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SACS Criteria for QEPs

- Purpose is to improve some aspect of student achievement or the learning environment
- QEP idea selected based on input from the broader university community. Input required for implementation planning too.
- Idea selected based on empirical data (eg: NSSE)
- Idea selected to relate to the University’s strategic plan, mission, vision (FUTURES and UNC Tomorrow)
- Must be well focused. (“improve advisement” is too vague)
- Use actual student learning outcome achievement data (not course grades) to evaluate the success of the QEP once it is implemented
QEP Topic Identification Process

Not a top-down process. SACS requires community input.

- Input; Phase I
- University Data
- Input; Phase II
- UNC Tomorrow
- Buy-In & Input this Summer
- Write QEP this Summer
- $ Marketing $ Fall & Spring
University Community Input Phase I

- **Nominal Group** Technique with all schools/colleges, for faculty, staff, and administrators (400+ participated). Resulted in Top 5 Improvements: Study Skills, Reading Skills, *Critical Thinking Skills*, Writing Skills, and Experiential Learning

- **Staff focus group** (1 group). Ranked top concern from faculty list and added to list of improvements.

- **Student focus groups** (4 groups). Ranked top concern from faculty list and added to list of improvements. (SoT, SoAg, CoEng, Student Athletes)

- **Student survey** (700+). Ranked faculty list. Study Skills, *Critical Thinking Skills*, Reading Skills, Writing Skills, and Experiential Learning

- **Alumni blog**; listed improvements that included more internships, start coops, better career planning, *analytical skills*.

- **Alumni survey** (low return rate, 6%, 30 out of 500) Made up for this later

- **Board of Trustees** (8 of 13, 61%) listed improvements: retention, basic skills, student services
Existing University Data Collected

- **Sophomore and senior surveys:** Sophomores rated career related services and advising related items low; seniors had higher rates of satisfaction.

- **Collegiate Learning Assessment:** Near lowest among schools, slightly lower than expected based on SAT scores, gains during school similar to other schools (assessment is all about *critical thinking*).

- **National Survey of Student Engagement:** Lower faculty support, less class prep, less writing, less speaking/presentation, less quantitative analysis, less advisement, *more critical thinking*, more computer use.

- **Faculty Survey of Student Engagement:** Require less writing, advise less, structure courses to foster *critical thinking*.

- **Wabash** (used CLA and NSSE-type questions): Lower *critical thinking*, lower SATs, lower positive attitudes toward reading, higher at wanting to succeed at business, higher at wanting to make a lot of money.
Existing University Data Collected

- **Accuplacer:** 48% of incoming freshmen scored below cutoff score in math.
- **High failure rate courses:** mostly math related courses.
- **Praxis I scores:** low in writing and math but very low in reading.
- **UNST annual reports:** year 1 report showed deficits, year 2 report showed improvement and satisfactory progress, noted that departments are not addressing UNST objectives.
- **Student Services annual/consultant reports:** CAE – weak connection to academic programs, should include career counseling w/ advisement, Career Services – big disparity in schools/colleges that get interviews at career fairs and those who don’t get interviews.
- **Department five-year reports:** retention varies, professional exam have satisfactory pass rates.
- **Accreditation Reports:** Electrical Engineering concludes that students are not prepared for college.
University Community Input Phase II

- All groups were able to see input from other groups.

- Each group rated the *importance* of an area of achievement improvement AND rated how well the University is *performing* in that area.

- Results provided us with a matrix.

- Sent out final survey for faculty vote on main focus of QEP
Importance-Performance Analysis with Faculty, Staff, Admin – Alumni – Student Data


Adjusted IP Analysis

- Faculty
- Student
- Alumni
- Grand Mean
Final QEP Survey

- Asked faculty to vote for one area to be the focus of the QEP.
  - Choices: writing skills, reading skills, critical thinking skills, oral communication skills, analytical skills
- Schools/Colleges: all 9
- Departments: 32
- Return rate: 40%
- Writing: 75
- Critical thinking: 88
- Oral communication: 16
- Reading: 38
- Analytical: 42
Strategic Plans, Visions, Missions

- FUTURES = Interdisciplinary + Global + Critical Thinking

- UNC Tomorrow = Global + Community + Economics + Public School Education + Health… + Soft Skills and Critical Thinking

- A&T Vision = Learner centered + intellectual capital + interdisciplinary + discovery + engagement + excellence

- A&T Mission = Research intensive + research clusters (2008-2010 Undergraduate Bulletin)

- Both UNC Tomorrow response reports identify that basic skills will be the focus of UNST

- However, UNST states that departments are not integrating UNST
Decision on the QEP

Critical Connections

- Primary Focus: Critical Thinking
- Related Writing, Reading, Analysis, Speaking
- Global context – connect to UNC-Tomorrow
- Undergraduate student research as vehicle
- Outcomes characterized by CLA rubric
- Builds on UNST but not done by UNST
- Freshman to Senior
- Design the basic curriculum
- Schools/Colleges customize and integrate with disciplinary content as a vehicle
- Might designate a core course per department per freshman to senior year/chairs: every course
- Requires student outcome assessment
- Benchmarks for QEP evaluation
- Should become part of strategic plan for SACS to view it with confidence
- Start implementation Fall Semester, 2010
Approved by Chancellor’s Cabinet, Dean’s Council
George Stone and Vincent Childress, lead writers of summer draft
Stephen McCrory-Henderson, Loury Floyd, Robin Liles, and the 12-monthers and summer school QEP committee members have volunteered participation
Department chairs, summer faculty, and students need to provide input and feedback during this summer while the first draft QEP is being written.
Literature review: just completed
Overall concepts/outline
Input sessions
Writing
Feedback sessions
Writing
Chairs and summer faculty (and some students) are absolutely needed to participate in planning talks this July and August. There will be more input sessions this fall.
Critical thinking is that mode of thinking — *about any subject*, content, or problem — in which the thinker improves the quality of his or her thinking by skillfully analyzing, assessing, and reconstructing it. Critical thinking is self-directed, self-disciplined, self-monitored, and self-corrective thinking. It presupposes assent to rigorous standards of excellence and mindful command of their use. It entails effective communication and problem-solving abilities, as well as a commitment to overcome our native egocentrism and sociocentrism. (The Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2009, no page/online)

Critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action. In its exemplary form, it is based on *universal* intellectual values that *transcend subject matter divisions*: clarity, accuracy, precision, consistency, relevance, sound evidence, good reasons, depth, breadth, and fairness… (Herrick, 1991, no page/online)

**Includes any discipline: literature, fine arts, broadcasting, creative writing…**
Given deliberately designed instruction ...sustained over the course of students’ study...the following critical thinking student learning Goals are proposed for discussion. These learning outcomes should also be adapted for use in Bluford Library and for use in Student Affairs for the purposes of guiding both formal and informal critical thinking instruction within those units.

Goal 1
- The student will judge the quality of premises, evidence, and conclusions of an argument.

Goal 2
- The student will “Use analytical thinking skills to evaluate information critically” (University Studies, 2005, p. 2).

Goal 3
- The student will construct logical, ethical conclusions, decisions, and problem solutions.

Goal 4
- “Effectively employ critical thinking skills in written and oral communication” (University Studies, 2005, p. 2).

Goal 5
- The student will transfer critical thinking skills from one situation to another.
Goal 1
The student will judge the quality of premises, evidence, and conclusions of an argument.

Objectives for Goal 1

1.1 The student will explain critical thinking, including related assumptions and limitations.
1.2 The student will explain the uses of critical thinking in everyday life, such as advocacy, conflict resolution, and responsible decision making within the family, work, and society.
1.3 The student will explain the criteria for general critical thinking: “clarity, precision, accuracy, relevance, significance, fairness, logic, depth, and breadth, evidentiary support, probability, predictive or explanatory power” (National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking, 2009, no page/online)

4.1 The student will judge the relevance of information needed to reach a desired conclusion or decision or to solve a problem.
4.2 The student will recognize flawed or deceptive premises and conclusions.
Goal 2
The student will “Use analytical thinking skills to evaluate information critically” (University Studies, 2005, p. 2), and synthesize data and information.

Objectives for Goal 2
- 2.1 The student will break evidence down into subparts by analyzing it.
- 2.2 The student will summarize the interrelationships of, or connections among, multiple evidence, data, or information in a synthesis.
- 2.3 The student will demonstrate the logical use of data in analysis.
- 2.4 The student will evaluate the critical thinking of self and peers the specific standards of, “clarity, precision, accuracy, relevance, significance, fairness, logic, depth, and breadth, evidentiary support, probability, predictive or explanatory power” (National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking, 2009, no page/online) as criteria.
- 2.5 The student will demonstrate a self-awareness and self-confidence regarding his or her own critical thinking.
Input Discussion: Goal 3 Learning Outcomes

Goal 3
The student will reach logical, ethical conclusions.

Objectives for Goal 3

- 3.1 The student will construct logical arguments to reach conclusions, decisions, and problem solutions within the context of his or her major/discipline.
- 3.2 The student will use inference to reach valid conclusions, decisions, and problem solutions based on data or evidence that is logically connected to the conclusion.
- 3.3 The student will use deduction to reach valid conclusions, decisions, and problem solutions based on rational assumptions, observations, or evidence that is logically connected to the conclusion.
- 3.4 The student will consider alternative premises, alternative data or information when trying to make a decision.
- 3.5 The student will correct flawed arguments: flawed premises, flawed inferences, and flawed conclusions, decisions, and problem solutions.
- 3.6 The student will recognize that some problems are structured and narrow and that some arguments are ill-structured and complicated.
- 3.7 The student will appreciate the influence of critical thinking on self and others.
- 3.8 The student will recognize ethical and scholastically disciplined critical thinking, such as using honest premises, real data, rational conclusions, versus unethical and scholastically undisciplined critical thinking, such as propaganda, dishonest arguments, and conclusions reached based on emotion.
Input Discussion:
Goal 4 Learning Outcomes

Goal 4
“Effectively employ critical thinking skills in written and oral communication”
(University Studies, 2005, p. 2).

Objectives for Goal 4

4.1 The student will read critically the works of authors, researchers, and peers.

4.2 The student will write persuasive arguments to reach valid conclusions, decisions, and problem solutions.

4.3 The student will write using correct grammar, mechanics, punctuation, sentence structure, spelling, and vocabulary.

4.4 The student will correctly cite references and quotations and abide by the ethics of writing, such as not plagiarizing.

4.5 The student will clearly communicate clear arguments and conclusions, decisions, or problem solutions through the spoken word.

4.6 The student will clearly communicate persuasive arguments, conclusions, decisions, or problem solutions through the spoken word.

4.7 The student will clearly communicate through the spoken word using correct grammar, vocabulary, and word usage.
Goal 5
The student will transfer critical thinking skills from one situation to another.

Objectives for Goal 5

- 5.1 The student will apply critical thinking to situations outside of the context of his or her major/discipline.
- 5.2 The student will design and conduct research appropriate to the modes of inquiry of his or her major/discipline (University Studies, 2005, see objective six). (This objective is not to be confused with typical term papers and reports.)
- 5.3 The student will apply critical thinking in a context that extends his or her global awareness and cultural competence (University Studies, 2005, see objective 11).
Additional thought needs to be given to the extent to which certain critical thinking learning outcomes should be taught during particular years of a student’s progression through the University. There are at least two perspectives. **Will we compare students from department to department or will we compare sophomores to juniors within any given department?** If we compare the former, then articulation (or the teaching of specific outcomes in specific years) will be necessary. If we compare the latter, then articulation is less necessary.
**QEP Coordinator** is responsible for the overall implementation of the QEP

- The **QEP Coordinator** is responsible for the overall implementation of the QEP and reports to the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Research (institutional effectiveness). He or she will work with the QEP Advisory Committee and the QEP Assessment Taskforce to ensure that the QEP is carried out as planned and make revisions when necessary. The Coordinator will work closely with the Academy of Teaching and Learning to facilitate professional development. The Coordinator works closely with department chairs to ensure that the process of curriculum integration of QEP student learning outcomes meets those specifications described in this plan and helps departments “tailor” instruction to address the teaching and learning of critical thinking. The Coordinator is responsible for posting student outcome achievement data as related to the standardized institutional assessment on the QEP information management system, for analyzing data, interpreting data, and revising the QEP accordingly. Therefore, the QEP Office is going to need a support staff member, and all in the QEP office must work closely with the information management system administrator. Department chairs are ultimately responsible for ensuring that professors post relevant, in-class assessment data to the information management system. Additionally, the QEP Office must work closely with the Division of Information Technology to ensure the scanning of annual standardized institutional assessment or the management of the assessment online. The Coordinator is also in charge of preparing the draft five-year report for A&T’s SACS liaison to submit to SACS and for reporting any “appreciable changes” to the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Research (institutional effectiveness) so that it, in turn, can file an “appreciable change report” with SACS. The QEP Coordinator should keep that office informed on a regular basis. The QEP Coordinator is also responsible for continuing to market the QEP across the University community beyond the pre-SACS reaffirmation on-campus visit.
QEP Advisory Committee provides review and advice to the QEP Coordinator in all aspects of QEP implementation.

- The QEP Advisory Committee is responsible for providing review and advice to the QEP Coordinator in all aspects of QEP implementation. This includes providing input into the finalized design of the professional development program, the tracking of the assessment development process conducted by the Assessment Taskforce, implementation by departments, collection and interpretation of assessment data, collection and interpretation of QEP program evaluation data, and QEP implementation revision. The Advisory Committee should have a representative from the Office of Planning, Assessment, and Research; from the Faculty Senate, from the Staff Senate, each school/college including Bluford Library, from Student Affairs in general, from the Center for Academic Excellence, and from the Chancellor’s Cabinet.
Assessment Taskforce is primarily responsible for developing A&T’s general assessment of critical thinking student learning outcomes. The Assessment Taskforce is primarily responsible for developing A&T’s general assessment of critical thinking student learning outcomes to be used across departments. It is also to recommend assessment specifications for additional, in-class assessments developed by the departments. The Taskforce will monitor the validity and reliability of the general and specific assessments and recommend changes accordingly. It assesses the assessment system. The Assessment Taskforce should be comprised of members with working knowledge of statistical processes and experience in psychological and/or sociological research.
The **Academy of Teaching and Learning** is primarily responsible for the professional development program and is assisted by the QEP Office’s support staff.

The **Department Chairperson** is responsible for making sure that professors and instructors integrate curriculum and instruction that address QEP student learning outcomes. The chair is also responsible for supporting the professors’ participation in QEP professional development (provided by the University), and the chair makes sure that the **Department QEP Assessment Coordinator** is helping professors and instructors design assessments on in-class assignments based on specifications and is helping professors and instructors report in-class student achievement data to the QEP information management system.

The **Professors and Instructors** are responsible for attending University sponsored professional development. They are responsible for deciding where in their various courses the specific critical thinking student learning outcomes should be integrated in coordination with any plans of freshman-through-senior-year curriculum articulation. They will design in-class instruction and assignments to deliberately and explicitly teach critical thinking in the context of the course content. Assessment design should be based on specifications from the Assessment Taskforce. Professors and Instructors are responsible for making sure in-class assessment data is posted to the information management system.
The Advisor is responsible for developing a critical thinking remediation plan in cooperation with any advisees who are scoring below expectations on critical thinking benchmark assessments. The advisor should check advisees’ benchmark scores during each advisement period. The advisor should also monitor the progress of students who return from academic suspension. The Center for Academic Excellence should play a role in remediation of underachieving students.

**Student Affairs** is responsible for providing informal, critical thinking-related education as the topic interfaces with various programs and efforts in that division.

The Students are responsible for helping to develop a culture of scholastic excellence in critical thinking. Students must develop and maintain their self-awareness of their own growth in critical thinking skills and judge the quality of their own critical thinking. Students must become willing to participate meaningfully in class discussions and other means for developing their critical thinking skills. Students who perform below expectations on in-class critical thinking assessments are responsible for getting help from their professors and instructors. Students who perform below expectations on critical thinking benchmark assessments are responsible for working with their advisors to develop a remediation plan.
The **QEP Information Management System Administrator** is responsible for maintaining the QEP information management system in order for it to receive data from departments and the QEP Office. He or she must coordinate with the QEP Coordinator and the Registrar to ensure that benchmark assessments are available to professors, advisors, students, and other QEP related personnel via the Banner system.

The **Registrar** must coordinate with the QEP Information Management System Administrator and the QEP Coordinator to ensure that benchmark assessments are available to professors, advisors, students, and other QEP related personnel via the Banner system.

The **Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning, Assessment, and Research** is responsible for facilitating the satisfactory conduct of the QEP Office by coordinating with and supervising the QEP Coordinator. She is responsible for including QEP student learning outcome assessment data and QEP program evaluation data in the overall institutional effectiveness process. She is responsible for reporting QEP progress to SACS.
The **Provost** is responsible for providing financial support and leadership that emphasizes thoughtful implementation of the QEP.

The **Chancellor** is responsible for maintaining the QEP as an emphasis in the University’s strategic plan, and he is responsible for emphasizing the importance of sustaining the QEP effort.

The **Board of Trustees** is responsible for encouraging the sustained implementation of the QEP.

The **Larger University Community (including Staff and Alumni)** is responsible for contributing to the development of a culture of assessment and scholastic excellence because such a culture will provide a foundation for the success of the QEP.
Input Discussion: Assessment

Formative and Summative Assessments

- **Freshman Year Student Assessments**
  - Formative student learning outcome achievement assessment through in-class assignments.
  - Formative assessment of satisfaction through Student Opinion forms (course evaluations by students).

- **Benchmark:** Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through an *end-of-year, University-wide*, standardized critical thinking test *for all undergraduates*.

- Summative assessment of student satisfaction through a survey administered with the standardized critical thinking assessment.
Formative and Summative Assessments

- **Sophomore Year Student Assessments**
  - Formative student learning outcome achievement assessment through in-class assignments.
  - Formative assessment of student satisfaction through Student Opinion forms (course evaluations by students).

- **Benchmark:** Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through an *end-of-year, University-wide*, standardized critical thinking test.

- **Benchmark:** Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through *portfolio review* within departments at the *sophomore year*.

- Summative assessment of student satisfaction through a survey administered with the standardized critical thinking assessment.

- Advisors review achievement of students who were on critical thinking remediation plans.
Formative and Summative Assessments

- **Junior Year Student Assessments**
  - Formative student learning outcome achievement assessment through in-class assignments.
  - Formative assessment of satisfaction through Student Opinion forms (course evaluations by students).

- **Benchmark:** Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through an *end-of-year, University-wide*, standardized critical thinking test.

- Summative assessment of student satisfaction through a survey administered with the standardized critical thinking assessment.

- Advisors review achievement of students who were on critical thinking remediation plans.
Formative and Summative Assessments

- **Senior Year Student Assessments**
  - Formative student learning outcome achievement assessment through in-class assignments.
  - Formative assessment of student satisfaction through Student Opinion forms (course evaluations by students).
  - **Benchmark:** Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through an *end-of-year, University-wide*, standardized critical thinking test.

- **Benchmark:** Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through *portfolio review* within departments at the senior year in capstone courses.

- Summative assessment of student satisfaction through a survey administered with the standardized critical thinking assessment.

