

Edison State College's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)



**QEP Advisory Committee Meeting
July 11, 2012**

Eileen DeLuca, Dean, College and Career Readiness, QEP Director



QEP Goal

Through the full implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan, Edison State College's first-time-in-college (FTIC) students will be self-reliant learners imbued with critical thinking skills.



Direct Measures of Achievement

- ▶ In response to the SACS COC recommendation to narrow the focus of the QEP, the QEP Implementation Committee and the SLS 1515 faculty have narrowed the scope of the QEP to focus course content and assessment efforts on two of the four Cornerstone Experience frameworks, namely ***critical thinking*** and ***success strategies***.



Indirect Measures of Achievement

1. Once fully implemented, the QEP will facilitate an increase in student retention rates, rates of persistence, and graduation rates.
2. Through each phase of implementation, the QEP will foster increased rates of student satisfaction and student engagement.
3. As the faculty complete the Cornerstone Experience Instructor professional development modules, they will apply newly obtained knowledge to their practices to promote critical thinking and enhance the likelihood of success for first-year students.
4. As the staff and administrators complete the Cornerstone Experience Services professional development modules, they will apply practices that promote critical thinking and success to their interactions with first-year students.



Pilot Semester: Spring 2012 Course Sections

Campus	Sections	Enrollment
Lee	11	126
Collier	3	58
Charlotte	1	25
Hendry/Glades	1	7
District Total	16	216



Direct Measures-Critical Thinking-Spring 2012 Pilot

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Critical Thinking Journal assessment scored with the Critical Thinking Rubric	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric (20% should achieve a 4: exemplary).	<p>The students' achievement of each dimension (Clarity, Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic) of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity: 59% of the students received a "3" or higher, falling 11% short of the stated goal. 22% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 2%. • Accuracy: 72% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 2%. 29% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 9%. • Relevance: 90% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 20%. 50% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 30%. • Significance: 83% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 13%. 41% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 21%. • Logic: 72% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 2%. 31% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 11%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing additional support nonnative speakers of English, for example, allowing them to seek help in the College Prep Center labs where the Instructional Assistants are better trained to provide support to English language learners. ▪ Providing "EAP Transition Services" in fall 2012. This program will help bridge the gap for nonnative speakers of English who are enrolled in credit courses. ▪ Continuing working on standardizing the rubric scoring.

Direct Measures-Critical Thinking-Spring 2012 Pilot

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Final Essay Assignment scored with Critical Thinking Rubric	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric (20% should achieve a 4: exemplary).	<p>The students' achievement of each dimension (Clarity, Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic) of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity: 75% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 5%. 28% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 8%. • Accuracy: 76% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 6%. 36% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 16%. • Relevance: 86% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 16%. 48% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 28%. • Significance: 76% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 6%. 41% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 21%. • Logic: 79% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 9%. 43% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 23%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing additional support nonnative speakers of English, for example, allowing them to seek help in the College Prep Center labs where the Instructional Assistants are better trained to provide support to English language learners. ▪ Providing "EAP Transition Services" in Fall 2012. This program will help bridge the gap for nonnative speakers of English who are enrolled in credit courses. ▪ Continuing to work on standardizing the rubric scoring.

Direct Measures-Critical Thinking-Spring 2012 Pilot

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Scores on the California Critical Thinking Skills Test	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, baseline data will be established for comparison and goal setting for the 2012-2013 academic year.	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 showed no statistically significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores in Spring 2012.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The level of reading difficulty of the CCTST and the lack of relationship to the course curriculum may make it an inappropriate tool to measure critical thinking as achieved in this course. ▪ After a review of several Critical Thinking Assessment tools, The CCTDI was chosen to replace the CCTST.

Direct Measures-Success Strategies-Spring 2012 Pilot

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Scores on the Smarter Measure Learning Readiness Indicator “personal attribute” “technology knowledge” and “technical competency” items.	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, baseline data will be established for comparison and goal setting for the 2012-2013 academic year.	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 showed no statistically significant differences in “personal attribute items” or “Technology Competency” in Spring 2012. There was statistically significant improvement in “Technology Knowledge.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementing Microsoft’s Digital Literacy Curriculum ▪ Continuing “Technology Tuesdays” ▪ Scheduling open lab times for students to get one-on-one support and/or complete the digital literacy curriculum. ▪ Implementing Canvas in SLS 1515 sections. ▪ Providing Canvas training to students and Faculty.

Direct Measures-Success Strategies-Spring 2012 Pilot

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Success Strategies Presentation rubric	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, 70% of students that complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric (20% should achieve a 4: exemplary).	<p>The students' achievement of each dimension (Completion of the problem-solving template, Timeline for Project Completion, Demonstration of Effective Group Communication Skills, and Presentation) of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Completion of the problem-solving template: 98% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 28%. 44% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 24%. ● Timeline for Project Completion: 89% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 19%. 37% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 17%. ● Demonstration of Effective Group Communication Skills: 85% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 15%. 46% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated goal by 26%. ● Presentation: 86% of the students received a "3" or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 16%. 52% received a "4" or higher exceeding the stated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Providing more training in working in a group and communicating well in a group. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Providing additional technology workshops for students who intend to use Power Points or Digital storytelling in their final presentations. ■ Standardizing the Group Project Rubric.

Direct Measures-Success Strategies-Spring 2012 Pilot

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Qualitative data from Final Essay assignment	Random sample of Final Essay assignments will be analyzed and discussion of success strategies will be coded. The codes will be grouped into concepts and categories that lead faculty will use to describe the success strategies that appear most salient among respondents. The concepts and categories will be used to develop a survey instrument to be used with students in subsequent semesters for self-report of acquisition and application of success strategies.	Random samples of essays were collected in spring 2012. Thematic coding scheduled for August 2012.	The themes that are identified through the coding process will be used to help design a student engagement survey instrument for use in future semesters.

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Retention, Persistence, Graduation

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>Within course completion rate (derived from course grade distributions)</p>	<p>Once fully implemented, students will successfully complete the Cornerstone Experience at a rate of 85% with a C or better.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reviewing grade distribution report each term for the SLS 1515 classes. ▪ Providing additional faculty training. ▪ Developing an "Early Alert" committee to provide timely support to students.

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Retention, Persistence, Graduation

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Term-to-term retention reports (derived from the Banner Student Information System)	<p>Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, term-to-term retention will increase by 5% each year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Baseline for students enrolled in two or more developmental studies, AY 11-12 and 12-13• Baseline for students enrolled in any developmental studies, AY 13-14 and 14-15• Baseline for students without developmental studies, AY 15-16	Term to term retention reports will be available in 2012-2013.	These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform student retention efforts.

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Retention, Persistence, Graduation

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Year-to-year retention reports (derived from the Banner Student Information System)	<p>Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, year-to-year retention will increase by 3% each year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Baseline for students enrolled in two or more developmental studies, AY 11-12 and 12-13• Baseline for students enrolled in any developmental studies, AY 13-14 and 14-15• Baseline for students without developmental studies, AY 15-16	Year to year retention reports will be in 2013-2014.	<p>These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform student retention efforts.</p>

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Retention, Persistence, Graduation

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Cohort graduation reports derived through the Banner Student Information System	<p>This analysis will use the cohort graduation rate associated with students that entered ESC as FTIC during AY 10-11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cohorts from AY11-12 and AY12-13 who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline• Cohorts from AY13-14 and AY 14-15 who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline• Cohort from AY15-16 who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline	Cohort data will be available in 2013-2014.	These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform student retention efforts.

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Retention, Persistence, Graduation

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>Course Outcome items from SIR II: 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and Student Effort & Involvement items: 34, 35 and 36</p>	<p>Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪The overall mean score for the “Course Outcome” Items was 4.28 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (3.75). ▪For the “Student Effort and Involvement” Items, the overall mean score was 4.10 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (3.74). These pilot data have met the stated goal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Initiating an Early Alert committee in Fall 2012 to help support SLS 1515 success and retention.

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Student Satisfaction and Engagement

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>Engaged Learning items from the SENSE: 19a, 19b, 19e, 19g, 19h, 19i, 19j, 19k, 19l, 19m, 19n, 19o, 19q, 20d2, 20f2, and 20h2</p>	<p>Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Engaged Learning benchmark over the previous year's results.</p>	<p>SENSE data will be available in spring 2013.</p>	<p>These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the FYE Programming Committee, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform student engagement efforts.</p>

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Student Satisfaction and Engagement

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Faculty/Student Interaction items from SIR II: 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 Subset of Active and Collaborative Learning items from CCSSE: 4f, 4g, 4h, and 4r	Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.	The overall mean score for the “Faculty-Student Interactions” Items was 4.89 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (4.37).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continuing to provide faculty training and support through TLC Workshops and Conferences. ▪ Continuing to provide opportunities to share best practices through Cornerstone Communities of Practice.



Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Student Satisfaction and Engagement

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>Student-Faculty interactions items from CCSSE: 4k, 4l, 4m, 4n, 4o, and 4q</p>	<p>Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Student-Faculty interactions benchmark over the previous year's results.</p>	<p>CCSSE data will be available in summer 2013.</p>	<p>These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the FYE Programming Committee, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform student engagement efforts.</p>

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Student Satisfaction and Engagement

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Qualitative data from focus group responses	Focus group responses will be analyzed and discussion of student satisfaction and engagement will be coded. The codes will be grouped into concepts and categories that lead faculty and staff to understanding the elements of the course and extracurricular activities that increased students' satisfaction and engagement. The concepts and categories will be used to develop a student survey instrument for use in subsequent semesters. Survey data will be used to inform course and program	Focus groups were held on Lee, Collier, Charlotte, and Hendry Glades campuses. Trends: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student satisfaction with the Passport Assignment ● Student suggestions regarding more sports and/or intramural activities ● Student suggestions regarding communication about and timing of campus events ● Student dissatisfaction with Critical Thinking Exam ● Student satisfaction with interaction with professor and other students ● Students wanting more technology training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revising and Continuing the Passport Assignment- ● Requesting more sports and/or intramural activities- ● Increasing communication about and timing of campus events ● Replacing the Critical Thinking Exam ● Continuing positive interactions with professor and other students ● Providing more technology training

