Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Planning Committee
Friday, May 1, 2009 – 1:00-3:00 p.m.


Survey Results & Feedback
• The survey data do not show a clear “winner”
• We might be able to combine two or more of the topics
  o Combining the topics would mean that we would have to rethink the scope and budget scenarios
• No matter which topic we choose, we should not ignore the comments left for the other two
  o The qualitative data is very valuable information that we may be able to use later in this process
• In the Topic Involvement section, how seriously should we take the question about what you could see other students at Mason getting involved with? Are peoples’ perceptions of others relevant here?
  o One possible explanation of the disconnect: the students who responded to the survey could be those who are more involved on campus and are thinking about other students who might not be as involved
• Stats questions, but not sure if we can do it in time…
  o Can we separate graduate students from undergrads to see if the different group responses have any impact on the outcome? We’ll look and see…
  o Can we separate all four groups for the final forced-ranking question (undergrads, grads, faculty/staff, and alumni)?
    ▪ Is one population in particular skewing our numbers?
• All groups have bought into these topics equally as possible QEPs
• We need to be sure that we are not overemphasizing the value of the survey numbers
  o Our data is not from a random sample and we had a limited number of respondents
  o This survey was never meant to be a vote because of the fact that it is not random or representative of the population
  o The survey data is only advisory
• Student Scholarship is the best topic for the widest crowd and all departments can become involved
• Are the responses break-down of faculty by college/school (from 2007-2008 Fact Book):
  ▪ ICAR = 1.5% full-time faculty
  ▪ CEHD = 8.3 % full-time faculty
  ▪ CHHS = 5.5% full-time faculty
  ▪ CHSS = 31.0% full-time faculty
  ▪ Volgenau = 10.5% full-time faculty
  ▪ Krasnow = 1.3% full-time faculty
  ▪ SOM = 6% full-time faculty
  ▪ SPP = 5% full-time faculty (graduate-only school)
  ▪ COS = 20.5% full-time faculty
  ▪ CVPA = 4.7% full-time faculty
• Representation of faculty/staff from these colleges/schools in our survey (once University Life and other administrative units are removed):
  - ICAR = 2% of respondents
  - CEHD = 12% of respondents
  - CHHS = 7% of respondents
  - CHSS = 30% of respondents
  - Volgenau = 5% of respondents
  - Krasnow = 1% of respondents
  - SOM = 7% of respondents
  - SPP = 3% of respondents
  - COS = 20% of respondents
  - CVPA = 8% of respondents

• We’ll write a report that includes key aspects of the survey data—who was surveyed, who responded, whether it’s representative or not (mention that it is not random)
  - Despite the vote—it was ONLY guidance and just one data point
  - Include data that we struggled with, including perceptions of others, faculty and student divisions, etc.

• The support letters are nice and let us know that people outside of Mason have an eye on our QEP, but the letters should not influence our ultimate decision...

**Topic Selection Rubric**
• Do not sum the topics at the bottom of the chart, but do select the one topic that you believe should be our QEP

• Revisions to rubric
  - Number the different criteria
  - SACS criteria: #3, #4, #5, #6 (you’ll weight these higher when you get to the end)
    - Use asterisks to separate these from the others
  - #7: mention that the topic will allow us to build on current initiatives and resources
  - Remove #8: whichever topic we choose, we’ll make the budgets fit
  - Remove #11: not important right now, we’ll plug each topic into best practices later...
  - Keep #9 and #10 as separate items in the rubric
  - Keep questions about scope so we can infer what might be possible in the two scenarios
  - Base the ratings on a 4-point scale, where 1=outstanding and 4=poor

• The rubrics will be a basis for our discussion next week
• Add language about feasibility to the questions about assessment (#5 and #6)
• We’ll have two rounds of committee voting: one through the rubric and another during next week’s meeting after discussion