

Direct Measures: Spring 2012 Pilot

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>Critical Thinking: As a result of successful completion of the Cornerstone Experience course, students will be able to: a) Explore how background experiences impact their values and assumptions and explain how they influence personal relationships; b) demonstrate intellectual rigor and problem-solving skills by analyzing and evaluating information, generating ideas, and resolving issues; c) apply intellectual traits, standards, and elements of reasoning in the context of their personal and academic lives.</p>	<p>Results of the Critical Thinking Journal assessment scored with the Critical Thinking Rubric</p>	<p>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>	<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" 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" 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" 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" 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" exceeding the stated goal by 11%. 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Implementation Team meeting on July 6 and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>At the meeting on July 6, the QEP Implementation team reviewed these data. The lead faculty commented that the "Clarity" criterion includes use of Standard English. She noted that non-native speakers of English struggled with achieving this criterion. The committee recommends providing more support for non-native speakers, 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. The Dean of College and Career Readiness will work with the Director of Academic Support Programs, and the FYE Coordinator to plan additional support programming for non-native speakers of English and students in general who have remedial communication needs. In addition, new "EAP Transition Services" will be provided in fall 2012. This program will help bridge the gap for non-native speakers of English who are enrolled in credit courses.</p> <p>The lead faculty also discussed how</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
				<p>some instructors graded grammar more strictly than others (which was a topic of discussion at the rubric standardization session in March). The incoming lead faculty will want to continue working with the faculty to work towards and standard manner of scoring the "Clarity" criterion.</p>
	<p>Final Essay Assignment scored with Critical Thinking Rubric</p>	<p>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>	<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" 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" 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" 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" exceeding the 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Implementation Team meeting on July 6 and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>At the meeting on July 6, the QEP Implementation team reviewed these data. The lead faculty commented that the "Clarity" criterion includes use of Standard English. She noted that non-native speakers of English struggled with achieving this criterion. The committee recommends providing more support for non-native speakers, 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. The Dean of College and Career Readiness will work with the Director of Academic Support Programs, and the FYE Coordinator to plan additional support programming for non-native speakers of English and students in general who have remedial</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			<p>stated goal by 21%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logic: 79% of the students received a “3” or higher, exceeding the stated goal by 9%. 43% received a “4” exceeding the stated goal by 23%. 	<p>communication needs . In addition, new “EAP Transition Services” will be provided in fall 2012.This program will help bridge the gap for non-native speakers of English who are enrolled in credit courses.</p> <p>The lead faculty also discussed how some instructors graded grammar more strictly than others (which was a topic of discussion at the rubric standardization session in March). The incoming lead faculty will want to continue working with the faculty to work towards and standard manner of scoring the “Clarity” criterion.</p> <p>At the meeting on July 11, the QEP Advisory committee discussed the importance of ensuring consistent support services (e.g. EAP transitions) across campuses.</p>
	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.	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Assessment Subcommittee Meeting on May 15, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on July 6 and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>At the meeting on May 15, the QEP assessment subcommittee theorized possible reasons for lack of gains including the reading difficulty of the test and the students’ negative attitude about completing the test as</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
				<p>reported in the student focus groups. 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 QEP Assessment subcommittee, the Standardized Assessment subcommittee and the QEP Implementation Team and with the lead faculty for the course. All of the groups support replacing the CCTST with the CCTDI.</p> <p>At the meeting on July 11, the QEP Advisory committee discussed the importance of faculty clarifying the purpose of the assessment with the students.</p>
<p>Success Skills: As a result of successful completion of the Cornerstone Experience course, students will be able to: a) develop strategies for effective written and verbal communications, use of technology, listening, reading, critical thinking, and reasoning, and b)</p>	<p>Scores on the Smarter Measure Learning Readiness Indicator “personal attribute” items: time management, procrastination, persistence, academic attributes, locus of control, and</p>	<p>By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, baseline data will be established for comparison and goal setting for the 2012-2013 academic year.</p>	<p>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.”</p>	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Assessment Subcommittee Meeting on May 15, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on June 8, and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>As a result of these data and the focus group data, the QEP Assessment subcommittee suggested asking students to take the SmarterMeasure</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>demonstrate independence self-efficacy through effective personal management, use of college resources and the development of positive relationships with peers, staff, and faculty.</p>	<p>willingness to ask for help; “technology knowledge” items: technology usage, technology in your life, technology vocabulary, and personal computer/Internet specifications; “technical competency” items: computer competency, and Internet competency.</p>			<p>assessment before the semester begins. Based on those scores, students can be advised to complete Microsoft’s Digital Literacy Curriculum. As a follow-up, at the FYE/Academic Success meeting held on May 21, these results were shared and the groups suggested that in addition to the 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. These workshops and open lab times will be scheduled for fall 2012. These data were shared with the QEP Implementation team at the June 8 meeting and the lead faculty to inform curricular revisions (e.g. adding a technology focus). In response, beginning in fall 2012, all faculty will be required to use Canvas and provide canvas training to students.</p> <p>At the QEP Advisory Meeting, Faculty committee members felt strongly that SLS 1515 instructors need to be able to schedule class time in a computer lab in addition to the FYE programming. While this is feasible in the 2012-2013 academic year, it will become increasingly difficult as the numbers of sections grow unless there is some formal commitment made by the</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	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" 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" 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" 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" 	<p>college to increase computer lab space.</p> <p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Implementation Team meeting on July 6 and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>At the meeting on July 6, the QEP Implementation team reviewed these data. While the students in general performed well on the assignment, the lead faculty suggested that students may need more training in working in a group and communicating well in a group. The Dean of College and Career Readiness will work with the FYE Coordinator to provide this additional FYE programming. In addition they will plan additional technology workshops for students who intend to use Power Points or Digital storytelling in their final presentations.</p> <p>The Group Project Rubric will be standardized in fall 2012.</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			exceeding the stated goal by 32%.	
	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 Pilot

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
Once fully implemented, the QEP will facilitate an increase in student retention rates, rates of persistence, and graduation rates.	Within course completion rate (derived from course grade distributions)	Once fully implemented, students will successfully complete the Cornerstone Experience at a rate of 85% with a C or better.	<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. 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Assessment meeting on May 15, the QEP Implementation meeting on June 8, and the QEP Advisory meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>All committee members were</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lee: 76.9% passed with a “C” or better. • District: 76.5% passed with a “C” or better. 	<p>encouraged by the numbers in this inaugural semester. The spring 2012 data will serve as a baseline. The Banner Team 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. Based on these data and the focus group data, additional measures will be put in place to increase successful course completion, including additional faculty training, and the addition of an "Early Alert" committee to provide timely support to students.</p>
	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.
	Year-to-year retention reports (derived from the Banner Student	Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, year-to-year retention will increase by 3% each	Year-to-year retention reports will be in 2013-2014.	These data will be reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the Lead

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
	Information System)	year. <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 		faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee to inform student retention efforts.
	Cohort graduation reports derived through the Banner Student Information System	This analysis will use the cohort graduation rate associated with students that entered ESC as FTIC during AY 10-11. <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 	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.

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
		<p>who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline</p>		
	<p>Course Outcome items from SIR II: 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and Student Effort and 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>	<p>For the Spring 2012 SIR II administrations, 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.</p>	<p>The Course Success rates and SIR II data from spring 2012 were reviewed at the QEP Assessment subcommittee meeting on June 26 and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>Faculty members on the advisory committee suggested comparing the overall mean scores to those of two-year institutions (in addition to the four-year institution comparisons),</p> <p>The data will be shared with the SLS 1515 faculty at the first faculty meeting in August 2012. The groups will strategize ways to continue to exceed the stated goal in terms of student satisfaction with courses as measured by the SIR II. Also, an Early Alert committee will be initiated in fall 2012 to help support SLS 1515 success and retention.</p>
<p>Through each phase of implementation, the QEP will foster increased rates of student satisfaction and student engagement. The success of this measure will</p>	<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</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>be demonstrated through the quality of student/student, student/faculty, and student/college engagement.</p>	<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>engagement efforts.</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>
	<p>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</p>	<p>Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.</p>	<p>The overall mean score for the "Faculty-Student Interactions" Items was 4.89 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (4.37).</p>	<p>The SIR II data from spring 2012 were reviewed at the QEP Assessment subcommittee meeting on June 26 and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>The data will be shared with the SLS 1515 faculty at the first faculty meeting in August 2012. The committees will strategize ways to continue to exceed the stated goal in terms of student satisfaction with courses as measured by the SIR II. The College will continue to provide faculty training.</p>
	<p>Qualitative data from focus group responses</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Focus groups were held on Lee, Collier, Charlotte, and Hendry Glades campuses. Trends:</p> <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 	<p>The student focus group data were reviewed by the QEP Assessment Subcommittee May 15, the QEP Implementation Team on April 19, and the QEP advisory committee on July 11, 2012 to inform program planning and revision 2012-2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging through the Passport Assignment- Based on the students' responses, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee recommends that the

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
		<p>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 improvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student satisfaction with interaction with professor and other students • Students wanting more technology training 	<p>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. The lead faculty will work on revising the Passport Assignment in Summer B, 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requesting more sports and/or intramural activities- This suggestion was shared with Dr. Teprovich (Director of Student Life) at the QEP Marketing Meeting. With the addition of student housing these types of programs will increase in 2012-2013. • Receiving communication about and timing of campus events- In addition to weekly emails sent to SLS 1515 faculty, the FYE/Academic Success program will be launching a

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
				<p>Facebook page for fall 2012 to be managed by the FYE Coordinator. The committee also recommends 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 were shared with Dr. Teprovich (Director of Student Life) at the QEP Marketing meeting. They will also be used by the FYE Coordinator as programs are planned for 2012-2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not seeing the value of the Critical Thinking Exam- The students’ 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). The CTDI has been vetted through the QEP Assessment Subcommittee, the Standardized Assessment Subcommittee, and the SLS

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
				<p>1515 lead faculty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interacting with professor and other students-These data will be shared with the college faculty, administrators, and staff to inform creating a similar positive atmosphere in other college classes and/or similar positive relationships outside of SLS 1515. Requesting more technology training-The QEP Assessment committee recommends asking students to take the SmarterMeasure assessment before the semester begins. Based on those scores, students will be advised to complete Microsoft's Digital Literacy Curriculum. In addition to Academic Success workshop series such as "Technology Tuesdays," the program specialists will schedule open lab times for students to get one-on-one support and/or complete the digital literacy curriculum beginning in fall 2012. The FYE/Academic Success staff began planning these workshops and training at the meeting on May 21 (see attached minutes).

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>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.</p>	<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>
	<p>Professional Development Surveys</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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>	<p>The survey results and instructor feedback were reviewed with stakeholders at Training and Development Subcommittee meetings on June 6, May 15, and April 16, at the QEP Assessment Subcommittee Meeting on June 26, and at the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>The "Feedback on Cornerstone Certification Modules Report" lists the feedback from the constituent groups and ideas for improvement. Based on the feedback, the trainings are undergoing revision to include: 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. In addition, more attention to Critical Thinking training will be necessary for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept. Dr. Rebecca Gubitti will lead the workshop revision during Summer B 2012. New modules will be in place for Fall 2012. In addition, faculty attending the 32nd Annual Conference on Critical</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	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).	<p>Thinking will become facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in fall 2012.</p> <p>The SIR II data from spring 2012 was reviewed at the QEP Assessment subcommittee meeting on June 26 and the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>The data will be shared with the SLS 1515 faculty at the first faculty meeting in August 2012. The groups will strategize ways to continue to exceed the stated goal in terms of student satisfaction with course communication.</p>
<p>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.</p>	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.	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>The survey results and instructor feedback were reviewed with stakeholders at Training and Development Subcommittee meetings on June 6, May 15, and April 16, at the QEP Assessment Subcommittee Meeting on June 26, and at the QEP Advisory Meeting on July 11, 2012.</p> <p>The "Feedback on Cornerstone Certification Modules Report" lists the feedback from the constituent groups and ideas for improvement. Based on the feedback, the trainings are undergoing revision to include: 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</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
				<p>some of the modules. In addition, more attention to Critical Thinking training will be necessary for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept. Dr. Rebecca Gubitti will lead the workshop revision during Summer B 2012. New modules will be in place for fall 2012. In addition, faculty attending the 32nd Annual Conference on Critical Thinking will become facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in fall 2012.</p>
	<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>