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Faculty Application of Training

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>Academic Challenge items from CCSSE: 4p, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, 6a, 6c, 7, 9a (Fall 2012)</p>	<p>Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Academic Challenge benchmark over the previous year's results.</p>	<p>CCSSE data will be available in summer 2013.</p>	<p>These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform practices that promote critical thinking skills.</p>

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Faculty Application of Training

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Professional Development Surveys	Following completion of the professional development modules, 80% of trained faculty will report using critical thinking and first-year student success strategies as measured on Likert scale items.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Thirty-two of the forty faculty completers responded to the Cornerstone Instructor Module survey. ▪68.4% of the completers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they had applied the “Critical Thinking” knowledge gained from the modules to their teaching or interactions with students (falling 11.6% short of the stated goal). ▪81.7% of the completers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they had applied the “Success Strategies” knowledge gained from the modules to their teaching or interactions with students (Exceeding the stated goal by 1.7%). 	<p>Revising the trainings to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) more course-specific content b) more hands-on activities and specific examples c) face-to-face requirements for some of the modules d) lengthier sessions for some of the modules. e) more attention to Critical Thinking training will be necessary for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept. <p>Faculty attending the 32nd Annual Conference on Critical Thinking will become facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in Fall 2012.</p>

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Faculty Application of Training

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
SIR II Communication items: 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.	Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.	The overall mean score for the "Communication" Items was 4.83 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (4.37).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Continuing to provide faculty training and support through TLC Workshops and Conferences.▪ Continuing to provide opportunities to share best practices through Cornerstone Communities of Practice.

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Staff and Administrator Application of Training

Measurement Method/ Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Professional Development Surveys	Following completion of the professional development modules, 80% of trained staff and administrators applying critical thinking and first-year student success strategies as measured on Likert scale items.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Thirteen of the twenty-five staff and administrators who completed the required modules completed the survey. ▪76.6% of the completers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they had applied the “Critical Thinking” knowledge gained from the modules to their teaching or interactions with student falling 3.4% short of the stated goal. ▪50% of the completers “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that they had applied the “Success Strategies” knowledge gained from the modules to their teaching or interactions with students) falling 30% short of the stated goal. 	<p>Revising the trainings to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) more course-specific content b) more hands-on activities and specific examples c) face-to-face requirements for some of the modules d) lengthier sessions for some of the modules. e) more attention to Critical Thinking training will be necessary for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept. <p>Faculty attending the 32nd Annual Conference on Critical Thinking will become facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in Fall 2012.</p>

Indirect Measures-Spring 2012-Staff and Administrator Application of Training

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>SENSE items from A Plan and a Pathway to Success category: 18d, 18g, 18e, 18f, and 18h</p>	<p>Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in A Plan and Pathway to Success benchmark over the previous year's results.</p>	<p>These data will be available in Spring 2013.</p>	<p>These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform practices that promote critical thinking skills.</p>

Fall 2012 Course Sections

Campus	Sections	Enrollment
Lee	16	TBD
Collier	5	TBD
Charlotte	2	TBD
Hendry/Glades	1	TBD
District Total	24	TBD



New in Fall 2012

▶ Dr. Martin Tawil, Lead Faculty

- ▶ Through his work on QEP subcommittees and as part of the inaugural SLS 1515 faculty, Dr. Tawil has shown tremendous support for the goals of the College's Quality Enhancement Plan and dedication to and enthusiasm for supporting the success of first-year students. Dr. Tawil will provide leadership to the Cornerstone faculty.

▶ Whitney Rhyne, Coordinator, First-Year Experience

- ▶ Formerly a Program Specialist in the FYE/Academic Success Department, Ms. Rhyne brings a vast experience in student support and academic success programs. Ms. Rhyne will coordinate the First-Year Experience academic success workshops, on and off campus events, and provide leadership to the Peer Architect (mentoring) program.
-



New in Fall 2012: Peer Architects

Peer Architects are student leaders who help SLS 1515 students during their transition to Edison State College. Each Peer Architect will act as a mentor for first-year students. Peer Architects are assigned to a specific section of the Cornerstone Experience Class, and put on workshops throughout the semester especially geared towards enhancing a first-year student's overall experience.



Initiatives to Explore

- ▶ Honors Sections and Partnership with Ave Maria University
- ▶ Linked Courses (e.g. spring Pilot with ENC course)
- ▶ QEP Blog
- ▶ Interest-Based Tracks
- ▶ Fidler Research Grant



Thank you for your participation!

<http://www.edison.edu/fye/>

