

3.3.1.1 Response Team Minutes

January 19, 2012

12:15-1:00 p.m.

S-117

Eileen DeLuca	<i>Present</i>	Marty Ambrose	<i>Present</i>
Kevin Coughlin	<i>Present</i>		
Sandra Seifert	<i>Present</i>		

1.The group reviewed the 3.3.1.1 recommendation issues, and progress towards addressing each issues. In addition, the group discussed responsibilities of the 3.3.1.1 response team members.

Issue to be addressed: *Review unit plans related to Distance Education. Find more evidence of assessments at the discipline and course level to compare with traditional seated counterparts. Find additional evidence of assessment informing improvement and/or unit plan objectives. Provide evidence of developing a process to ensure future compliance.*

Plan: Eileen, Sandra, and Marty will review Distance Ed. plans. and SACS COC policy. Kevin has built a course-level assessment cycle, received feedback from Discipline Chairs and is awaiting approval from the Interim VPAA. Sandra and Marty suggested asking a member of Edison Online to join the group to be involved with the Distance Education review. Eileen will contact Rona Axelrod.

Issue to be addressed: *Review the SACS COC's "Distance and Correspondence Education" policy statement vis-à-vis ESC's 3.3.1.1. assessment of compliance and focused report and address any gaps. Provide evidence of assessment for program with more than 50% online (Commission's Distance and Correspondence Education policy).*

Plan: Eileen, Sandra and Marty will review the policy statement and compare it to the assessment of compliance and focused report. Sandra and Marty suggested asking a member of Edison Online to join the group to be involved with the Distance Education review. Eileen will contact Rona Axelrod.

Issue to be addressed: *Provide more evidence across programs for assessment done at the level of student learning outcomes and at the course level. Find additional evidence of assessment informing improvement and/or unit plan objectives. Provide evidence of developing a process to ensure future compliance.*

Plan: Kevin identified the most frequently offered Arts and Sciences courses (courses that have general education components in their syllabi) across the college's program. On January 6 he shared the list with the Discipline Chairs and asked for input in regards to developing a feasible assessment cycle. He also asked chairs to submit narratives regarding the common measurement tools being used in each

course. He sent an assessment cycle matrix to the Interim VPAA for review on January 12. Kevin also designed Course-Level Assessment Methods Usage Guidelines. Marty asked for clarification about common assessments. Kevin explained that the assessments had been identified by the discipline chairs and would not be prescribed to them.

Issue to be addressed: *Ensure all unit plans contain completed "use of results" sections. 100% of unit plans must be updated.*

Plan: A due date of January 17 was set. IRPE office will audit unit plans for compliance. Kevin will provide an update to the response team. Eileen, Sandra, and Marty will make recommendation to IRPE office in regards to how to ensure continuous compliance to planning and assessment cycles. The team discussed the idea of moving the target date for completion of mid-year reviews to later in the spring semester to ensure unit planners have time to focus on completion as well as time to disseminate results to their departments, and have meetings to make plans for the use of results.

Issue to be addressed: *Review unit plans across disciplines for consistency of documentation of program and course level plans.*

Plan: The course-level assessment cycle includes a procedural guideline. The guidelines will ensure that department chairs and unit planners have standardized and actionable assessment information to inform planning. Eileen, Sandra, and Marty will provide feedback.

Issue to be addressed: *Provide more training for administrators, faculty and staff regarding the planning and assessment cycle, and use of TEd/SPOL.*

Plan: Kevin held planning cycle trainings on January 3, January 5, and January 6. He will have a proposed 2012-2013 training schedule by Friday, January 20. The forthcoming training schedule will include: a. Roles and responsibilities of unit planners, associate deans, deans and vice presidents; b. Planning cycle (3 years); c. Assessment cycle (3 years). Update: At the meeting held on 1/26, the group suggested holding open "make and take" sessions where unit planners could come in with their plans, and members of the 3.3.1.1 team could give suggestions and direction towards the development of the objectives.

Issue to be addressed: *Staff the IRPE office appropriately to ensure oversight of college-wide planning and assessment activities, and to provide both regularly scheduled and "just-in-time" training to administrators, faculty and staff.*

Plan: A "Director of Assessment" position is posted. Kevin is chairing the committee and will move forward to review applications ASAP. He plans to have the first meeting scheduled by January 27. Marty suggested reviewing the Curriculum Specialist role and exploring the possibility of having a Curriculum Specialist in each department.

Issue to be addressed: *Clearly define accountability of compliance (i.e. define who is ultimately responsible for incomplete and/or inadequate program planning and assessment).*

Plan: For response team to discuss: The unit planners are responsible for their plans. A chain of command is evidenced in the approval chain. Question: Does the placement in a chain imply a level of responsibility for the implementation and assessment of a plan?

2. Eileen asked Sandra and Marty to review the SACS COC Distance and Correspondence Education policy, the original 3.3.1.1 assessment of compliance and the focused report. She asked them to take notes to bring to the meeting on 1/26.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

3.3.1.1 Response Team Minutes

January 26, 2012

12:15-1:00 p.m.

S-250 B

Eileen DeLuca	<i>Present</i>	Marty Ambrose	<i>Absent</i>
Kevin Coughlin	<i>Present</i>	Rona Axelrod	<i>Absent</i>
Sandra Seifert	<i>Present</i>	Larysa Rybak	<i>Present</i>

1. Prior to the meeting, Rona Axelrod worked with Mary Myers to gather a comparison of student evaluation report statistics from 2010-2011 (online vs. face-to-face) and a comparison of grade distributions for online and traditional instruction. She shared these results with the team.
2. During the meeting, the group reviewed the SACS COC "Distance and Correspondence Education Policy."
3. Sandra pointed out some of the areas that may have been lacking in the original assessment of compliance and the follow-up focused report (e.g. unit plans that were incomplete or underdeveloped).
4. Eileen noted that on p. 3, the policy states that distance education programs must be compared to campus-based courses and programs in terms of assessments of "student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction." This was used as a frame of reference for reviewing the Edison Online Unit Plans and the data that Rona shared. Some findings:
 - a. One of the unit plan outcome-specific goals (found in objective ID #1581) is related to student learning outcomes (measured through Gen. Ed. assessment). An additional outcome-specific goal may need to be added here to relate to course level assessment (achievement of course-specific student learning outcomes) in courses that offer both traditional and on-line sections.
 - c. One of the outcome-specific goals (found in objective ID #1581) is related to student "success" which may be tied to retention, but Kevin suggested the unit planners may want to add a separate "retention" goal to more closely align with the intent of the SACS COC policy. He also noted that retention data from fall 2011 is available and could therefore be included as a mid-year result. The team will work with Edison Online to provide direction towards requesting current retention/success data from the Banner team to input under "actual results." In addition, data should be disseminated to stakeholders, analyzed and used to inform program improvement.
 - b. One of the unit plan outcome-specific goals (found in objective ID #1358) is related to student satisfaction (measured through e-SIR reports).

5. Prior to the meeting, Rona shared that the BSN Nursing program and programs in the School of Education both have a significant number of courses that are offered online.
6. During the meeting, the team discussed the need to create a spreadsheet showing (by program) the number of courses that are offered in an online format. The spreadsheet should distinguish courses that are offered both online and face-to-face versus those offered online only. This could serve as a point of departure for reviewing these programs to ensure their unit plans contain outcome-specific goals related to "student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction." The team will request the spreadsheet from Edison Online.
7. Kevin shared statistics regarding the number of mid-year "actual results" and "use of results" that had been reported in unit plans. He and Crystal put together a spreadsheet, showing for each unit plan objective, whether it had been approved and whether it included the following components: an appropriate assessment measure, intended results, a status report, actual results, and use of results. Kevin will share the spreadsheet with the 3.3.1.1 response team, so the team can provide support to the unit planners with incomplete or underdeveloped plans. Eileen will review the spreadsheet and divide the plans among group members who will communicate with individual unit planners to offer support. In addition, Eileen suggested holding open "make and take" sessions where unit planners could come in with their plans and members of the 3.3.1.1 team could give suggestions and direction towards the development of the objectives.
8. Kevin shared that the current draft of the course-level assessment plan cycle will be shared with the discipline chairs and deans for final comment by the end of the week.
9. Sandra shared that the Math Department has already engaged in the use of common course assessments and pre- and post-testing. Kevin commented on the efficacy of using pre- and post-tests without control groups.
10. Once the course level assessment plan is implemented, the IRPE office will provide support to the departments in terms of data collection and analysis. The group discussed the type of data that the IRPE office could provide to the departments as gleaned from common exams, rubrics, checklists, etc. Eileen suggested that the heart of the 3.3.1.1 recommendation is that departments need to analyze these data at department meetings, and use the data to inform both the revision of assessment tools and reflection on instructional delivery with the aim of increasing achievement of student learning outcomes.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

3.3.1.1 Response Team Minutes

February 9, 2012

12:15-1:00 p.m.

S-250 B

Eileen DeLuca	<i>Present</i>	Marty Ambrose	<i>Present</i>
Kevin Coughlin	<i>Present</i>	Rona Axelrod	<i>Present</i>
Sandra Seifert	<i>Present</i>	Larysa Rybak	<i>Present</i>

1. Prior to the meeting, Mary Myers sent a matrix listing online course offerings sorted by department. Eileen, Kevin, and Dobin reviewed the matrix and requested the addition of a series of columns (one per program) to help identify programs with substantial online offerings. A "yes" or "no" in each column could be inputted to indicate if the course is a core program requirement. This will provide a reference for any narrative we would need to write regarding percentage of program completion that may be achieved through online courses. The SACS COC recommendation asks us to provide evidence of comparable retention, satisfaction and achievement of student learning outcomes within programs with more than 50% of the courses offered via distance learning. Reviewers would expect to see related objectives in both Edison Online unit plans and those programs that are identified as having significant online offerings.

2. During the meeting, Eileen shared the status of the unit plans that were initially found incomplete:

Edison Online Objective #1581: Eileen and Kevin met with Dobin on Tuesday to review the objective. The group worked on revising the objective title and description to more closely align with the SACS COC verbiage regarding demonstrating comparability of student retention, satisfaction, and achievement of student learning outcomes. Kevin has been working on a number of course level assessment studies that will be used as actual results. Dobin and Kevin will meet with Edison Online faculty and staff to review results.

Continuing Ed. Objective #1493, 1494, 1495, 1496, 1497: Eileen and Kevin met with Adrian Kerr and Wendie Thompson on Tuesday to review plans. The group discussed the type of data that could be collected, summarized and reported in the mid-year results, as well as strategies for engaging in a review of results to inform program improvement. Wendie will take the lead on gathering the data and updating the plan.

General Education Objective #1418, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1422: Eileen, Kevin and Marty met to review plans and discuss actual results and use of results.

- #1418: Since there is data available from summer and fall, Marty volunteered to take the lead on gathering scoring teams to score the student artifacts using the Gen. Ed. rubrics. Kevin is seeking funding for stipends through the VPAA office. The group will also recommend funding for a “Rubric Revision Institute” in the summer.
- #1419: Eileen sent AccuTrack data from the English and Oral Communications Academic Success center to Kevin so that the IRPE office may use the student usage data to run studies demonstrating the effect of these support services.
- #1420: This objective will be deferred to the next academic year.
- #1421: Eileen has data on faculty attendance in Critical Thinking workshops and evaluations of the training. She will upload the data into TEd.
- #1422: Eileen asked Amy Teprovich to provide data about student participation in service learning or volunteer work related to Global Socio Responsibility. Marty is taking a class to the *Education for a New Humanity* events and will work with Wendy Chase and Cathy Wilkins to implement a student survey. Eileen will also ask faculty in the baccalaureate programs to share data from student participation in activities related to GSR.

3. TEd support workshop/drop-in training: Eileen and Caroline Seefchak will host a TEd user training on Tuesday, March 20 from 2:30-4:00 and Wednesday, April 4 from 2:00-3:30 and L-110.

4. Eileen and Kevin are scheduled to meet with Joyce Rollins on Feb. 10 at 10:00 am. Eileen will work on setting up appointments with other unit planners still in need of support. She will send the dates/times to the 3.3.1.1 team.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

3.3.1.1 Response Team Minutes

February 2, 2012

12:15-1:00 p.m.

S-250 B

Eileen DeLuca	<i>Present</i>	Marty Ambrose	<i>Absent</i>
Kevin Coughlin	<i>Absent</i>	Rona Axelrod	<i>Present</i>
Sandra Seifert	<i>Present</i>	Larysa Rybak	<i>Present</i>

1. Prior to the meeting, Kevin Coughlin and Crystal Revak reviewed all unit plans and created a spreadsheet, showing for each unit plan objective, whether it had been approved and whether it included the following components: an appropriate assessment measure, intended results, a status report, actual results, and use of results. The spreadsheet was sent to members of the 3.3.1.1 response team. Eileen sent a message to each of the unit planners with incomplete plans. The message alerted the unit planner to the incomplete objectives, and offered the unit planners the opportunity to meet with members of the 3.3.1.1 response team if in need of support.

2. During the meeting, Eileen shared the status of the unit plans that were initially found incomplete:

AA Humanities & Social Sciences: Message was sent to Dr. Dennison. Upon review of the plans, it seems that for at least some objectives, data should currently be available. Marty Ambrose offered to touch base with Dr. Dennison and offer support.

AS Nursing: Message was sent to Mary Myers. As of 2/2, no progress had been made. A follow-up message will be sent next week.

Certificate Accounting and Certificate Computer Programming: Message was sent to Mary Myers. As of 2/2, no progress had been made. A follow-up message will be sent next week.

Continuing Education: Message was sent to Mary Myers. Adrian Kerr updated plans, but plans still lacked "actual results" and "use of results." A meeting has been scheduled for Feb. 7, 2:30 p.m. with Adrian Kerr, Wendie Thompson, Kevin Coughlin and Eileen DeLuca.

Edison Online: Message was sent to Mary Myers and Rona Axelrod. Rona, Dobin, Melissa and Mary have a meeting scheduled on 3/3 to review plans and address updates.

General Education: Marty Ambrose agreed to work with Kevin and Eileen to update these plans. A meeting will be scheduled for early next week. These plans will also be reviewed at the response team meeting on Feb. 9.

Law and Public Service Programs: Message was sent to Mary Myers and Kim Gresham. Kim sent an email on 2/1 indicating that she had updated the plans. Although the plans now contain status reports, they are still missing actual results and use of results. Eileen will contact Kim to offer further support.

Learning Resources: A message was sent to Bill Shuluk. He updated the status reports, but the plans still lack actual results and use of results. Eileen will contact Bill to offer further support.

School of Education: Message was relayed to Erin Harrel. A meeting has been scheduled on Feb. 10 from 10:00-11:00 a.m. with Joyce Rollins, Kevin Coughlin, and Eileen DeLuca.

3. The group held a discussion to differentiate the expectations of status reports, actual results, and use of results. "Use of Results" seemed to be the area that most planners had difficulty with. However, this is one of the most important areas in the planning process. The group brainstormed ways to help planners better understand how to report actual results and use of results, and how to further engage planners in the culture of assessment.

a. Eileen described how she and Caroline set a day at the end of each month to update TEEd/SPOL. The monthly meeting allows them to review stated objectives, make sure they are tracked, gather any available data, and make plans and report on use of results. When data become available, they are disseminated to faculty through meetings, and summaries are uploaded into TEEd/SPOL. During the meetings, faculty make plans for use of results. Minutes are kept and uploaded as one record of "closing the loop." If there are any artifacts (e.g. a rubric that was revised, a flyer from a workshop that was created in response to an identified need, a new policy that was implemented, etc.), these items can also be uploaded to SPOL. Other ways to close the loop: provide evidence of changes or improvements made based on analysis of data, and include related objectives with revised outcome-specific goals appearing in the following cycle's unit plans.

b. Rona suggested that unit planners needed more training with TEEd/SPOL. For many planners, the system may be scary or intimidating. She suggested assigning mentors to planners. She would also like to see a session in a computer lab, or with laptops, where participants could pull up SPOL and practice filling in the fields, etc. Larysa agreed and asked to be invited to one of the sessions, so she could learn more about the use of TEEd/SPOL.

c. Sandra suggested that the IRPE office create a document that lists all of the TEEd/SPOL fields. Following the name of each field, she would like to see an abstract of what type of information should be entered there. Eileen noted that Kevin includes examples of completed plans in his training module. The addition of guidelines with an abstract would provide additional guidance.

d. Sandra suggested that planners need to be reminded to update plans, and that there needed to be someone to enforce that plans are regularly updated. Eileen added that planners also needed regular face-to-face support. Eileen described how at one time (under a previous dean), planners were sent monthly reminders to update plans, but largely, compliance was not enforced, and support was not offered. The current Dean of IRPE has improved communication and has provided much support through a coherent assessment schedule, large group and small group training, and running and

explaining studies to planners. The “Director of Assessment” (position is posted) will provide additional support.

3. Sandra volunteered to join in any unit plan support meetings if she is available. Eileen will send out dates.

4. Eileen will work with the TLC to schedule open support sessions.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

3.3.1.1 Response Team Minutes

March 1, 2012

12:15-1:00 p.m.

S-250 B

Eileen DeLuca	<i>Present</i>	Marty Ambrose	<i>Present</i>
Kevin Coughlin	<i>Present</i>	Rona Axelrod	<i>Present</i>
Sandra Seifert	<i>Present</i>	Larysa Rybak	<i>Present</i>

1. The group reviewed the current draft of the 3.3.1.1 response narrative. The narrative provides a response to Recommendation 7: *The Committee recommends that the institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.*
2. Kevin took the lead on writing the narrative which has three main sections.
3. The first section describes the evolution of the processes for planning and assessment. The first table will contain examples of the application of assessment results to continuous improvement planning. Examples will include 2011-2012 unit plans with mid-year results as well as related 2012-2013 unit plans. Kevin completed a number of studies that have recently been shared with Math/Science Unit Planners, Social Sciences Unit Planners, and Business Unit Planners. Those planners are currently updating mid-year results with Kevin's support.
4. The second section focuses on examples of how the college complies with the SACS COC policy on Distance and Correspondence Education in terms of assessing comparability of online and face-to-face courses in terms of achievement of student learning outcomes, retention, and student satisfaction. The group discussed the college policy about percentage of an AA that may be completed online. Rona will get clarification on the policy to ensure the verbiage used in the narrative is accurate. Going forward, student satisfaction comparisons may be measured via a comparison of SIR II data and e-sir data from courses offered in both Modalities. Larysa is working on SIR II data to make sure it is accessible for unit planners.
5. The third section focus on assessment of General Education competencies. Related unit plans will be provided in the third table. Marty is leading the general education scoring session on Friday, March 9. The data will be used as actual results for a number of the plans. Other data informing these plans include attendance in Critical Thinking training, and Academic Success Center Data. Kevin has run studies to demonstrate the relationship between

attendance in the Writing Center and Oral Communication Center and students' grades in corresponding courses (i.e. ENC 1101 and 1102, SPC 1017 and 2023). Though the data showed that students who participated in the services in these centers did significantly better in the courses, there is a limitation to the data. Kevin described other studies that could provide further information such as looking at the number of hours spent in the center and determining if there is positive correlation to grades earned. Another study could determine if there is a differential performance in labs that are less staffed. Marty also talked about student self-report or reflective feedback. Students could complete a survey each time they visit the center. A survey could also "pop up" as they exit Accutrack. Eileen will share these ideas with Academic Success Center faculty for implementation. Kevin will meet with Marty and Cynthia to review Writing Center Data, and Myra and Kelly to review Speech Center Data.

6. Kevin and Eileen encouraged the group to send feedback on the current draft of the narrative. They will continue to work on the narrative and provide support to unit planners to ensure completion of mid-year results.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

3.3.1.1 Response Team Progress

Team Members: Eileen DeLuca, Kevin Coughlin, Sandra Seifert, Marty Ambrose, Larysa Rybak, Rona Axelrod

- The 3.3.1.1 Response Team has met weekly since January 19 (see attached meeting minutes).
- On December 9, 2011, the Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness department distributed a three-year, unit planning calendar to all unit planners; this calendar is available for the entire College community through the Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness web page.
- A deadline for mid-year unit plan results was set for January 17. After the 17th, Kevin Coughlin and Crystal Revak reviewed all unit plans and created a spreadsheet, showing for each unit plan objective whether it had been approved and whether it included the following components: an appropriate assessment measure, intended results, a status report, actual results, and use of results. The spreadsheet was sent to members of the 3.3.1.1 response team. Eileen DeLuca sent a message to each of the unit planners with incomplete plans. The message alerted the unit planner to the incomplete objectives, and offered the unit planners the opportunity to meet with members of the 3.3.1.1 response team if in need of support. A number of the plans have been updated since the first message. Some of the planners requested a support meeting.
- Kevin Coughlin identified the most frequently offered Arts and Sciences courses (courses that have general education components in their syllabi) across the college's program. He shared the list with the Discipline Chairs and asked for input in regards to developing a feasible assessment cycle. He also asked chairs to submit narratives regarding the common measurement tools being used in each course. The assessment cycle matrix was sent to the Interim VPAA for review and approval, and then out to the chairs and unit planners. Kevin also designed Course-Level Assessment Methods Usage Guidelines.
- Eileen and Kevin met with Dobin Anderson on February 7 to revise and update Edison Online Plans. One of the unit objectives was revised to better align with the SACS COC Distance and Correspondence Education Policy Statement which asks that courses offered in both online and face-to-face formats be comparable in terms of retention, satisfaction and achievement of student learning outcomes.
- Eileen and Kevin met with Adrian Kerr and Wendie Thompson on February 7 to revise and update Continuing Ed. Plans. Wendie Thompson is working on summarizing the data and entering "actual results" and "use of results."
- Eileen, Kevin and Marty met on February 7 to strategize how to update Gen. Ed. plans and complete the summer and fall Seybert Assessments. Marty has since identified a scoring team and set a date for the scoring session (February 22). Kevin requested stipend funding from the VPAA office. Eileen requested and received data from the TLC and Student Life which has been uploaded and reported in "actual results" and "use of results."
- The 3.3.1.1 response team worked with the TLC to offer a TEd support workshop/drop-in training. Eileen and Caroline Seefchak will host a TEd user training on Tuesday, March 20 from 2:30-4:00 and Wednesday, April 4 from 2:00-3:30 in L-110.

- Eileen met with Joyce Rollins on Feb. 10 to update two of the School of Ed. Unit Objectives. Joyce Rollins and Martin Tawil are working on tracking down some of the data and updating the plans.
- Eileen and Kevin are meeting with Denise McNulty and her staff on February 16 to review the AS Nursing unit plans and offer support for submitting “actual results” and “use of results.”
- Eileen and Kevin are meeting with Bill Shuluk on February 16 to review the Learning Resources unit plans and offer support for submitting “actual results” and “use of results.”
- Eileen and Kevin are meeting with Rodney Dennison on February 17 to review the Humanities unit plans and offer support for submitting “actual results” and “use of results.”
- Mary Myers and Rona Axelrod sent a matrix listing online course offerings sorted by department. Eileen, Kevin, and Dobin Anderson reviewed the matrix and requested the addition of a series of columns (one per program) to help identify programs with substantial online offerings. Mary and her team updated the matrix. College Prep Assessment clerks are working on updating the spreadsheet to show the percentage of each program’s core course that are offered online. This provides a reference for any narrative we would need to write regarding percentage of program completion that may be achieved through online courses. The SACS COC recommendation asks us to provide evidence of comparable retention, satisfaction and achievement of student learning outcomes within programs with more than 50% of the courses offered via distance learning. Reviewers would expect to see related objectives in both Edison Online unit plans and those programs that are identified as having significant online offerings.

3.3.1.1 Response Team,

Thank you for participation and feedback at today's meeting. I have attached an updated progress/responsibilities matrix to this email. I know how busy everyone is at this time of the semester, so I truly thank you for volunteering your time and expertise. For your convenience, I am also attaching the SACS COC Distance and Correspondence Education Policy Statement. As discussed in today's meeting, Eileen, Sandra and Marty will review the policy statement vis-à-vis ESC's 3.3.1.1. assessment of compliance and focused report and note any areas where we may be able to address any gaps. I am sending a message to Rona Axelrod asking if she can join us in this review. Below is the link to the accreditation documents you will want to review to compare the policy statement to what we reported.

www.edison.edu/accreditation

- To access the initial **assessment of compliance narrative**: On the left side of the screen, below "Compliance Certification Report" you will click on "Comprehensive Standards." A document will pop up. The narrative for 3.3.1.1 is located on pp. 63-74.
- To access the **focused report narrative**: On the left side of the screen, click on "Focused Report." A document will pop up. The narrative for 3.3.1.1 is located on pp. 23-29.

I have asked Amanda to enact a standing reservation of room S-117 for our team to meet each week on Thursdays from 12:15-1 p.m. (also available via teleconference). For next week's meeting (January 26), I hope we can share our feedback regarding the Distance Ed. issues. We will also receive a status report from Kevin regarding compliance with mid-year reports. Based on his audit, we may need to make a plan for providing support to unit planners whose "actual results" and/or "use of results" sections may need further development.

Thanks again for all you do,

Eileen

3.3.1.1 Response Team,

Thank you for participation and feedback at today's meeting. The minutes are attached. If you were unable to attend today's meeting, please review these minutes and let me know if you have any questions or comments.

If available before next week's meeting (February 9, 12:15-1:00 p.m. S-250B), Rona will send a copy of a matrix of programs noting courses that are offered online. The spreadsheet will distinguish courses that are offered both online and face-to-face versus those offered online only. This could serve as a point of departure for reviewing these programs to ensure their unit plans contain outcome-specific goals related to "student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction." If completed, we will review the matrix at next week's meeting. In addition, the group will review the General Education Program unit plans.

Some of the unit planners who were contacted last week regarding incomplete unit plans are in need of further support and have requested a meeting with 3.3.1.1 response team members. Two meetings have been set so far:

February 7, 2:30-3:30, I-217: Adrian Kerr, Wendie Thompson, Kevin Coughlin, Eileen DeLuca

February 10, 10:00-11:00, U-214 A: Joyce Rollins, Kevin Coughlin, Eileen DeLuca

Any 3.3.1.1 response team members are welcome to join these meetings if available. If you are interested in joining in via telecom or conference call, please let me know ASAP.

Thanks again for all you do,

Eileen

*This message also appears as an announcement on our canvas page.

To access:

<http://edison.instructure.com/courses/263249/groups>

3.3.1.1 Response Team,

Thank you for participation and feedback at yesterday's meeting. The minutes are attached. Let me know if you have any questions or comments.

There is an Academic Affairs Prioritization meeting scheduled next week during our usual meeting time. We may not be able to meet as a group, but I will keep you updated about any meetings scheduled with unit planners.

Any 3.3.1.1 response team members are welcome to join these meetings if available. If you are interested in joining in via telecom or conference call, please let me know ASAP.

Thanks again for all you do,

Eileen

*This message also appears as an announcement on our canvas page.

To access:

<http://edison.instructure.com/courses/263249/groups>

3.3.1.1 Response Team,

Thank you for participation and feedback at today's meeting. I know how busy everyone is at this time of the semester, so I truly thank you for volunteering your time and expertise. I have attached the minutes from the first two meetings. The minutes from the 1/26/2012 meeting include some action items regarding the review of unit plans. If you were unable to attend today's meeting, please review these minutes and let me know if you have any questions or comments.

I have also attached the Unit Plan Evaluation Spreadsheet guide that Kevin created. This matrix describes the features of the unit plan that the IRPE office is reviewing in terms of completion and efficacy.

Before next week's meeting (February 2, 12:15-1:00 p.m. S-250B), I will send a copy of the completed Unit Plan Evaluation Spreadsheet with some directions for how we will contact and offer support to the unit planners with unit plans in need of further development. During the meeting next week, I will ask Rona to provide an update regarding revisions to the Distance Ed. unit plans (see notes in minutes).

Thanks again for all you do,

Eileen

*This message also appears as an announcement on our canvas page.

To access:

<http://edison.instructure.com/courses/263249/groups>

Hi Wendie,

I reviewed the CE unit plans. It looks like you are on the right track and have made very good progress!

Some specific comments:

1. **Unit plan 1493**-This one looks pretty good. The spreadsheet of inquiries and meeting minutes are good documentation supporting the “actual results” and “use of results.”

2. **Unit plan 1494**-I see you uploaded related documents and an example of an improvement that was made based on student suggestions. Your “actual results” reports that over 70% of students rated their classes as “good or better.” Any documents you have to support this would enhance the plan. An example would be a spreadsheet with all student responses or a summary table. Another example would be a pdf (one running document) that contains a scan of all student evaluation responses.

3. **Unit plan 1495**-Under actual results you list the name of new externship sites. You may want to preface each with a statement such as, “The following externships sites were added in [month]...” Also, the narrative you have added under “use of results” sounds more like actual results. You may want to cut and paste those and add them to the “actual results” section above. In “use of results,” discuss how the addition of sites and the decreased wait time have improved services and/or what you will do in the future to continue to improve in this area. Finally, you have question marks where wait times should be entered. Do you have this data to include?

4. **Unit plan 1496**-Do you have a copy of a sign-in sheet or some other record to support the statement “20 people attended...”? If so, you will want to upload it as documentation.

5. **Unit plan 1497**-In the “actual results” section you have stated that 90% of the students in the CPR class believed they had developed better skills. Any documents you have to support this would enhance the plan (see examples in #2). Also, you mentioned that there are letters from students that have been attached, but they haven’t been uploaded yet.

As stated when we met, you will want to enter regular status going forward. You will also want to find ways to make assessment / documentation part of the CE culture. Spreadsheets of evaluation data, minutes of meetings where data was reviewed and used to inform improvements, attendance records, etc. should be compiled, reviewed and uploaded into the unit plans at regular intervals.

I hope these comments are helpful. If you are able to make any revisions/updates please do so as soon as possible. Kevin and I will be submitting the 3.3.1.1 response this week.

Thanks!

Eileen

K. Coughlin and C. Lozano (attendees)

Cynthia:

Thank you so much for your time today. During our meeting, we discussed the results from the Mid-year analyses of Writing Center student participant study. A comprehensive set of these results is available as an attachment to the 2011 2012 Unit Outcome 1419. The following summarizes our discussion:

1. We noted the positive and significant impact that center participation had on student grades in both ENC 1101 and ENC 1102
2. We also noted that, when considered as a group, Oral Comm. Center participants enjoyed a higher course success rate than the overall success rates in both ENC 1101 and ENC 1102
3. We discussed the number of students enrolled in ENC 1101 and ENC 1102 (for Fall 2011) and the number of these students served in the writing center
4. Because the number of times that a student came to the center was not correlated with grade improvement, the group concluded that pursuing assistance in the center was the primary factor associated with improved performance
5. Given these considerations, the group spent a sizeable portion of the meeting discussing methods through which more students could be served through the Writing Center; these methods included:
 - a. Increasing the center's capacity to meet student demand for services (additional instructional assistants)
 - b. Increasing the number of workshops offered per semester
 - c. Increasing the percentage of composition students that are served by the writing center; we agreed that an increase from 6.7% to 10% (from 315 to 467 students) was attainable.

I believe that item item 5 above will serve as the basis for a 2012-2013 unit plan. Please note that this e-mail will act as minutes of our discussion. If you have any corrections to the above summary, please reply to this e-mail via "reply-all"

Have a great day

Dr. Dennison,

As a follow-up to our meeting on Friday, the following unit plan objectives need to be updated with actual results and use of results as soon as possible. We are submitting a draft of the 3.3.1.1 response this week. I have included some notes regarding our discussion on each objective:

1502-Part of the final actual results talks about “room for instructional improvement...” (last sentence). You may want to use that as a basis for entering narrative into the “use of results” section.

1503-I just have some notes here about checking with Kathy Clark...regarding “Connect” goals.

1569-Check with Myra to see if any of the data has been scored, if there are any actual results or use of results. Otherwise describe specific times/dates that the scoring will be completed and how the results will be used.

1587-Kevin has just completed a study that included data from attendance in the Oral Communication Center. This may be used as part of the actual results for this objective.

1597-I provided you with the TLC data on faculty participation in Critical Thinking workshops. You should be able to compile some actual results here. Also, you may want to upload meeting minutes that show where faculty discussed critical thinking, share ideas, etc.

1614-There seems to be usable information in the status reports that can be summarized as actual results.

1616-There may be some PHI 2600 survey results here as reported in the status reports. You may need to contact Crystal Revak to gain access to the results.

I have notes about deleting or deferring the following objectives: 1570, 1580, 1615.

Thanks,
Eileen

Eileen DeLuca, Ph.D.

Dean

College and Career Readiness

(239) 985-3498

ecdeluca@edison.edu

GEB 1011 Study Data Analysis Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2012, 1:30-2:15 p.m.

In attendance: Kevin Coughlin, Doug Nay, Eileen DeLuca

1. Kevin reviewed the fall 2010 and fall 2011 results and summaries for the GEB 1011 exam which is a course level assessment of overall AS Business Administration program goals.
2. In general, students scored poorly on items related to the “comparative and absolute advantage.”
3. In general, students scored well on items related to “styles of leadership” objective.
3. On the items related to the “economic advantage” objective, student scores were consistently high.
4. The scores for students across all campuses in Edison Online sections are higher than the face-to-face courses.
5. On the average, the scores for students across all outcomes in Collier are lower than all other campuses.
6. Dr. Nay and Dean Coughlin discussed the possible reasons for the lower scores on the Collier Campus and the higher scores in Edison Online.
7. One of the possible reasons the group came up with for the difference was the possible difference in the test administration.
8. Another possible reason discussed was the different staffing patterns on campuses (e.g. full-time to adjunct ratios).
9. Dean Coughlin and Dr. Nay discussed how the results of the studies could be used to inform a 2012-2013 unit plan to augment the full-time faculty pattern on Collier Campus.
10. Dean Coughlin and Dr. Nay reviewed the item discrimination results. Dean Coughlin explained which items seemed to be the most reliable. They talked about possible revisions to exam items to provide an appropriate amount of items for measuring each objective. Dean Coughlin suggested the test should have less items related to “styles of leadership” and more items related to “comparative and absolute advantage.”
11. Dean Coughlin and Dr. Nay talked about the advantages and disadvantages of using true/false items as a measure of the achievement of an objective.
12. Dean Coughlin and Dr. Nay compared the fall 2011 results to the stated goal of 50% of students would score a 70% or better on the exam. They noted that students had not currently achieved that goal.

13. Dean Coughlin and Dr. Nay discussed further studies that could be conducted that could inform instruction and test revision. With a revised exam, the IRPE office could not compare overall mean performance, but they would be able analyze results to see if performance on the exam affected the differences in performance among campuses.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

Professor Holland:

Thank you for the time that you spent with me today. Because we discussed a variety of topics and suggested numerous changes to your 2011 2012 unit plans, I wanted to provide you with a summary of my understanding of our discussion. Specifically, I wanted to outline the manner in which you will be condensing your ten unit plans into three plans.

Conceptually, your ten outcomes appear to fall into three general categories:

1. Optimum Learning Environment Associated with the Achievement of Learning Outcomes
2. Graduation Rate, Graduate Performance, and Graduate Satisfaction
3. Faculty Development

All of your current unit plans are based on 14 assessment measures and their associated goals. The following outline summarizes the manner in which your three resulting outcomes will incorporate these measures and address NLNAC Standards:

1. 1445: Optimum Learning Environment Associated with the Achievement of Learning Outcomes (Combining Unit Outcomes 1446, 1447, 1456, 1449, and 1473)
 - a. NCLEX Predictor Exam (results by campus and Student Learning Outcome)
 - b. SIR II Items 24 and 26 (results by campus)
 - c. NUR 2941L Rubric (results by campus)
 - d. NUR 2941L Success rates (by campus)
 - e. NUR 2260L Success rates (by campus)
 - f. NUR 1023L Check list (results by campus)
 - g. NUR 1023L Success rates (by campus)
 - h. NUR 1062L Check list (results by campus)
 - i. NUR 1062L Success rates (by campus)
 - j. Associated NLNAC Standards
 - i. 6.1
 - ii. 6.5
 - iii. 6.5.3
2. 1448: Graduation Rates, Graduate Performance, and Graduate Satisfaction (Combining Unit Outcomes 1446, 1450, and 1392)
 - a. NCLEX First Time Pass Rate (results by campus)
 - b. Eight Semester graduation rate (results by campus)
 - c. Graduate Satisfaction Survey (results by campus)
 - d. NUR 2941L Preceptorship 4 Point rubric (related to 1 c above)
 - e. Employer Survey
 - f. Placement rates
 - g. Associated NLNAC Standards
 - i. 6.1
 - ii. 6.5.1
 - iii. 6.5.4
3. 1393: Faculty Development (Combined with Unit Outcome 1394)
 - a. Faculty FQF
 - b. Faculty turn-over rate
 - c. SIR II Results (results by campus)

- d. Clinical Associate Evaluations (results by campus)
- e. Orientation Survey Results
- f. Associated NLNAC Standards
 - i. 2.1
 - ii. 2.4
 - iii. 2.7
 - iv. 2.9

Based on our discussion, I understand that you will:

1. Rebuild outcomes 1445, 1448, and 1393 with the assessment measures outlined above
2. Develop goals based on the assessment measures retained in the three remaining outcomes (you will be incorporating goals from the current set of unit outcomes)
3. Report mid-year actual results for the assessment measures
4. Apply these results to the development of 2012-2013 Unit outcomes

I believe that we estimated the completion time to be Wednesday, February 29th.

Again, thank you for your time!

Professor Walters and Westfield (attendees):

Thank you so much for your time today. During our meeting, we discussed the results from the Mid-year analyses of Oral Comm. Center student participant study. A comprehensive set of these results is available as an attachment to the 2011 2012 Unit Outcome 1587. The following summarizes our discussion:

1. We noted the positive and significant impact that center participation had on student grades in both SPC 1017 and SPC 2023
2. We also noted that, when considered as a group, Oral Comm. Center participants enjoyed a higher course success rate than the overall success rates in both SPC 1017 and SPC 2023
3. The group was especially interested in the significant difference in mean speech grades
4. Because the number of times that a student came to the center was not correlated with grade improvement, the group concluded that pursuing assistance in the center was the primary factor associated with improved performance
5. Given these considerations, the group spent a sizeable portion of the meeting discussing methods through which more students could be served through the Oral Comm. Center; these methods included:
 - a. Continuing focus on internal marketing (expressed through a percentage increase in the number of Facebook fans)
 - b. Increasing the staffing capacity to serve more students at more times (perhaps reclassification of one instructional assistant to a full-time position); we will track increases in the number of student participants from term to term to measure the impact of this effort (goal would include increasing the number of participants by 10%)
 - c. Identify an Oral Comm. Center lead faculty member for each campus to promote the Center's utility and advocate for its use

I believe that item 5 above will serve as the basis for a 2012-2013 unit plan. Please note that this e-mail will act as minutes of our discussion. If you have any corrections to the above summary, please reply to this e-mail via "reply-all"

Have a great day

Planning Online Feedback >> Planning Unit: BAS - Public Safety Administration - 201238 / Objective Professor Worch:

I am writing in reference to your 2011-2012 unit outcome 1464. In this outcome, you include the following assessment methods:

1. Results of Oral Defense Review Board Assessments
2. Baseline data regarding oral defense review board inter-rater correlations
3. Capstone project rubric
4. Percentage of all core courses that are supported with master syllabi (with assessable assignments)

Based on these measures, I was expecting your documentation to include:

1. Results of Oral Defense Review Board Assessments (in either raw form or as aggregated results)
2. Analyses of assessments listed above that highlight inter-rater correlations
3. Capstone project rubric (and any student achievement results based on rubric)
4. Inventory of courses with an indication of their master syllabi status

These documents do not appear to be uploaded to your plan. I believe that the Gen Ed Rubrics were uploaded in error, and I removed them. Would you please update your documentation.

Thank you for your help.

Billee,

Thanks for making the updates. Below are some comments on each objective.

Objective 1434: You have access to some mid-year results that you will want to report:

1. You have attached a memorandum that includes the results of a fall 2011 student satisfaction survey. One of your goals is...*By the end of the 2011-2012 academic year, 80% of student responses will indicate satisfaction with all dimensions of records and registration services.* Under “actual results,” you should give a brief overview of any survey items related to records and registration, and describe how close or far the responses came towards achievement of the stated goal. Also, describe whether satisfaction has increased or decreased from the previous semesters. Under “use of results,” explain how you shared this data with staff (e.g. Did you review the data at a staff meeting? What conclusions did you come to? What specific plans do you have for improving services based on the survey response?) If you have meeting minutes where this was discussed, upload them. If you haven’t had a meeting to review these surveys with staff, you will want to schedule one as soon as possible.

2. Another goal reads...*By the end of the 2011-2012 academic year, zero course substitutions will be in violation of college procedures.* I believe that the group that you co-chair, the 3.5.3 Response team, created documents that show how the number of inappropriate course substitutions has decreased from the period of January-June to the period of July-December. You may want to link these reports to this objective. You will want to summarize the findings under “actual results,” share the results with staff, and describe how you will use the results. As above, any discussion with staff at a meeting should be listed and follow-up meeting minutes should be included as a link.

Objective 1299: You state, *Transcript evaluation remains a manual process; however, with the addition of another transcript evaluator we have increased efficiency and reduced the processing time.* If you have any data to support that statement, you may want to include it in the summary and/or upload a table, chart, etc.

Objective 1435: In “use of results,” you state that...*Online registrations increased 79.6%. This data will be used to enhance student communications to improve online usage by 82%.* You may want to be more specific here about how the data is used to “enhance student communications.” That is, did something happen that led to the increase in online registrations? You have a great deal of documentation and status reports that suggest that there were communication efforts. You may want to make the connection between the communication efforts (cause) leading to the results; rather than the other way around. Are you going to continue or improve these communication efforts?

In general, you will want to make review of data and follow-up documentation part of the culture of the registration staff. As the new planning cycle begins, you will want to think about what new goals you want to set based on the achievement of this year’s goals.

I hope this helps!

3.3.1.1. Response Team:

There is an Academic Affairs Prioritization meeting during our regularly scheduled meeting time this Thursday, so we will not be meeting as a group. Some updates:

1. Marty has reconvened the experienced faculty scoring teams who will score Gen. Ed. assessments artifacts from this past summer and fall. She will provide leadership for the two scoring session on Feb. 22 from 3:00-6:00 and 6:00-8:00.

2. Kevin and I are continuing to meet with unit planners in need of support:

- Bill Shuluk (Learning Resources), 4:00-4:30, Thursday, February 16, H-205
- Nursing Faculty, 9:00-9:30, Friday, AA-167
- Rodney Dennison (Humanities plans), 10:00-10:30, Friday, H-205

Team members are welcome to join in any of the meetings. If you are interested in joining in via telecom or conference call, please let me know ASAP.

3. To provide further clarification to the spreadsheet provided by Edison Online, Ivon Lopez is going through each column, summing the total number of courses online and dividing by the number of required courses to show the percentage of courses in each program that may be completed online. I hope to send you an updated spreadsheet by Friday.

After the meetings with the unit planners on Friday, Kevin and I will begin drafting the 3.3.1.1 response. We will send out a rough draft to the team for review and feedback.

Thanks again for your participation!

3.3.1.1 Response Team,

Thank you for participation and feedback at today's meeting. I know how busy everyone is at this time of the semester, so I truly thank you for volunteering your time and expertise. I have attached the minutes from the first two meetings. The minutes from the 1/26/2012 meeting include some action items regarding the review of unit plans. If you were unable to attend today's meeting, please review these minutes and let me know if you have any questions or comments.

I have also attached the Unit Plan Evaluation Spreadsheet guide that Kevin created. This matrix describes the features of the unit plan that the IRPE office is reviewing in terms of completion and efficacy.

Before next week's meeting (February 2, 12:15-1:00 p.m. S-250B), I will send a copy of the completed Unit Plan Evaluation Spreadsheet with some directions for how we will contact and offer support to the unit planners with unit plans in need of further development. During the meeting next week, I will ask Rona to provide an update regarding revisions to the Distance Ed. unit plans (see notes in minutes).

Thanks again for all you do,

Eileen

Thanks again for all you do,

Eileen

*This message also appears as an announcement on our canvas page.

To access:

<http://edison.instructure.com/courses/263249/groups>

3.3.1.1. Response Team,

I wanted to provide you an update on progress:

1. Marty and the scoring team have two meetings on Feb. 22 from 3:00-6:00 and 6:00-8:00 to score the Gen. Ed. assignments.

2. Kevin and I met on Friday with unit planners in need of support:

- Nursing Faculty, 9:00-9:30, Friday, AA-167
- Rodney Dennison (Humanities plans), 10:00-10:30, Friday, H-205

*Bill Shuluk (Learning Resources) is rescheduling for this coming week

3. As a follow-up to the nursing meeting, Kevin developed program unit outcomes for the BSN program. He was able to glean status reports, actual results, and use of results from their accreditation documents. He sent the unit plans to the unit owners with request for documentation.

4. Last week and over the weekend, Kevin completed several studies related to the General Education Unit Plans and plans in other programs. He and Marty will meet later this week to review a study of student achievement as related to academic success center attendance. He has sent analyses and summaries to the respective unit planners and has begun scheduling follow-up meetings to review the results.

5. This weekend, I contacted several of the unit planners that had been contacted previously or that we had met with, to remind them to update plans. There has been some progress.

6. The Continuing Education unit planners made progress with incomplete plans and asked me to review them. I sent them feedback this weekend with suggestions to enhance the plans.

7. Based on the spreadsheet and program plan sheets provided by Mary Myers and her team, Ivon Lopez created a spreadsheet that shows the percentage of credits in a program that may be completed online. The spreadsheet suggests that the following programs have substantial (50% or more) of course offerings available online:

1. Associates in Arts Degree-100%
2. Nursing BSN-92% of upper division credits
3. Public Safety Administration-85% of upper division credits
4. Supervision and Management-100% of upper division credits
5. Accounting Technology-81% of AS credits
6. Business Administration-81% of AS credits
7. Criminal Justice Technology-100% of AS credits

Kevin and I reviewed the unit plans in these areas to determine if goals had been set regarding comparing online to face-to-face courses in terms of achievement of student learning outcomes, retention, and student satisfaction. We contacted the unit planners to make suggestions of how

to modify existing plans to focus on these measures. Going forward, these programs in addition to Edison Online will need to include objectives related to comparability in each unit planning cycle.

8. After the meetings with the unit planners on Friday, Kevin and I began an outline of the 3.3.1.1 response (see attached document). The outline gives an overview of the areas that will be covered in the narrative response. We hope to make headway on this on Monday. Please review the outline as compared to the SACS COC recommendations for 3.3.1.1 and let us know if you think we are headed in the right direction. We will send out a draft of the narrative as soon as possible.

Please note that Kevin has done so much work as related to the 3.3.1.1 response that it is impossible to summarize it here. Judging from his email correspondence, he hasn't slept all weekend.

Thanks again for your participation!