

AGENDA
Quality Enhancement Plan Implementation Team
Friday, February 24, 2012, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
ETA 101, Lake Worth

Attendance:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Allen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carleton Chernekoff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lyam Christopher
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Capers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Findley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan McGavin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Pain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ana Porro	<input type="checkbox"/> Roger Ramsammy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kristi Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lynn Trezise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mindy Yale

ITEM 1: WORKSHOPS

Discussion: Facilitators each spoke of their experiences which were, for the most part, positive. Almost all attendees were eager to have conversations and learn about critical thinking and to learn how to integrate it into what they do at the College. Some participants asked when the next workshops would be held and requested to be notified.

The challenges faced that should be considered in the next round of workshops include these: unpredictable enrollment, the mix of disciplines and positions (some were very positive about this factor, some were not), and the invitation. It was suggested that we create a better way to promote future workshops to let people know they are interesting and fun. It was suggested that we at least consider offering additional workshops in the fall instead of only in the spring (in coming years).

Feedback from participants was overwhelmingly positive. Out of 375 responses total to five questions about the workshops, 98.1% (all but 7) were favorable responses.

Data/source: data submitted from workshops (“Clickers” or hard copy surveys were used) by facilitators

Action: Team will meet at end of semester to arrive at consensus regarding future workshops

ITEM 2: PLANNING AHEAD

Discussion: Next year’s team...

Data/source: Karen Pain asked each team member to let her know their preference to stay or not stay on the committee as soon as possible so that she can make a recommendation to Dr. Sass regarding the number of openings for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Action: Each committee member will determine his/her interest in remaining on the committee next year and give the response to Ms. Pain as soon as possible.

ITEM 3: QEP Rubric

Discussion: Must determine (1) format of the rubric and (2) specific content of cells
Must have a final suggested version to present to the assessment committee by 3/16
Final rubric will be used to score 2009 and 2010 scenario responses (part of our baseline data) at the April 13th meeting with some members of the assessment committee.

It was decided that the rubric must be easily understood, available on a single page, and to the greatest extent possible, avoid the use of words with meanings that can be argued.

The following are the committee's suggestions to score each outcome analytically using five levels:

- (1) Lacking: does not demonstrate the required skills
- (2) Emerging: poorly demonstrates the required skills
- (3) Developing: moderately demonstrates the required skills – needs improvement
- (4) Competent: successfully demonstrates the required skills
- (5) Exemplary: distinguishably demonstrates the required skills

Data/source: QEP learning outcomes, multiple rubric samples

Action: Ms. Pain will create a rubric using these rating descriptions, the committee will reflect on each item for a few days, committee members will send feedback to Ms. Pain by Wednesday, 2/29, and she will make edits and send back out to team. The goal is to complete a final suggestion to submit to the Assessment Committee on or before March 16th.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:03pm

Respectfully submitted
Karen Pain, QEP Manager