

Minutes: QEP Student Learning Outcomes/Assessment Subcommittee

Tuesday, October 7, 2014: 1:30 – 2:30 p.m.

Attendance: Michelle Boyer-Pennington, Carol Swayze, Terry Goodin, Sheila Otto, Tina Johnson, Chris Brewer, Dwight Brooks, Mari Weller, Tim Graeff, Kari Neely, Michael Hein

Michelle called the meeting to order at 1:30. Minutes of last meeting was approved. Michelle updated the committee on progress that has been made since last meeting. The GA is doing research on QEPs, learning outcomes and program goals. We will make contact with schools that have learning outcomes that we want to use. Lexy's document has links to other schools' QEPs that Dianna Rust sent out. Be sure to look at those soon if we haven't already.

Save the date for the logo contest. Still to do: Choose slogan or motto and logo. PR class is working on a slogan or motto. Tentative name of QEP is MT Engage.

Michelle sent out the 16 VALUE rubrics. Sheila sent out the General Education information and rubrics used General Education outcomes. Only critical thinking is measured on the Gen Ed test (CAT Skills Test). Assessments must be able to measure the outcomes in the proposal. Psychology Dept. uses CCTST to look at critical thinking.

Definition of terms:

Engagement per Tinto in "Completing College" book: one of 4 Factors to improve retention:

- Involvement (Engagement) Engagement in and out of classroom as part of academics
- Setting expectations
- Support
- Assessment and feedback (early warning systems)

Engagement – Active, deep, high-impact learning

Enriching educational experiences include community service, internships, conversations with others with different culture/beliefs, and active and collaborative learning (NSEE measure). Chris explained the NSEE and noted that we are still waiting on some results from the last test. We have a 22-23% response rate on students taking it. Our students are reporting slightly below average. Chris has a list of peer institutions that are compared to us. We have room for improvement on engagement.

Dwight noted that we still need a working definition of "engagement". Michelle informed the committee that the Research group is working on that and we should be able to nail something down after the next meeting of the QEP Subcommittee Chairs. We are to determine the SLOs and assessment measures. We are measuring outcomes of engagement. NT agrees that we need a definition of engagement and pointed out the UNC QEP as an example. In the meantime, we will use Michelle's definition of engagement to base our SLOs on. She took all the research from QEP committee last year and started putting together SLOs based on what we have. We need 3 – 4 SLOs and 2-3 Program Goals.

Tim voiced his support of the Learning Outcome 1 that Michelle drafted. There was some discussion regarding the difference between SLO 1 and SLO 2 (Critical Thinking). We need to think about the

courses and content of Gen Ed. Michael noted that critical thinking is major specific not general education. It was recommended that we use Integrative Thinking/Reflective Thinking as the title for Learning Outcome 1. It was suggested that we might not use SLO 2 as a separate SLO, since there seems to be overlap with SLO 1. Kari reminded the group that critical thinking measures are not embedded right now in English classes. It was mentioned that we need to remember the importance of being able to reflect on self (strengths, weakness, etc.). Much discussion followed regarding SLO 3. It was determined that Professional/Personal Development would be a better description than Career Readiness. Chris stated that Career Readiness will be difficult to measure and added that the concern of the students is actually their ability to find a job, how to do resumes, technical writing, interviewing and knowing how to conduct a job search.

The meeting ended with Michelle asking each member to determine “what you would like to see and not want and why”. Meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. Next meeting is in two weeks, October 21 at 1:30 p.m.