

Minutes: QEP Assessment Subcommittee  
Wednesday, January 23, 2013  
2:00-3:00 p.m.  
S-262D

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

1. Focus Groups: During the December meeting, the committee reviewed the SLS 1515 student focus group data from Lee and Charlotte campuses. Since that meeting, Eileen received the data from Hendry/Glades. The H/G data provided additional support for the themes identified from the Lee and Charlotte data:
  - Students noted that “Time Management” was a positive and/or significant component of the course.
  - Students noted positive experiences with their professor.
  - Most comments about Peer Architects were positive but vague.

As discussed in the December meeting, based on these data, the group discussed ways to infuse more time management strategies into the course such as reviewing Calendar in Canvas, having students use course schedules to enter assignments into planners, creating a weekly schedule and evaluating time usage, etc.

2. Peer Architect Focus Group and Evaluation Data: Twelve Peer Architects participated in a focus group led by two non-SLS faculty. Eileen shared some of the trends in the focus group data:
  - Peer Architects said that Technology was the main reason students sought their assistance after class.
  - Peer Architects discussed the difficulty of trying to motivate students.
  - Some Peer Architects felt “out of the loop” and wanted more communication with the professors. They felt it was important to meet the professor before the start of the course, and on a regular basis during the semester. They felt it was helpful to have access to the syllabus and to any emails sent to the class. They requested a “meet and greet” before the beginning of the term. They also want to know and understand their assigned professors’ expectations.
  - Peer Architects wanted the opportunity to directly address the students, and suggested that they be given time at the beginning of class to apprise students of campus events.

Whitney Rhyne conducted evaluations at mid-term and end of term where Peer Architects evaluated their own experience in their classes and with their assigned professors, and

professors evaluated the performance of Peer Architects. She also evaluated each peer architect and used student engagement data as another way to rate the efficacy of the peer architects. These data in addition to the focus group data were used by Eileen and Whitney to design guidelines for peer architects and for professors. In addition, these data were used to inform the design of the training session for the fall 2013 peer architects. Finally, a “meet and greet” session was held prior to the spring 2013 semester where faculty had the opportunity to meet their assigned peer architect(s).

3. Crystal sent the success strategy rubric out to students on all campuses on Monday, December 10. 43 students responded. The committee reviewed the summary of the survey results. Some of the trends discussed:
  - 92.5% of the respondents reported that they located and received assistance from the Academic Success Centers/labs as a result of completing the course. Eileen reported that all centers saw an increase in traffic during the fall 2012 term. Dr. Trogan suggested that these data could be used to support requests for additional positions for the centers. Other services visited by more than 50% of respondents: Advising staff, financial aid staff, and library staff.
  - 67.6% of the students reported attending student life activities as a result of attending the class. Other events attended by more than 50% of respondents are the Career Events.
  - In terms of self-report of improvement in the areas of “arriving to class on time,” “attending class,” “reviewing the course schedule,” “using a calendar or lists make sure assignments are completed on time,” and “working on large project incrementally,” the majority of the respondents felt that they have “always” done this and either “hadn’t changed” or “made some improvement.”
  - In terms of self-report of improvement in the areas of “using small group communication skills,” “participating and asking questions when appropriate,” “forming a relationship with other students,” “meeting with the professor outside of class for help,” and “thinking critically about texts and lectures,” the majority of the respondents felt that they have “always” done this and either “hadn’t changed” or “made some improvement.” There was an almost equal amount that reported that they “didn’t do this much before the class” but had “improved a little” or “a great deal.” Two areas where the majority felt that they “didn’t do this much before the class and have improved a great deal” is in “using small group communication skills” and “thinking critically about texts and lectures.”
  - The majority of the respondents reported that as a result of the class, they had improved in the following areas:
    - Time management
    - Goal Setting
    - Organization Skills
    - Persistence
    - Communication

- Considering opinions different from my own
- Avoiding activities and behaviors that may make me unsuccessful
- The majority of the respondents reported applying the following learning strategies in other courses:
  - Note-taking
  - Critical thinking
  - Study skills
  - Creating a schedule
  - Creating a budget
  - Test-taking strategies

One area was reported by less than 50% of the respondents, “forming study groups.”

- The majority of the respondents reported applying the following knowledge gained from the Learning Styles Inventories, Personality Inventories, and Multiple Intelligences Inventories:
  - Choosing a major
  - Choosing a career goal
  - Forming relationships
  - Changing study habits
  - Communicating with others
  - Researching professors for future classes
  - Appreciating diversity

The committee discussed the self-report aspect and the respondents’ beliefs that they came to course already having success strategies and/or had behaviors correlated with success. One aspect of the course is to engage students in self-discovery and critical reflection. Eileen will share these data with faculty to inform further development in this area.

4. Kevin explained the results from the Correlated means T-test, Post-test versus Pre-Test for the CCTDI and SmarterMeasure conducted by the IRPE.
  - CCTDI: There were statistically significant improvement in all domains (Truth seeking, Open-mindedness, Analyticity, Systematicity, Inquisitiveness, Confidence in Judgment, and Maturity in Judgment).
  - SmarterMeasure: There was statistically significant improvement in the domain of Technology Knowledge. There was a statistically significant decrease in scores for the domains of “personal attributes,” “technology competency,” and “life factors.”
5. Eileen shared the post-test report that was available with the CCTDI data. She shared the report with the faculty at the Community of Practice held on January 14 and led a discussion on how to further support the students’ development in each domain. One area that students have lower scores in is “Truth Seeking.” This involves a disposition

towards considering the validity of sources, following the evidence where it leads, problematizing beliefs, considering alternative points of views based on evidence, etc. Eileen discussed ways the faculty could model and encourage “truth-seeking.”

6. Fall SIR II Results: In all areas, the overall mean scores for the fall 2012 SLS 1515 sections exceeded the comparative four-year mean.

Course Outcome items from SIR II: 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and Student Effort and Involvement items: 34, 35 and 36	Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.	For the fall 2012 SIR II administration, the overall mean score for the “Course Outcome” Items was 4.2 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (3.8). For the “Student Effort and Involvement” Items, the overall mean score was 4.0 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (3.7).
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.	For the fall 2012 administration, the overall mean score for the “Communication” Items was 4.7 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (4.6).
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.	For the fall 2012 administration, the overall mean score for the “Faculty-Student Interactions” Items was 4.7 which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (4.4).

7. Training completion and evaluation data: Based on the data spreadsheet from the TLC, 558 employees had attended one or more Cornerstone Trainings. 75 faculty had completed all 10 Instructor Modules. 41 staff completed all 5 required modules (many from that group completed all 10 modules and are additionally qualified to teach the course). Eileen will ask HR for an updated snapshot of the total number of ESC employees. She noted that these data may include participants who are no longer employed by the college and/or participants who are employed on an intermittent basis (e.g. adjunct employees). The overall results from the surveys completed indicate high satisfaction with the trainings with the majority of respondents reporting that since completing the trainings, they have applied practices that promote critical thinking and success strategies among students. These data will be reviewed by the QEP Training and Development subcommittee to continue to improve the trainings. In all areas the evaluations from the fall 2012 training indicated higher satisfaction and application of strategies than the spring/summer 2012 evaluations. Eileen suggested that this increase was due to the improvements made to the fall training sessions based on feedback from the spring/summer evaluations. For example, many of the trainings were revised to contain content and examples more specific to the SLS 1515 course. In addition, the

poor quality videos were removed as a training option, with all trainings being conducted face to face or through a webinar.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca