Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Planning Committee  
Tuesday, November 16, 2010 – 10:00-12:00 p.m.

Present: Kathy Alligood, LaNitra Berger, Matt Cronin, Rick Davis, Kim Eby, Craig Gibson, Shannah Jacobsen, Brian Mark, Sharon Pitt, Padhu Seshaiyer, Amy Snyder, Cathy Tompkins, Bethany Usher, Terry Zawacki, and Ying Zhou

Updates
- Overall, folks who have heard presentations at our various meetings across the university have been excited about the QEP and the variety of options it offers
- The RS designator is currently in the system!
- The URL for the OSCAR website has been created (oscar.gmu.edu) and will re-route visitors to the QEP website until the new one launches next summer

QEP Video
- Rick and Kim have met with Richard Wood at GMU-TV to begin thinking about our QEP videos
- We initially want to create one video and add more to the collection
- The video(s) will be filmed in January, edited in February, and launched on March 14th
- We need to think about what undergraduate research and creative activity looks like and who embodies it most
- What faculty and students would be willing to participate, and who would show really well on video? We are looking for:
  o Students who have participated in such opportunities and are energetic about them
  o Mentors (do not have to be faculty members) who have participated in curricular or co-curricular activities with undergraduates
- Potential prompts:
  o Main focus for students and mentors: “What was your most exciting moment in your research or creative project?”
  o For students and mentors: question about how undergraduate scholarship has influenced their long-term goals
  o For students: “What does scholarship mean to you?”
    ▪ This does not necessarily have to make it into the final cut of the videos, but it may be interesting to see what is said
  o For mentors (instead of question 2): “Describe the way that undergraduates have been involved with you in research and creative work.”
  o For mentors (if applicable): “How does scholarship inform your teaching?”
  o Ask about more specific experiences – concern that the question about inquiry-based classes is too broad
    ▪ Focused questions are better than broader ones
- A “preface” will be built into each interview to share about what the QEP is and how it defines scholarly activity
- We should consider conducting joint interviews to catch the interaction between mentors and their students
- We need volunteers who are willing to sit in the green room to interview students and mentors for the videos
  o Volunteers: Sharon, Craig, LaNitra, and Rick
Comment from Consultant: SLOs
• We will not change the SLOs in the actual document, but there is concern that we need something more specific
  o This concern could be due to the fact that the assessment chapter in our draft document was not fully complete
• Our outcomes, as written, have been kept broad so that folks across the disciplines can see themselves in the SLOs and adapt them for their own courses and work
  o Are we defining high competence in a way that folks across the disciplines could still see a place for themselves?
• In the narrative of the assessment section, we need to articulate that the SLOs are being kept broad so that all disciplines can see a way to contribute to the process
• We may want to provide SACS with sample rubrics about what we mean by specific outcomes
  o How do we define good research? How do we define effective communication?
  o We need concrete examples of what faculty are currently using (look to rubrics from synthesis courses) and how they could be made different
• Present Bethany’s document (with a “DRAFT” watermark) in the QEP document? Or, present only the “high competence” column as a benchmark?
  o Concerns about Level I column for the two “Creation of Scholarship” outcomes
  o Do we need any qualitative language in the SLOs?
  o Going across the chart we’re moving to degree of independence and quality of product
  o Quality is not present in the middle level – may need words including personal reflection, sound conclusions, etc.
  o Decision: we will include SLOs as they are currently written and only show Level IV (as a draft) in the document
• We will keep these broad for now and then break them down in the spring
• First SLO: This will measure students’ understanding through UNIV 100 and ENGL 101 courses, along with those intro courses in which faculty share about their own research (this would come through in course evaluations)
  o Change language in high competence column to differentiate it from actual SLO
• Second SLO: Is it that students can find opportunities or that they become engaged in scholarship?
  o Our QEP activities indicate that this would be more about locating opportunities
  o Is this a program outcome? It seems like the measurement will be quantitative

Comment from Consultant: URSP Mentoring Program
• The Committee does not support removing the URSP mentoring program from the document
  o Concern that this is an important aspect of our program for students to share what they have learned with other students
• Students in the UAP focus group shared that they would like to continue to give back to the program as mentors after serving as participants
• We need to be more clear in the narrative for this program that we do not expect it to require additional resources
  o Eliminating the capital ‘m’ in mentoring may also help to address this confusion

Program Outcome #6
• Decision: we will keep PO6 as it is written, with the assumption that keeping it broad means that we can address all three possible revisions (getting at student perceptions, attitudes, and clarity of future goals)