Minutes: QEP Assessment Subcommittee
Wednesday, October 10, 2012
1:00-2:00 p.m.
S-262D

Eileen DeLuca-co-chair	***Present***	Scott Van Selow	***Present***
Kevin Coughlin-co-chair	***Present***	Amy Trogan	***Present***
Crystal Revak	***Present***	Susan Marcy	***Present***
Monica Moore	***Present***		

1. The committee reviewed the SmarterMeasure Pre/Post-test 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 three areas that are reported on for the QEP: Life Factors, Personal Attributes, and Technology Knowledge. There were positive increases in the fourth area, Technology Competency, but the post-test scores were not statistically significantly higher. Eileen shared the data with the QEP Implementation Team who 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.

Kevin discussed some of the issues with the data collection. A number of the students completed the assessment more than two times. He was not able to use their data in the analysis. Also, the sample size of this administration may be too small to provide accurate results. The assessment committee strategized ways to reduce the amount of observations that would need to be discarded. Scott suggested using the time stamp as a way to determine the first and last attempt. Eileen suggested that all faculty administer the assessment during class time and the availability window be strictly monitored.

2. The Summer Term SIR II data has arrived. Crystal will work on creating spreadsheets with overall means for the items reported in the QEP.

3. Crystal reported that the SENSE Survey administration went well. Most surveys have been returned. The results will be available in February. Scott posted a link to the SENSE website on the Student Assessment Committee Canvas page.

4. Crystal, Eileen and Amy reviewed the randomly selected final essay drafts. They did open coding and then selective coding to find instances of students reporting application of success strategies. They created a spreadsheet of codes with in vivo examples. From the data they

developed a survey draft. The Assessment committee reviewed the survey draft. Susan suggested that "other" be added as a choice to some of the items. Kevin suggested some items were unnecessary if the survey would be distributed by CRN. Eileen will make revisions and work with Crystal to send the survey by CRN. Kevin also suggested using Likert Scale ratings for all items rather than "check all that apply" items. The group discussed the difference in the type of data each type of item could provide. Eileen will revisit the survey and make revisions. Scott suggested that when students complete the survey, they can "exit" on any web page that we choose. For example, we can have students exit onto the FYE programming page.

5. Eileen shared the "Career Interest Survey" administered to the current SLS 1515 students. The purpose of the survey was to get a snapshot of current career/academic program interest. Over 30% of current students from all campuses responded. (See results below). The data can be used for interest-based section planning and advising. Since many students are choosing health professions, it will be important to recruit faculty from the Health programs to teach the SLS 1515 course. Additionally, student should know and understand the process for getting accepted into limited access programs. They need to understand that to be competitive for some of the programs, they must maintain a very high GPA. Students may also want to consider less competitive Health related majors.

Of the following career tracks, which are you most interested in pursuing?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Business/Public Service (Examples: Accounting Applications, Crime Scene Technology, Criminal Justice, Firefighter, Network Specialist, Small Business Management, Paralegal, Lawyer)	23.3%	50
Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM) (Examples: Computer Programming, Drafting and Design, Internet Services, Mathematician, Scientist, Engineer)	11.2%	24
Education (Examples: Elementary Teacher, Middle School Teacher, High School Teacher)	8.8%	19
Health Science (Examples: Nurse, Medical Doctor, Physician's Assistant, Emergency Medical Technician, Paramedic, Cardiovascular Technology, Dental Hygiene, Health Information Management, Human Services, Radiologic Technology, Respiratory Care)	42.8%	92
Undecided	14.0%	30
	answered question	215

6. Rubric Standardization and Focus Groups will be discussed at the next meeting.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca