

University of South Carolina
Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal Committee
Minutes
June 14, 2010
1:30 p.m.

Attendees: Mary Alexander (Ex-officio), Ashley Cohen-Brunell (student), John Gardner (Ex-officio), Susanne 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: Helen Doerpinghaus (Ex-officio), Michelle Faucett (student), Bruce Nims (Lancaster)

1. Mary Alexander, who is responsible for the SACS budget, was introduced to the Committee. Mary has been added as an ex-officio member of the QEP Proposal Committee.
2. The minutes of last meeting (May 12, 2010) were distributed and approved with minor corrections.
3. Irma Van Scoy requested comments from IdeaPOP that may relate to the QEP. Irma mentioned that Davis Baird gave a presentation on how the Honors College manages beyond-the-classroom experiences for honors students and described the benefits of these experiences to students. Given that this is similar to the ideas surrounding the QEP, Irma suggested that the Honors College may serve as a model or pilot and that we can learn from their experiences.
4. Irma stated that the main agenda at this meeting was to work towards consensus on the big ideas of the QEP.
5. Major topics of discussion included the following:
 - a. Focus: The Committee agreed that the focus of the QEP is integrative/integrated learning with the inclusion of service learning and international studies as components of the plan.
 - b. Definition: Irma shared the rationale behind the definition outlined in the Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal. Irma pointed out the AACU definition of integrative learning and the AACU's rubric on integrative learning.
 - i. Irma shared a handout summarizing five possible components of integrative/integrated learning and the committee discussed how we should define the term integrative/integrated learning. Irma asked everyone to consider how they would define integrative/integrated learning for our QEP plan, i.e., what would each of committee member describe as the two most important ideas in integrative/integrated

learning? Committee members suggested the following components of integrated/integrative learning:

- For students to put theory into practice
 - For students to become actively involved and make connections between experiences
 - Significant guidance and feedback during experiences
 - Moving students toward independence
 - Student reflection on experiences and their future goals
 - Integrating the campus experience itself
 - Making connections more visible for students.
 - Integrating within- and beyond-the-classroom experiences and making learning more intentional
 - Individualized learning plans so each student achieves his/her highest level of knowledge and competencies
 - For students to learn more deeply and act more intentionally
- ii. As an additional way for the Committee to clarify the goals of the QEP, Irma asked committee members to consider a title that would capture the “core” of the QEP. Suggestions included:
- Learn More Deeply, Act More Intentionally
 - Connecting Learning Experiences
 - Making Connections for Deeper Learning
 - Integrating Intellectual Experiences
 - Engaging Intellectual Experiences
 - Sharing and Creating New Knowledge through Integrative Learning and Living
 - Empowering Integrative Learning and Actions: For Now, For Later, Forever
 - Enhancing Learning (or Quality) through Integration
 - Keeping ‘USConnect’ as an opening title followed by a colon and one of the more detailed titles
- iii. Irma synthesized the Committee’s responses and suggested that the two main components of our definition of integrated/integrative learning are
- Participation in a wide range of experiences within and beyond the classroom, and
 - Reflection, including both reflection on immediate experience and reflection over time which integrates a broad array of experiences
- c. Learning Outcomes: Irma asked the Committee if the learning outcomes outlined within the QEP proposal were stated correctly or if they needed to be revised in light of our new understanding of the big ideas behind the QEP. John Gardner reminded the Committee that the SACS team will likely be interested in evidence. That is, how is the QEP committee going to know that we have accomplished our goals? John suggested we may need to consider something concrete, such as assessment of student portfolios.

There was a discussion regarding students' planning and selection of experiences as a learning outcome (draft goal number one). It was suggested that it might be more appropriate to include student planning as a step in the process rather than as a learning outcome.

There was consensus that participation and reflection should be included in the learning outcomes (draft goals number 2 and 3), but exact wording was not discussed. Learning outcomes will be discussed further at the next meeting.

- d. Implementation: The Committee reaffirmed the commitment to use Orientation, University 101, and the First-Year Reading Experience as vehicles for introducing students to the big ideas behind the QEP. The Committee concurred that implementation should include making connections among existing opportunities more visible. Implementation will be discussed further at the next meeting, June 24, 2010.

6. Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.