

Planning Objective Report

Objective Report:

Objective ID: 1587

Objective Title: Expanded Services for Students enrolled in Speech Courses

Unit Manager: Dennison, Rodney

Planning Unit: 162102 - AA - Humanities, Communication and Social Science

Obj. Status:

Obj. Purpose: Student Learning Outcome

Unit Purpose:

2009-2009

Objective Description:

Once the effort to expand the hours of the Oral Communication Center (OCC) has been implemented, faculty will successfully incorporate the lab services into their course designs, and this will have a direct and positive impact on student capacity to achieve Speech Learning Outcomes. Overall, the expanded hours will allow the department to serve the increasing demand for our services by students on the Lee Campus, and provide additional assistance to support future assessment initiatives.

Institutional Goals

A. Assess and refine current Academic Support Services

Objective Types

No Objective Types to Display

Planning Priorities

No Planning Priorities to Display

Tasks

Due Date	Status	Priority	Task
10/15/2011	In Progress	High	Completion of paperwork to change the job status of the OCC instructional assistant from part-time to full-time by October 15, 2011
11/15/2011	In Progress	High	Interview candidates for the position and hire full time OCC instructional assistant by November 15, 2012
12/31/2011	In Progress	High	Implement a reliable and valid assessment plan to evaluate the quality and value of the academic support received by students by December 31, 2011.

Assessment Measures

Date	Assessment Measure
10/20/2011	SIR II Results (Interaction and organizational planning items)
10/20/2011	OCC Lab Student Survey Results
10/20/2011	Approved and implemented plan for assessing academic support by the OCC center on the Lee Campus
10/20/2012	Approval to upgrade the job status of the OCC instructional assistant from part-time to full-time by October 15, 2011

Intended Results

Date	Intended Results
10/20/2011	To establish and implement a plan for assessing academic support by the OCC by the start of Spring Semester 2012.
10/20/2011	To establish a baseline of assessment results for the OCC by the end of Spring 2012
10/20/2011	To increase the number students receiving instructional assistance in the OCC by 10% by the end of the Spring 2012 Semester

Status Reports

Report Date	Status Report
2/20/2012	The oral communication center coordinator collected participation records for 86 students who visited the center during the Fall 2011 semester. These data records for each visit that a student made to the center. The data records included length and purpose of visit. All of these students were matched with Fall 2011 grades for SPC 1017 or SPC 2023.

Actual Results

Date	Actual Results
02/20/2012	<p>Mid-year results Oral Communication Center (OCC) and SPC 1017 Grades Part 1 (See uploaded SAS output)</p> <p>Frequency distribution for all students SPC 1017 (n = 1161) grades indicates that 85.79% of students completed the course successfully</p> <p>Mean SPC 1017 grade for all participants was 2.97 (with a standard deviation of 1.317)</p> <p>Frequency distribution for the OCC participant grades in SPC 1017 (n = 63) indicates that 95.24% of participants completed the course successfully</p> <p>Mean SPC 1017 grade for OCC participants was 3.508 (with a standard deviation of 0.98)</p>
02/20/2012	<p>Mid-year results Oral Communication Center (OCC) and SPC 1017 Grades Part 2 (See uploaded SAS output)</p> <p>No significant correlation exists between the number of times that a student visited OCC and his or her grade in SPC 1017</p> <p>An ANOVA was conducted to test for significant differences between the mean grade value for center participants (n = 63) and students who did not use the OCC (n = 1098).</p> <p>The results of this analysis indicate that students who participated in the OCC earned (on average) significantly better grades in SPC 1017 than those who do not (f = 11.07; df = 1160; pr > f 0.0009)</p> <p>NOTE: Cell sizes are so different as to preclude the reliability of ANOVA results</p>
02/20/2012	<p>Mid-year results Oral Communication Center (OCC) and SPC 2023 Grades Part 1 (See uploaded SAS output)</p> <p>Frequency distribution for all students SPC 2023 (n = 188) grades indicates that 75.53% of students completed the course successfully</p> <p>Mean SPC 2023 grade for all participants was 2.64 (with a standard deviation of 1.597)</p> <p>Frequency distribution for the OCC participant grades in SPC 2023 (n = 23) indicates that 95.65% of participants completed the course successfully</p> <p>Mean SPC 2023 grade for OCC participants was 3.609 (with a standard deviation of 0.89)</p>
02/20/2012	<p>Mid-year results Oral Communication Center (OCC) and SPC 2023 Grades Part 2 (See uploaded SAS output)</p> <p>No significant correlation exists between the number of times that a student visited OCC and his or her grade in SPC 2023</p> <p>An ANOVA was conducted to test for significant differences between the mean grade value for center participants (n = 23) and students who did not use the OCC (n = 165). The results of this analysis indicate that students who participated in the OCC earned (on average) significantly better grades in SPC 2023 than those who do not (f = 9.92; df = 187; pr > f 0.0019)</p>

Use of Results

Date	Use of Results
03/02/2012	On February 28, Dr. DeLuca reviewed the Academic Success Center Data Analysis (provided by the IRPE) with the Academic Success Staff (see attached meeting minutes). The group discussed inferences to be made from data as well as future studies that could be run to provide additional insight into the connection between use of the Writing Center and Oral Communication Center and success in related courses (ENC 1101, 1102, SPC 1017, 2023). These results will also be shared with the faculty liaison for the center.
03/02/2012	<p>K. Coughlin, M. Walters, and K. Westfield (attendees):</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
03/02/2012	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Gap Analysis

SWOT

Units Impacted

No Units Impacted data

Associated Standards

Associated Outcomes

Documents

File Name	File Size	Date Modified
Minutes Speech Faculty and IA 03022012.pdf	148.134 KB	3/2/2012
Minutes_FYE_Academic_Success_Staff_Meeting_022812.pdf	349.751 KB	3/2/2012
SPC 1017 2023 sTUDY sas Output 02192012.docx	16.245 KB	2/20/2012

SPC 1017 Grade distributions and grade value means-All Observations 17
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The FREQ Procedure

SHRTCKG_GRDE_CODE_FINAL

SHRTCKG_ GRDE_CODE_ FINAL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
ff				
A	546	47.03	546	47.03
B	343	29.54	889	76.57
C	107	9.22	996	85.79
D	25	2.15	1021	87.94
F	61	5.25	1082	93.20
W	79	6.80	1161	100.00

SPC 1017 Grade distributions and grade value means-All Observations 18
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The MEANS Procedure

Analysis Variable : GRADE_NUMER GRADE_NUMER

N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
ff				
1161	2.9732989	1.3170540	0	4.0000000
ff				

SPC 1017 Grade distributions, grade value means, and correlation--Support Center Participants Onl 19
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The FREQ Procedure

SHRTCKG_GRDE_CODE_FINAL

SHRTCKG_ GRDE_CODE_ FINAL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
ff				
A	43	68.25	43	68.25
B	15	23.81	58	92.06
C	2	3.17	60	95.24
F	1	1.59	61	96.83
W	2	3.17	63	100.00

SPC 1017 Grade distributions, grade value means, and correlation--Support Center Participants Onl 20
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The MEANS Procedure

Analysis Variable : GRADE_NUMER GRADE_NUMER

N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
ff				
63	3.5079365	0.9482244	0	4.0000000
ff				

SPC 1017 Grade distributions, grade value means, and correlation--Support Center Participants Onl 21
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The CORR Procedure

2 Variables: Center_visits GRADE_NUMER

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Label
Center_visits	63	1.88889	1.28403	119.00000	1.00000	8.00000	Center_visits
GRADE_NUMER	63	3.50794	0.94822	221.00000	0	4.00000	GRADE_NUMER

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 63
 Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	Center_ visits	GRADE_ NUMER
Center_visits	1.00000	0.08684
Center_visits		0.4986
GRADE_NUMER	0.08684	1.00000
GRADE_NUMER		0.4986

SPC 1017 ANOVA Center Participation(IV) Grade Value(DV) 22
 14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Center_part	2	No Yes

Number of Observations Read 1161
 Number of Observations Used 1161

SPC 1017 ANOVA Center Participation(IV) Grade Value(DV) 23
 14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: GRADE_NUMER GRADE_NUMER

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	1	19.040988	19.040988	11.07	0.0009
Error	1159	1993.131278	1.719699		
Corrected Total	1160	2012.172265			

R-Square Coeff Var Root MSE GRADE_NUMER Mean
 0.009463 44.10498 1.311373 2.973299

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
--------	----	-----------	-------------	---------	--------

Center_part	1	19.04098764	19.04098764	11.07	0.0009
Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Center_part	1	19.04098764	19.04098764	11.07	0.0009

SPC 1017 ANOVA Center Participation(IV) Grade Value(DV)

24

14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for GRADE_NUMER

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	1159
Error Mean Square	1.719699
Critical Value of Studentized Range	2.77471
Minimum Significant Difference	0.3333
Harmonic Mean of Cell Sizes	119.1628

NOTE: Cell sizes are not equal.

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	Center_part
A	3.5079	63	Yes
B	2.9426	1098	No

SPC 2023 Grade distributions and grade value means-All Observations

25

14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The FREQ Procedure

SHRTCKG_GRDE_CODE_FINAL

SHRTCKG_ GRDE_CODE_ FINAL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
AA				
A	81	43.09	81	43.09
B	51	27.13	132	70.21
C	10	5.32	142	75.53
D	1	0.53	143	76.06
F	19	10.11	162	86.17
W	26	13.83	188	100.00

SPC 2023 Grade distributions and grade value means-All Observations

26

14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The MEANS Procedure

Analysis Variable : GRADE_NUMER GRADE_NUMER

N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
188	2.6489362	1.5968381	0	4.0000000

SPC 2023 Grade distributions, grade value means, and correlation--Support Center Participants Onl 27
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The FREQ Procedure

SHRTCKG_GRDE_CODE_FINAL

SHRTCKG_ GRDE_CODE_ FINAL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
A	17	73.91	17	73.91
B	5	21.74	22	95.65
W	1	4.35	23	100.00

SPC 2023 Grade distributions, grade value means, and correlation--Support Center Participants Onl 28
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The MEANS Procedure

Analysis Variable : GRADE_NUMER GRADE_NUMER

N	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
23	3.6086957	0.8913284	0	4.0000000

SPC 2023 Grade distributions, grade value means, and correlation--Support Center Participants Onl 29
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The CORR Procedure

2 Variables: Center_visits GRADE_NUMER

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Label
Center_visits	23	3.17391	2.82283	73.00000	1.00000	13.00000	Center_visits
GRADE_NUMER	23	3.60870	0.89133	83.00000	0	4.00000	GRADE_NUMER

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 23
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	Center_ visits	GRADE_ NUMER
Center_visits	1.00000	0.26313
Center_visits		0.2251
GRADE_NUMER	0.26313	1.00000
GRADE_NUMER	0.2251	

SPC 2023 ANOVA Center Participation(IV) Grade Value(DV) 30
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The GLM Procedure

Class Level Information

Class	Levels	Values
Center_part	2	No Yes

Number of Observations Read	188
Number of Observations Used	188

SPC 2023 ANOVA Center Participation(IV) Grade Value(DV) 31
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The GLM Procedure

Dependent Variable: GRADE_NUMER GRADE_NUMER

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Model	1	24.1394052	24.1394052	9.92	0.0019
Error	186	452.6903821	2.4338193		
Corrected Total	187	476.8297872			

R-Square	Coeff Var	Root MSE	GRADE_NUMER Mean
0.050625	58.89422	1.560070	2.648936

Source	DF	Type I SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Center_part	1	24.13940515	24.13940515	9.92	0.0019

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean Square	F Value	Pr > F
Center_part	1	24.13940515	24.13940515	9.92	0.0019

SPC 2023 ANOVA Center Participation(IV) Grade Value(DV) 32
14:37 Sunday, February 19, 2012

The GLM Procedure

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) Test for GRADE_NUMER

NOTE: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than REGWQ.

Alpha	0.05
Error Degrees of Freedom	186
Error Mean Square	2.433819
Critical Value of Studentized Range	2.78996
Minimum Significant Difference	0.685
Harmonic Mean of Cell Sizes	40.37234

NOTE: Cell sizes are not equal.

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Tukey Grouping	Mean	N	Center_part
A	3.6087	23	Yes
B	2.5152	165	No

Minutes

FYE/Academic Success Meeting

Building Q

February 28, 2012, 9:00-10:30 am.

Eileen DeLuca	<i>Present</i>	Helen Algernon	<i>Present</i>
Amanda Romero	<i>Present</i>	David Downing	<i>Absent</i>
Joseph Kaye	<i>Present</i>	Jane Stavelly	<i>Present</i>
Mireille Lauture	<i>Present</i>	Anna Cool	<i>Present</i>
Whitney Rhyne	<i>Present</i>		

1. Dr. DeLuca explained the unit planning process and reviewed unit plans related to academic success: Objective 1557, *Academic Success staff will develop workshops, College-wide, that have measurable learning outcomes and student satisfaction measures.* 1314, *Once the FYE department is operational, we will provide students with an array of student support services. These services will enhance the institution's capacity to achieve the goals associated with the Quality Enhancement Plan.*
2. Dr. DeLuca reviewed Academic Success workshop data as related to unit plan objective 1557. The overall results of workshop evaluations have been positive as measured on a Likert Scale. The group talked about the success of the workshops. Dr. DeLuca discussed how workshops should have at least one stated learning outcome going forward. The directors are working on creating a workshop database. The group discussed the shortcomings of the current workshop evaluation form. Dr. DeLuca shared a suggested template for a new workshop evaluation form that was developed by Monica Moore. She asked staff to consider the new form and what they would change to make it work for Academic Success workshops.
3. The group discussed the FYE-focused workshops and extracurricular events as related to unit objective 1314. Dr. DeLuca asked if workshop evaluations are being used. She asked Whitney to take the lead on getting extracurricular event feedback from the SLS 1515 students. Whitney will create a survey document to be used at the end of the term and share with the group for feedback.
4. The group reviewed Academic Success Center data as related to unit plans 1419 and 1587. The data show that students who participated in the Writing Center and Oral Communication Centers did significantly better in related courses (ENC, SPC) than students who didn't. The group discussed the positive trend as well as the limitations of the inferences that could be made from data. The group discussed other ways to attempt to measure the positive effects of participation in the centers.
4. The group reviewed a spreadsheet of the ideas that the FYE/Academic Success staff submitted for the Mission and Goals of the FYE/Academic Success Department. Some trends that emerged:

- Supporting retention, persistence, and success
- Providing support and answers
- Providing the tools and skills for success

Some issues discussed:

- Do FYE and Academic Success need separate mission and goal statements?
- Which services overlap? Which must remain separate?
- What should the reporting structure look like to ensure students are getting appropriate support?

Dr. DeLuca will take the suggestions to begin crafting the mission statement and goals. She will share with the staff for additional input.

5. Dr. DeLuca advised the staff that further restructuring may occur as decided by the cabinet. She will keep staff informed.

6. Strained communication between program specialist and other staff in the department was discussed. For the best interest of the department and the services offered to our students, an improved effort in communication of projects, ideas, and workshops being offered is necessary. Whitney will include Jane Stavelly, Helen Algernon, and Dr. Lauture in her “weekly wrap up” emails to SLS students. Program specialists are to communicate projects they are developing or improving to one another.

5. Student Assistants were discussed. The staff noted that there is still ambiguity about reporting structure. Dr. DeLuca reiterated the process of restructuring. She repeated that in the transition period all student assistant hires must ultimately be approved by Dr. DeLuca. Whitney was concerned about the day-to-day reporting structure. Dr. DeLuca said that she would work with Joseph Kaye to come up with a stated policy. Whitney agreed to share the student assistant schedule with all the staff to increase communication and to avoid misunderstandings.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca and Amanda Romero

Kevin Coughlin

From: Kevin Coughlin
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2012 3:41 PM
To: Myra Hale Walters; 'kdumitrescu@edison.edu'
Cc: Eileen DeLuca; Rodney Dennison
Subject: Mid Year Results Meeting RE 2011 2012 Outcome 1587

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

Kevin B. Coughlin
Dean of Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness
8099 College Parkway
Fort Myers, FL 33919
(239) 489-9027