<u>In Attendance:</u> Mary Alexander, Helen Doerpinghaus, John Gardner, Sarah Krivak, Jeremy Lane, John McDermott , Irma Van Scoy

Meeting called to order at 9:30 am.

A. Opening of the meeting
    1. Due to small number of attendees at this meeting and complexity of the last meeting, review and acceptance of previous minutes were postponed until August meeting.
    2. Helen and others noted the significant progress made in the past few meetings; basic plan for QEP proposal seems to be in place.

B. Review of document 'Potential Data for Assessment'

    1. <u>Introduction</u>. Irma noted that the Western Carolina University's QEP was used as model for format/structure of the document. She indicated a correction on p. 2: cross out 'and other' in #1. She suggested we begin review of the document on the section on student performance assessments and then move to assessments of institutional actions. The committee agreed.

        Irma noted that the document had been developed to show benchmarks. Year 1 would serve as baseline; Years 2 & 3 are similar in that students would be identifying and engaging in out-of-class experiences. Assessments of Years 2 & 3 would focus on student engagement and assessment of individual experiences with some attention to synthesis across experiences. Year 4 would focus on students' integration/synthesis of experiences throughout their college careers. Post-graduate data has also been added.

    2. <u>Review of assessment of student performance</u>. The committee supported using the assessment strategies of student performance listed in the document and there was further discussion related to assessment of each learning outcome.
        a. In relation to the first learning outcome the committee particularly discussed the following:
            i. Survey of precollege students re: engagement in 'beyond classroom' activities; track and compare with similar survey at end-of-degree.

    ii.   Use of orientation and U101 as potential groups for data collection; could also be used for getting feedback to help with revisions and assessments of extra-curricular activities.

    iii.   Identifying and collecting data from assessments that are already in place on such experiences as large group activities (e.g., MLK day functions), service in local schools and other settings, etc.

    iv.   Tying in with Carolina Core (CC) assessments, particularly in relation to the VESR learning outcome which seems to be the CC outcome most closely related to the QEP.   Data on VESR will be gathered for the CC in students' first two years.

    v.   Student focus group interviews as relatively easy to implement and a good source of data.

    vi.   The NSSE survey as providing helpful data. A budget concerned was raised regarding continued administration of the survey. Helen will check on this.

    vii.   Adding specific questions to the university course evaluations to collect data related to the QEP.

b.   In relation to the second learning outcome (LO), the committee made the following points and additional suggestions:

    i.   It seems appropriate that year 4 data will focus less on LO 1 and more on LO 2.

    ii.   It was recommended that the Career Center might be a good resource to use for collection of longitudinal data; i.e. interviews with incoming freshmen, then as they progress, continued interviews until they finish.

    iii.   The senior-year integrative course of some units (culminating assessment designed to help students make connections between CC courses and their academic major) may include assessment of the VESR learning outcome. That data could be compared to VESR data collected during the students' first two years.

    iv.   Other 'easy data' might be helpful (e.g., percentage of students who change majors, number of years from start to completion). Much of this data is already available through other campus resources.

    v.   Exit surveys could provide helpful feedback, but exit surveys are not currently implemented by all units. This would have to be investigated.

    vi.   Post-graduate surveys are a good source of additional information, but return rates are typically very low.

3.   <u>Review of 'Process Evaluation'.</u>

a.   The importance of organizing, coordinating, and better communicating to students what experiences are available rather than just increasing the number of opportunities were noted.

b. Regarding technology, it was suggested that we invite the 10th Dimension authors back to committee meeting for further discussion. The potential integration of social media as part of the technology for the QEP was discussed.
c. The possibility of a co-curricular transcript was discussed. Many noted that several universities are moving this way. The potential for using Blackboard as a data collection tool if co-curricular transcripts are implemented ('mine the system') was suggested. Several people noted the problems with self-report data & verification of experiences.

C.   Plans for increasing the visibility of the QEP and obtaining broad input

Irma noted that the key to getting optimal effectiveness from the QEP is faculty buy-in. Helen and others suggested possible venues for communication/presentation of the QEP to faculty, including visits to regional campuses, presentation at unit-level faculty meetings, faculty senate, and faculty forums, an updated QEP website, workshops through the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), and articles in the USC Times. This would also entail development of talking points and a basic presentation that could be used by committee members. Irma will talk with Jed about possibilities at the CTE for the fall since their schedule is likely already under development. Plans for communication and broader university involvement will be discussed further at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.