- Advisors review achievement of students who were on critical thinking remediation plans.
Input Discussion: Assessment

Formative and Summative Assessments

- **Faculty and Staff Annual Assessments**
  - Formative assessment of satisfaction in each instance of professional development for the year.
  - **Benchmark:** Summative assessment through an *end-of-year, satisfaction survey on the QEP professional development program.*
  - **Benchmark:** Summative assessment through an *end-of-year, satisfaction survey on the QEP overall program, effectiveness, support*

- **QEP Advisory Committee’s Overall Annual Assessment**
  - Formatively reviews data analyses as they become available.
  - Summative review of comprehensive assessment data.

- **QEP Assessment Taskforce’s Assessment of the Comprehensive Assessment System**
  - Summative review of the comprehensive assessment system.
Input Discussion: Comprehensive Assessment

Comprehensive Assessment of Critical Connections

- Assessment Taskforce designs a standardized University critical thinking assessment. This assessment is the annual benchmarking test for student achievement of learning outcomes related to critical thinking. Different forms of the test will be used because the same basic assessment will be administered four times to a student over the course of the student’s stay at the University.

- Departments design department assessments based on specifications provided to all departments from the Assessment Taskforce.

- Professors design in-class/in-lab assessments. Essay tests are fine but these should also include authentic assessments such as research studies, market research, problem-solving activities, design processes.

- Assessment rubrics are developed by the Assessment Taskforce to be adapted by departments for use in assessing authentic assessments/assignments by professors.

- Departments send in-class student achievement data up to the data management system.

- Do we want to require portfolios? At the last input session, yes was the answer.

- Do we want to eventually require students to pass the standardized assessment in order to graduate? At the last input session, no was the answer.
Input Discussion: Comprehensive Assessment

Comprehensive Assessment of Critical Connections

- Do we want an end-of-year standardized assessment every year for all students? At the last input session, yes was the answer, or do we want to have a benchmark standardized assessment at, say for example, the end of the sophomore year and at the end of the senior year?
- Should there also be standardized formative assessments to avoid “data overload?”
- Formative student learning outcome achievement assessment through in-class assignments.
- Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through an end-of-year, University-wide, standardized critical thinking test for all undergraduates.
- Summative student learning outcome achievement assessment through portfolio review within departments at the sophomore and senior years, with seniors being assessed in the department's capstone course.
- Departments should appoint a QEP assessment coordinator.
Comprehensive Assessment of Critical Connections

- Formative assessment of satisfaction through Student Opinion forms.
- Formative assessment of professor, staff, and administrator satisfaction.
- Formative assessment of each instance of professional development.
- Summative assessment of student satisfaction through a survey administered with the standardized critical thinking assessment.
- Summative assessment of professor, staff, and administrator satisfaction at the end of each year (including summative assessment of satisfaction with professional development at the end of each year).
- Summative assessment through student, faculty, staff, and administrator focus groups.
- The assessment system should be able to determine the effectiveness of Student Affairs and Bluford Library when it comes to their contributions to the development of students’ critical thinking abilities.
Comprehensive Assessment of Critical Connections

- Summative assessment through a review of the annual QEP budget.
- The QEP Coordinator and QEP Advisory Committee change the QEP based on the assessment findings, and they make recommendations to the administration regarding those changes that only the administration can make, such as funding.
- In the first year of implementation, the primary objective of assessment will be to develop valid and reliable in-class assignment and portfolio rubrics and the standardized University assessment.
- In the second year of implementation, the primary objective of the assessment system will be to conduct a quasi-experiment to demonstrate critical thinking instructional effectiveness in a pretest-posttest control group design.
- While changes will certainly be made in the first and second years, in the third, fourth, and fifth years of implementation, the main goals of the comprehensive assessment system will be to improve student achievement of learning outcomes and improve and revise the QEP.
Input Discussion: End First Summer Input Session

- This is where we left off last week.
Professional development sessions should be scheduled in annual series.
The first year of professional development should focus on applying the basics of critical thinking throughout the university’s curriculum.
The fall semester of the second year should focus on “Understanding Content as a Mode of Thinking” (Elder, 2004, no page/online).
The spring semester of the second year should focus on helping students to read and write for substance.
Subsequent years of professional development should focus on the various specific approaches to and varieties of critical thinking.
Provide additional follow-up opportunities, such as informal discussions and webinars, in order to keep the learning “alive” and allow further application of what was learned in the first professional development session of the year (Elder, 2004).
The following is a description of those things that must be addressed in professional development.

