

Wednesday, April 17, 2013
2:00-3:00 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	Abby Willcox	Absent

1. SENSE Data Results: The SENSE Data from fall 2012 is available (see attached summaries). For the QEP Assessment, we will report achievement on two of the SENSE Domains, *Clear Academic Plan and Pathway* and *Engaged Learning*.

Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results
SENSE items from Clear Academic Plan and Pathway category: 18d, 18g, 18e, 18f, and 18h	Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Clear Academic Plan and Pathway benchmark over the previous year's results.	For the Clear Academic Plan and Pathway Items the weighted score remained stable at 48.9 in 2011 and 2012. This falls short of the stated goal of a 5% increase.
Engaged Learning items from the SENSE: 19a, 19b, 19e, 19g, 19h, 19i, 19j, 19k, 19l, 19m, 19n, 19o, 19q, 20d2, 20f2, and 20h2	Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Engaged Learning benchmark over the previous year's results.	For the Engaged Learning Items there was an increase in weighted score from 49.2 to 51.4, thus increasing the score 4%. This falls 1% short of the stated goal.

Eileen shared these data as well as the comparative results for all domains.

SENSE Survey Weighted Scores by Benchmark				
	2011	2012	Difference	% Change
Early Connections	46.9	47.8	0.9	2%
High Expectations and Aspirations	54.4	53	-1.4	-3%
Clear Academic Plan and Pathway	48.9	48.9	0	0%
Effective Track to College Readiness	50.9	52.5	1.6	3%
Engaged Learning	49.2	51.4	2.2	4%
Academic and Social Support	49.4	51	1.6	3%

There is positive improvement in “Early Connections,” “Effective Track to College Readiness,” “Engaged Learning,” and “Academic and Social Support.” The only area of decrease is in the “High Expectations and Aspirations” items. These items focus on the students’ expectations to succeed and behaviors such as how often they turn in late assignments. However, the scores in that area were already higher (and remain higher than the cohort average), and so a decrease is not as troublesome. Eileen noted that in 2012, the ESC cohort was above the comparative “extra-large college” weighted scores in all domains. Eileen suggested that the results be disseminated via the RTA Web page. She also sent the results to the QEP Implementation team and suggested that Dr. Davis and Dr. Wright disseminate with faculty and staff and use data as a basis for unit planning.

The assessment discussed revising the SENSE goals for next year. An increase of 5% over the previous year’s goals each year may be unrealistic, especially when ESC is scoring above the comparative weighted scores. The assessment committee concluded that the new goal should be scoring 3% above the comparative “extra-large college” weighted scores for the given year. This way, the college would not be “competing against itself” to the point where it would not be able to show additional gains.

Abby Willcox was unable to attend but provided data from the SLS 1515 students who self-identified. She created a report that showed the SLS 1515 students’ responses vis-à-vis the overall ESC cohort. In most areas the unweighted mean scores of the SLS 1515 students were higher on items that indicated a positive behavior/belief than the overall cohort and lower on items that indicated an undesirable behavior/belief (see attached report).

The SENSE data will be reviewed at the QEP Advisory meeting on April 26.

2. Focus Groups: A total of 20 students participated in the SLS 1515 student focus groups held on April 15 and 16. Amy reported that the students were extremely enthusiastic about the course. They very much enjoyed the aspects of the course that helped them learn more about themselves. They were very enthusiastic about the instructors. Kevin added that the students seem to like the self-assessments and the self-awareness gained from the assessments. All focus group leaders reported that while the fall 2012 focus group students were generally positive, the students this term seemed to be even more positive. All students seemed to highlight a connection with the professor, comparing it to other courses where they felt less connected with the instructor. Some students felt like they came into the class either lost or thinking they didn’t need the course, but realized that the course was very useful to them in terms of academics and goal-setting. They also were very positive about the peer architects. However, the spring students spoke less about campus events. The assessment committee concluded that it may be useful to compare focus group themes from fall to fall and spring to spring. Amy and Scott noted that the overall response to the GPS assignment was positive, but some students noted that it was difficult to get to places or activities due to

time constraints. Kevin and Eileen got the same response from their students. The students suggested maybe having less required components of the GPS. Scott reported that some of the students found the journal assignment to be tedious. The assessment committee discussed why the journal might not seem immediately relevant or useful to the students. Scott suggested perhaps letting the students know that the first couple of journals are an introduction, the next few are for practice and should have a great deal of feedback, and the last three are for the summative grade. Kevin suggested having the students use a program such as a Flesch Reading Ease measure or a related program to note sophistication of writing and document growth over the semester.

Focus groups for the other campuses are scheduled and the data will be shared at a future meeting. Once all data is in, it will be coded for themes and the themes will be disseminated to the faculty.

3. Advisory Meeting: There will be a QEP Advisory Meeting on April 26. The team will discuss a policy for staffing SLS 1515 sections. There will also be an Advisory Meeting in July (TBA). At this meeting, the data for QEP Implementation Year 1 will be disseminated. Eileen encouraged all Assessment team members to attend the July meeting.
4. Availability for AY 2013-2014: Eileen thanked everyone for their work this year and invited all members to continue to serve on the committee for 2013-2014. She asked members to let her know their availability. A meeting schedule will be designed for the fall.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca