Report

to the

QEP Advisory Council

January 14, 2013

Compiled by: Kaye Betz, QEP Director

Table of Contents

QEP Tracking Table - Implementation Activities and Timeline 2011-2014

Description		AY 2010/11			AY 2011/12			AY 2012/13			AY 2013/14		
Complete; In Progress; Partially Complete; Incomplete **A**=As Needed; **C**=Create; **R**=Review; **U**=Update; **X**=Execute		Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer
Instruction	Number of Sections (Estimated)	(2) 2	(12) 22	(5) 7	(22) 32	(25) 34	(10) 12	(37) 41	(31)	(12)	(37)	(31)	(12)
	Number of Students (Estimated)	(40) 39	(264) 474	(110) 123	(484) 645	(550) 724	(220) 230	(814) 833	(682)	(264)	(814)	(682)	(264)
	Full-Time Faculty Involved (Estimated)	(2) 2	(8) 9	(TBD) 4	(10) 12	(10) 12	(TBD) 6	(12) 15	(12)	(TBD)	(14)	(14)	(TBD)
	Part-Time Faculty Involved (Estimated)	(0) 0	(0) 0	TBD 0	(2) 2	(2) 3	TBD 2	(4) 2	(4)	TBD	(6)	(6)	TBD
Align Final Exam to Course Objectives		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R	-	-
Prepare for Fall Convocation on QEP		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Focus Fall Convocation on QEP		X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
Faculty/Program Director Workshop		X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Resources	Acquire QEP-relevant resources	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
	TLCC Math Tutor Training	R	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
	QEP-focused Displays	C	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Professional Development	The Teaching Professor Conference	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X
	Rubric Discussion Videoconference	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Learner-centered Rubric Workshop	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X
	AMATYC Conference	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-
	FTYCMA Conference	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-
	Learner-centered Syllabi Development	X	-	R	-	-	R	-	-	R	-	-	R
	College-wide Lunch and Learn Series	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
	Instructional technology workshops	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	Bridge-Building Sessions	-	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
	Learner-centered Pedagogy Workshop	-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	MAA/FTYCMA joint meeting	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-

	College-wide QEP Topics Workshop	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-
	Other Learner-Centered Conferences	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Review and Apply Prior Term's Assessments		-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Toolboxes	First day strategies	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
	Clicker questions	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
	Learner-centered math activities	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Faculty	Submit *Doc. to Support the Sel. Status* forms to QEP Director	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X
	Submit Syllabus for MAT 1033 course to QEP Director	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Submit *Planning for Transformation* exercise to QEP Director	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X
College-wide Activities	QEP Materials Disseminated at New Student Orientation*	-	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	QEP Materials Disseminated at Student Information Tables*	-	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	QEP Materials Disseminated at Welcome Back Week*	X	X	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Electronic QEP Newsletter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Poetry Contest	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Performance of the Play *Proof*	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4-1-1 Reading Program (Math Book)	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-
Joint Student Services/math faculty meeting		X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
Joint TLCC tutors/math faculty meeting		X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
Professional Development Committee		C	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
QEP Advisory Council		C	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
Apply Early Warning System for MAT 1033		R	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Publish Annual QEP Summary Report		-	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-
Com. Coll. Survey of Student Engagement		R	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	R	-	-
MAT 1033 Report as part of 5-year Review		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-

*Discontinued Summer 2012 due to focus of QEP shifting from awareness to professional development.

Note: The number of part-time faculty in Fall 2012 was not as high as projected because some of our adjuncts are now being hired as full-time faculty. For Fall, two part-time faculty participated rather than four. In Spring 2013 three part-time faculty will participate rather than four as projected.

Current Status of the QEP

Implementation Team

The Implementation Team met once during 20131.

Joint Meetings:

Joint meetings between the mathematics faculty and advisors and between mathematics faculty and tutors are held each term on each campus.

Term	Campus	Joint Between	And	Meeting Date
20131	Winter Haven/JDA	Mathematics Faculty	Advisors	09/07/12
20131	Winter Haven/JDA	Mathematics Faculty	Tutors	09/07/12
20131	Lakeland	Mathematics Faculty	Advisors	09/14/12
20131	Lakeland	Mathematics Faculty	Tutors	09/14/12

Conferences:

Mathematics faculty attend various conferences throughout the year and then report back to other mathematics faculty upon their return.

Term	Conference	Participants
20131	FTYCMA Fall Retreat	David Rose, Steve Frye, Joy D'Andrea (presenter), Jim Rhodes, Penny Morris
20131	AMATYC Conference	Penny Morris (presenter), Mostafa Zamani, Jim Rhodes (presenter), Richard Leedy, Richard Decker, Kaye Betz, David Rose, Megan Cavanah, Carolyn Horseman (presenter), and Mike Malone

Classroom Enhancement Grant:

The Classroom Enhancement Grant is sponsored by The Polk State College Foundation and administered by the QEP Implementation Team. For the academic year 2012-2013, Paul Carbonell and Cherry Olds were the recipients.

Paul Carbonell has been implementing learner-centered strategies into his theater and communication classes for several years. Paul uses strategies such as deep-breathing, mirroring activities, theater games, and students' imaginations to engage students and focus on learning. Paul plans to use the Classroom Enhancement Grant to purchase an iPad to streamline technology demonstrations as well as purchase theater props and award-winning plays to bring the world of theater alive to students.

Cherry Olds employs many learner-centered strategies in her programming and technology classes both with the College and the Collegiate High School. Cherry is able to extensively use learner-centered practice with a Collegiate High School class that meets for two semesters. The students use robots, service learning, and projects as active learning strategies to engage and excite students. Cherry plans to use her award for the purchase of more computer and robot supplies for her students.

Adjunct Professional Development and Adjunct Mentoring:

Adjunct instructors for courses MAT 0018 and MAT 0028 were invited to attend a presentation entitled *Developing Responsible Learners.* The aim of the session was to educate and help the adjunct instructors incorporate learner-centered teaching practices into their developmental math courses. The presentation was offered once on the Winter Haven campus and twice on the Lakeland campus to reach as many instructors as possible. Kaye Betz facilitated each session with the help of Paul Pletcher for the Winter Haven session, Jim Rhodes and Penny Morris for one Lakeland session, and Anna Butler for the final Lakeland session.

New Faculty Professional Development:

At the New Faculty Experience in August, four mathematics faculty designed and presented learning centers to demonstrate active learning strategies that can be used in the classroom. A panel discussion followed the learning centers. Presenters were Kaye Betz, Anna Butler, Penny Morris, and Jim Rhodes.

At the New Faculty Experience in November, Kaye Betz explained the learner-centered rubrics to the new faculty. Lorne Fairbairn and Nerissa Felder shared their use of the rubric along with several learner-centered strategies they had used in their classes.

Marketing:

Originally, awareness was the main focus of the QEP. The focus now is on professional development.

The QEP logo has been changed to reflect the new Polk State College colors. Additionally this term, new graph paper notebooks were ordered to reflect the updated QEP logo.

QEP Web Page:

The web page is being kept current.

Electronic QEP Newsletter:

Newsletters were published in October 2012 and December 2012.

http://www.polk.edu/currentstudents/academics/qep/Pages/QEPNewsletter.aspx

QEP Mugs:

Faculty were asked to send a paragraph about how they had incorporated active learning or learner-centered teaching strategies into their class activities. Their comments were written in the October 2012 QEP newsletter. Pal Good and Neal Steiger each received a QEP coffee mug for sharing their active learning strategies.

Mathematics Teaching Team

August 2012:

The chart below identifies the professors on each campus and the number of classes each professor taught.

Intermediate Algebra Classes -– 2013-1			
Lakeland/Airside – 22 QEP (16 non-QEP)		Winter Haven/JDA – 19 QEP (8 non-QEP)	
Professor	Number of QEP classes	Professor	Number of QEP classes
Richard Decker	2	Roger Aleman	2
Lorne Fairbairn	1	Joyce Lee	2
Steve Frye	2	Paul Pletcher	2
Richard Leedy	3	Cindy Scofield	2
Penny Morris	2	Larry Albright	3
Anna Butler	4	Max Hawkins	4
Nerissa Felder	3	Steve Drier*	2
Jim Rhodes	1	Mostafa Zamani*	2
Mike Malone*	4		

** New participants this term*

Basic differences between the QEP and the non-QEP classes:

QEP classes have 22 students instead of 30
Professors participate in Bridge Building Sessions, biweekly discussion groups
Professors use varied teaching methods to accomplish the three competencies they selected from Dr. Blumberg's list of 21 competencies

Bridge Building Sessions:

The Bridge Building Sessions are biweekly discussion groups held on alternate Tuesdays, one week with the Winter Haven faculty and one week with the Lakeland faculty. See Appendix C for a list of the types of activities that have been included in the Bridge Building Sessions.

MAC 1105 Sessions:

Modeled after the QEP Bridge Building Sessions for MAT 1033, mathematics instructors teaching MAC 1105 have formed a collaborative group for the purpose of sharing and discussing teaching strategies, tests, and activity ideas.

Professional Development Team

The Professional Development Team met on 11/28/12.

20131 Lunch and Learn Series				
Date	Campus	Breakfast/ Lunch/Dinner	Title	Presenter
9/28/12	Winter Haven	Breakfast	*The Big Bang Theory of Learning Styles*	Beverly Woolery
10/2/12	Lakeland	Lunch	*PAL With Pizzazz!*	Kari Sabin

10/11/12	Lakeland	Lunch	*Wacky Ways to Prevent Plagiarism*	John Barberet
10/13/12	Lakeland	Breakfast	*Assessing Student Learning Outcomes*	Donald Painter/Cindy Freitag
10/18/12	Lakeland	Lunch	*Using Pop Culture to Engage and Explain*	Orathai Northern
11/10/12	Lakeland	Breakfast	*Motivating Students for Success*	Donald Painter
11/12/12	Lakeland	Lunch	*Encouraging Critical Thinking While Handling Political Incorrectness*	Jim Haischer/Sanford Betz/Colleen Caldecut
11/15/12	Lakeland	Lunch	*Roundtable Discussion of Successful Strategies for Involving Students*	Sally Fitzgerald/Kaye Betz
11/16/12	Winter Haven	Breakfast	*Mirror, Mirror in the Classroom: Reflective Teaching and Learning Strategies to Promote Student Success and Professional Practice*	Lynda Wolverton/Courtlann Thomas

Listed below are a few of the topics planned for the spring sessions. A flyer with dates, times, and locations has been distributed.

Polk State College's Study Abroad Programs: First Global Ambassador Leadership Program
PAL with Pizzazz!
Internationalizing Our Curriculum: Helping our Students Become Global Citizens
Incorporating Writing Across the Disciplines
On-Course Workshop
The Big Bang Theory of Learning Styles
Transitions to Success: Teaching with Purpose
Numbers are not Just for Math: Building Numeracy across the Curriculum
Serving Students with Disabilities: PTSD and ADA
PAL Roundtable

4-1-1 Book:

The math-related book selected for the 4-1-1 reading program this year is Thomas Levenson's *Newton and the Counterfeiter: The Unknown Detective Career of the World's Greatest Scientist.*

Learning Resources Team

TLCC Math Tutor Training:

Tutor training continues. Following the conversations of the math tutor/faculty meetings, we continue to stress the learner-centered focus in the one-to-one tutoring sessions.

Tutors strive to highlight what the student knows and encourage them by identifying skills they have already developed and then building further.

Lakeland TLCC:

Working as a math faculty liaison, Debra Laraway developed handouts that reinforce fundamentals from the developmental courses, which prove helpful to our MAT1033 students. Many students get bogged down by the early concepts and the handouts are resources they can use independently, allowing more time to focus on new concepts when they work with the tutors. In the spring, Megan Cavanah will continue what Debra Laraway started.

The Lakeland TLCC has designated a specific section of the math tutoring area for MAT1033 and the two developmental courses. Throughout the week, tutors are scheduled and specifically designated for these same courses. By circulating in the designated area, the tutors are able to provide more immediate support to those students, as well as encourage group interaction that happens when students in the same class are working alongside one another.

Student Services Team

Student Educational Plan:

As part of the advisors and mathematics faculty joint meeting held each term, Terrance Hays (Winter Haven), and Jessica Buchanan and Michelle Sams (Lakeland) shared the new Student Educational Plan. While students still continue to have access to their degree audit, they now have the ability to plan their courses and make choices about which term they will take each course. This enables students to play a bigger role in planning their future. Students can ask “what if” questions and see the effect. It is a beneficial tool we can encourage students to use so they can take on more responsibility for their learning.

Assessment and Evaluation Team

(Separate Report by Peter Usinger)

Suggested Adjustments to the QEP

Currently, we are supposed to produce one QEP newsletter each fall, spring, and summer term. Because more happens with the QEP during the fall and spring, I would like to suggest producing two newsletters in the fall, two in the spring, and none in the summer.

Appendix A:

Summary of
Math: The Bridge to Success
Polk State College's Quality Enhancement Plan

The purpose of *Math: The Bridge to Success* is to improve student learning in Intermediate Algebra. With improved learning, students will be more successful in Intermediate Algebra so that they may more readily progress toward further academic and/or career goals.

Expected QEP Outcomes:

1. Students will demonstrate all five student learning outcomes in Intermediate Algebra.
2. Students who take Intermediate Algebra will successfully complete it on the first attempt.
3. Students who successfully complete Intermediate Algebra will be successful in the subsequent mathematics course.
4. Students completing Intermediate Algebra will graduate in their selected degree programs.

The mathematics faculty are not changing what they teach. They are changing how they teach. Using Dr. MaryEllen Weimer's five key changes (function of content, role of the instructor, responsibility for learning, processes and purposes of assessment, and balance of power) along with Dr. Phyllis Blumberg's rubrics, mathematics faculty at Polk State College are moving toward learner-centered teaching.

Definition adopted at Polk State College: Learner-centered teaching is an instructional design which intentionally and purposefully creates an environment that engages students as active partners in their own learning processes through meaningful interaction with course content, the professor, and each other. It presents increasing opportunities for learners to take responsibility for their own learning with the goal of becoming self-directed, life-long learners. Learner-centered teaching supports this process through defining clear objectives and integrating formative and authentic assessment into the learning process.

Along with specific changes in the way that mathematics is taught in the classroom, college-wide changes are taking place. The TLCC, library, and students services are all working together with the mathematics faculty to provide support and help change occur. Learner-centered teaching workshops are conducted for all faculty.

Appendix B:

List of Twenty-One Learner-Centered Components

The Function of Content

1. Varied uses of content: In addition to building a knowledge base, instructor uses content to help students know why they need to learn content, acquire discipline-specific learning methodologies, use inquiry or ways of thinking in the discipline, and learn to solve real-world problems.
2. Level to which students engage in content
3. Use of organizing schemes
4. Use of content to facilitate future learning

The Role of the Instructor

5. Creation of an environment for learning through organization and use of material that accommodates different learning styles
6. Alignment of the course components-objectives, teaching or learning methods, and assessment methods – for consistency
7. Teaching or learning methods appropriate for student learning goals
8. Activities involving student, instructor, content interactions
9. Motivation of students to learn (intrinsic drive to learn versus extrinsic reasons to earn grades)

The Responsibility for Learning

10. Responsibility for learning
11. Learning to learn skills for the present and the future - including, for example: time management, self-monitoring, goal setting, how to do independent reading, and how to conduct original research
12. Self-directed, lifelong learning skills - including, for example: determining a personal need to know more, knowing who to ask or where to seek information, determining when need is met, and development of self-awareness of students' own learning abilities
13. Students' self-assessment of their learning
14. Students' self-assessment of their strengths and weaknesses

The Purposes and Processes of Assessment

15. Assessment within the learning process
16. Formative assessment (giving feedback to foster improvement)
17. Peer and self-assessment
18. Demonstration of mastery and ability to learn from mistakes
19. Timeframe for feedback

The Balance of Power

20. Flexibility of course policies, assessment methods, learning methods, and deadlines
21. Opportunities to learn

Appendix C:

QEP Bridge Building Sessions
Tuesdays, 1:30-3:00

Activities over the past four terms:

1. various methods of formative assessment
2. ways to connect new material to old material
3. concept maps
4. using visuals
5. active learning
6. appropriate feedback
7. making the content meaningful to the student
8. giving students more opportunities to participate in class
9. using critical reflection
10. sharing of teaching strategies for various topics
11. each person individually looking at their item analysis from the last final exam
12. using conceptual questions
13. speaker from economics sharing how students use Intermediate Algebra topics in his class
14. sample chemistry lab
15. respiratory care formulas
16. discussion of topics in math readings
17. sharing of ideas brought back from conferences
18. demonstration of how to use clickers
19. demonstration of how to use a smart board
20. demonstration of how to use a sympodium
21. TED talks
22. math games
23. incorporating You-Tube clips and images into lesson
24. teaching MAT 1033 online demonstration
25. math-enhanced rubrics
26. using PowerPoint in a learner-centered way
27. developing responsible learners
28. assessment techniques
29. taking ownership in class
30. Classroom Assessment Techniques
31. science connections
32. lots more

In most of the sessions, the participants share and demonstrate something, whether it is a new math game, how to make a topic meaningful, how to incorporate a You-Tube clip, or something else. Everybody participates and at many of the sessions the participants are responsible for presenting something.

Appendix D:

Teams, Committees, Councils

Professional Development Team:

The Professional Development Team is responsible for offering learner-centered professional development activities. With the assistance of college staff, a group of faculty will facilitate workshops and other training sessions. In particular, inter-departmental collaboration opportunities emphasizing the relevance of mathematics to other disciplines, careers, and life experiences will be encouraged. Membership will include the District Director for Academic Support Services (chair), faculty representation from both campuses, a Staff and Program Development Committee representative, and WEQC representation.

Courtlann Thomas (Chair)
Fatin Morris (Winter Haven faculty)
Sherry Siler (Winter Haven faculty)
Cindy Freitag (Lakeland faculty)
Bruce Dubendorff (Lakeland faculty)
Carol Martinson (Lakeland faculty).
Rose Collins (SPD Committee and Lakeland faculty)
Beverly Woolery (EPI)
Jim Rhodes (Lakeland faculty)
Sandra Hinko (Lakeland faculty)
Linda Young (Winter Haven faculty)
Sally Fitzgerald (Lakeland adjunct faculty)
Cindy Jaskolka (WEQC)

Student Services Team:

The Student Services Team will be responsible for the development and facilitation of programs, activities, and services that will support the QEP, particularly the utilization of the Early Warning System. Membership will include the deans of Student Services (Co-chairs), advisors, academic success counselors, and other pertinent staff college-wide.

Saul Reyes (Co-chair)
Reggie Webb (Co-chair)
Gregory Marshall
Michelle Sams
Cate Igo
Kim Pearsall
Simmi Johnson
Mary Westgate
Yulonda Bell
Kerry Shapiro (Airside)
Lenora Burnett
Sue Candia

Learning Resources Team:

The Learning Resources Team will be responsible for the development of auxiliary services to support MAT 1033, including the improvement and integration of individual and group tutoring, development of new tutoring materials and student workbooks, utilization of films on demand, development of new testing strategies, and the redevelopment of testing facilities. Membership will include the directors of Learning Resources (Co-chairs), TLCC staff, tutors, and student representatives from both campuses.

Bill Foege (Co-chair)
Chris Fullerton (Co-chair)
Cheryl Garnett (JDA)
Gerry Hubbs (Winter Haven TLCC)
Kim DeRonda (Lakeland TLCC)
Mike Whann (Lakeland Tutoring Coordinator)
_____ (Lakeland tutor)
Lee Wilkerson (Winter Haven tutor)
_____ (Lakeland student)

Implementation Team:

The Implementation Team will consist of the chairs of the Mathematics Teaching Team, the Student Services Team, the Learning Resources Team, and the Professional Development Team, as well as one academic dean and one representative from each: the Workforce Education Quality Council (WEQC), the Business Office, the Facilities Department, the student body, the Lakeland faculty (campus liaison), and the Winter Haven faculty (campus liaison). The Implementation Team along with other members of the various teams will carry out the implementation activities of the QEP, providing recommendations as needed. Under the QEP Director's leadership, each campus liaison will assist with implementation tasks on his or her respective campus, in particular where a specific team is not already assigned.

Kaye Betz (Chair)
Roger Aleman (Mathematics Teaching Team Co-chair)
Richard Leedy (Mathematics Teaching Team Co-chair)
Saul Reyes (Student Services Team Co-chair)
Reggie Webb (Student Services Team Co-chair)
Bill Foege (Learning Resources Team Co-chair)
Chris Fullerton (Learning Resources Team Co-chair)
Courtlann Thomas (Professional Development Team Chair)
Martha Santiago (Academic Dean)
Saritza Guzman-Sardina (WEQC)
Teresa Vorous (Business Office)
George Urbano (Facilities)
Wallace Minto (Winter Haven student)
Nick Coffman (Winter Haven student)
Lynda Wolverton (Lakeland liaison)
Becky Pugh (Winter Haven liaison)
Latrice Moore (BAS faculty)
Beverly Woolery (EPI)

Mathematics Teaching Team:

The Mathematics Teaching Team will provide support and guidance to other mathematics faculty members for the purpose of redesigning courses and promoting learner-centered teaching in a collaborative classroom atmosphere. Membership will include primarily MAT 1033 faculty but is open to all Polk State College faculty and students as well. The team will select co-chairs.

Richard Leedy	Paul Pletcher	Larry Albright
Roger Aleman	Cindy Scofield	Jim Rhodes
Rich Decker	Steve Frye	Max Hawkins
Penny Morris	Anna Butler	Mostafa Zamani
Lorne Fairbairn	Nerissa Felder	Steve Drier
Joyce Lee	Mike Malone	

QEP Advisory Council:

The QEP Advisory Council will provide input, guidance, and feedback regarding the implementation and evaluation of the QEP. Further, it will assist the College in promoting community awareness of the QEP by serving as liaison between the community and the College. A key responsibility of the QEP Advisory Council will be to review and address expectations that appear either too high or too low based upon the assessment. Membership on the Council will include Polk State College faculty, staff, community members, and student representatives.

Ken Ross (Chair)
Patricia Jones (District Academic Dean)
Kathy Bucklew (Registrar)
Jude Ryan (faculty)
Melissa LaRock (administrative assistant)
Karen Greeson (WEQC)
Steve Elias (community member)
Robert Gerber (student)

Assessment and Evaluation Team:

The Assessment and Evaluation Team will provide assessment support, evaluation resource management, data analysis and information required for the evaluation, and further development and implementation of the QEP project. This team will review all facets of the QEP assessment data and provide assessment summary reports and comparative evaluations. Membership will include the college's Research and Reports Coordinator, the Mathematics Department's Assessment Coordinators, and one representative each from the Institutional Effectiveness Council and the Planning and Budget Council. The Research and Reports Coordinator will be in charge of providing ongoing assessment support concerning all QEP-relevant inquiries.

Peter Usinger (Chair)
Mary Beth Freeman (Research and Reports Coordinator)
Stephen Drier (Mathematics Assessment Coordinator)
Steve Frye (Mathematics Assessment Coordinator)
Teresa Vorous (Institutional Effectiveness Council)
Chris Fullerton (Planning and Budget Council)

QEP Assessment Summary – 2011/2012 (1/13/2013)

Table of Contents

Overview

This report summarizes data from the first full year of implementation of Polk State College's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) during academic year 2011/12. Throughout this second phase of the QEP implementation, 12 full-time and 3 part-time Mathematics faculty from both of the college's main campuses did modify their instructional practice by integrating the learner-centered principles outlined in the plan. Thus, the data presented focuses on comparing their instructional outcomes and other assessment information with those of the Mathematics faculty teaching the remaining sections of MAT1033. In addition several longitudinal assessment data will be presented as well.

Across most tables, the two groups are identified by the *QEP* and *Non-QEP* descriptors in the respective table rows or columns. Since this report's data mainly serves as an extended baseline for the multi-year QEP implementation assessment, it will not yet cover all variables of the entire assessment spectrum (e.g., continual success tracking after MAT1033 completion has been omitted). In addition, some measures from the original assessment design have been dropped (Second-Day Student Survey) or modified (End-of-Term Student Survey), while results from the College's Withdrawal Survey have been added. Sub sample sizes for a valid and differential demographics-based analysis are still insufficient at this time and will be included in the longitudinal student tracking analyses for the Fall 2013 report.

MAT 1033 Student Success Rate Summary 2011-2012

Student success data for AY 2011/12 (Fall and Spring) show significant higher pass rates for QEP versus Non-QEP courses, minor differences between FT and PT faculty (involving slightly higher pass rates for full-time faculty), and noteworthy differences (but still within typical range) between online and face-to-face delivery formats of the course, with online courses showing the somewhat higher failure and withdrawal rates.

AY 2010-2011	Students Enrolled	Grade Distribution								Success Rates		
		A	B	C	D	F	W1	W2	W4	A-C %	A-D %	F/W %*
QEP	1,397	141	292	348	150	246	159	45	16	55.9%	66.6%	32.2%
Not-QEP	1,211	133	203	239	147	240	172	62	15	47.5%	59.6%	39.1%
FT Faculty	1439	141	299	316	172	259	174	65	13	52.5%	64.5%	34.6%
PT Faculty	1169	133	196	271	125	227	157	42	18	51.3%	62.0%	36.4%
Online Classes	204	16	40	38	20	34	30	20	6	46.1%	55.9%	41.2%
Face to Face	2404	258	455	549	277	452	301	87	25	52.5%	64.0%	34.9%
Fall/Spring 2011/12	2,608	10.5%	19.0%	22.5%	11.4%	18.6%	12.7%	4.1%	0.8%	52.0%	63.4%	34.5%
Fall/Spring 2010/11	2,487	11.2%	16.4%	20.7%	10.9%	20.6%	12.9%	6.6%	1.2%	48.3%	59.2%	40.1%
Fall/Spring 2009/10	2,363	10.5%	18.2%	23.4%	11.0%	16.1%	13.6%	6.5%	0.7%	55.9%	66.6%	32.2%

***) Note: W4 values are excluded from this calculation.**

4-Year MAT 1033 Student Success Rate Comparison (by Term)

After the implementation term (2011-2) of the QEP showed the highest average Failure/Withdrawal (F/W) Rate in several years, average pass rates for the academic year have continuously improved since then, even when controlling for term-based variances. While, based on faculty commentary, the original drop can be attributed to certain learning-curve (U-Curve Theory) related losses as a result of changing instructional strategies, we can now note an across-the-board gain in MAT1033 pass rates for the most recent QEP implementation year.

Term	Enrolled	Passed	Pass %	W	W %	F/W1-2	F/W1-2 %
2009-1	1162	730	62.8%	218	18.8%	432	37.2%
2009-2	967	563	58.2%	235	24.3%	404	41.8%
2009-3	356	228	64.0%	86	24.2%	128	36.0%
2010-1	1299	854	65.7%	241	18.6%	445	34.3%
2010-2	1096	647	59.0%	265	24.2%	449	41.0%
2010-3	356	240	67.4%	68	19.1%	116	32.6%
2011-1	1345	849	63.1%	220	16.3%	483	35.9%
2011-2	1142	621	54.4%	285	25.0%	513	45.9%
2011-3	357	259	72.5%	54	15.1%	98	27.5%
2012-1	1441	946	65.6%	234	16.2%	484	37.7%
2012-2	1167	707	60.6%	235	20.1%	440	35.4%
2012-3	366	276	75.4%	38	10.4%	89	24.3%

MAT 1033 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Five Core QEP Learning Outcomes – Departmental Final Exam

The table below compares the most recent QEP and Non-QEP course results across the five aggregated QEP learning outcomes in face-to-face classes with the outcomes of the QEP pilot implementation term. This should serve as a preliminary trend indicator as it compares the most recent results with the baseline QEP measures established earlier, while being sensitive to variances that exist between spring and fall terms.

#	Description	All 2011-2	QEP 2012-2		Non-QEP 2012-2	
1.	Solve and graph systems of equations and inequalities.	61.2%	58.5%	-2.70%	56.9%	-4.30%
2.	Perform basic operations with functions.	53.0%	69.8%	16.80%	66.2%	13.20%
3.	Factor polynomials and solve quadratic equations.	74.9%	67.0%	-7.90%	66.2%	-8.70%
4.	Simplify and solve rational expressions and equations.	53.5%	57.6%	4.10%	62.1%	8.60%
5.	Simplify expressions involving fractional exponents or radicals.	66.3%	71.4%	5.10%	74.1%	7.80%
Average Final Exam Score		65.5%	64.5%	-1.00%	65.6%	0.10%
% Students Passing Final Exam		66.5%	63.9%	-2.60%	70.3%	3.80%
N of Students Passing Final Exam		646	305		180	
Total N of Students Taking Final Exam		972	477		256	

The table below compares the QEP student learning outcome results for Fall 2011 (2012-1) and Spring 2012 (2012-2) with non-QEP classes across delivery formats. The results for student learning outcomes measures strongly suggest to review the transfer of the existing QEP methodology into the online environment. The data shows larger than expected differences between delivery methods in all areas. With regard to the general differences between QEP and non-QEP classes: the results somewhat reflect the lower QEP withdrawal rates and therefore a larger amount of students with performance weaknesses retained in QEP courses. The table shows QEP scores with positive score differentials (>0.75%) compared to non-QEP classes with green highlights, those showing negative score differentials with red highlights.

#	Description	QEP Passing Scores				Non-QEP Passing Scores			
		F2F 2012-1	Online 2012-1	F2F 2012-2	Online 2012-2	F2F 2012-1	Online 2012-1	F2F 2012-2	Online 2012-2
1.	Solve/graph systems…	62.5%	44.44%	58.5%	52.00%	54.8%	68.40%	56.9%	58.20%
2.	Perform basic opera…	71.4%	58.33%	69.8%	60.00%	71.3%	64.50%	66.2%	68.20%
3.	Factor polynomials…	70.1%	47.78%	67.0%	61.30%	61.6%	67.90%	66.2%	73.30%
4.	Simplify/solve ration…	61.3%	52.78%	57.6%	55.00%	56.2%	57.50%	62.1%	55.60%
5.	Simplify expressions…	72.9%	61.90%	71.4%	65.20%	68.0%	72.60%	74.1%	68.80%
Average Final Exam Score		67.4%	53.1%	64.5%	58.9%	61.5%	66.5%	65.6%	64.4%
% with Passing Score		68.2%	27.8%	63.9%	56.7%	58.0%	71.1%	70.3%	63.6%

MAT 1033 Student Success Rates in 14 Math Department SLOs

The following tables show the results of the final departmental tests for Fall 2011 and Spring2012 in a slightly different format than shown on the previous page. It reflects the 14 department-internal SLO-s, instead of the five SLO-s defined in the QEP. The comparison is designed to lead to a more differential understanding of the QEP-related impact and the tracking of persistent areas with performance weaknesses. The first table compares results for face-to-face classes, the second for online classes.

