

University of South Carolina
Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal Committee
Minutes
March 4, 2010
2:00 p.m.

Attendees: Helen Doerpinghaus (Ex-Officio), Michelle Faucett (student), Susanne Hicklin (Institutional Assessment), Sarah Kivak (International Programs), Jeremy Lane (Music), Val Littlefield (History), John McDermott (Business), Phil Moore (Ex-officio), Bruce Nims (Lancaster), Dennis Pruitt (Ex-Officio), Irma Van Scoy (Education/Chair). Guest: Ebbie Yazdani (student representative on the QEP selection committee).

1. **Welcome/Introductions:** Irma welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for agreeing to serve on the QEP Committee. Members introduced themselves.
2. **Committee operating procedures/minutes:**
 - a. Irma noted that open and honest discussion is the most important element of the committee's procedures and that all committee members should feel free to share their perspectives. She emphasized the importance of our diverse representation including professional staff, faculty, university administrators, and students.
 - b. Irma thanked Jeremy for agreeing to take minutes in advance of today's meeting. The committee agreed to rotate the responsibility of recording minutes and proceed in alphabetical order from Jeremy Lane. Val Littlefield will take the minutes at the next meeting, then Jed Lyons, etc. Minute recorders can take notes by hand or with their own lap top or may request a lap top in advance of the meeting. Notes will be given to Irma who will edit them for distribution to committee with approval at the next meeting. It is anticipated that minutes will be posted on the QEP website.
 - c. Helen pointed out that we do have a QEP website which currently includes the four selected QEP proposals. She noted that the Provost's office will assist in updating the website as the committee's work progresses. It was noted that a link to the website was included in Irma's e-mail.
3. **Committee Charge and Timeline:**
 - a. Irma noted that the *Challenges of Higher Education* handout based on a PowerPoint presentation of Dennis Pruitt provides a nice context for the QEP—what are the “big things” that we are trying to accomplish in higher education such as creating optimal learning environments and helping our students achieve at high levels? She also noted learning outcomes are a key component of the QEP proposal and shared a handout providing sample QEP learning outcomes and the Carolina Core learning outcomes.
 - b. Review of timeline & general procedures:

- i. Irma reviewed the key elements of a successful QEP proposal as represented by the acronym POTTER (participation, outcomes, transformation, timeline, embedded, research),
 - ii. the charge to the committee (emphasizing the development of the proposal followed by nomination of a “lead evaluator” to serve on the SACS on-site team), and
 - iii. the timeline for 2010 (including selection of topic and elements in April-May and a potential pilot in the fall).
- 4. **Introduction to Quality Enhancement Plans:** Phil Moore presented highlights of the QEP process. He stressed the following:
 - a. It is important to select a lead evaluator for the SACS on-site team who will provide significant, yet supportive, feedback for the proposal.
 - b. The compliance elements of SACS should be “checked off” prior to the visit. The primary focus of SACS visit in 2011 will be the QEP.
 - c. The QEP should have a broad-based view – needs to span as many areas across the curriculum as possible; inclusion of both undergraduate & graduate is desirable. The SACS review team will be interested in the degree to which faculty and students express “buy-in” of the QEP proposal.
 - d. The list of questions for the QEP proposal reviewers is a good checklist to use for review of our QEP. The team should also keep in mind the questions listed under the ‘QEP in Simple Terms’ (see handout).
- 5. **Update on development of USC QEP to date:** Helen reviewed the work of the QEP Proposal Selection Committee from last semester.
- 6. **Spring timeline:** Our goal is to meet with the proposal writers for each of the four selected proposals by the end of March and have a QEP topic with a draft of the learning outcomes, institutional goals, general plan for implementation, and broad-based involvement by the beginning of May. Patsy will poll the committee to establish a standard meeting day and time. Approximately five more meetings are anticipated in the spring semester (2 in March, 2 in April, and 1 in May). Summer meetings will be as needed.
- 7. **Overview and discussion of current proposals:** Ebbie and Jeremy, as participants in the QEP proposal selection committee, shared their perspectives on the highlights of the four proposals. Committee discussion ensued. Some noteworthy points:
 - a. Proposals were selected to engage students including not only those who actively seek involvement in the university community, but those who might need encouragement to be more engaged.
 - b. The 10th Dimension was viewed as the center of the proposals, possibly providing an “umbrella” that would bring together elements of the other 3 proposals.
 - c. The proposal on advisement was noted as potentially providing a very helpful service to students in supporting better course selection.

- d. Use of existing resources at USC was a point of commonality and integration. It was noted that the university has existing offices that support service-learning, international studies, and technology that could be used as resources in the plan.
 - e. Issues related to technology include investment of resources, 'updating' faculty on latest resources, making technology more available and current for the students to use in practical ways.
 - f. Benefits of incorporating real-world experience were discussed including the breadth of perspectives and understanding of diversity that students could develop by participating in service-learning and international education and making better connections to the many opportunities available at USC in- and outside of the classroom.
8. **Process for hearing from QEP proposers:** It was agreed that at our two March meetings, we would invite presenters from the selected proposals to present to the committee with 10 minutes to summarize/highlight their proposal followed by 15-20 minutes of discussion. Two groups would be invited to each of the two meetings. The committee brainstormed potential questions /topics for these discussions and noted the importance of a variety of committee members participating in the question and answer sessions. Possible topics/questions included
- a. Breadth of inclusion: Regional campuses? International students?
 - b. 'Living room' question: what would these proposers tell a prospective student about their proposal? Can they describe their proposal in such a way as to get buy-in from varied constituents?
 - c. What exactly are the learning outcomes of the proposal – what will students learn or what skills will they develop?
 - d. What is envisioned as the impact of the proposed QEP – can we track the impact on students through 4 years of UG education and into application in real life? 10 years from now? 40 years from now?

The committee also discussed whether or not the QEP would *require* student participation in certain kinds of activities separate from requiring courses. The relationship between the QEP and the Carolina Core (general education) requirements was briefly discussed.

9. Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m. with thanks to all.