

MINUTES  
Quality Enhancement Planning  
September 25, 2013  
3:30 – 5:00

**Topic 1: Question from Departments**

The committee first handled the following question from various faculty members: Can a department meet the QEP requirement of submitting tables for upper-division courses by choosing a course in a degree program that doesn't fall into their discipline?

The committee agreed that as long as a course is a core requirement of a degree program, then it can satisfy the requirement. However, departments should make every effort to make sure that their disciplines are represented.

**Topic 2: Survey**

The chair distributed a potential survey intended to collect data directly from the students. After examination, members agreed that the survey was too long and detailed for GST students or freshmen, but a revised version could possibly work for upperclassmen or as an exit survey.

**Topic 3: GST 100**

Members debated the best way(s) to introduce the topic of cultural competence to GST 100 students. The chair offered three alternatives to begin the conversation:

1. The "Iceberg Model"  
(<http://www.aacu.org/meetings/hips/documents/Beyondthetipoftheiceberg.pdf>)
2. "Dead Men's Path" a short story by Chinua Achebe
3. Various articles on Delta heritage written by Dr. Luther Brown  
(<http://deltacenterforcultureandlearning.com/what-is-the-delta/a-collection-of-essays-about-delta-heritage/>)

Members eventually settled on the idea of a shared reading ("Dead Men's Path" will be the initial reading.) which will be accompanied by a guide for mentors to use. Dr. Houston also revisited the idea of giving GST students a brief survey assessing their attitude toward cross-cultural experiences.

During the conversation about what vehicle GST should employ, members ventured into a discussion about the impact and effectiveness of the plan. Although the group did not come to a complete consensus, the prevailing thoughts were that:

1. The QEP Team has worked for nearly two years ensuring that this plan follows all SACS guidelines and has received broad-based approval and participation of the university.
2. The plan can (and should) be modified if the chosen assessment processes identify more appropriate methods or pathways. The QEP must remain flexible and adaptable.

### **Remaining Topics**

The chair ran down a list of other items that the QEP Committee still needs to address. These topics included creating a list of duties for the QEP Director; creating a list of duties for an as-yet-to-be-determined QEP Advisory Board; setting up a schedule for “best practices” workshops; and creating a feedback mechanism for faculty and staff.