Present: Kathy Alligood, LaNitra Berger, Rachel Bergman, Tim Born, Rick Davis, Kim Eby, Karen Gentemann, Shannon Jacobsen, Mary Kayler, Brian Mark, Sharon Pitt, Claudia Rector, Shelley Reid, David Revilla, Myurajan Rubaharan, Linda Schwartzstein, Amy Snyder, Joy Taylor, Cathy Tompkins, Bethany Usher, Terry Zawacki, and Ying Zhou

General Updates
- Please see the back of today’s agenda for publicity updates
- Please attend the QEP presentation to the SACS on-site review committee on Tuesday from 10:30-11:30 a.m. in the Mason Inn, meeting room 2 (be early)
  - They will also be meeting with undergraduates, graduate students, term-faculty, and tenured & tenure-track faculty
    - These folks will be attending QEP information sessions later this week
- The SACS committee may also want to have a meeting with the full QEP Committee on Wednesday morning
- We will send a draft of the subcommittee reports to Mary Crowe and all of you

Faculty & Curricular Activities Subcommittee
- The subcommittee has discussed three potential levels of designation:
  - We must have a set of criteria for the RS level because this will be recorded on transcripts
  - The RD level will exist only for QEP assessment purposes and will not go on the transcript
  - Basic designations will be useful for assessment, but there will also be some overlap among the three levels
- The subcommittee also discussed how criteria for each designator will relate to class size
  - Discovery courses will generally exist early on in students’ educations at Mason
  - The inquiry courses are less clear
  - Courses involving the creation of scholarship will tend to fall in students’ senior years
- Criteria for these designators must be fully embedded in the courses
  - For example, a simple discussion about ethics would not satisfy criteria
- Courses with designations will be evaluated each year
- We will start doing this as soon as the QEP is approved
  - We should use aspirational and pilot language in the notes about the timeline for the course designators and SDGs
  - We will start getting courses, already meeting the criteria for the RS designation, ready to be approved first
  - We’ll want to use piloting language, but a lot of this could possibly happen in the fall
    - A separate team may be needed to determine the application process for these courses, and this will slow down the timeline
- How many courses should we expect to meet the criteria at each of the three levels?
  - Will we control how many courses in each college or department receive the designations?
  - We do not want to be too selective at the foundational level (discovery)
  - We should look for a nice mix across the university so that the QEP is transformative
  - Departments will need to think about this holistically – where are they starting and where are they looking to go?
- How many criteria does a course have to meet to receive the designation? All? Or, only a subset?
• Scholarship Development Grants
  o Programs will be encouraged to look at what they already have and consider how they can
develop their courses at the 3 different levels
  o Some programs may focus on the whole of the scholarly landscape, integrating the 3
different levels, to move students up through the various levels of the pyramid
  o These can be small grants for individual courses (existing or new) or they can be larger for
revamping entire programs
  o Applications for individual courses must be submitted by the department so that it captures
the big picture
    ▪ This will lead to departmental conversations, which may also delay the timeline of
implementation
    ▪ We may need to share this at a Department Chairs meeting so they are thinking
about it
    ▪ Workshops for how folks can prepare for grants, with requests for initial proposals
that can be revised for actual submission, will help this to become an educational
process
  o SDGs will not be awarded for sole purpose of reducing class size, but will need to be a part
of the bigger picture
  o We’ll want to have plans for sustainability built in to this process
  o Applications are not limited to specific programs or disciplines, but can cross units and
schools
• How will the course designations be made visible to the students?
  o Without having RD and RI designations, this will not be as visible and students will be
unaware of the overarching design
  o Terry’s example: Students who are unaware that they are taking a WI course, often have
different perceptions of their writing experiences on course evaluations
  o We need to make the process of scholarly inquiry explicit to students, which will
through faculty and academic advisors

Assessment Subcommittee
• Please see the subcommittee’s handouts for additional details
• They have added details to each of the original student learning outcomes
• The draft rubric incorporates four different levels of proficiency
  o The subcommittee is tweaking language from the AAC&U VALUE rubrics to match our
specific SLOs
  o The middle and top levels have been combined in the rubric because those SLOs that
happen at the top level also tend to accomplish everything that has come before
  o At the top level, you would expect to see more students at the Advanced level, while at the
foundational level there would be more Novices
• Concerns that the “Reporting and/or Performance” section on the “Course Development
Framework” handout may not be applicable to the arts
• The rubric does not yet incorporate the very bottom or top of the pyramid, but will eventually
become a continuous rubric containing all three levels
  o Pieces may be pulled out for the purposes of applications for course designators or SDGs
• The rubric should be called “Draft of the Scholarly Landscape” with a disclaimer that other sections
will be added later
  o Mary Crowe wants to see a draft rubric and a draft of the criteria for the course designators
Student Scholarly Activities Subcommittee

- The subcommittee met to discuss the Undergraduate Student Travel Fund, along with the criteria for future URSP Director
- Undergraduate Student Travel Fund (USTF)
  - An advisory board will look at applications for funding
    - This board will be composed of faculty from across the disciplines, along with a student who has previously participated in the program
  - The OSCAR website should contain a listing of conferences and meetings that students can attend and/or present at
    - It will also include a list of student groups that support these activities, such as the various journal clubs that exist in COS
  - The date of the conference will dictate the deadline for travel applications, which is how the Graduate Student Travel Fund currently operates as well
  - Students will be asked to submit information about the conference, what they will be presenting, along with a recommendation from their faculty mentor/advisor
  - Student presenters will receive preference when applications are being reviewed, but students can also attend conferences to learn more about their disciplines
    - Whether the latter group is selected will depend on the amount of funds available
    - Departments will also be asked to supplement or match the funds provided by the USTF
  - Students who participate in the summer URSP will be strongly encouraged to present their work at a conference (either on campus or elsewhere) and will be eligible (and favored) for travel funds through the USTF
    - Students who participate in the summer URSP, must have also participated in the academic year URSP for at least one semester to ensure that they will be further along in their research
  - Anyone who receives travel funds should have to participate in the Celebration of Student Scholarship
  - We should think about creating an LLC for students who are engaging (or interested in engaging) in these opportunities at Mason
  - Students should be able to plan their travel in advance by using a central administrative PCard (overseen by OSCAR?) to limit the amount of out-of-pocket expenses that they would otherwise incur

Presentation Slides

- We should use both of the pie charts for the allocated resources, but add total budget numbers to them to present a more persuasive argument about how this will be supported over the five years
- Add the Office of Institutional Assessment to the “Personnel” slide (OIA)
  - Also, present the list of OSCAR collaborators here
  - Remove names of individuals, and add “Director of OSCAR” as a block under the office name
  - This should look more like an organizational chart for the purposes of clarity
- We will want to make the timeline more dynamic with some kind of animation
  - Break up the timeline by Committee with the events/activities that happened under the leadership of each?