

Minutes: QEP Assessment Subcommittee
 Tuesday, May 15, 2012
 10:00-11:00
 I-119A

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. Focus Group Responses: The subcommittee reviewed the focus group responses from all campuses. The subcommittee noted trends related to:

- **Student satisfaction with the Passport Assignment**-Students were glad that the assignment exposed them to services and events that they may have “missed” had they not been required to attend. The QEP Assessment Subcommittee recommends that the assignment continue to be used as a means to encourage campus engagement and familiarity with support services. Based on faculty feedback, the assignment may need to be slightly modified to be more appropriate for use on all campuses. Also, there needs to be better communication to the staff about the purpose of the assignment and ways to work with students who visit a service as part of the assignment.
- **Student suggestions regarding more sports and/or intramural activities**-This suggestion will be shared with Dr. Teprovich (Director of Student Life). With the addition of student housing these types of programs may increase.
- **Student suggestions regarding communication about and timing of campus events**- Students like email communication and flyers, but think that more communication would encourage more attendance. In addition to weekly emails sent to SLS 1515 faculty, the FYE/Academic Success program will be launching a Facebook page to be managed by the FYE Coordinator. Susan suggested creating more “family friendly” campus events to accommodate students with children. Also she suggested that Residence Life staff will most likely be tasked with increasing evening events. These suggestions will be shared with Dr. Teprovich (Director of Student Life).
- **Student dissatisfaction with Critical Thinking Exam**-Many students had a negative reaction to the exam and reported that they did not see the exam as meaningful. This reaction supports the concerns of the faculty, the QEP Assessment subcommittee and the QEP Standardized Assessment subcommittee. For the summer sessions the Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CTDI) will replace the California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST).
- **Student satisfaction with interaction with professor and other students**-Students felt that in this class (more so than others) they connected with the class members and felt supported by the instructors.

- **Students wanting more technology training**-Scott suggested asking students to take the SmarterMeasure assessment before the semester begins. Based on those scores, students can be advised to complete Microsoft's Digital Literacy Curriculum.

<http://www.microsoft.com/about/corporatecitizenship/citizenship/giving/programs/up/digitalliteracy/default.aspx>

In addition to Academic Success workshop series such as "Technology Tuesdays," the program specialists can schedule open lab times for students to get one-on-one support and/or complete the digital literacy curriculum. This suggestion will be shared with the FYE/Academic Success staff as they plan summer workshops.

2. Grade Distribution Report: Barb Perrine will send a grade distribution report each term for the SLS 1515 classes. The report shows the number and percent of students in each section who completed the class successfully with a "C" or better. For spring 2012, the results are as follows:

- Charlotte: 66.7% passed with a "C" or better.
- Collier: 82.1% passed with a "C" or better.
- Hendry/Glades: 57.1% passed with a "C" or better.
- Lee: 76.9% passed with a "C" or better.
- District: 76.5% passed with a "C" or better.

The stated goal for 2012-2012 is "85% of students will pass the course with a 'C' or better." The spring 2012 rates fall short -8.5%. This semester will serve as a baseline. Kevin will work with Barb to modify the report to present the data in the format we need for QEP reporting.

3. Review of Critical Thinking Exam "Pre/Post" results: Kevin analyzed the California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) test data and provided the group with the results of a correlated means t-test, post-test versus pre-test as well as means and standard deviations for pre and post tests by domain. For the spring 2012 data, there were no statistically significant difference between the pre- and post test scores. The group theorized possible reasons for lack of gains including the reading difficulty of the test and the students' negative attitude about completing the test. Though some members of the subcommittee feel that the CCTST measures relevant domains of Critical Thinking, the majority of the committee feels that the level of difficulty of the exam and the lack of relationship to the course curriculum may make it an inappropriate tool to measure critical thinking as achieved in this course. The CCTDI has been vetted through this subcommittee, the Standardized Assessment subcommittee and with the lead faculty for the course and the groups support replacing the CCTST with the CCTDI.

4. Review Smarter Measure Data "Pre/Post" results: Kevin discussed some of the problems and issues that led to data anomalies. He was only able to analyze a subset of the tests. For those that completed 100% of the test and that had both a pre and post test, Kevin analyzed the SmarterMeasure Inventory data and provided the group with the results of a correlated means

t-test, post-test versus pre-test as well as means and standard deviations for pre and post tests by domain. There were statistically significant differences in four domains:

- Learning styles
- Life factors
- Tech knowledge
- Typing Words Per Minute

Scott pointed out that an increase on the “Learning Styles” measure may not necessarily indicate a gain or growth. This domain may not be something that is reported on in terms of “achievement” of the success skills outcome. "Life Factors" is another domain that won't necessarily change due to the course. Due to time, the group will continue to review and discuss these data at the next meeting as well as strategize ways to minimize some of the problems associated with pre and post testing (e.g. multiple attempts).

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca