel/expenses/stipends of outside
   experts who can address the new QEP student cohort
   and services to it $2,000.00

Culture of Writing $7,000.00

a. Expansion of the Culture of Writing Festivals and campus
   initiatives to nurture a culture of writing
   throughout the college

QEP Workshop development $5,000.00

Personnel $33,000.00

Steering Committee $6,500.00

a. $1,500/release time for the QEP Chair
b. $1,000 for each Standing Committee Chair
   (Assessment, Advisory/Engagement, Professional
   Development, Culture of Writing, Literature Review)

Faculty/Staff Stipends $26,500.00

a. Development of additional QEP courses $8,000.00

b. The Director of the Academic Center for
   Writing $15,000.00 (To be paid as a stipend
   in addition to his salary for work as the Director
   of the Academic Center for Writing)

c. Assessment $3,500.00
   1) Faculty stipends for Assessment Committee
      student artifact evaluation $3,000.00
   2) External expert artifact evaluator $500.00

Total $50,000.00