ITEM 1: Student Contest

Discussion: Essay contest only. 2/9/15 – 3/23/15. The speech cluster will offer a speech contest that will include a critical thinking category that is sponsored by QEP. There was insufficient support for poster category.

Official rules and rubric were discussed. Rules previously vetted by QEP Support Team in November; additional editorial suggestions were made by the leadership team today.

Rubric – essay only. Current proposed point structure is a maximum of 30 points: 1-10 points each for outcomes (analysis and interpretation, drawing conclusions, evaluation and explanation) and 6 for writing skills (spelling and grammar). With maximum scores, this structure allows an 80%/20% weight on thinking and writing skills respectively as requested by the Advisory Council last spring. Point structure unchanged.

Judging – Development Day (3/26) will be used for initial “calibration” session to score sample essays as large group during first hour. We’ll form 2-person teams, divide and distribute the essay, and then use the second hour/lunch to judge assigned essays. Teams will finish scoring on their own (individually, electronically, or by meeting together) and provide results to Karen no later than Tuesday April 7.

Winners – must meet minimum criteria (and therefore are not guaranteed to be awarded on every campus); will be announced at campus award events throughout April and then posted on the QEP website by May 1.

Prizes – will be determined based on number of winners (minimum: $150 awards as top prizes); will be advertised as “Cash prizes of at least (or up to) $150!” This will be coordinated with speech cluster members as they are re-instituting a speech contest this year in conjunction with the QEP contest. The speech cluster prompt will be the same as the QEP prompt and will include a critical thinking category. Prize amounts should therefore be similar.
Marketing the contest – text messages to students (2/9 with reminders before and after spring break); LED sign, student newsletter, faculty email, intranet announcement, internet announcement, and other venues as available

Data source: Previous meeting minutes (http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/qep/Documents/QEP-AC-042514.pdf) and email/phone communication fall 2014.

Action: Ms. Pain will make rubric and rules edits based on discussion and forward to leadership team for final comments before uploading to web.

ITEM 2  Assessment
Discussion: Three faculty members who are intentionally integrating critical thinking will be administering the CCTST and the CCTDI this semester and next. An additional sample is needed for a spring administration of the critical thinking scenario.

Data source: QEP assessment plan (within QEP document)
Action: Ms. Pain will work with IRE to select the spring sample for scenario administration.

ITEM 3  Professional Learning Groups
Discussion: All groups are meeting; some have had better luck at the “monthly” schedule than others, but everyone has had three successful meetings. Some monthly reports have not yet been submitted and facilitators were asked to get those in to Ms. Pain before the break.

PLG plans for spring are two-fold.

(1) Facilitators will continue to meet with their respective groups at times that work for the group and with content and focus that is already established. Ms. Pain is purchasing a one-hour webinar for participants that addresses the intentional and explicit integration of critical thinking into the classroom, Designing and Teaching a Course with a Critical Thinking Focus. It looks really interesting. If it is, facilitators will be encouraged to use or share the webinar with their groups.

(2) Facilitators will request feedback from participants about the development of the Title V Summer Institute to Improve Teaching, Learning, and Student Success.

Data source: n/a
Action: Facilitators will submit any missing reports before 12/18/15.

ITEM 3  Title V Summer Institute to Improve Teaching, Learning, and Student Success
Discussion: Current PLG facilitators and participants will have significant input regarding the parameters of the institute; possibilities were discussed today. Consensus is that there should be options for faculty so that those who have recently tried a best practice can use the institute to document and share results. Similarly, participants who need dedicated time to research and identify best practices should have the option to use the institute for that purpose.
Data source: Grants office personnel; Title V grant objectives
Action: Ms. Pain will develop a survey for current PLG participants to gather opinions about potential components and the application process and allowing for open-ended feedback as well. Additionally, she will schedule a live meeting on Lake Worth for anyone who can attend if it seems necessary or worthwhile.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00am.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen D. Pain, QEP Manager and Chair