

University of South Carolina
Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal Committee Minutes

June 24, 2010

1:30 p.m.

Attendees: Mary Alexander (Ex-officio), Ashley Cohen-Brunell (student), Helen Doerpinghaus (Ex-officio), John Gardner (Ex-officio), Susanne Hicklin (Institutional Assessment), Sarah Krivak (International Programs), Jed Lyons (CTE), John McDermott (Economics), Phil Moore (Ex-officio), Bruce Nims (Lancaster), Dennis Pruitt (Ex-officio), Irma Van Scoy (Education/Chair)

Absent: Michelle Faucett (student), Jeremy Lane (Music), Valinda Littlefield (History)

1. The minutes of last meeting were distributed and approved.
2. Irma noted that since distributing the chart on QEP Goals, Outcomes, and Actions for today's discussion, she also created a one-page, QEP narrative summary that she brought in hard copy for possible discussion at the end of the meeting.
3. Discussion of the Goals, Outcomes and Actions chart focused primarily on the middle two columns: Learning Outcomes and the Key Student Behaviors. Major points included:
 - a. Consensus that the learning outcomes generally reflect what we would like to accomplish.
 - b. The first learning outcome would be clearer with the addition of "**within and** beyond the classroom" and "other experiences" is not really needed. The revised outcome thus reads "Students will engage and reflect on learning opportunities within and beyond the classroom in the context of academic experiences."
 - c. Under key student behaviors for the first learning outcome:
 - i. Change the last bullet under the first learning outcome to read: "Reflect on beyond the classroom experiences and make connections between these experience and academic work." Irma should also work on the language on this bullet to more clearly refer to dispositions (values, ethics), knowledge, and skills so that it clearly addresses more than just "academic work".
 - ii. "Integrating between classes" needs to be added under key behaviors (probably best under the second learning outcome).
 - d. The second learning outcome was agreed to as written. There was a discussion as to whether this outcome should be directed at juniors and seniors. A further discussion ensued regarding how to ensure that students are learning and synthesizing throughout their collegiate career and the complications related to assessing students in a systematic way at multiple points in time.
 - e. There was a discussion on formative vs. summative assessment with points concerning formative assessment as developmental and intended to provide feedback to students to assist them in their growth and summative assessment as occurring at an end-point. It was noted that evaluation in the senior year can be summative for the student, but formative for the program in terms of using the data on student performance to inform program changes.

4. The discussion transitioned to questions regarding what we should assess. Are we assessing outcomes that are unique to the QEP? Could these be assessed by different units in terms of their particular disciplines? Should we be using the QEP to assess one or more of the outcomes of the Carolina Core? What about specific learning outcomes related to service learning and internationalization? Isn't our ultimate goal for students to be invested in society? We're striving to assist students in applying the abstract knowledge from the academy into their "real world" experiences. We're humanizing the theory gained in class. Isn't one of the goals to have students leave as life-long learners? Students should leave with the ability to learn and adapt, have a sense of motivation and curiosity.

There was a consensus that the QEP should have its own learning outcomes, rather than academic specific or general education. These outcomes will complement the Carolina Core, but the QEP assesses engagement and integration of multiple experiences.

It was agreed that the next question we need to answer is "What can we measure to show that the QEP works?" The committee revisited the AACU rubric on integrative learning and concurred that the most productive next step would be for committee members to send Irma suggestions regarding assessment of the QEP outcomes by next Wednesday. She will compile the suggestions and distribute them to the committee for discussion at our next meeting.

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