

Meeting Minutes
QEP Implementation Team
Friday, November 30, 2012
10:00am – 12:00 noon
CBP 201, Lake Worth

Attendance:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Allen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Caroll Capers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eliana Carvalho Mukherjee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carleton Chernehoff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lyam Christopher
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Findley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Manuel Larenas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Daniel McGavin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Pain, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Reeder	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Helen Shub (guest)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kristy Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Zyanya Torres	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Wells (optional)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elizabeth Wilber (optional)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mindy Yale	

ITEM 1. Deliverables

Discussion: POLO – the committee reviewed the current format of the College’s digital library called POLO (Panther Online Learning Objects) that is currently being developed for students. Karen Pain reported that the site maintainer agreed to add a “faculty and staff” tab so that critical thinking strategies for faculty and staff can be housed in the same online location. The committee members agreed that it makes sense to merge efforts with this north campus project.

Rubric – faculty present were asked to consider what assignments they might have for which they could use the current critical thinking rubric. Lyam Christopher asked if the rubric was official and could now be shared. Ms. Pain suggested that it is ok to share informally with faculty and staff, but to remind anyone it is a work in progress and revisions could still be pending.

Data: Current critical thinking rubric
 POLO web page:
<http://cdm16073.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/landingpage/collection/p16073coll3>

Action: Ms. Pain will continue to work with the north campus committee on POLO; committee members will review syllabus and assignments to determine how, if at all, they might integrate the use of the critical thinking rubric when they submit their deliverables next spring.

ITEM 2. Workshops

Discussion: The schedule is now confirmed and most room numbers are assigned. Workshops have been loaded into the Human Resources professional development page for registration and tracking purposes. There are 20 confirmed workshops within the series that will run from 2/15 through 2/22/13. The schedule and descriptions were made available.

Changes can still be made if submitted to Ms. Pain by 12/7/12. Ms. Pain provided an excerpt from a document that offered guidelines for encouraging dialogue. Many asked for the full document.

Data: *A Discussion Guide for Facilitators* (2010). Magna Publications, Inc.

Action: Any committee member who is presenting a workshop and wishes to make changes to the description should submit the revised description to Ms. Pain by 12/7/12. Ms. Pain will send the full discussion guide by email to the committee.

ITEM 3. Assessment results

Discussion: Scenarios scoring: Everyone received and analysis of the paired scoring session that took place to score the critical thinking scenarios from the fall 2012 general education learning outcomes assessment. Each analysis showed what percentage of scores between the two readers were apart by one point, and which reader scored higher each time when differences occurred. The possibility of a retreat was discussed that could include time dedicated to an extended "calibration" session so that, as a group, we can reach better consensus on specific scores. April 5, 2013 appears to be the best date.

Scenarios results: Student scores dropped from spring baseline results (average 3.04 on 5-point scale) to fall results (2.59 on 5-point scale); it is suspected that reasons include a revised scenario that allowed for more direct scoring of each outcome and slight revisions on the rubric.

California Critical Thinking Skills Test: This test measures each QEP outcome. Baseline assessment was conducted last spring with 175 students in ENC1101 sections. The fall sample was a subset of the random sample selected by IRE as part of the regular general education assessment cycle. Student scores improved in all categories, increasing from a total average score of 12.3 to 15.1 out of 34 possible points. The baseline sample ranked between the 28th (score of 12) and 36th (score of 13) percentiles for two-year colleges; the fall sample ranked in the 52nd percentile.

Data: Analysis of scenario scoring sessions. California Critical Thinking Skills Test report as obtained from Insight Assessment.

Action: Ms. Pain will seek approval and a location for a day-long retreat in the spring semester to dedicate extended time to a discussion of rubric and score calibration.

ITEM 4. Updates

Adjunct and new faculty/staff training: A sub-committee is currently in the revision phase of developing an introduction to the QEP and the critical thinking learning outcomes, and an introductory workshop will be schedule for approximately one month after the start of each semester beginning fall 2013. All adjuncts and new employees will be exposed to the introduction and invited to the subsequent workshop.

Vision: Ms. Pain discussed suggestions for language in a possible QEP report within a Lake Worth campus report to be published in spring 2013. The language would mirror previous discussions regarding the vision and intent of the QEP. Key words to be communicated are collaboration, reflection, and scholarship.

“Cohort” training and resources: 8 out of 13 chapter summaries are complete. Ms. Pain is creating a single document to be shared with the cohort that will encompass a summary of the 13 separate but related critical thinking topics from the Facione book that has been reviewed by many cohort members. Additional resources, such as those offered by the Critical Thinking Foundation (Paul and Elder), will be purchased after we determine exactly what to produce for College-wide use this spring. A flip-booklet or small spiral booklet will be designed to include a QEP “statement” to articulate the expectation of the QEP, the learning outcomes, and “questions” that faculty/staff can ask students to encourage the students to use specific critical thinking skills associated with each outcome.

Spring schedule: Meetings will be held on January , 11, March 15, April 5, and April 26, on Lake Worth campus as usual, from 10am-noon. February 15th will be used as a workday for each committee member to prepare for workshops (except for Elizabeth Wilber, who has a workshop that day). All committee members will present workshops during the week of February 15th-22nd as part of the workshop series. Kim Allen, Carleton Chernekoff, and Brian Findley, will rotate onto the Advisory Council as of the January meeting. Ms. Pain noted their valuable contributions over more than two years, and let them know they are welcome to continue informal participation with the implementation team as we move forward.

Data: Previous meeting minutes (<http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/qep/meeting-minutes.aspx>) and communication between QEP manager and committee members since the 11/30 meeting.

Action: Ms. Pain will continue to work on each of the items above to move the initiatives forward. She will also send a draft of the letter for possible inclusion in the Lake Worth campus report to those who are in attendance at the meeting for comment before the final draft. Spring meetings will be scheduled in Outlook and meeting notices will be sent to all members.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

Submitted by:

Karen Pain, Chair