Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Planning Committee  
Tuesday, March 1, 2011 – 12:30-2:30 p.m.

Present: Kathy Alligood, LaNitra Berger, Rachel Bergman, Tim Born, Rick Davis, Kim Eby, Karen Gentemann, Craig Gibson, Shannon Jacobsen, Mary Kayler, Mills Kelly, Brian Mark, Shelley Reid, David Revilla, Myurajan Rubaharan, Lynne Schrum, Padhu Seshaiyer, Joy Taylor, Cathy Tompkins, Megan Tucker (observer), Bethany Usher, Terry Zawacki, and Ying Zhou

General Update
- SACS on-site team will be here in 4 weeks, and we will forward the list of team members to you
- At our next full Committee meeting (March 22nd), Kim and Bethany show the presentation
- Our QEP evaluator and assessment person will likely want to meet with representatives of the QEP committee
- QEPs will be distributed to key stakeholders on campus next Monday, March 7th, and will be accompanied by a letter from Kim and Bethany
- Our video will be about 1.5 minutes and will appear on GMU-TV, the web, and possibly YouTube
  - This video will open our presentation to the review team

Feedback on Design & Content of Faculty Summary
- These will be distributed the week after spring break to all faculty mailboxes
- The front cover does not illustrate that this is relevant to faculty
  - Rename it: “Faculty Guide to the Students as Scholars QEP”
  - Also include the Mason logo
- Text must explain how faculty can benefit, along with the funding that is available to their students
  - Potential text: “Over the lifetime of the project, the QEP will spend _____ on students. You can help your students have access to these funds by _____."
  - A graph should accompany the text and catch the attention of faculty
    - The graph should illustrate the funding available for faculty-student research partnerships
    - The graph should also pay attention to the curricular aspect of the QEP
  - Question about page 4 and a suggestion that the pyramid and chart should be side-by-side
    - Invert the pyramid?
- Each page should involve one kind of QEP activity that faculty will be able to participate in
  - We should keep the text general and open so that all can see themselves in this document
- Headings should be more about faculty than about the QEP
- Will this publication be appropriate for folks in University Life?
- We will send a preliminary notice to faculty so that they will know this is on the way
  - An ALL-UNIV announcement should go out on the same day the summary goes in the mail

Outreach Plan
- A student brochure will be distributed once we have more concrete information for them
- QEP Committee has agreed to wear our Academic Advising Expo t-shirts to class!
  - Shirts will be light gray with green print
- We will turn our sticker design into magnets
- Bookmarks
  - Replace “have you seen the light?” with “What’s your bright idea?”
- Flags for the JC
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Students as Scholars} should be in the center of the flag, not "Fostering…"
  \item Remove the white part at the bottom
  \item Move "Fostering…" to the white bar
  \item Only use qep.gmu.edu as the website URL
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Poster
    \begin{itemize}
      \item See comments on flag
      \item Quotes need to be larger
    \end{itemize}
  \item MasonAds LCDs
    \begin{itemize}
      \item The light bulb background is too busy with the text and should be moved down to one corner
      \item Do we want to project this onto the screen in the JC atrium?
      \item We should split the last two slides
    \end{itemize}
  \item An ALL-UNIV announcement will be distributed to students the week of March 28th
  \item We may want to target the atrium of the Engineering Building, the food cart area of Enterprise, etc.
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Should we post flyers or posters in every academic building?
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Student Scholarly Activities Report}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Team will finalize what was discussed at their first meeting next week
  \item They discussed the expansion of UAP into URSP
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Funding will include a $500 faculty stipend and $500 for supplies
      \item The summer program will eventually include housing so that students are fully immersed in their projects and goals
        \begin{itemize}
          \item These students will come from the previous URSP cohort because they will already have a relationship with their faculty mentors and will be farther along in their projects
          \item Students will receive a $3,600 stipend for the summer so that our program is competitive with NSF
        \end{itemize}
      \item Undergraduate Student Travel Fund
        \begin{itemize}
          \item Will use the Graduate Student Travel Fund as a model and ask departments to share some of the costs
          \item Will also make money available for students who are interested in attending conferences
          \item This fund will only supplement costs and will not cover the entire trip
          \item This will provide a way to track how students are disseminating their research
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
  \item Students will be able to participate for either one semester or a full year (with a renewal application)
    \begin{itemize}
      \item When students renew their projects for a second year, the zero-credit option will allow another student to participate in URSP by freeing up funding
    \end{itemize}
  \item Application deadlines will be moved up so that students can make their summer plans in advance
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Application will open on March 1 with an early April deadline and selection by mid-April
      \item We should ensure that application deadline coincides with those for NSF, Amgen, and study abroad
    \end{itemize}
  \item Do students need to conduct their research on campus or can they use their funding to study somewhere else in the country or even abroad?
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Committee decision is yes, but how?
      \item Student should submit a proposal with a Mason faculty member, but the faculty member does not necessarily have to travel with the student
    \end{itemize}
  \item The composition and size of the URSP selection committee was discussed
\end{itemize}
o It will need to be larger than it currently is to include representation of various disciplines and WAC
o Subcommittees will closely examine proposals to maintain selection of high-quality projects

- The team is currently discussing how part-time students will be able to participate and how the structure of the program will facilitate their participation
- We should think about using the QEP Leadership Council as the core for the selection committee and then pulling in expertise for various subcommittees as needed

Faculty & Curricular Activities Report
- Discussed Research Discovery (RD), Research Inquiry (RI), and Research & Scholarship (RS) courses to correspond with the three different levels of the pyramid
  o RD = ENGL 100 and UNIV 100/300 courses
    ▪ Each major should include an intro course that meets RD outcomes
    ▪ Concerns that this level will be too simple to meet because faculty can just direct students to the QEP website
      - Bullets 1d and 1e on the Assessment team’s document set this designation apart from what happens in most classes
  o RI = ENGL 302
    ▪ This designation will meet middle level outcomes
  o Not all are comfortable with this three-level structure
  o How will the designators be used?
    ▪ Courses do not have to be publically labeled, but will be used for assessment purposes
    ▪ Many think that these designations should be public for students applying to grad school or seeking employment
      - We have also tossed around the idea of honoring students (on transcripts or at graduation) who participate in RS courses

- Goals for the next full Committee meeting are to determine:
  o Whether there will be three or two levels of designation for all courses
  o What each level means
  o How courses will meet the requirements of these levels
  o The relationship between course designations and SDGs
    ▪ Will courses automatically be designated if they receive a SDG? Or, can courses be designated without support?
    ▪ Different levels of grants or different levels of designators? Both?

Assessment Report
- See Student Learning Outcomes document on the wiki for more information!
- The team tried to develop ways to operationalize the three levels and show what each level entails
  o This could be used as a faculty guide
  o They tried to show logical steps in moving through the process of scholarly inquiry
  o They added new language to the outcomes, but need feedback on whether these are generalizable and can be used across the disciplines
- They worked from page 23 of the QEP in the production of the steps involved at each level
- We’ll want to make sure that the word “creative” doesn’t disappear from this document!
  o Level III, bullet 1, letter b is problematic for the arts – you don’t always know who the product is going to be for and there isn’t always novelty (maybe originality?)
Move this under Level III, bullet 2, letter e and change it to say “Determine who the intended audience is”?
  - Level III, bullet 2, letter h is nice for all disciplines

Goal for next meeting:
  - To share rubrics

George Mason Review (Paula Salamoun)
  - Please promote this journal to students
  - They are hoping that this will become the #1 undergraduate journal in 5 years