QEP PHASE II RETREAT
FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 2009
2 P.M. – 5 P.M.


Absent: M. Richard, J. Humphrey, M. Schmidt

1. Minutes from the meeting on December 11 were unanimously approved.

2. The committee members discussed budget constraints before beginning to share ideas for VSU’s QEP.

3. J. LaPlant opened the floor to suggestions and ideas:
   - Visit with Department Heads Council to make them aware of the QEP; ask them how or where UG Research would fit.
   - Put together or solicit from departments and colleges what funds they would be willing to commit to UG Research; the departments keep the funds for their own projects, but present centralized accounting.
   - Solicit from students and faculty what our needs are concerning undergraduate research. J LaPlant mentioned the survey already done for community input during the Phase I QEP.
   - Do an inventory of what’s going on in each college; each committee member could investigate her/his own unit in the next month.
   - Assessment requirements for UGR; the committee would need a baseline for measurement for each department.
   - Have each dean present at the CUR symposium on what each college does with undergraduate research; open up this year’s CUR to all schools; J LaPlant suggested delaying this idea until April 2010, since the planning for this year’s symposium has been done.
   - Require each college to create an undergraduate research committee and have each give a symposium; have the best undergraduate symposium students present their work at the graduate research symposium.
   - Create on-line public facilities to facilitate and raise awareness of undergraduate research.
   - Build the QEP into the curriculum; gateway and capstone courses, independent studies, internships, senior thesis; do it in lower-division courses, not just in junior or senior courses.
• Possibly create a research track within majors? Minority students possibly disadvantaged in this; what about PERS courses with a research component?

• What counts as undergraduate research?

• As the new coordinator of Area B, J. LaPlant noted that there are possibilities through revising Area B—could create courses on community research project or a project on the nature of research, cutting edge research, or research ethics.

• CHEM 4910 is an elective research class; vital for those going on to grad school, med school; grants work well with these students. Many programs are now requiring publications/presentations for admission – the UGR would help with this.

• What do we need to build in to support faculty who want to work with undergraduate research? Workshops, colloquia, support groups, professional development…Maybe a VSU Faculty Excellence Award for mentoring undergraduate research.

• The UGR students could present to other classes, as well as in symposia.

• Can we get more student involvement on the committee? Emails were sent to the Dean of Student Affairs and the Dean of Students for input. Possible student recruits would be from SIFE, SGA, Honors, AP/PSO. Send any names to J. Kinney or J. LaPlant.

• The University of Kentucky has a current position posted for a Director of the UR program; we may want to look at it for details on responsibilities.

• What about a research ethics course? They’re often required for NSF grants. VSU already has an ethics minor run by Dr. Christine James. The Grants and Contracts Office also has on-line resources in this area in various fields.

• It’s not a good idea to require everyone to get into the undergraduate research program. If the program is set up well, it will draw students and faculty to it.

• Administration will have to reward faculty who are involved; has to fit in to promotion and tenure; could the Boyer model be used regarding whether faculty teach or do research? Would it be possible to ease the faculty member’s workload with course release?

• Use the CUR symposium’s definition of research; broad to include more fields.

• Consensus that a coordinator is a must for the Office of Undergraduate Research. More than a course release will be needed for the position.

• Is there a role here for graduate students? SACS suggests that we focus on one group of students. Currently, there is little money available for our grad students. K. Hull feels comfortable connecting graduate and undergraduate symposia in the future. Eventually, work would be done on increasing funding. It was suggested that grad students could be used as part of mentoring teams for undergraduate research.
• Push faculty to apply for grants in Math/Science/Technology. J. Trombetta informed the committee that getting research funding is a big part of the capital campaign, though it’s usually better to have a defined topic before asking donors for funding. Start-up funds are needed, though. Corporate sponsorship could help to fund a campus-wide symposium.

• The budget subcommittee should consider submitting several budget options (A/B/C or $$/$$/$$$) which could be reviewed by the SACS Leadership Team.

• What are the possible initiatives for the first years?
  o Publications
  o Centralization/coordination; maybe initially a coordinator would be appointed who would get a course release; use graduate students? The budget committee can hammer out the options.
  o Summer programs, curriculum changes, annual symposia for each college
  o Special recognition through Faculty Excellence Award?

4. The next QEP meeting will be in late February. Tasks for committee members before the next meeting include:

  • Everyone is to bring an inventory of undergraduate research in their department/unit to the next meeting.
  • Submit student names for potential committee members to J. Kinney or J. LaPlant
  • Consider areas of individual expertise/interest
  • Review the QEP handbook (look at subcommittee possibilities)
  • Try to come up with some marketing ideas

Subcommittees, once assigned, can do preliminary research to present to the group as a whole. For example, the Assessment Committee can look at what other QEPs have done and how. J. LaPlant will send committee members a list of subcommittees, according to the QEP handbook.

K Hull asked how the subcommittees would be organized and how multiple subcommittees would put together a single proposal. J. LaPlant said to the subcommittee chairs will report to the leadership group (composed of the Chairs of the subcommittees.) K. Cragg offered the help of the Strategic Research and Analysis office and encouraged people to pass that on to their units.

Committee and subcommittee minutes will be posted on the SACS/QEP webpage. It’s also available for links to other college websites or for uploading information. Please send all information to be uploaded to vrwood@valdosta.edu in the Accreditation Compliance Office. WebCT is also available for materials that the committee does not wish to be made public.