

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**ENGAGING MINDS: CRITICAL READING FOR COLLEGE SUCCESS**

QEP Co-Director, [REDACTED] QEP Co-Director, [REDACTED]

*Engaging Minds: Critical Reading for College Success*, the University of South Carolina Beaufort's Quality Enhancement Plan, aims to improve the quality of education at USC Beaufort by improving our students' skills as critical readers. Key to this plan is the creation of a campus-wide interdisciplinary community of scholars—faculty, students, and staff—engaged in and devoted to critical reading. To prepare students to join this community, an improved freshman composition curriculum will train students in basic research skills and teach them how to better analyze, evaluate, and construct arguments. To prepare faculty to lead this community, instructors across the curriculum will receive training in how best to teach critical reading.

To create and sustain a campus community of critical readers, USC Beaufort will adopt *The New York Review of Books (NYRB)* as a common reading for all students, faculty, and staff. USC Beaufort's faculty selected the *NYRB* as its common reading because this publication met the major criteria defined by the faculty: (1) we wanted a publication that would both *model* and *provoke* critical reading; (2) we wanted a publication that would *engage* our students through its *relevance* and by *challenging* them to grow as readers; (3) we wanted a publication that would be diverse enough in its offerings to appeal to faculty and students across the disciplines, challenging our students to expand their range of interests and embodying what we mean by "a well-rounded liberal arts education." Because we recognize that a common text cannot by itself make an effective common reading program, we will provide students, faculty, and staff with multiple events, activities, and forums to engage them with this reading and to forge a common community of critical readers. Regardless of format, these events and activities will all be structured to improve the way our students analyze, evaluate, and construct arguments.

USC Beaufort will revise its freshman composition courses to successfully initiate students into our community of critical readers, giving them the skills to critically read texts as sophisticated as the *NYRB*. This new curriculum will incorporate essays from the *NYRB*, along with other materials and an improved pedagogy, to teach students how to better analyze, evaluate, and construct arguments. Working closely with university librarians on those basic research skills inseparable from effective critical reading, students will construct their own researched arguments. By the end of this course, students should be well equipped to participate in USC Beaufort's community of critical readers.

To prepare faculty across the disciplines to lead a campus-wide community of critical readers, USC Beaufort will make a significant commitment to faculty development. A series of workshops and seminars will help prepare faculty to make the most of our common reading program and most effectively teach critical reading skills within the context of their own disciplines. English faculty will receive training to teach the revised English composition curriculum, and the library will add resources to its collection to support this new initiative.

*Engaging Minds* is thoughtfully designed and will be carefully implemented and assessed (using, among other instruments, the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test, with a pre-test/post-test structure) to ensure that it has the maximum positive impact on our students' critical reading skills. The entire university community was involved in selecting the topic and designing the plan, which grows out of "a broad based institutional process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment." While USC Beaufort has made a substantial commitment of physical, financial, and personnel resources to *Engaging Minds*, we have been careful to stay well within its institutional capabilities. We believe that this is a plan with enormous potential to enhance student learning. Because critical reading skills are foundational to success in every academic discipline and every career, any plan that promises to significantly improve our students' critical reading skills promises success for our students both in the university and in life.



QEP Impact Report  
**“Engaging Minds: Critical Reading for College Success”**

***Title and Brief Description:***

The University of South Carolina Beaufort (USC Beaufort), a senior campus of the State's flagship public university system, brings the University of South Carolina's statewide mission of teaching, research, and public service to the Lowcountry of South Carolina. USC Beaufort offers baccalaureate degrees that respond to regional needs, draw upon regional strengths, and prepare graduates to contribute successfully in communities locally and around the globe. It is the newest and one of the fastest growing four-year public universities in South Carolina, serving 1724 students with 17 degree programs with nine concentrations/tracks, two associate degrees, two certificate programs, 18 minors, six pre-professional advising tracks and the lowest tuition of any public university in the state.

USC Beaufort's Quality Enhancement Plan, “Engaging Minds: Critical Reading for College Success,” was an ambitious plan to improve students' critical reading abilities. As originally proposed, this plan included the following: (1) a revised freshman composition curriculum, focusing on the critical reading of arguments and the research skills inseparable from good critical reading; (2) a faculty development component to train faculty to teach critical reading in the English program and across the disciplines; (3) increased student-librarian interaction through classroom library instruction and library research; and (4) adoption of the *New York Review of Books* as a campus-wide common reading program intended to foster a community of critical readers through shared readings, events, forums, and lectures.

1. Succinct List of Initial Goals and Intended Outcomes of the QEP

**Table 1: QEP Objectives and Strategies/Initiatives**

Objectives	Strategies/Initiatives
1. Improve skills as critical readers	1. Critical reading enhanced English 101 curriculum
2. Improve research skills in those areas most central to critical reading	2. Faculty development opportunities for teaching critical reading
3. Increased engagement in critical reading	3. Increased student-librarian interaction through classroom library instruction and library research in English 101
	4. A campus-wide common reading using the <i>New York Review of Books</i>

The primary goal of the QEP was to *improve the critical reading abilities of our students*, a core skill of a liberal arts education. To this end, the QEP formulated two student learning outcomes related to critical reading and those research skills necessary to support it:

- 1) Students will improve their skills as critical readers, specifically with respect to the critical reading of arguments.
- 2) Students will improve their research skills in those areas most central to critical reading. That is, students will be able to access needed information effectively and efficiently, evaluate additional information and its sources critically, and ethically and legally incorporate this information within an argument of their own design.

Student engagement is not generally considered a student learning outcome. However, the QEP advanced the argument that critical reading skills could be improved through a campus-wide common reading program that would foster increased student contact with faculty outside the classroom and increased participation in University events and public forums sponsored by the QEP Steering Committee (QEPSC). Thus the QEP also adopted a student engagement objective:

- 1) Students will increase their engagement in critical reading.

To assess its main goal and learning outcomes, the University administered the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test to incoming freshmen, rising sophomores, and rising juniors beginning in Fall 2009. Although in April of 2007 only 46% of USC Beaufort's rising juniors scored at or above the national mean for their peers on the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test, the QEP intended to improve student scores so that by April 2013, at least 70% of rising juniors would score at or above the national mean of their peers. Students were also required to show proficiency in both critical reading and research skills by scoring in the adequate range or higher for each subcategory on a specially designed evaluation rubric for the researched argument paper required of all English 101 students. Indeed the QEP expected that 80% would show such proficiency as a consequence of the combined effect of a revised freshman composition curriculum and student engagement with our common reading program. The QEP expected to see steady improvement in student engagement indexed by increasing participation in its common reading program and data collected annually by the Rising Junior Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

## 2. Discussion of Significant Changes Made to the QEP and the Reasons for Making Those Changes

Based on recommendations from the SACSCOC On-Site Committee, the QEPSC added a process evaluation plan for classroom pedagogy and learning related to the revised English 101 curriculum that allowed for changes and improvements to take place throughout the semester. Initially, process evaluation took the form of a mid-term assessment on reading assignments administered at least three times during the semester. This assessment was implemented in fall 2009 but was considered too onerous by the faculty, and further departmental discussion with the QEPSC helped the committee realize that it needed to be very careful not to overburden faculty. Following additional discussions with English department faculty and instructional librarians, the QEPSC arrived at a more effective mid-term evaluation in Fall 2010 and subsequent semesters. The QEP Co-Directors, the English Department Chair, English 101 faculty, and the librarians met together twice during the mid-semester each fall (when

95% of our sections of English 101 are taught) to discuss challenges with implementation, share ideas and assignments (and their results) and arrive at solutions that helped keep the QEP on track. The general feeling among the faculty was that this was a truly useful innovation.

### 3. QEP’s Impact on Student Learning Outcomes

***SLO 1: Students will improve their skills as critical readers, specifically with respect to the critical reading of arguments.***

Although the very ambitious goals set out in the original QEP for student critical reading performance on the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test were not met, there was substantial progress in student critical reading performance. Whereas only 27% of September 2009 incoming freshmen scored above the national mean on the CAAP Critical Thinking Test, 60% of April 2013 rising juniors scored above the national mean. This is no small accomplishment considering that approximately 37% of the incoming freshmen are first-generation college students and a higher percentage of seniors work 20 or more hours per week. (According to NSSE 2013, 39% of USCB seniors were employed for 20 or more hours per week and seniors averaged working 15.3 hours per week—significantly higher than the comparison group of all NSSE-participating institutions who averaged 12.7 hours per week ( $p < .05$ .) These numbers are a testament to the success of USC Beaufort’s plan to improve students’ skills as critical readers. Table 2 provides the results from the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test along with the other assessments of SLO1. It should be noted that these scores include transfer students who did not take enhanced freshman English courses at USC Beaufort.

**Table 2: Achievement of SLO 1 Targets**

Measure	Target	Actual	Met/ Not Met
Percent of Spring 2013 rising juniors scoring at or above the national mean on the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test	70%	60%	Not Met
Percent of Fall 2011 students in English 101 who scored in the adequate range or higher for each category/subcategory of the evaluation rubric for the researched argument paper			
• Claims	80%	89%	Met
• Reasons, Evidence & Warrants	80%	91%	Met
• Organization and Coherence	80%	92%	Met
Percent of Spring 2013 rising juniors who strongly agree with the statement, <i>“The instruction and coursework required for the general education program at USC Beaufort have helped me to read and think more carefully, analytically, and critically.”</i>	70%	43%	Not Met
Percent of Spring 2013 rising juniors who agree or strongly agree with the statement, <i>“My English 101 class emphasized critical thinking and helped me to improve as a critical thinker.”</i>	90%	73%	Not Met

The scores in Table 3 do not include transfer students. A careful analysis of those 215 students who began at USC Beaufort as freshmen and therefore participated in the English 101 QEP initiative, and who took the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test as incoming freshmen, rising sophomores, and rising juniors, revealed that 55% of the students improved their scores, and 62% of the students improved their national percentile rankings.

**Table 3: Comparison of Native USC Beaufort Students ACT CAAP Scores**

<b>Percentage of USC Beaufort Students Performing AT or ABOVE National Mean</b> <i>Median National Percentile Ranks (NP)</i> N=cohort size	<b>Incoming Freshmen</b>	<b>Rising Sophomores</b>	<b>Rising Juniors</b>
<b>Sept 2009 incoming freshmen</b> ( <i>April 2010 rising sophomores; April 2011 rising juniors</i> )	<b>26%</b> 33 <sup>rd</sup> NP N = 46	<b>30%</b> 28 <sup>th</sup> NP N = 46	<b>50%</b> 49 <sup>th</sup> NP N = 46
<b>Sept 2010 incoming freshmen</b> ( <i>April 2011 rising sophomores; April 2012 rising juniors</i> )	<b>34%</b> 38 <sup>th</sup> NP N = 47	<b>45%</b> 38 <sup>th</sup> NP N = 47	<b>55%</b> 56 <sup>th</sup> NP N = 47
<b>Sept 2011 incoming freshmen</b> ( <i>April 2012 rising sophomores; April 2013 rising juniors</i> )	<b>35%</b> 33 <sup>rd</sup> NP N = 43	<b>40%</b> 43 <sup>rd</sup> NP N = 43	<b>51%</b> 61 <sup>st</sup> NP N = 43

While this is noticeable improvement, the goal was to work to improve scores for all students—not just 55% of the students and this appears to be a consistent concern beyond USC Beaufort. One of the QEP-related faculty development initiatives led the QEPSC to analyze a recent major study of 2,322 students at 24 American colleges and universities that had almost identical findings as USC Beaufort. In *Improving Undergraduate Learning*, Richard Arum, Josipa Roksa, and Esther Cho found that “45% of students did not demonstrate any significant improvement in learning, as measured by CLA [College Learning Assessment] performance, during their first two years of college.” (The CLA is a test of critical reading and thinking that is designed to measure critical thinking skills similar to the ACT CAAP.) When USC Beaufort’s results were compared with the results described in *Improving Undergraduate Learning* and Arum and Josipa’s accompanying book *Academically Adrift* (2011), the similarities became clear.

The QEP was more successful in hitting its targets on the evaluation rubric for the researched argument paper required of all English 101 students. In Fall 2009, the QEP pilot-test sections did quite well in most categories, with students clearly demonstrating their ability to construct claims (93%) and support them with reasons and evidence, and making warrants explicit when necessary (86%). Organization and coherence was a robust 86%. In 2010, 98% of all students scored in the adequate range or above in organization and coherence and in constructing claims and 96% scored in the adequate or above category for supporting their claims with reasons and evidence. In 2011, we once again hit our target with 89% of all students scoring in the adequate range or higher for constructing claims, 91% for reasons, evidence and warrants and 92% with respect to organization and coherence.

On the Spring 2013 Survey of Rising Juniors, 43% of USC Beaufort’s rising juniors strongly agreed with the following sentence: “The instruction and coursework required for the general education program at USC Beaufort have helped me to read and think more carefully, analytically, and critically.” Although this represented some significant improvement, it fell short of the QEP’s original target of 70% strong agreement. Furthermore, when the QEPSC compared baseline data with data from the 2009 critical reading enhanced English 101 pilot-test and non-pilot-test cohorts it found that in 2011, 38% of QEP pilot-test rising juniors strongly agreed with this claim, while 36% of non-pilot-test students strongly agreed with this claim. In brief, the 2% difference seemed to imply that the QEP curriculum in English 101 had no apparent effect on how students viewed the impact of the general education curriculum as a whole.

A more encouraging set of results (albeit not as good as anticipated) was to be found in an additional survey question created specifically for the QEP that asked the same students to evaluate how much their English 101 sections helped them improve as critical thinkers. On this question in Spring 2011, English 101 pilot-test students overwhelmingly felt that their English 101 sections had helped them as critical thinkers (90%)—far more than for their non-pilot-test peers (67%). The lesson drawn from a comparison of these two questions on the Rising Junior Survey seems to be that students in the enhanced English 101 classes clearly felt the course improved their critical thinking skills, but that impact was diluted so much as to be almost unnoticeable after completion of the entire general education curriculum. This implies that a single class can have only a limited impact on how the rising juniors rate USC Beaufort’s *overall effectiveness* in helping them to improve as critical thinkers.

**SLO 2: Students will improve their research skills in those areas most central to critical reading.**

The second expected outcome of USCB’s QEP was to improve students’ research skills in those areas most central to critical reading. Specifically, the QEPSC intended for students to improve their ability to access need information effectively and efficiently, evaluate additional information critically, and ethically and legally incorporate this information within an argument of their own design. Here again, substantial progress was made although all targets were not met.

**Table 4: Achievement of SLO 2 Targets**

Measure	Target	Actual	Met/ Not Met
Percent of Fall 2011 students in English 101 who scored in the adequate range or higher for each category/subcategory of the evaluation rubric for the researched argument paper			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognizes Need for Sources</li> </ul>	80%	91%	Met
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds Sources</li> </ul>	80%	86%	Met
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporates Sources</li> </ul>	80%	82%	Met
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cites Sources</li> </ul>	80%	72%	Not Met
Percent of rising juniors who strongly agree with the statement, “ <i>The instruction and coursework required for the general education program at USC Beaufort have helped me to find, evaluate, and appropriately use information.</i> ”			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 2010</li> </ul>	38%	35%	Not Met
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 2011</li> </ul>	50%	31%	Not Met
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>April 2013</li> </ul>	70%	34%	Not Met

It is important to recognize that one of the innovative and novel aspects of the QEP’s approach to critical reading was its emphasis on research skills. As William Eller wrote 50 years ago, “almost any scheme which will enhance the student’s background of information will improve his critical reading prospects. In order to evaluate the validity of a printed statement it is usually necessary to possess considerable information about the subject.” The QEP emphasized the need to couple the teaching of critical reading with the teaching of research skills as a means of empowering first and second year college students to seek this kind of additional information on their own. Through closer collaboration with the University’s reference librarians and the creation of new kinds of research assignments, the QEP promised to make the library a more central part of student life and learning at USC Beaufort. Over the course of the QEP, librarians made 161 presentations on research skills and techniques to English 101 and 102 sections, and instructional librarians attended the mid-term evaluation meetings held during the fall semester.

USC Beaufort’s goal was to have at least 80% of students score in the adequate range or higher on the evaluation rubric for the researched argument paper. In Fall 2009, students in the QEP pilot-test sections did quite well in most categories with 87% of all students recognizing the need for sources and 88% able to find sources. However, students had more difficulty with evaluating sources (79%), and they struggled to incorporate (71%) or cite (54%) their sources effectively. In response, the English faculty met with the QEPSC to come up with strategies to improve students’ abilities to incorporate and cite sources. Evaluation rubric assessments for Fall 2010 and Fall 2011 show that the abilities to incorporate and cite sources remained the weakest areas of student performance, but both improved tremendously. The ability to incorporate sources improved from 71% to 82% performing at the level of adequate or above. The ability to cite sources correctly improved from 54% to 77% (2010) or 72% (2011) performing at the adequate level or above. This is outstanding improvement, although students have yet to hit the target level in this area. In all other areas of this assessment, targets were met.

The QEP also set goals for student responses to the Survey of Rising Juniors. 1) By April 2010, 38% of rising juniors should strongly agree with the following statement: “The instruction and coursework required for the general education program at USC Beaufort have helped me to find, evaluate, and appropriately use information.” 2) By April 2011, 50% of the rising juniors who began their college careers at USC Beaufort should strongly agree with this statement. Although very close to hitting the goal of 38% in 2010, the actual 35% represents a significant improvement from 28% in 2007. The April 2011 and 2012 numbers slipped backwards, at least as far as strong agreement is concerned. With the redesigned library interaction in English 101 that was implemented in fall 2010, the QEPSC hoped there would be some beneficial effect on rising juniors in April 2012. However, this did not materialize and in April 2013, only 34% of rising juniors strongly agreed that the general education coursework improved their ability to find, evaluate, and appropriately use information. Nonetheless, overall agreement and strong agreement with this statement was at 84%.

***SLO 3: Student Engagement Objective: Students will increase their engagement in critical reading.***

The third objective of USC Beaufort’s QEP was to increase student engagement with respect to critical reading. While the NSSE and Rising Junior surveys did not yield results that unequivocally demonstrated that students increased their engagement with critical reading, USC Beaufort is generally pleased with the overall impact on student engagement.

**Table 5: Achievement of Student Engagement Objective Targets**

Measure	Target	Actual	Met/ Not Met
<b>2011 First Year Student Responses to NSSE Items</b>			
1d. In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources?	3.40	3.26	Not Met
1p. In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class?	2.11	1.90	Not Met

1t. In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers)?	3.00	2.67	Not Met
2b. During the current school year, how much of your coursework emphasized analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular situation in depth and considering its components?	3.15	3.03	Not Met
2c. During the current school year, how much of your coursework emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships?	3.10	2.70	Not Met
2d. During the current school year, how much of your coursework emphasized making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions?	3.05	2.81	Not Met
3b. During the current school year, about how many books have you read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment and academic enrichment?	2.40	1.98	Not Met
6a. During the current school year, about how often did you attend an art exhibit, play, dance, music theatre or other performance?	2.20	1.70	Not Met
6d. During the current school year, about how often did you examine the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue?	2.75	2.49	Not Met
6e. During the current school year, about how often did you try to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her own perspective?	2.90	2.72*	Not Met
6f. During the current school year, about how often did you learn something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept?	3.05	2.67	Not Met
9a. About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)?	3.90	4.10	Met
11a. To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your acquiring a broad general education?	3.40	3.06	Not Met
11e. To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your ability to think critically and analytically?	3.50	3.13	Not Met
13. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	3.35	3.10	Not Met
Participation In Student and Faculty Forums	97%	80%	Not Met

With respect to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), although many measures increased over the baseline first-year student rating in 2008, there is still a long way to go to meet the goals set out in the original QEP. However, student participation in faculty and student forums and/or public lectures came very close to the stated goals with 67% of April 2010 rising juniors reporting attending at least one event within the past two years, and with this percentage rising to 80% in April 2013.

Engagement with USC Beaufort's common reading as measured by the rising junior survey was even more impressive. To see in April of 2011, that 54% of rising juniors who began their college careers at the University reading the *New York Review of Books* (NYRB) for their own pleasure is truly remarkable. While this high level was not attained every year, the fact that *more than* 37% of students read the NYRB for pleasure during each year of the QEP still exceeds expectations.

Students who reported on the April 2010 Survey of Rising Juniors that they read the NYRB regularly for pleasure, overwhelmingly and disproportionately scored above average on the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test. These students had a median score of 64 on the test (66<sup>th</sup> national percentile) and a mean score of 65 (71<sup>st</sup> national percentile), whereas the entire cohort of rising juniors had a median score of 60.7, only 0.3 points below the 45<sup>th</sup> national percentile on the exam. The number of students who began their college careers at USC Beaufort and who reported reading NYRB articles for classroom assignments grew from 51% in April 2010 to 83% in April 2013.

#### 4. Conclusion

USC Beaufort successfully implemented the QEP and assessment plan. Although targets have not been met for many indicators of student performance, the University has significantly improved students' critical reading and research skills. With regard to the ACT CAAP, although the target of 70% of juniors scoring at or above the national mean in April 2013 was not met, the target was approached with 60% of rising juniors scoring at or above the national mean. The QEPSC feels this is an impressive achievement, especially when measured against the anemic 27% of incoming freshmen who achieved this benchmark in August 2009. Student engagement with the common reading program was outstanding.

The goals spelled out in the QEP for student performance on the ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Test were ambitious—perhaps too ambitious to meet. However, the assessment data speaks to how to improve in the future.

USC Beaufort's QEP assessment plan and ACT CAAP results bear a strong resemblance to the data underpinning the SSRC-CLA Longitudinal Project described above and Arum and Roksa's *Academically Adrift*, and it makes sense to learn from their recommendations: (1) encourage faculty to have high expectations for students; (2) encourage faculty to combine writing-intensive and reading-intensive activities *within the same class* and encourage, or require, students to take these classes; (3) rethink student study patterns (especially time on task) and encourage more individual, as opposed to group, work; (4) finally, these efforts to improve critical thinking need to take place across the disciplines. The SSRC-CLA Longitudinal Project also suggests that "Students who took courses requiring both significant reading (more than 40 pages per week) and writing (more than 20 pages over the course of the semester) had higher rates of learning," as assessed by the CLA. After dissemination and discussion of these recommendations through QEPSC-sponsored events, and given that Rising Junior Survey results indicated that one course alone could only have a limited impact overall, the QEPSC initiated a major curriculum change related to reading and writing intensive classes that was not set out in the original plan. In Spring 2012, the QEPSC proposed:

**Writing/Reading Intensive Courses:** After the successful completion of ENGL 101 and ENGL 102, students must complete at least two **writing/reading intensive classes**, preferably at least one in the students' major. These courses may also satisfy other general education, program, or major requirements.

**Writing/Reading Intensive Course Definition:** Writing/reading intensive courses require at least 15 pages of formal out-of-class writing per semester and at least 40 pages per week of reading.

Although the Courses and Curricula Committee tabled the issue at its September 2012 meeting, the Nursing, Education, and Business Departments forged ahead to create and implement new writing-and reading-intensive courses that met this definition. At the request of the QEP Co-Directors, the Courses and Curricula Committee revisited this issue in January 2013 and sponsored a faculty forum on February 22, 2013 to further discuss the proposal from the QEPSC. (The proposal had already been discussed at the department level in Spring 2012.) After faculty requested and reviewed further information concerning the percentage of USC Beaufort's students currently meeting these requirements, the academic departments agreed to require at least one reading- and writing-intensive class beyond English 101 and 102. At its April 11, 2013, meeting, the QEPSC suggested the following language for USC Beaufort's University Bulletin, "All degree programs at USC Beaufort require their majors to take at least one reading and writing intensive course beyond USC Beaufort's General Education English requirement." In Spring 2014, the Courses and Curricula Committee reviewed this proposal and endorsed it. One week later, the Faculty Senate approved the proposal and, effective fall 2014, all USC Beaufort degree programs will require at least one reading- and writing-intensive class beyond English 101 and 102. These curriculum changes were a direct result of USC Beaufort's Quality Enhancement Plan, *Engaging Minds: Critical Reading for College Success*.