

Western Carolina University SACS Review
The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
SACS Core Requirement 2.12
UC Cardinal Room
1:00 p.m., June 10, 2005
Meeting Minutes

Attended:

Cindy Atterholt- Chemistry and Physics; Troy Barksdale- University Planning;
Carol Burton- SACS Director; Elizabeth Frazier- Registrar's Office;
A.J. Grube- Law, Equity and Auditing; Kadence Otto- Health and Human Performance;
Co- Chair Scott Philyaw-History; Nory Prochaska- Math and Computer Science;
Co-Chair Brian Railsback- Honors College; Newton Smith- English; Mike Stewart- Facilities
Management; Newton Smith- English; Bart Andrus for Julie Walters-Steele- University Center

Absent:

Grace Allen- Accountancy, Finance and Entrepreneurship; Jennifer Brown- Athletics;
Heidi Buchanan- Library; Kyle Carter- Provost; Jane Eastman- Anthropology & Sociology;
Phil Cauley- Admissions; David Coffee- College of Business; Bruce Henderson- Psychology;
Bill Haggard- Student Affairs; Tammy Haskett- Orientation; Nell Leatherwood- Center for Regional
Development; Wade Livingston- CSP Graduate Student; Patsy Miller- Asheville Programs; Gordon
Mercer- College of Arts and Sciences; Irene Mueller- Health Sciences; Bob Orr- Office of the CIO; Bill
Studenc- Public Relations

Agenda:

I. Feedback on the QEP Handouts from Other Universities

Several committee members shared their impressions of the QEP from Clayton College and State University. Carol Burton provided feedback from SACS to Clayton State's QEP:

1) Define the terms student learning, performance, engagement and success. 2) Provide qualitative and quantitative means to assess learning outcomes. 3) Link the program learning outcomes to the QEP.

"The SACS on-site team was impressed with Clayton State, and particularly noted seven strengths". "Theses strengths were: the campus was aware of the QEP; we will have funds to support the QEP; there was enthusiasm for the QEP; there was commitment from the administration and faculty; we were open to new strategies and interventions; we had already made efforts to redefine the University to a culture of learning; and, we are a forward-looking University."

The QEP from NC State was very well received. Scott noted that the NC State QEP acknowledged areas where the university would be challenged by budget issues and suggested WCU might want to do the same. Newt said he knew Sharon Pitt, the Director of Learning and Technology at NC State, and he could contact her for information about the QEP process. Brian mentioned that Hugh Devine's contributions were apparent in NC State QEP and he might also be a resource person.

II. Rough Outline

- Brian presented a rough outline of the QEP draft document.
- It was suggested that the document have an annotated bibliography, and Newt suggested someone from the library help with the bibliography.

- Appendices are required.

Discussion of the draft QEP outline:

Carol suggested the introduction include the development and process used to identify the QEP. Newt said faculty research should be mentioned in order to engage faculty. Several suggestions were made about where to include faculty research in the outline and how to incorporate the millennial campus initiative.

Current service learning issues should be addressed, as well as involvement of Career Services, International Programs and student scholarships were part of the discussion. Documentation of existing programs and participation in the programs are needed to help support the QEP. Are internships or coops required by programs? Make service learning simpler.

III. Outline Subcommittees

- Introduction
- Mission
- Context Section- Newt volunteered for this section which discusses present strengths and weaknesses.
- Assessment- Troy was assigned.
- History- Present the history related to the region.
- Global Outreach

Carol stated the issues of resources and infrastructure need to be throughout the document and not in a separate section. She also said a QEP university committee will need to address support issues and make sure support is clear. Scott suggested resources be a sub-committee. Brian suspected the whole committee will be involved in resource issues. The university should create a permanent structure to monitor the progress of the QEP 5-10 years out.

IV. Next Meeting

- Next meeting scheduled for June 17, 2005 at 1:00 p.m. in the Cardinal Room of the University Center.
- Troy will arrange for the Strategic Planning Committee's report on the internal and external scanning of the university to be presented.
- Brian will e-mail the topic and outline to committee members.
- Carol asked everyone to review the SACS accreditation handbook, Section III, dealing with the QEP (pages 21-28).
- Carol reminded everyone the QEP must have focus, capability, broad based involvement and assessment.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.