Minutes
QEP Implementation Team Meeting
S-262D
September 20, 2012, 1:00-2:00 p.m.

Eileen DeLuca	*Present*	Martin Tawil	*Present*
Kathy Clark	*Present*	Kristin Zimmerman	*Present*
Tom Rath	*Present*	Whitney Rhyne	*Present*
Erin Harrel	*Absent*		

1. Subcommittee Recruiting: Eileen sent the information to the District Faculty Senate President requesting his support in recruiting faculty participants. She also sent a message out through the Portal, and separately to Deans and Academic Chairs encouraging participation. A number of faculty and staff have contacted her to find out more and join a subcommittee. The committee discussed Hendry/Glades representation on the QEP Implementation Team. Eileen will reach out to Duke Dipofi.

2. Subcommittee reports:

- FYE Programming: Whitney shared updates on programming. The "fun" events have been well-attended.   The academic workshops have had less attendance. The implementation team discussed strategies to increase student participation. The idea of increasing open lab hour was discussed. SLS 1515 faculty could be encouraged to send students to Q-127 during open lab hour to get more technology help. An upcoming event is Habitat for Humanity (Sept. 29). Eileen asked that Whitney forward the flyer to professors on all campuses since this "Saturday" event can be attended by students on all campuses. Check out: http://www.edison.edu/fye/workshops.php

- Curriculum: Martin will lead the first curriculum meeting on Thursday, September 27. He is also leading the twice monthly Community of Practice meetings for SLS 1515 faculty. Eileen asked Martin to share the Summer Term achievement data with the faculty to inform course improvement.

- Training and Development: Eileen and Rebecca Gubitti met with Rudy Moreira to ensure trainings become posted and marketed and to add additional trainings on all campuses. The video modules have been taken down. Rudy wants to contract with an outside vendor to create higher quality videos for the modules where appropriate. This could be a first-step in a process to also create online modules. Eileen reserved S-106/107 for December 12 and 13 to offer a "mini-conference" of Cornerstone Trainings

that could be available to faculty on all campuses. Rudy will begin scheduling sessions. They will try to schedule the five modules that all faculty and staff should complete on the 13th. They may also consider offering some modules on both days with the use of an additional room.

- Orientation/Advising/Registration: The group met on the 19th and discussed what went well and what could be improved from the fall registration cycle. The group spent a great deal of time discussing the Cornerstone hold. Pros: Hold seems to get students in the class during the first semester when the class would be most valuable to them. Dr. Davis is in favor of leaving the hold on. Cons: The hold requires students to contact an advisor every time s/he changes her/his schedule creating a disruption in the flow. Kristin and Dr. Watjen would like the Cornerstone hold to operate more like the Developmental hold (getting placed on the record after the first semester if the course hasn't been successfully completed).   To inform further discussion, Tom will seek a regular Banner report showing the number who would potentially need the Cornerstone course during the registration cycle. Kristin will seek a report showing how many students with the hold made schedule changes after the initial registration. Two other issues that will need to be reviewed and resolved: The possibility of changing catalog wording to indicate that students will need to complete the course with a "C" or better to fulfill the college requirement. Also, clarifying when degree-seeking students enrolled in EAP courses will be required to take SLS 1515. Tom will contact Robert Olancin, Troy Tucker, and Violeta Rotonda (full-time EAP faculty) to weigh in on the discussion.

- QEP Assessment: The QEP Assessment committee met on September 12. Some of the summer term data reviewed:

Summer Term pilot data course success rates provided by the Banner Team:

Campus	Total	A-C	Passing %
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.

The CCTDI analysis provided by the IRPE.

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
Post-Test					
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
Pre-Test					
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."

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.

Issues with Canvas data submission:

> 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.

Critical Thinking Journal data:

Critical Thinking Journal-Summer 2012

	Accuracy	Clarity	Logic	Relevance	Significance
Overall Means	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 asked Martin to share this discussion with the faculty to and come to a consensus about the most appropriate manner for reporting achievement.

Final Essay data:

Final Essay-Summer 2012	Accuracy	Clarity	Logic	Relevance	Significance
Overall Means	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%.

Group Presentation data:

Group Presentation - Summer 2012	Completion	Demonstration	Presentation	Timeline
Overall Means	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%.

The SmarterMeasure data became available after the QEP Assessment Meeting. The data provided by IRPE:

Summer 2012 (201230) Parts of Term A and B
Smarter Measure Assessment

Table 1
Correlated or Paired Means T-Test, Post-Test versus Pre-Test

Variable	n	df	Mean Difference	SD	t	Pr < t	Effect Size (d)
Learning Style	118	117	6.36	9.23	7.48*	<.0001	0.53
Personal Attributes (%)	118	117	2.33	6.48	3.91*	0.0002	0.31
Reading Recall (%)	118	117	0.34	20.50	0.18	0.8578	0.03
Reading Words per Minute	118	117	82.79	3997.60	0.22	0.8224	0.03
Typing Accuracy	114	113	1.94	17.16	1.21	0.2302	0.15
Typing Adjusted Words per Minute	114	113	2.08	4.83	4.60*	<.0001	0.26
Technology Knowledge (%)	114	113	5.10	8.69	6.26*	<.0001	0.44
Technology Competence (%)	117	116	1.22	11.80	1.12	0.2638	0.13
Life Factors (%)	120	119	4.49	7.52	6.54*	<.0001	0.6

* Significant difference at the alpha = .05 level

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

Variable	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Pre Test					
Learning Style	120	63.57	11.42	34.29	85.71
Personal Attributes (%)	120	78.05	6.18	62.50	93.75
Reading Recall (%)	120	69.92	18.03	10.00	100.00
Reading Words per Minute	120	723.57	2858.35	35.00	24840.00
Typing Accuracy	119	91.01	16.72	0.00	100.00
Typing Adjusted Words per Minute	119	21.65	8.91	0.00	55.00
Technology Knowledge (%)	119	65.43	11.85	34.38	90.63
Technology Competence (%)	120	88.58	11.28	44.44	100.00
Life Factors (%)	121	79.54	6.88	61.00	94.00
Post Test					
Learning Style	120	69.83	12.06	37.14	95.71
Personal Attributes (%)	120	80.07	6.78	61.46	91.67
Reading Recall (%)	120	70.58	20.59	10.00	100.00

Reading Words per Minute	120	807.74	2653.52	15.00	24840.00
Typing Accuracy	117	92.92	7.39	66.00	100.00
Typing Adjusted Words per Minute	117	24.00	9.00	5.00	53.00
Technology Knowledge (%)	117	70.78	12.27	40.63	95.31
Technology Competence (%)	119	90.03	11.00	44.44	100.00
Life Factors (%)	121	83.98	7.73	63.00	99.00

Overall, there were statistically significant improvements in two of the three areas that are reported on for the QEP: Personal Attributes, and Technology Knowledge. There were positive increases in the third area, Technology Competency, but the post-test scores were not statistically significantly higher. The implementation team strategized ways to get students more technology training and just-in-time instruction, including increased open-lab hours. Additionally, it was suggested that Peer Architects receive training in the use of Canvas and submitting assignments through Canvas so that they may provide further assistance to SLS 1515 students as they learn to use online learning management systems.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca