

Minutes: QEP Assessment Subcommittee
 Wednesday, April 25
 11:30-12:30
 I-119A

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

1. Focus Group Update: Focus groups were held on Hendry/Glades and Charlotte campus last week and on Collier Campus this week. These groups had small amounts of students participating, but the focus groups’ leaders report that they received useful feedback. Focus groups for Lee Campus are scheduled for today, Wednesday, April 25, with two time slots: 1:00-2:00 (with focus group leaders being available 1:00-2:30) and 4:00-5:00 (with focus groups leaders being available to 4:00-5:30). Fourteen students signed up for Lee Campus. Once all focus groups are complete, Eileen will compile comments into a spreadsheet and share with the group. Eileen wanted the group’s opinion on distributing a survey to students. Kevin suggested that the SIR II in addition to the student focus groups may suffice. The themes that emerge from the focus group could be used to build a survey for future semesters. Scott suggested that custom questions could be built into the SIR II for future semesters as well. Kevin suggested it may be appropriate to develop a survey that measured student satisfaction with various student services. The survey data could provide baseline information that helps the unit planners in the Student Services area to set QEP-related goals and engage in activities that increase student satisfaction and engagement.

2. The group shared feedback on the “success skills” measures. Susan, Amy and Crystal felt many of the items on the LASSI were redundant. Susan and Amy suggested that the redundancy could lead to frustration and lower the validity of the measure. Kevin discussed the purpose of the redundancy and how this could be viewed as a positive feature. Eileen and Amy found that SmarterMeasure aligned with many of the components of the success skills outcomes in the course. Amy noted that the Reading Rate and Recall portion of SmarterMeasure was looking at Reading comprehension rather than reading strategies. Eileen agreed. Scott suggested that typing speed and accuracy could be correlated to technical competency. The group discussed each of the Domains in SmarterMeasure: Life Factors, Personal Attributes, Learning Styles, Reading Rate and Recall, Technical Competency, Technical Knowledge, Typing Speed and Accuracy. The group agreed that each domain was useful and agreed to review the pre/post data collected from each. Eileen will bring this recommendation to the curriculum subcommittee and also suggest that they review areas of the curriculum to ensure that there are activities and assignment that address all of the components of the success skills outcomes are (such as developing strategies for the use of technology).

3. The group shared feedback on the critical thinking assessments. Susan felt that the reading level and difficulty of the Test of Everyday Reasoning (TER) was almost identical to that of the California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST). Eileen agreed. The group noted that the readability could interfere with getting a true measure of the students' achievement of the critical thinking. The group also noted that the test may be frustrating for students. The group also reviewed paper copies of the Cornell Critical Thinking test. Like the CCTST, many of the domains seem relevant, but the readability level was judged to be much too high. Eileen reviewed the California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTDI) and reported that it was much more student friendly. The inventory contains about 60 statements that students indicate (in Likert Scale format) how much they agree with the statements. The domains covered include Truth seeking, Open mindedness, Inquisitiveness, Analyticity, Systematicity, Critical thinking self-confidence and Maturity of judgment. Eileen will send the link to the team so they can review its efficacy. Scott suggested that the faculty may want to consider a direct assessment of the students' acquisition of the vocabulary related to critical thinking and/or the Elder Paul model. Eileen reported that Steve Piscitelli will lead a Critical Thinking training this summer (June 28 and 29). He presents a simplified version of the Elder Paul model, known as the "RED" model: Recognize assumptions, Evaluate information, Draw Conclusions. Eileen suggested that this model (and related vocabulary) may be more accessible for the students and could be incorporated into assessments.

4. Update on Standardized Assessment Subcommittee: This subcommittee has been working to ensure faculty are given guidance for administering assessments, as well as working with the Banner team to ensure students are loaded properly for pre- and post-testing. All post-testing has been completed. Pre- and post-test data will be extracted within a couple of weeks and the report will be shared with the Assessment Subcommittee. Frieda Miller (and SLS 1515 faculty member and co-chair of the Assessment Subcommittee) feels that the CCTST and TER are too difficult for the student and is in favor of using the CCTDI.

5. Update on Curriculum Subcommittee: Myra Walters and Elaine Schaeffer designed a survey that they distributed to the entire SLS 1515 faculty. Some of the findings:

- The majority of the faculty members feel that the number of assignments in the course is manageable.
- The majority of the faculty members feel that the assignments are well-aligned with the student learning outcomes.
- The faculty had mixed feelings about the Passport assignment and how it was executed. They want to keep the idea, but revise the assignment.
- Some faculty felt that there were too many learning outcomes and/or some of the outcomes overlapped and/or some of the outcomes needed to be deleted. The committee may tweak some of the outcomes this summer.

Eileen will continue to work with both committees and share communication to make sure all groups are working in concert.

6. Faculty members have been submitting the requested random sample of student essays to Amanda Romero. Once the semester is over, the team will move forward with a plan to engage in grounded theory and thematic coding of success strategies discussions found in the essays.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca