

**TWO METHODS FOR INCREASING  
FACULTY GOVERNANCE IN UNIVERSITIES:  
TRANSCRIPT OF AN ON-LINE WORKSHOP**

Stuart A. Umpleby  
Research Program in Social and Organizational Learning  
The George Washington University  
Washington, DC 20052 USA  
[www.gwu.edu/~umpleby](http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby)

March 29, 2006

Transcript of a workshop during the Mid-Semester On-Line Conference  
of the Junior Faculty Development Program  
March 29, 2006

## Background

3:00-5:00 pm, Wednesday, March 29

Professor Umpleby has conducted the Quality Improvement Priority Matrix with several groups of JFDP Fellows at The George Washington University, and has published findings together with JFDP Fellows. Two methods useful for starting a quality improvement program in an organization are a group planning activity and a “quality improvement priority matrix.” 1) A group planning activity can, in a short period of time such as two days, produce a definition of an organization’s vision, define obstacles to achieving the vision, develop strategies for removing the obstacles, and then create actions to implement the strategies. 2) A quality improvement priority matrix begins with a list of features of a product or service or an organization. Customers or employees rate the features on importance and performance. Attention is then focused on features that are rated high in importance and low in performance. This method of “data-driven decision-making” is very easy to use. It requires no special knowledge of statistics.

Download the zip file below to find two papers about the Quality Improvement Priority Matrix, and complete the two questionnaires to participate in this study. In addition, check Professor Umpleby's website for Quality Improvement Priority Matrix articles and papers on the Technology of Participation:

<http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/>

Download: [2006\\_QualityImprovement.zip](#)

## Introduction

Speaker: [Stuart Umpleby](#)

A quality improvement priority matrix (QIPM) is a way of increasing the role of faculty members in the governance of departments, schools, and universities. The method is easy to learn and the results are easy to understand. Rather than having decisions be made by one or a few administrators, the judgments of faculty can be combined to reveal the faculty judgment on priorities. Or, students could be surveyed to reveal their combined sense of needed actions. By focusing attention and improvement efforts on the subjects of greatest concern to faculty and students, available resources can be used most efficiently. Also, morale will improve more quickly.

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 02.55.41

Data from a QIPM can also be used to compare the judgments of faculty members on different campuses. See the paper at this link for comparisons of the judgments of faculty members in the Department of Management Science at The George Washington University in Washington DC and the Department of Management at Kazan State University in Kazan, Russia.

[http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/recent\\_papers/2004\\_comparing\\_priorities\\_in\\_academic\\_department\\_russia\\_america\\_naoumova\\_umpleby.htm](http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/recent_papers/2004_comparing_priorities_in_academic_department_russia_america_naoumova_umpleby.htm)  
posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.01.06

### **Role of faculty and administration**

Should the faculty and the administrative staff play the same role in quality improvement at the departmental level?

posted by: [magda arzakanyan](#) | 03/29/06 | 02.59.56

### **Role of faculty and administration**



Based on my experience leading quality improvement efforts in the GWU Dept. of Management Science and the GWU School of Business, I would say that administrative staff people are the most enthusiastic about quality improvement in general. (QIPM is one specific method.) Staff people want to operate more efficiently and to do this they need cooperation from the people they serve. Organizing a quality improvement team gives them that structured cooperation. They feel elated.

Faculty, on the other hand, tend to feel that "quality improvement" means they will be expected to work harder, when they are already working as hard as they can.

The nice thing about QIPM is that it is a way for faculty members to tell administrators, and each other, what they think is most important. Hence, faculty respond well to it. Administrators also respond well, since the results are the combined judgments of the faculty (or students). The recommended priorities may not be adopted completely, but at least they become known in usable form.

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.11.22

### **QIPM questionnaire usage and analysis**



Dear Dr. Umpleby! Thanks for exciting materials. I am really interested in "Quality improvement priority matrix" and would like to try to use this method in my country (Kazakhstan). Do you have a special questionnaire adjusted to Central Asia region (I have seen in your website that you are working with Uzbekistan, in Russian or Uzbek) or you used the same questionnaire everywhere.

What kind of statistical analysis are you using? Do I need a validation process before starting research? What is the first/second/third factor or group of factors that mainly determine quality? Have you done factor or component analysis?

posted by: [Almira Kustubayeva](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.07.35

## Russian language, mathematics



I have been very lucky to collaborate with several very capable people on the further development of this method. Irina Naoumova in Kazan, Russia, translated the questionnaire into Russian and surveyed her faculty. She used the same items in order to have comparable results, even though some items were less relevant to her faculty members.

The statistics can be done using Excel. However, one of my students created an on-line version. See [www.qipm.com](http://www.qipm.com). Igor Dubina in Barnaul, Russia, has further developed the method and plans to create a software package to simplify using the method. He can be reached at Igor Dubina, [din@econ.asu.ru](mailto:din@econ.asu.ru) and [igor\\_dubina@yahoo.com](mailto:igor_dubina@yahoo.com).

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.17.54

## My opinion



I think a “quality improvement priority matrix” is a very, very good tool for understanding the existing level of development and consequently for improving it. To achieve better results one should prepare matrix forms for different improvement problems and then fill in the forms.

posted by: [Nasrutdin Dilmuradov](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.12.01

## Thank you!



After going through all the prep documents last night, I found them really inspiring to propose some of the things found there to the faculty in my home department. Thanks for sharing that with us.

posted by: [Gordana Durkovic](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.13.15

## QIPM Methods



Dear Stuart,  
thank you for wonderful ideas about quality improvement. We do need improvement always and everywhere.

As I understood, in the first method the goal is to specify problems at your place and then find solutions. Also, team work is important. The second method - to identify importance and current performance of features of the organization. How could you calculate the results in both methods? Could you give examples, if possible, please?

How are these methods applicable in personal improvement? And are they applicable at all (for personal improvement)? Thank you.

posted by: [saltanat kazhimuratova](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.14.44

## Comparing the two methods



The two methods described in the paper with Irina Naoumova are very different.

1. The first is group facilitation or the "technology of participation". This is a way of conducting a conversation where the leader / facilitator does not present his or her opinions but rather asks questions of the participants. Ideas are brought together in a way that defines problems and offers solutions. The conversation is conducted in such a way that people do not debate each other, rather they work together to define problems and devise solutions. For a good description of how these methods are being used in Russia, see the paper with Tatiana Medvedeva in 2003 at [www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/ptp.html](http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/ptp.html).

There are two disadvantages with this method. First, the facilitator needs to learn new skills. This takes time and practice. Second, one must persuade a group of people to take a few hours, or even better a weekend, to devise a strategic plan for the organization. People often feel they are too busy to do planning. However, I highly recommend a planning session in a "retreat" once a year. The organization then improves more rapidly.

2. The second method (QIPM) is just a special kind of questionnaire. It takes only a few minutes to fill it out, and results can be processed with Excel. Hence, when people are "too busy", I suggest starting with QIPM.

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.38.11

## Importance & performance



I agree that QIPM can be a great method for change in a university department. If you know what your problem is, you can try to solve it. The problem is the group. For example, teaching assistants can be members of this group and they can have good results in the meeting, but they cannot make strategy because they do not have a big influence in the home department.

posted by: [Milena Karapetrovic](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.18.59

## Do what you can...



Teddy Roosevelt once said, "Do what you can, where you are, with what you have." (See a list of quotes at <http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/quotes/>. These can be printed out and posted near your office. Some have been translated into Russian by previous scholars.)

If you cannot persuade your boss to do what you think is needed, work with whatever group you can influence. As that group's performance improves, you will rise in the organization and thereby be able to influence more people. :-)

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.44.08

## Quotes



I like the quotes very much :-) and they are very applicable to any situation... so, I guess a positive attitude has to go together with these methods.

posted by: [Gordana Durkovic](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.53.51

## Quotes



I searched the site with quotes. I like them! Thank you.

This one in particular: Woody Allen's "If you're not failing every now and again, it's a sign you're not doing anything very innovative."

"Если время от времени ты не испытываешь затруднения, это знак того, что ты не делаешь ничего нового в жизни."

posted by: [saltanat kazhimuratova](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.03.30

## Quotes



Among your quotes I found that this one is applicable to our discussion too: Victor Hugo "An invasion of armies can be resisted, but not an idea whose time has come." It is time to change and improve!!!

posted by: [Damira Jantassova](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.18.00

## International faculty



In your opinion, how important is it to recruit some international visiting professors to work for the department in order to improve the functioning of the department?

posted by: [Mirajidin Arynov](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.47.02

## Global network of universities



I think international visiting professors can be quite helpful. And they are available via the Fulbright Senior Specialist Program (do a google search). However, I see these visits as just the first step. More important is keeping in touch via email during the succeeding years. Due to the internet we now have a single university system. I write papers with people in many countries, and I see them occasionally at conferences. I think all faculty members should be encouraged to make extensive use of the internet. The internet is an incredible resource. We are just beginning to learn how to use it well.

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.00.06

## Hello!



Since you have already worked with JFDP Fellows on this quality improvement matrix in a university department, I wonder if those fellows managed to follow up the results and if they managed to make some improvements at their departments at home?

posted by: [Alma Jahic](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.28.53

## Successes



Irina Naoumova was the head of her department when she did the QIPM survey with her faculty members. She found the results to be quite helpful, and she said her faculty did as well.

Tatiana Medvedeva was formerly a Professor of Economics. She is now the head of the Management Training Center for the West Siberian Railroad. She is very good at working with people. She uses the Technology of Participation. She is not familiar with QIPM. I worked on this method after the time she was a visiting scholar at GWU (1996).

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.49.25

## Success in Ekaterinburg and Shanghai



Roman Cheskidov in Ekaterinburg, Russia, is using the Technology of Participation with businesses in his city. He now has a consulting practice in addition to being a professor. Jixuan Hu, who did his doctoral degree with me, has a business in Shanghai, China, doing group facilitation with Chinese firms.

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.51.48

## QIPM



Thank you for providing us with very interesting materials. I'll share the information on the QIPM with the colleagues in my home country. It will be very valuable in the ongoing process of educational reform in Georgia.

posted by: [Nana Khetsuriani Khetsuriani](#) | 03/29/06 | 03.58.12

### **Resources for visiting scholars**



I have compiled a list of resources for our visiting scholars. Have a look at <http://www.gwu.edu/~rpsol/schresource.html>

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.04.14

### **US and European universities**

Do you know are those models different from those which are used at European Universities? And if there is any difference, do you know what is the difference?

posted by: [Jelena Brkic](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.01.09

### **European differences**



Dear Prof. Umpleby,

Your materials were really very informative, comprehensive and useful. Thank you for providing them to us.

Quality improvement and quality assurance are two key issues the universities in Albania are dealing with. Although the process seems to be easy to follow, sometimes the faculty, administrative staff and students are confronted with external elements that they cannot fully control. Do you think that there should be an interaction between the main factors affecting quality improvement/assurance and the external ones? In your experience, which are the most frequent "external factors" having an impact on quality improvement and how have you handled them?

posted by: [Adelina Albrahimi](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.02.51

### **Quality improvement vs. quality assurance**



The only term I came across in the whole posted materials on this subject was quality improvement, while in Europe scholars mainly speak of quality assurance, considering improvement as part of the assurance. Could you please provide some clarification on the

way these two terms are used in the States, or do you rather think that the wording is different, but the concept is the same? Thank you!

posted by: [Adelina Albrahimi](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.11.59

### **US, Europe, etc.**



Many names are used for the same thing -- quality improvement, quality assurance, total quality management, six sigma, continuous improvement, etc. What is important is not the label but the methods referred to. These methods have been shown to be highly effective in increasing the international competitiveness of businesses. They can also be used to improve the effectiveness of government agencies and universities and health care organizations.

The two methods I have been discussing -- technology of participation and QIPM -- are in my mind specific instances of quality improvement methods. For an introduction to other methods, look at [www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/mgt201](http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/mgt201).

These methods have been used in countries around the world. They need to be modified slightly to fit different cultural contexts, but people who know the local culture will tend to make these modifications in order to be successful.

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.13.45

### **"Meta-strategy" in QIPM**



QIPM is interesting tool. But it needs to be based on consensus among department staff (teaching as well as administrative) about the need to develop the new strategy. If such an agreement is lacking, there will be no practical use of the survey. On the other hand, the change in perception among staff and students can be very obvious and significant from one time to another. So, we must be aware that the results of the survey are always a time slice results. Who will decide how long they will be valid, and when a new survey is needed? If it is too often, it can perpetuate the trial-and-error method in defining the study program of a particular study group. Since usually all the new programs have to be validated by some external board, and this usually takes considerable time, it can easily happen that the program based on the survey starts to be effective at the moment when a new survey would show different views and needs. So, it is not only an improvement strategy based on the QIPM that we have to think about. We should have a "meta strategy", which will define the complete process of QIPM and its implementation.

posted by: [Krešimir Krnic](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.15.00

### **Uses of QIPM**



QIPM yields an agenda for action. Two questionnaires done a year apart show how people evaluate changes that have occurred in the past year. Hence, it is possible to see both where progress has occurred and which items have moved up on urgency or priority.  
posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.25.38

### **External influences**



Regarding external influences, my impression is that faculty members in the US have much more control over curricula, teaching methods, and hiring and promotion than do faculty members in most other countries. I expect to see a long term trend toward a larger role for faculty members in governance of universities in other countries. This will take time and effort, but I think it is necessary to make faster progress. Looking at how other universities function will yield ideas on where improvements can be made.  
posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.18.22

### **Schools and state**



I would like to make a comment referring to what is happening in this area in my country. The issue of quality in education becomes a very important issue in the process of education in the Republic of Serbia. The initiative has been raised under the title “Quality education for all- a way toward a developed society” and is incorporated in the overall national strategy of education reform. In that sense it is clear that quality in classrooms is not an issue only for schools to deal with (on an individual basis), but an issue of national importance as well. I see this as an appropriate way of thinking about quality in education.  
posted by: [Ana Aleksic](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.20

### **Education as a national goal**



Almost every country will say that improving education is a national goal. What is important is the method used to achieve the goal. Edwards Deming, one of the inventors of quality improvement methods, emphasized the importance of using quality improvement methods. People tend to think that they are always striving to improve, but if they are not using well-tested methods, they will not progress as rapidly as those who do use proven methods. I believe that learning and using these methods is the key to making rapid progress.  
posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.34.35

## Universities in transition countries



I have just read one of your papers - "How universities in transition countries can become more integrated in the global academic community". My interest in it was initially triggered by the fact that the study Participatory Strategic Planning was conducted with former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia academic staff. Since the study was carried out at the beginning of 2005, I was wondering what kind of results the planning has had so far.

posted by: [Milica Savic](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.35.21

## Results lie in local action



The planning activity that Milica refers to above was conducted with the JFDP scholars at GWU, and in the Washington area, last year. The subject was how they could improve their universities when they returned home. So, I would say that the results are primarily in the minds of the participants. The 2004 paper with Yaroslav Prytula combined the two methods -- group facilitation and QIPM. It also had two groups of participants -- the JFDP group in Washington and the JFDP scholars in the rest of the country via email. Both of these innovations came from Yaroslav Prytula. I think you will find the results of this planning activity to be "perspective stretching."

posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.47.46

## Defining quality of education



I am really interested in this topic, because I am going to Indiana University's conference on April 8, 2006, there I will present my abstract on "Quality of Higher Education in Tajikistan: Problems and Solutions." I have learned already from your papers that the idea of QIPM is, as you mentioned, very useful and easy. Last year we also developed a special questionnaire for our research project on higher education.

In my opinion, the term "quality" is very wide, and at the same time, very difficult to explain. We have only quantity indicators, which we have to change to quality indicators. And, quantity indicators are not always able to show associated quality.

