

Direct Measures: Fall 2012

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 2013 semester, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric.</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> <p>Overall means for each dimension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity: 2.73 (64.59% received "3" or higher) • Accuracy: 2.94 (80.73% received "3" or higher) • Relevance: 3.03 (85.37% received "3" or higher) • Significance: 2.92 (75.79% received "3" or higher) • Logic: 3.00 (82.70% received "3" or higher) • The stated goals for Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic were met. • The number of students receiving a "3" or better for Clarity fell short of the stated goal (-5.41%) with Clarity being the dimension with the lowest of the overall means. 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Advisory Meeting on February 8, 2013, the SLS 1515 Community of Practice meeting on February 11, and the QEP Assessment Meeting on February 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of Canvas has allowed each of the 10 journal entries to be scored on an individual rubric. • For spring 2013, the assignment has been streamlined to include seven journal entries. Going forward, the final three entries will be used to measure the summative achievement towards this goal. Earlier journal scores would be considered "formative." • Faculty continue to provide writing feedback and encourage students to have writing reviewed by instructional assistants to receive feedback on use of Standard English and clarity. • In the QEP Advisory meeting the committee discussed the possibility of linking a Developmental Writing class with an SLS 1515 class to provide further writing support.

Departmental/Unit Outcome	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 2013 semester, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric.	<p>The students' achievement of each dimension (Clarity, Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic) of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale.</p> <p>Overall means for each dimension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity: 2.77 (67.71% received "3" or higher) • Accuracy: 2.98 (80.12% received "3" or higher) • Relevance: 3.22 (88.86% received "3" or higher) • Significance: 3.10 (79.06% received "3" or higher) • Logic: 3.10 (82.83% received "3" or higher) • The stated goal for Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic were met. • The number of students receiving a "3" or higher for Clarity fell short of the stated goal (-2.29%), with Clarity being the dimension with the lowest of the overall means. 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Advisory Meeting on February 8, 2013, the SLS 1515 Community of Practice meeting on February 11, and the QEP Assessment Meeting on February 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning in fall term 2012, use of the Lee Campus Academic Success and College Prep Center labs became more "fluid." Students with writing needs receive assistance in either lab. • Faculty continue to provide writing feedback and encourage students to have writing reviewed by instructional assistants to receive feedback on use of Standard English and clarity. • In the QEP Advisory meeting the committee discussed the possibility of linking a Developmental Writing class with an SLS 1515 class to provide further writing support.
	Scores on the California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTDI)	After completing the Cornerstone Experience course, students will have statistically significant improvement in the following Critical Thinking Dispositions: Truth Seeking, Open	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 statistically significant increases across all variables in the scores between the pre- and post-test administrations.	These data were reviewed at the SLS Community of Practice Meeting On January 14, 2013, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on January 23, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30, and the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8.

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
		<p>Mindedness, Analyticity, Systematicity, Inquisitiveness, Confidence in Judgment, Maturity in Judgment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truth Seeking +1.09 • Open Mindedness +.71 • Analyticity +1.01 • Systematicity +.78 • Inquisitiveness +.70 • Confidence in Judgment +1.6 • Maturity in Judgment +1.24 <p>The largest increases were in in "Truth Seeking," "Analyticity," "Confidence in Judgment" and "Maturity in Judgment."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Community of Practice meeting, faculty reviewed results for each domain and discussed ways to model and support the development of critical thinking dispositions in the SLS 1515 course. • In the QEP Assessment meeting and the QEP Advisory meeting, the committees discussed how on both the CCTDI and through the recent General Education Competency TIM study, students demonstrate a need for further development in analyzing and critiquing information sources, judging the validity of information, and locating and properly citing sources. This is something that can be modeled and supported across the College. • Faculty who attended the International Conference on Critical Thinking are leading Critical Thinking trainings through the TLC in fall 2012 and spring 2013. Three faculty have agreed to attend a Critical Thinking Conference in summer 2013. • The Training and Development Subcommittee is considering a

