

University of South Carolina
Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal Committee
Minutes
April 14, 2010
11:00 a.m.

Attendees: Helen Doerpinghaus (Ex-Officio), Michelle Faucett (student), Susanne Hicklin (Institutional Assessment), Sarah Krivak (International Programs), Jeremy Lane (Music), Jed Lyons (CTE), John McDermott (Economics), Phil Moore (Ex-officio), Bruce Nims (Lancaster), Irma Van Scoy (Education/Chair).

Absent: Val Littlefield (History), Dennis Pruitt (Ex-Officio), John Gardner (ex-officio)

1. The minutes of the two last meetings (March 11, 2010; March 31, 2010) were distributed and approved.
2. There was a preliminary discussion of the risk and return of the 10th Dimension proposal. Irma Van Scoy read the list of questions that she had posed earlier for consideration by the three sub-groups (10th Dimension, International, and Service Learning). These questions raised issues of risk and return, cost and benefit, and learning outcomes. Phil Moore noted the existence of a 16-page document about Service Learning.
3. It was agreed that we would split up into the three sub-groups to address those and other questions. This took about 40 minutes.
4. Upon our return, each group reported on the discussion in their group.
5. The first group to report was the Service Learning group (SL). Jed Lyons presented the report of their discussion. The following points were noted:
 - a. Jed listed some of the many colleges already engaged in SL, including Engineering and Education. Some were providing professional preparation, but many were not. Helen said that an academic focus was necessary for SL.
 - b. Irma raised the issue of the number of students who would participate in service learning and the possibility that all students have some exposure, even if brief. Others could be given more.
 - c. Irma also suggested the possibility of a certificate upon completion of a certain number of SL courses as has been suggested for international experiences.
 - d. Jed noted that at times we think in terms of Columbia, or the world, but little in between (e.g., state and national). Helen agreed that that national exposure should be part of the mixture and noted the example of USC students having gone to New Orleans to help after Katrina.
6. Sarah Krivak reported for the International group.

- a. Sarah noted that this group had emphasized the ties to the other two groups, SL and 10D. She said the 10D could be an essential clearinghouse to connect projects thematically. For example: someone interested in hunger in Columbia (SL) could also research hunger in Africa (International).
 - b. Sarah explained that there were many opportunities already, so that it would be cost-effective to build the QEP around this theme.
 - c. Title VI funding is available, and has been accessed by Michigan State and Iowa. They have self-directed programs and language programs that we might emulate.
 - d. It was mentioned that condensed, two-week courses at the end of normal courses might be a way to infuse the curriculum or even realize short trips abroad.
 - e. Sarah noted that International and cultural aspects arise in unexpected places, like Math (she mentioned Mosque construction) and natural Sciences. She also pointed to the First Year Reading Experience as a source of Global Engagement.
 - f. Finally, it was noted that the Walker Institute, the CTE, and linked courses were all possible resources.
7. Phil Moore reported for the 10th Dimension group.
- a. Phil emphasized that the 10D project is a way to make connections across the themes. He also pointed out that the other two themes, SL and International, were actually two of the three “Pillars” already built into the new Carolina Core. The third is undergraduate research and the group suggested that we consider making “research” part of the QEP.
 - b. Phil mentioned that Learning Outcome description might be a concern with the 10D proposal, but that their group thought that the virtue of the plan was to synthesize the learning outcomes of the other two themes.
 - c. Helen emphasized the novelty of the 10D proposal. She thought it would be important to see if anyone else had similar experiences from which we could learn.
 - d. Bruce wondered how long it would take to implement. Helen said a small-scale prototype existed, but that the original group that designed it was now out of the picture. It was up to us to find someone to design it, either web-based, or phone-based (via apps).
 - e. Irma expressed concern about the technology involved. Phil and Helen thought it was more about integration and connections, not the technology per se. Phil noted that the database was most important and independent of the interface. Jeremy and Jed noted practical difficulties in tagging courses and, especially, different sections of the same course. Jed mentioned constant turnover each semester; Jeremy pointed to the need for non-majors more than majors for good information.
 - f. Helen suggested that the Curriculum and Course Change Committee of the university could help with the tagging process during the introduction phase for new courses.

8. It was agreed that each group leader would synthesize their comments in a 1-page document that could be circulated to everyone. Then, an attempt would be made to write a preliminary draft of the QEP, integrating the ideas of all groups.
9. The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.