In your opinion, what does mean "quality of education" by itself?

posted by: [Azim Bayzoev](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.39.50

## Definition of quality



Quality is defined by the customer. Who is the customer of education? An obvious answer is the student. But at a research university the answer can be the faculty. It is the

faculty who do research, keep in touch with the state-of-the art, and advance what is known. Because US research universities believe that their primary responsibility is to develop their faculty resources, they provide travel money to conferences, summer research support, and course relief (fewer classes to teach). A high quality faculty attracts students and generates additional income through research grants. The prestige of a university is usually measured by the publication record of the faculty. Improving the working conditions of faculty is the key to becoming a world class university.  
posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.41.09

### Who is using QIPM?



It is very interesting for me to know how many US universities use the “quality improvement priority matrix”? and when did they start using it? Thank you.  
posted by: [Mirajidin Arynov](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.45.24

### An aid to faculty governance



I am not sure what other universities are using QIPM. But such quadrant diagrams are used very widely in industry, particularly among Baldrige Award (quality award) winners. In a recent class a student from the US Dept. of Treasury explained how she had used a variation of it in a project with IBM, which was consulting with Treasury. The university administration of GWU does something they call "gap analysis" which is very similar to QIPM. This may be the result of my advocating the use of QIPM several years ago when I was a member of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee. This committee of the Faculty Senate reviews the University budget and prepares a report for the Faculty Senate. Hence, the faculty can see any budgets they want, and, indeed, a process is in place for the faculty to regularly review the University's budgets. This is part of what we call "faculty governance." "Faculty governance" means the faculty are in charge of the university. Administrators work for the faculty. It does not work exactly like that. Administrators have the responsibility for ensuring that the university remains financially viable. But governance of the university is a shared responsibility among faculty and administration.  
posted by: [Stuart Umpleby](#) | 03/29/06 | 05.02.24

### Quality In Higher Education



What is the main issue that has had the most influence on quality of higher education according to your research?  
posted by: [Almira Kustubayeva](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.52.30

## About relative parameters



I think this matrix has to be enriched by relative parameters such as number students per PC and so on, because it is difficult to identify problems just based on subjective estimation.

posted by: [Farhod Rahimov](#) | 03/29/06 | 04.53.17

## Transferability to home departments



Dear Stuart Umpleby,

It is very nice to communicate with you during this session, I found your research is really very useful. Quality improvement methods are beneficial for discovering what is important and what will improve the management of the educational system. Having been here for 3 months I know that I would like to change many things at my home department, but I had a question about what features of organization should be focused on and what should we begin to change. Because it is very easy to break but difficult to build a new education system, the best way is to change step by step. Now I know we can start with the statistical results of a quality improvement priority matrix.

I guess that this quality improvement method (questionnaire and survey) has been certainly integrated since the year 1995. I am wondering, can we take this questionnaire and survey as a basis to make the same research at our home departments?

posted by: [Damira Jantassova](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.30.29

## Experience in using it



I guess that a quality improvement priority matrix is a simple but powerful management tool, but how I can gain experience in using it?

posted by: [Marina Kevkhishvili](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.31.02

## Expectations for improvement



Even though I knew how big the discrepancy is at my home university department between importance and performance on the features in the matrix, I was impressed with the picture I had when I filled out the matrix. It is a powerful tool.

But I don't believe that I or other fellows in my country could have the power to influence improvements at my home university. I have in mind that most of the budget available for the university goes for staff salaries, even though the salaries are so small. What kind of improvements can we expect?

posted by: [Julijana Cicovic](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.32.16

## **Albanian experience and improvement – hard task**

Something about the Albanian experience-

salary of a prof. is not adequate , prof. are obligated to supplement their salaries by doing other work in or outside their academic field

- missing equipment, we must share computers with other colleagues
- absence of financial autonomy
- student evaluations are not used for the improvement of teaching
- head of department is elected by faculty members
- curricula are passed by a council of faculty and head of department and the dean

Some of the problems:

- insufficient technical equipment
- old methodology, insufficient funds
- insufficient teaching materials
- slow curriculum change
- limited networking beyond faculties

Anyway, in recent years there have been improvements. For example:

- training of faculty abroad in different programs (academic and administrative fields) through TEMPUS, Council of Europe, etc.
- raising funds from the enrollment of students but not yet financial autonomy
- Bologna process
- grants from several projects (for books , equipment, etc.)
- a new library supported by the Ministry of Education and the Austrian Ministry of Education
- bilateral agreements
- exchange of professors and administrative staff with other universities
- revising of curricula in the framework of the Bologna process

However, improvement of quality in university departments remains a hard task for us. Each professor teaches more than 200 students.

posted by: [Ledina Mandija](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.35.34

## **One person's effectiveness**



Hi. I have already completed questionnaire. I think the questions are very wise and relevant for my country... but after we do the survey in our home universities, we should make some changes to meet the wishes and desires we and our colleagues enumerated. What concrete activities would depend on us in Uzbekistan? Do you think that one person is able to make changes?

posted by: [Nilufar Begibayeva](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.36.18

## Questionnaire for alumni



Some points in the questionnaire seem not to be applicable for my university. Can I add some information which would better answer the question?

posted by: [Yevgeniy Tetyukhin](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.36.52

## Methods, results



Thank you for very useful materials. I am sure that these materials were, are and will be very effective. As you said, these methods work in Russia and Uzbekistan. Could you tell me, are there changes in buildings, equipment, and faculty protection (salary, insurance, academic expenses) in these countries?

posted by: [Azatkul Kudaibergenova](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.37.49

## Increasing effectiveness of available resources



Thank you for these materials. I am interested in the quality improvement priority matrix. QIPM is very useful for increasing the role of faculty members in the governance of universities. Our system of education preserves Soviet methods of governance and therefore our Ministry of Education tries to improve it. Considering our system of education how can we increase effectiveness of our available resources?

posted by: [Rafiq Alakbarov](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.38.43

## Tips for refining methods



The presented methods for starting a quality improvement program in an organization are very interesting! I am wondering whether the two methods can be used for the same phenomenon and point out different results. Afterwards by simulating the end results we might come up with better solutions and meantime with some tips in perfecting the mentioned methods ... I would like to know your opinion about that.

posted by: [Visar Rustemi](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.39.50

## QIPM in specific academic programs



Dear Dr. Umpleby,

I would like to know how QIPM can be implemented in a Tourism and Hospitality organization?

posted by: [Gabriela Rakicevik](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.40.21

## U.S. classrooms use no formal quality standards?



I have realized that there are no formal quality standards that are explicitly used in classes. Is that situation only at GWU or it is the usual American approach?

posted by: [Lara Jelenc](#) | 03/30/06 | 09.41.30

## Answers to remaining questions



You are quite welcome to use my questionnaire at your university. And, of course, feel free to add and subtract features to make the questionnaire appropriate for your university.

I think the high priority items will be different for different departments and will change in time. In my department strategic planning and quality improvement methods have very high ratings. In other universities salaries, equipment and research support may have the highest ratings.

Farhod Rahimov noted that a QIPM yields only subjective data. This is quite correct. The results may be useful for agenda setting or for comparing priorities, but are not sufficient for comparing conditions at different universities.

For help in learning to use a QIPM or the Technology of Participation, I suggest that you contact people in your region who have used these methods. Look at the papers at [www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/qipm.html](http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/qipm.html) and [www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/ptp.html](http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/ptp.html). If you do not find an email address, do a google search on the name. We make a website for each of our visiting scholars. See <http://www.gwu.edu/~rpsol/visitsch.html>.

Several of you noted that you have limited resources and questioned what one person could do. To find additional resources, look at <http://www.gwu.edu/~rpsol/schresource.html>. Regarding the possibility of change, remember how much has changed in the past 20 years. For what one person can do, read the quotes at <http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby/quotes/>. The two methods we discussed in this on-line seminar help in making the best use of the resources of time and attention.

I am sure there are many new ways to use these methods. Please experiment and tell me your results.

Regarding tourism and hospitality, this field is very sensitive to customer satisfaction. Consequently, it tends to be a leader in adopting quality improvement methods.

Regarding course evaluations, many instructors at GWU and other US universities hand out course evaluation forms at the end of the semester. Instructors are encouraged to do this, but they do not always do so.

I have an email list of GWU JFDP alumni to whom I send occasional news such as conference announcements. If you would like to be added to this list, just let me know.

Good luck to all of you.

--

Stuart Umpleby, Research Program in Social and Organizational Learning  
2033 K Street NW, Suite 230, The George Washington University,  
Washington, DC 20052

[www.gwu.edu/~umpleby](http://www.gwu.edu/~umpleby), tel. 202-994-1642, fax 202-994-5284