- Critical thinking basics.
- Improving reading and writing as they relate to critical thinking.
- Examples for how to teach each critical thinking outcome in various disciplines and situations (e.g.: conflict resolution).
- Disciplines as “modes of inquiry.”
- How to integrate critical thinking into the department’s curriculum.
- How to tie in undergraduate student research with critical thinking.
- How to tie in global awareness and cultural competency with critical thinking.
- How to integrate the department’s content and critical thinking with other disciplines in other departments.
- Assessment of critical thinking.
- How to assess the transfer of critical thinking in everyday life.
- Informal education for critical thinking.
- Critical thinking learning communities.
Input Discussion: Securing Buy-In

How do you get faculty and staff to be willing to teach critical thinking?

Givens
- Democratic, bottom up (fac, staff, admin, student, alum) topic selection will have helped.
- SACS requirement
- Part of the Strategic Plan
- Chancellor, deans, and chairs like it

But what else
- Professional development on all aspects will help.
- Make it part of the evaluation and reward system.
- Demonstrate the benefits to students.
Marketing Critical Connections

- Once the QEP topic is developed, the whole University must know of it and why it is important. Everyone must know what the QEP is or SACS will make a recommendation.

- Marketing subcommittee, and lead marketing person, should have QEP marketing as their primary responsibility. They must be engaging of the whole University and energetic in their efforts.

- **Print Materials:**
  - Parking hang tags
  - Banners on key buildings
  - Posters in dorms and all buildings
  - Poster on closed circuit TV
  - Aggie Report, Register, A&T Magazine
  - Materials that each professor can teach to his or her own students
  - University homepage
  - Sports ticker at the stadium /gym
  - Give-a-ways at key locations [pencils, calculators, note pads]
  - Tent cards in the cafeteria and in student lounge areas across campus, in the library
  - Screen savers across campus

- **Human Intervention:**
  - Radio show
  - Regular radio ads
  - Promotional contests across all groups of students: Greeks, department clubs, dorms, cafeteria, etc.
  - Information sessions with school/college administrators, faculty, and staff
  - Information sessions with ALL divisions, NOT JUST Academic Affairs
  - Visit each department
  - Visit each office
  - Contest rewards (iTunes gift cards)
  - Critical Thinking Critter (circulates among students, quizzes them, gives out rewards)
Input Discussion: Marketing the QEP

Results of Student QEP Marketing Focus Groups
Marketing students from all sorts of majors in and out of the School of Business and Economics participated. Greek Council reps and SGA reps were invited.

Names and Slogans

Critical Connections: It’s All about Critical Thinking
Critical Connections: Teaching Student How to Think, Not What to Think
Thinking Beyond Borders
What would thinking do?
Moving Forward with Critical Thinking
Problem Solving: No Borders, No Boundaries
Critical Thinking: Elevating Education Beyond Borders
Critical Thinking: Connecting the Pieces Beyond Borders
Input Discussion: Marketing the QEP

Names and Slogans

Critical Thinking: Your Guide to Universal Decision Making
Input Discussion: Marketing the QEP

Names and Slogans

Connections: It’s about Thinking
Input Discussion: Marketing the QEP

Names and Slogans
Marketing Committee now is liking the following.

For the name:  
*Critical Thinking*

For the slogans:  
Banner and Posters  
“We teach students *how to think, not what to think.*”

For equating the terms QEP and Critical Thinking  
**Got QEP? QEP = CT**
Marketing Committee meets tomorrow from 9 am to 10 am in 103 Price.