

Minutes: QEP Assessment Subcommittee
 Wednesday, March 28
 11:30-12:30
 H-205

Eileen DeLuca-co-chair	<i>Present</i>	Scott Van Selow	<i>Present</i>
Kevin Coughlin-co-chair	<i>Present</i>	Amy Trogan	<i>Present</i>
Crystal Revak	<i>Present</i>	Susan Marcy	<i>Present</i>

1. The team reviewed the current QEP assessment plan. The focus of the plan has narrowed based on feedback from the SACS COC on-site team as well as from SLS 1515 faculty.

a. Direct Measures: Critical Thinking

- ✓ Critical Thinking Rubric: A rubric standardization session was held on March 3. Eileen and nine faculty participated. In addition to scoring artifacts from across campuses, the faculty engaged in pair and large group discussion about various facets of the rubric. They recorded qualitative responses to a series of questions about the rubrics. The faculty also engaged in discussions about how the journals were assigned and how critical thinking was being taught. A number of faculty indicated they desired additional training/support to teach critical thinking. Assessment clerks put together a summary of qualitative responses. The IRPE office provided inter-rater correlations. The quantitative and qualitative data were reviewed by the faculty on March 26. The curriculum subcommittee will revise the rubrics and the updated versions will be used for final scoring of the journals. For this term only, data will be collected via carbonless copy forms. The rubric will also be used to score the final essay assignment.
- ✓ California Critical Thinking Skills Test: Many of the faculty believe that the reading difficulty of the test is too high. The company reports that the test items are written at an eighth grade level. The same company offers a version of the test designed for high school and two-year colleges. The readability is reported to be at a sixth grade level. The Standardized Assessment subcommittee is reviewing that test and others as a possible alternative. Students took a pre-test at the beginning of the term. They will post-test in a couple of weeks.

b. Direct Measures: Success Skills

- ✓ Group project Rubric: Eileen reported that the faculty will review and standardize this rubric in fall 2012. Faculty will pilot usage in the next few weeks to score the students group projects. Eileen will ask faculty to take notes and provide qualitative responses about the rubric's efficacy. She will provide a series of prompts similar to those the faculty used to record their qualitative responses to the Critical Thinking Rubric.
- ✓ SmarterMeasure Assessment: Students took the SmarterMeasure inventory at the beginning of the term and will complete it again at the end of the term. The faculty and students have had a positive response to the instrument, and the report it provides to the individual student. However, there is a concern that SmarterMeasure may not be specifically designed to measure the success strategies that correlate with academic success. The company's Website provides detailed studies related to the efficacy of the measure, but it states that SmarterMeasure

focuses on identifying whether or not students are prepared for online course. Below is narrative from the website. Relevant sections appear in bold:

It should be noted that SmarterMeasure is not designed to be a predictor of academic success. There are a myriad of variables which impact academic success in online courses ranging from the student's intelligence to the level of interactivity of the online faculty member. SmarterMeasure is an indicator of the degree to which online, hybrid and technology rich courses are a good fit for a student. SmarterMeasure does not make a value judgment indicating that a student should or should not take the courses. Rather it informs the student of their strengths and opportunities for growth in areas related to taking these type courses. If a student is indicated to be deficient in a certain area and then if the school provides appropriate remediation and/or support, then SmarterMeasure can serve as a retention tool by helping students succeed as they learn in the context of online or technology rich courses. (<http://www.smartermeasure.com/research/construct-validity/>).

Eileen will send the group information about other Learning Styles/Life Factors inventories that may be a better fit.

- ✓ Qualitative Data from Final Essay Assignment: Random samples of the students' final essay assignments will be analyzed and any discussion of success strategies will be coded and grouped into concepts. Later the codes and concepts will be used to design a survey instrument. The IRPE office will generate a random sample of students. A set number of students from each class will be chosen. The faculty will be asked to provide copies of the final essay of the selected students. The coding will be done over the summer. A stipend (for training and coding) will be offered to faculty who wish to participate.

C. Indirect Measures: Retention and Satisfaction

- ✓ Course completion rates will be available after spring 2012.
- ✓ SIR II scores will be available after spring 2012.
- ✓ Term-to-term retention rates, year-to-year retention rates, and cohort graduation reports will become available over the implementation timeline.

Indirect Measures: Survey Data

- ✓ Crystal reported that the SENSE survey will be administered in fall 2012.
- ✓ Crystal reported that the CCSSE will be administered in spring 2013.

D. Indirect Measures: Focus Groups

- ✓ Student Focus Groups: The QEP Implementation Team designed a set of questions for student focus groups. The questions were also vetted through the QEP response team. The group discussed the protocol for focus group sessions. Kevin suggested that the groups include between 8-10 students. Eileen will set tentative dates and times and ask faculty to have students sign-up during class. There is funding available for pizza, cookies, and drinks. Members of the QEP Assessment Subcommittee who are available during the scheduled times are encouraged to help lead the sessions.

2. Learning management systems (Canvas, TK20): Eileen reported that the Banner team listed both TK20 and Canvas as options for collecting student assessment data from the rubrics. The subcommittee discussed the pros and cons of each. Scott and Amy reported that grading with rubrics on Canvas is

convenient and the IRPE office should be able to pull raw data from Canvas. Amy volunteered to have a Canvas course set up for the subcommittee.

3. The group agreed to meet from 11:30-12:30 for the remainder of the spring 2012 term.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca