

Minutes: QEP Assessment Subcommittee  
 Wednesday, September 12, 2012  
 1:00-2:00 p.m.  
 H-206

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

1. The committee reviewed the Summer Term pilot data course success rates.

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>A-C</b>	<b>Passing %</b>
Charlotte	20	17	85
Collier	38	35	92.1
Hendry/Glades	6	6	100
Lee	115	108	93.9
District Total	179	166	92.7

The overall district pass rates are 7.7% over the stated goal of 85%. Eileen noted that historically, the summer term success rates in the Developmental Studies courses are much higher than fall and spring terms.

2. Kevin is working on reformatting the SmarterMeasure data to do the pre-/post-test analysis.

3. Kevin reviewed the CCTDI analysis.

CCTDI Summer A and B 2012

Table 1

Correlated Means T-Test, Post-Test versus Pre-Test

Domain	df	Difference Between Means	SD	t	Pr < t
Truth Seeking	134	2.60	4.93	6.13	< .0001
Open Mindedness	134	1.74	4.52	4.47	< .0001
Analyticity	134	2.18	4.46	5.68	< .0001
Systematicity	134	2.55	5.34	5.55	< .0001
Inquisitiveness	134	1.78	4.11	5.03	< .0001
Confidence in Judgment	134	3.83	4.82	9.23	< .0001
Maturity in Judgment	134	2.10	4.92	4.95	< .0001

*n* = 135

Table 2  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Pre and Post Tests by Domain*

Variable	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max
<i>Post-Test</i>					
Truth Seeking	135	37.99	6.89	19.17	57.50
Open Mindedness	135	42.88	6.17	27.50	60.00
Analyticity	135	47.88	5.58	37.27	59.09
Systematicity	135	46.67	6.39	31.82	60.00
Inquisitiveness	135	52.71	4.92	39.00	60.00
Confidence in Judgment	135	49.47	6.30	35.56	60.00
Maturity in Judgment	135	43.82	6.94	23.00	60.00
<i>Pre-Test</i>					
Truth Seeking	166	34.52	6.12	22.50	50.00
Open Mindedness	166	41.05	5.12	28.33	54.17
Analyticity	166	45.62	5.52	29.09	60.00
Systematicity	166	43.66	6.29	20.91	59.09
Inquisitiveness	166	50.96	5.16	39.00	60.00
Confidence in Judgment	166	45.89	6.55	25.55	58.89
Maturity in Judgment	166	41.31	6.55	0.25	60.00

Across all variables, there were significant increases in the scores between the pre- and post-test administrations. The largest increase was in “Confidence in Judgment.” Kevin noted that there were a number of students who had taken the pre-test but did not have scores for the post-test. The difference could not be accounted for by attrition. Eileen will need to work with faculty to ensure vigilance about pre/post completion. Scott suggested that faculty could add a one question quiz in Canvas, “Did you complete the CCTDI assessment?” as a way to prompt completion.

Eileen discussed how the CCTDI seems to align well with the Critical Thinking skills that are developed in the course. Classes take 20-25 minutes to complete the assessment, and it provides a user-friendly report for the students. The readability is on target, with only a few students asking for clarity on some of the vocabulary in the items.

The committee discussed the need for more computer lab space to allow all sections to complete the Web-based assessments during class time. The concern was brought to the attention of the VPAA who suggested purchasing more laptops and mobile carts. Scott suggested that tablets may be a better alternative because they are less costly and more functional. Eileen will work get a quote from the technology staff and check for available funding.

4. Eileen and Kevin provided an update on the use of Canvas for collecting the rubric data. Canvas was used in the Summer B sections and is currently being used in a fall sections, region-wide. Some issues:

- During the summer term, faculty individually chose how each rubric criterion would weigh in the overall grade. For this reason, faculty had to enter rubric scores twice for each assignment: once to determine the grade, once to extract the rubric performance level scores for each criterion (e.g. 4,3,2,1). Some faculty did not enter the scores twice, and therefore the data could not be extracted from those sections. Dr. Tawil worked with the faculty to establish common weights for the rubrics, so in the fall sections, faculty only need to enter scores once.
- The data extracted from Canvas comes in a format that is not very user-friendly. Kevin, Eileen and Dr. Susan Hibbard had a phone conference with Dobin Anderson to try to determine a way to get a report that would not require so much reformatting. Dobin reported that Canvas’ initial focus was to make the system student-friendly. The techs are now catching up on making the data reporting end more sophisticated. Dobin and the IRPE office will continue communication with the Canvas techs to ensure that we are able to generate more functional reports. For the summer data, Eileen reformatted the spreadsheets so that overall mean scores could be reported for each rubric criterion. This is a temporary fix.

5. The committee reviewed the Critical Thinking Journal data.

**Critical Thinking  
Journal-Summer 2012**

	<b>Accuracy</b>	<b>Clarity</b>	<b>Logic</b>	<b>Relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>Overall Means</b>	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.3
% of students receiving a “3” or higher	63%	73%	78%	94%	75%
% of student receiving a “4”	3%	2%	7%	10%	9%

The percentage of students achieving a “3” or higher on the “Clarity, Logic, Relevance, and Significance” criteria achieved and exceeded the stated goal of 70%. On the “Accuracy” criterion, the percentage of students achieving a “3” or higher fell short of the stated goal by 7%.

In all criteria, the number of students achieving a “4” or higher fell short of the stated goal of 20%

The committee engaged in an extended discussion about the feasibility of meeting the stated goal of 20% of students receiving a “4.” It was noted that if 10 journal scores are

being averaged, it would be rare that someone would receive a “4” across any given criterion for all of the 10 entries. Also, Scott suggested that for purposes of reporting achievement, we may only want to focus on the final journal entry or a number of the final entries (e.g. the average of the last three). Earlier journal scores would be considered “formative,” averaged in to the students’ overall grades, but would not count towards the reporting of summative achievement for the purpose of the QEP, which would focus on the students’ achievement as a result of the course. Kevin suggested that his office could run a study to examine how the scores increase across time. Eileen will ask Dr. Tawil and the faculty to discuss the most appropriate manner for reporting achievement.

6. The committee reviewed the Final Essay data.

**Final Essay-Summer  
2012**

	<b>Accuracy</b>	<b>Clarity</b>	<b>Logic</b>	<b>Relevance</b>	<b>Significance</b>
<b>Overall Means</b>	3.33	3.09	3.39	3.61	3.46
% of students receiving a "3" or higher	97%	88%	88%	91%	87%
% of students receiving a "4"	36%	21%	51%	70%	45%

The percentage of students achieving a “3” or higher on all criteria achieved and exceeded the stated goal of 70%.

The percentage of students achieving a “4” on all criteria achieved and exceeded the stated goal of 20%.

7. The committee reviewed the Group Presentation data.

**Group Presentation -  
Summer 2012**

	<b>Completion</b>	<b>Demonstration</b>	<b>Presentation</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>Overall Means</b>	3.37	3.54	3.67	3.34
% of students scoring "3" or higher	100%	100%	100%	100%
% of students scoring "4"	37%	54%	67%	34%

The percentage of students achieving a “3” or higher on all criteria achieved and exceeded the stated goal of 70%.

The percentage of students achieving a “4” on all criteria achieved and exceeded the stated goal of 20%.

8. The committee will discuss the SmarterMeasure results, SENSE Implementation, final essay coding, Summer Term SIR II Data, and the Career Interest Survey at the meeting on October 10.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca