

**University of South Carolina**  
**Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**April 28, 2010**  
**11:00 a.m.**

**Attendees:** Helen Doerpinghaus (Ex-officio), Michelle Faucett (student), Susan Hicklin (Institutional Assessment), Sara Krivak (International Programs), Jeremy Lane (Music), Valinda Littlefield (History), Jed Lyons (CTE), John McDermott (Economics), Phil Moore (Ex-officio), Dennis Pruitt (Ex-officio), Irma Van Scoy (Education/Chair)

**Absent:** John Gardner (Ex-officio), Bruce Nims (Lancaster)

1. The minutes of last meeting (April 14, 2010) were distributed and approved.
2. Irma Van Scoy informed the committee that she was working with Elise Ahyi on the website. There was discussion on design of website to link to various pages such as international studies, service learning.
3. Irma stated that the main agenda at this meeting was to discuss draft of proposal and noted that she had received comments from Dennis Pruitt, Bruce Nims, and John Gardner. She asked Dennis Pruitt to summarize the comments he had made via e-mail to the group. Dennis discussed BOT retreat and the six peaks of excellence presented by USC President and Provost and raised the issue of aligning QEP with some aspects of this new focus such as leadership. The group discussed whether or not leadership should be integrated into the QEP as a more specific goal. Ultimately, it was decided that we needed to focus primarily on the four approved QEP proposals that came through the broad-based system for developing the QEP. These were noted as consistent with supporting students in developing leadership qualities.
4. The group proceeded to engage in a far ranging discussion of the draft proposal. Major topics included the following:
  - a. Major goals/learning outcomes: We want students to draw from and synthesize curricular and co-curricular experiences in constructing knowledge, skills, and values. Another goal is for students to design individual learning paths, take initiative in designing their programs of student and co-curricular experiences, and become life-long learners. The significance of service learning and international studies in broadening students' perspectives was also noted. The potential for the QEP to lessen students' time-to-degree was raised.
  - b. The breadth of the proposal: How much can we realistically accomplish? We need to think carefully if goals are realistic and what is practical with budget constraints. It was suggested that we need one clear idea, e.g., in 5 years faculty and students will understand what integrated learning is and why it is important.
  - c. Connecting QEP proposals: We can make connections between many aspects of the QEPs that have been proposed within the concept of integrated learning

including international studies, service learning, and the technology proposed in the 10<sup>th</sup> Dimension. These can all work together.

- d. Current resources: We are already doing work on integrated learning and need to build on what we already have. There are numerous resources in service learning and international studies including the Office of Student Engagement (there was mention of adding an Office of Student Learning), University 101, Capstone, Honors College, and Women's Studies, and required or recommended courses in other areas.
  - e. Balance: We need to keep a balance between such issues as theory and application and academic versus career concerns. Topics discussed included the significance of beyond the classroom experience and preparation in topics such as financial literacy.
  - f. Practical considerations: Faculty suggested that an important goal is meeting accreditation requirements. Questions were also raised concerning the degree to which the concept of integrated learning is understood and how that would/should impact the proposal. Focus groups with parents to explore how we could clearly communicate integrated learning were suggested. It was reiterated that we need to design the QEP for as broad an impact as possible (i.e., impacting a large number of students).
  - g. Technology: Although our ultimate goal may be to incorporate innovative technologies, we can start as simply as with a website. Development of the database is important including careful selection of key words so that links occur as envisioned. We also need to show that the database has the capability to change.
  - h. Student products: Technology could be used to create student products that demonstrate the integration of their learning, e.g., e-portfolios. USC has e-portfolio capability on Blackboard. It was noted that there needs to be flexibility in determining culminating projects to meet the needs of students and programs in various disciplines.
  - i. Development of the QEP overtime: It was noted that not everything has to be done at once. For example, a focus on undergraduate research could be added later.
- 5. It was suggested that the next draft of the document begin to narrow our focus. It could include an opening paragraph might define integrated learning, its goals, how we propose achieving them, and where they lead students. Irma agreed to send out another draft for the committee's consideration at the May 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - 6. Michelle Faucett noted that she cannot be here in the summer. Irma will work on getting another student representative to attend this summer who the committee agreed could then continue on in the fall.
  - 7. Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.