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
				<p>“Critical Thinking Group” to meet once a month, implement Critical Thinking Activities in their classes and report back.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the QEP Advisory Meeting it was noted that there has been greater consistency in the spring 2013 term now that all faculty are administering the CCTDI in the lab setting. Students take the assessment more seriously, and the discussion of the results immediately after taking the exam has been positive.
<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) 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>Scores on the Smarter Measure Learning Readiness Indicator “life factors” items: time, place, reason, resources, skills, “personal attribute” items: time management, procrastination, persistence, academic attributes, locus of control, and willingness to ask for help; “technology knowledge” items: technology usage, technology in your life, technology</p>	<p>After completing the Cornerstone Experience course, students will have significant improvement in the following indicators: Personal Attributes, Life Factors, Technology Knowledge and Technology Competency.</p>	<p>A correlated means t-test, post-test versus pre-test as well as means and standard deviations for pre and post-tests by domain were derived.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was statistically significant improvements in Technology Knowledge. There was a slight decrease in one area, Personal Attributes, and statistically significant decreases in two areas, Technology Competency and Life Factors. 	<p>These data were reviewed at the SLS Community of Practice Meeting On January 14, 2013, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on January 23, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30, and the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In response to these and other data suggesting students lacked technology competency, Peer Architects were provided technology training prior to the spring 2013 semester. In addition, the FYE Coordinator worked with all campuses and centers to ensure technology workshops and support are available college-wide.

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
	vocabulary, and personal computer/Internet specifications; “technical competency” items: computer competency, and Internet competency.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FYE/Academic Success Department purchased 4 Canon Cameras, 4 Dell Laptops and will purchase a MacBook Pro for student use for projects requiring technology. At the QEP Advisory meeting the faculty suggested that the new requirements for the Edison GPS Assignment will promote the use of technology among students. The QEP Advisory Committee recommended having SLS 1515 review the SmarterMeasure Technology Competency Items to help design activities to promote technology usage. A set of 10 headsets were purchased for each campus for student use on the SmarterMeasure assessment and general usage for audio files.
	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.	<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 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Advisory Meeting on February 8, 2013, the SLS 1515 Community of Practice meeting on February 11, and the QEP Assessment Meeting on February 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SLS 1515 faculty revised the Success Strategy assignment guidelines in fall 2012 to

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			<p>template: 3.16 (82.25% received “3” or higher)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline for Project Completion: 3.09 (80.20% received “3” or higher) • Demonstration of Effective Group Communication Skills: 3.00 (76.11% received “3” or higher) • Presentation: 3.06 (78.16% received “3” or higher) • The goal was met for all of the rubric dimensions. 	<p>improve the alignment between the stated outcomes and the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring 2013 assignments will follow the updated guidelines and be scored on the updated rubric.
	<p>Qualitative data from Final Essay assignment used to Develop a Success Strategies Survey</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>A “Success Strategies” survey was sent out to the fall 2012 SLS 1515 students in December 2012. 43 students responded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 92.5% of the respondents reported locating and receiving assistance from the Academic Success Centers/labs as a result of completing the course. 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 	<p>These data were reviewed at the SLS Community of Practice Meeting On January 14, 2013, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on January 23, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30, and the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee discussed how the data supported the need for additional positions for in the academic success centers. • 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

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
		strategies.	<p>majority of the respondents felt that they have “always” done this and either “hadn’t changed” or “made some improvement.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: 	reflection.

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			<p>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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	

Indirect Measures: Fall 2012

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
<p>Once fully implemented, the QEP will facilitate an increase in student retention rates, rates of persistence, and graduation rates.</p>	<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: 74.4% passed with a “C” or better. • Collier: 83.9% passed with a “C” or better. • Hendry/Glades: 86.7% passed with a “C” or better. • Lee: 74.9% passed with a “C” or better. • Overall College: 77% passed with a “C” or better. <p>The overall college pass rates are 8% below the stated goal of 85%.</p>	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30 2012, the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8, and the QEP Assessment Meeting on February 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An early alert committee was implemented in fall 2012 to provide an additional network of support for students who require referrals to instructional assistants and academic coaches. For spring 2013, the Early Alert Committee has created and updated Website and submission form. The Early Alert Committee has college-wide representation and in spring 2013 will make progress towards providing consistent services college-wide. • In January a proposal was approved by the College’s Curriculum committee to revise the course syllabus to state that successful completion of the course requires a grade of “C” or better.

Departmental/Unit Outcome	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)	Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, term-to-term retention will increase by 5% each 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 	A Chi Square analysis was conducted for students who tested in two or more developmental studies courses and enrolled in 2011-2012 as compared to the students with the same criteria who enrolled in 2012-2013. An additional Chi Square Analysis was conducted with students who tested in two or more developmental studies courses enrolled in fall 2012, and enrolled in SLS 1515 compared to students who tested in two or more developmental studies courses, enrolled in fall 2012, but did not enroll in SLS 1515. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From fall 2011 to spring 2012, 73.39% of the students were retained. From fall 2012 to spring 2013, 74.02% of the students were retained (an increase of .63%, falling 4.37% short of the stated goal). • Those students who enrolled in the SLS 1515 were retained from fall to spring at a rate of 77.22%. Those that did not enroll in SLS 1515 were retained from fall to spring at a rate of 65.06%. There was a statistically significantly higher rate of retention for those students who enrolled in SLS 1515. 	These data were reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee on March 13, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on March 20, the Lead faculty, and the QEP Advisory committee on April 26 to inform student retention efforts. These data support the efficacy of the course and the committees will continue to improve measures to enforce the course requirement based on the implementation timeline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty added a required interaction with advisors (outside of class) as part of the GPS assignment. • Group Advising sessions were implemented and targeted at SLS 1515 students. The college will continue efforts to support term-to-term retention such as the group advising sessions.
	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 AY 11-12 and AY 12-13 who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline • Cohorts from AY 13-14 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 AY 15-16 who graduate within 	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
		150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline		
	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 administrations, 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).	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on January 23, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30, and the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8.</p> <p>The groups strategized ways to continue to exceed the stated goal in terms of student satisfaction with courses as measured by the SIR II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QEP Implementation Team is working on a plan for selecting faculty to teach SLS 1515 to be implemented in fall 2013 for spring 2014 selection. • Early Alert services became consistent college-wide during the spring 2013 semester to help support SLS 1515 success and retention.
Through each phase of implementation, the QEP will foster increased rates of student satisfaction and student engagement. The success of this measure will	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.	These data were reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee on April 10, the QEP Assessment Committee on April 17, and the QEP Advisory committee on April 26 to inform student retention efforts.

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>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment committee 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.
	<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>
	<p>Faculty/Student Interaction items from SIR II: 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 Subset of Active and Collaborative Learning items from CCSSE: 4f,</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 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).</p>	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on January 23, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30, and the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8.</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
	4g, 4h, and 4r			<p>The committees strategized ways to continue to exceed the stated goal in terms of student satisfaction with courses as measured by the SIR II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College will continue to provide faculty training through the TLC and through the Community of Practice Meetings. • The QEP Implementation Committee and QEP Advisory committee began a draft of a SLS 1515 staffing plan to include a review of recommendations and dispositions.
	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.	<p>Three focus group sessions were held on Lee Campus, one on Charlotte campus and one on Hendry/Glades. A focus group session was scheduled on Collier, but no students attended.</p> <p>Trends noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Time Management: Many students noted that learning about "Time Management" was a positive and/or significant component of the course. This was also mentioned frequently when students were asked which aspects of the course helped 	<p>These data were reviewed at, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on January 23, the SLS 1515 Community of Practice on January 28, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30, and the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on these data, the group discussed ways to infuse more time management strategies into the course such as reviewing the Calendar in Canvas, having students use course schedules to enter assignments into planners, creating a weekly schedule and

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
		<p>Survey data will be used to inform course and program improvement.</p>	<p>them achieve their academic or career goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting positive interactions with faculty: Many students had a positive experience with their professor. • Valuing Peer Architects: Most comments about Peer Architects were positive but vague. Those who were specific mentioned that the PA's provided assistance outside of class, reminded them to do homework, gave counseling, and acted as a liaison with the professor. They also noted that the PA's knew "what we are going through." • Learning Critical Thinking Skills: Students were positive about learning Critical Thinking and the journals. • Critiquing Group Presentation: Group Projects received mixed reviews. Some saw the benefits of learning group communication skills, others found working in groups to be frustrating. Finally, some students found public speaking to be a challenge. • Critiquing Passport Assignment: Passport assignment received mixed reviews. Some students found the assignment to be time 	<p>evaluating time usage, etc.</p>

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			<p>consuming and/or felt forced to socialize. Other students found the assignment enjoyable and useful.</p>	
<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>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>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Twenty-four of the forty-three faculty completers responded to the Cornerstone Instructor Module survey. ▪ 79% 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 1% short of the stated goal). ▪ 79% 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 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Training and Development meeting on January 31, 2013, QEP Advisory Meeting on February 8, and the QEP Assessment Meeting on February 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on results from spring and summer 2012 surveys, the trainings were revised to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ more course-specific content ✓ more hands-on activities and specific examples ✓ face-to-face requirements for some of the modules ✓ lengthier sessions for some of

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			students (falling 1% short the stated goal).	<p>the modules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ more attention to Critical Thinking training for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept. • Based on spring 2013 evaluations, further revision will be made to Critical Thinking Modules to include more practical applications. • Faculty attending the 33rd Annual Conference on Critical Thinking will become facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in fall 2012. • At the QEP Assessment Subcommittee meeting it was suggested that faculty, staff and administrators be reminded of the training goals and the specific modules that are encouraged for each group. The QEP Director will work with the Training and Development Committee to re-broadcast goals. • A Summer Training Institute has been scheduled for June 2013. Harlan Cohen will lead a workshop on supporting first-year students and Dr. Sandra Maguire will lead a workshop on helping first-year students

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 4.7, which exceeds the comparative mean for four-year institutions (4.6).	<p>develop critical thinking skills.</p> <p>These data were reviewed at, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee on January 23, the QEP Implementation Team meeting on January 30, and the QEP Advisory meeting on February 8.</p> <p>The groups strategized ways to continue to exceed the stated goal in terms of student satisfaction with course communication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The QEP Implementation Committee and QEP Advisory committee began a draft of a SLS 1515 staffing plan to include a review of recommendations and dispositions.
<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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thirteen of the seventeen staff and administrators who completed the required modules completed the survey. ▪ 69% 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 11% short of the stated goal. ▪ 69% of the completers "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they had applied the "Success 	<p>These data were reviewed at the QEP Training and Development meeting on January 31, 2013, the QEP Advisory Meeting on February 8, and the QEP Assessment Meeting on February 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Based on results from spring and summer 2012 Surveys, the trainings were revised to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ more course-specific content ✓ more hands-on activities and

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
			<p>Strategies” knowledge gained from the modules to their teaching or interactions with students) falling 11% short of the stated goal.</p>	<p>specific examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ face-to-face requirements for some of the modules ✓ lengthier sessions for some of the modules. ✓ more attention to Critical Thinking training for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on spring 2013 evaluations, further revision will be made to Critical Thinking Modules to include more practical applications. • Faculty attending the 33rd Annual Conference on Critical Thinking will become facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in fall 2013. • A Summer Training Institute has been scheduled for June 2013. Harlan Cohen will lead a workshop on supporting first-year students and Dr. Saundra Maguire will lead a workshop on helping first-year students develop critical thinking skills.
	SENSE items from Clear Academic Plan and Pathway category: 18d, 18g, 18e, 18f, and	Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Clear Academic Plan and Pathway benchmark	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.	These data were reviewed by the QEP Implementation Committee on April 10, the QEP Assessment Committee on April 17, and the QEP Advisory

Departmental/Unit Outcome	Measurement Method/Assessment Tool	Outcome-Specific Goal (Performance Expectation)	Actual Results	Use of Results
	18h	over the previous year's results.		<p>committee on April 26 to inform student retention efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment committee 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.