

Western Carolina University SACS Review  
The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)  
SACS Core Requirement 2.12  
UC Cardinal Room  
2:00 p.m., November 10, 2005  
Meeting Minutes

Attended:

Cindy Atterholt- Chemistry and Physics; Heidi Buchanan- Library; Carol Burton- SACS Director; David Coffee- Accountancy, Finance and Entrepreneurship; Jane Eastman- Anthropology & Sociology; Elizabeth Frazier- Registrar's Office; A.J. Grube- Office of the Provost; Bill Haggard- Student Affairs; Tammy Haskett- Orientation; Wade Livingston- CSP Graduate Student; Patsy Miller- Asheville Programs; Irene Mueller- Health Sciences; Co- Chair Scott Philyaw-History; Nory Prochaska- Math and Computer Science; Co-Chair Brian Railsback- Honors College; Bill Studenc- Public Relations; Julie Walters-Steele- University Center

Absent:

Grace Allen- Accountancy, Finance and Entrepreneurship; Troy Barksdale- University Planning; Jennifer Brown- Athletics; Kyle Carter- Provost; Phil Cauley- Admissions; Gordon Mercer-Public Policy Institute; Bob Orr- Office of the CIO; Kadence Otto- Health and Human Performance; Newton Smith-Chair of the Faculty Senate; Mike Stewart- Facilities Management

QEP Topic:

**“AEIOU: Academic Engagement Inside and Outside the University”**

Agenda:

I. Calendar Review

- Committee members need to submit their spring semester calendars to Scott or Brian so meeting times and days for the spring semester can be scheduled in advance.
- Ann Chard, SACS Liaison, will be on campus Nov. 14; Carol reviewed Ann's schedule for her visit.
- Committee members were reminded to attend the luncheon meeting at 11:30 a.m. in the Ramsey Center Hospitality Suite and the university community reception at 3:00 p.m. in the UC Grand Room; both events will conclude with a question and answer period.
- Ann Chard will answer questions about the QEP and compliance. She will have read a draft outline of the QEP but will not have read any of the compliance reports.
- The committee was asked to generate questions and concerns related to the QEP for Ann Chard during the question/answer period.

II. Suggested Questions and Concerns for Ann Chard:

- Process Questions
  - 1) Is our QEP's focus clear?
  - 2) Is our QEP manageable?
  - 3) What recommendations do you have for streamlining our QEP?
  - 4) How can we resolve the issues around having a QEP that is focused but includes the university community?

- 5) What recommendations do you have for our process beyond this point? How would you evaluate our progress, considering our timeline and the on-site visit in April, 2007? (are we behind, ahead, just right?)
- 6) How do you perceive the relationship between strategic planning and the QEP?
- 7) How should we reflect this relationship in our planning/document?

- Implementation Questions

- 1) Is our definition of engagement succinct and clear?
- 2) How specific should our recommendations for implementing the QEP be?
- 3) Some QEPs have had action plans included in them? Is this a preference of SACS?
- 4) How specific should our learning (and other) outcomes be? For example, should we develop 3 or 4 outcomes for each of our key areas?
- 5) Can we measure/assess what we plan to do?

- Follow Up Questions

Will you recommend other Quality Enhancement Plans that you have reviewed that could help us to:

- 1) Refine our QEP?
- 2) Address our assessment questions?

### III. Subcommittee Reports

- All subcommittees reviewed the draft outline of the QEP.
- The subcommittee on Academic and Co-curricular Programs raised the issue of undergraduate research and its inclusion in the implementation of A.E.I.O.U.
- Scott reminded the members that at a previous meeting the term “undergraduate research” was changed to “student research”.
- Carol mentioned that she had edited the draft where mention of the undergraduate research conference appeared. She reminded the committee that the QEP should be representative of campus constituents’ concerns and the feedback generated from earlier meetings; the undergraduate research program should not seem to be a cornerstone of the QEP unless it was a recommendation raised in the early stages of developing the QEP.
- Brian stated the Undergraduate Research Conference was included as a component of the QEP for outcome and assessment purposes. Brian considers undergraduate research to be an example of the application of knowledge beyond the classroom.
- Discussion ensued regarding undergraduate research and its place in the QEP.

### IV. Discussion and Feedback about the QEP Draft

- The committee questioned the footnote on page 3 which defines a “focused growth institution”. The committee agreed the footnote should remain in the document.
- A.J. Grube shared with the committee that the Strategic Planning Committee deferred to the QEP Committee’s definition of engagement and will incorporate this definition into the University’s strategic plan.
- The committee discussed the time parameters on the desired outcomes mentioned on page 5 in the first paragraph. The suggestion was made to change “future careers” to

- “early careers”.
- Irene mentioned that on page 6 under “Academic and Co-Curricular Programs” internships and co-ops of the academic departments are not mentioned. Irene also mentioned the professional practice experiences and clinicals required by programs within her college were also excluded. Nory stated this issue was raised several weeks ago during the QEP workshop and the decision was made to have the “Careers” subcommittee cover these areas.
  - On page 7 under the first bullet, Irene suggested the “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning” be mentioned. After more discussion, Carol suggested moving all three of the bullet points to another section. Another suggestion was to remove the bullet points and just list the programs.
  - On the first line, page 8, a recommendation was made to state that the Faculty Center will “publicize engagement, disseminate information about engagement and facilitate collaboration as well as champion and validate engagement efforts.”
  - The section on “Careers” starting on page 8 is still being drafted. More details is required. The focus will be on the four questions developed for the outline.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. Next meeting: November 16 at 1:00 p.m. in the UC Cardinal room. The agenda will focus on debriefing Ann Chard’s visit.