Face-to-Face Classes	Non-QEP 2012-1		QEP 2012-1		Δ Score	Non-QEP 2012-2		QEP 2012-2		Δ Score
SLO Description	% Passing	Avg Score	% Passing	Avg Score		% Passing	Avg Score	% Passing	Avg Score	
Linear Equations	37.6%	59.0%	46.5%	66.5%	7.5%	46.5%	65.6%	45.1%	65.1%	-0.5%
Linear Inequalities	51.2%	51.2%	55.0%	55.0%	3.8%	50.8%	50.8%	49.9%	49.9%	-0.9%
Linear Systems	41.6%	41.6%	51.1%	51.1%	9.5%	41.0%	41.0%	45.7%	45.7%	4.7%
Evaluate Functions	81.7%	81.7%	83.0%	83.0%	1.3%	79.7%	79.7%	83.6%	83.6%	3.9%
Domains of Functions	61.0%	61.0%	59.8%	59.8%	-1.2%	52.7%	52.7%	56.0%	56.0%	3.3%
Rational Exponents	58.0%	58.0%	60.9%	60.9%	2.9%	62.9%	62.9%	53.5%	53.5%	-9.4%
Factoring	76.1%	76.1%	82.8%	82.8%	6.7%	79.7%	79.7%	73.8%	73.8%	-5.9%
Quadratic Equations	45.4%	57.9%	59.2%	67.0%	9.1%	53.1%	62.9%	57.7%	65.3%	2.4%
Rational Expressions	70.1%	66.4%	77.1%	70.4%	4.0%	79.7%	73.0%	77.8%	70.9%	-2.1%
Rational Equations	26.1%	49.1%	29.6%	53.7%	4.6%	27.7%	54.7%	23.7%	47.4%	-7.3%
Proportion & Variation	40.0%	40.0%	49.3%	49.3%	9.3%	44.1%	44.1%	38.2%	38.2%	-5.9%
Radical Expressions	64.9%	69.9%	75.5%	76.6%	6.7%	73.4%	75.0%	73.4%	75.1%	0.1%
Complex Numbers	68.1%	68.1%	69.4%	69.4%	1.3%	70.3%	70.3%	64.6%	64.6%	-5.7%
Applications	47.4%	66.9%	54.6%	73.7%	6.8%	52.7%	73.2%	56.4%	74.0%	0.8%
Students Passing Final	58.0%	61.5%	68.2%	67.4%	5.9%	70.3%	65.6%	63.9%	64.5%	-1.1%

Online Classes	Non-QEP 2012-1		QEP 2012-1		Δ Score	Non-QEP 2012-2		QEP 2012-2		Δ Score
SLO Description	% Passing	Avg Score	% Passing	Avg Score		% Passing	Avg Score	% Passing	Avg Score	
Linear Equations	52.60%	75.00%	33.33%	50.00%	-25.0%	45.50%	60.60%	30.00%	55.00%	-5.6%
Linear Inequalities	71.10%	71.10%	38.89%	38.89%	-32.2%	57.60%	57.60%	46.70%	46.70%	-10.9%
Linear Systems	36.80%	36.80%	27.78%	27.78%	-9.0%	42.40%	42.40%	30.00%	30.00%	-12.4%
Evaluate Functions	86.80%	86.80%	77.78%	77.78%	-9.0%	90.90%	90.90%	86.70%	86.70%	-4.2%
Domains of Functions	42.10%	42.10%	38.89%	38.89%	-3.2%	45.50%	45.50%	33.30%	33.30%	-12.2%
Rational Exponents	52.60%	52.60%	50.00%	50.00%	-2.6%	45.50%	45.50%	60.00%	60.00%	14.5%
Factoring	81.60%	81.60%	55.56%	55.56%	-26.0%	87.90%	87.90%	73.30%	73.30%	-14.6%
Quadratic Equations	57.90%	64.50%	27.78%	45.83%	-18.7%	60.60%	69.70%	43.30%	58.30%	-11.4%
Rational Expressions	76.30%	65.80%	55.56%	53.70%	-12.1%	81.80%	68.70%	70.00%	60.00%	-8.7%
Rational Equations	26.30%	55.30%	38.89%	63.89%	8.6%	18.20%	42.40%	33.30%	56.70%	14.3%
Proportion & Variation	36.80%	36.80%	27.78%	27.78%	-9.0%	42.40%	42.40%	36.70%	36.70%	-5.7%
Radical Expressions	81.60%	77.00%	61.11%	66.67%	-10.3%	69.70%	71.20%	63.30%	69.20%	-2.0%
Complex Numbers	86.80%	86.80%	55.56%	55.56%	-31.2%	75.80%	75.80%	63.30%	63.30%	-12.5%
Applications	55.30%	72.40%	33.33%	58.33%	-14.1%	48.50%	72.70%	40.00%	65.00%	-7.7%
Students Passing Final	71.10%	66.50%	27.78%	53.11%	-13.4%	63.60%	64.40%	56.70%	58.90%	-5.5%

Faculty Self-Assessment: Learner-Centered Components

This table shows the improvement goals of QEP faculty across the learner-centered dimensions (as described in detail in the following section), which are identified by the dimension numbers noted in columns Change-1 to Change-3. The self-evaluation baseline-data for all 21 dimensions is shown in the top portion and the comparative end-of-term self-evaluation is shown in the bottom portion with areas of change highlighted. [Please note that actual change does not need to match the originally intended change. Change 1-3 columns in the 2012-1 section reflect intentions for the next term.]

Before 2011-2 (Original baselines)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Change 1 For 2011-2	Change 2 For 2011-2	Change 3 For 2011-2
Aleman	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	20	19	8
Lee	1	1	1	2	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	11	14	19
Pletcher	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	13	14	16
Scofield	1	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	11	15	18
Decker	4	3	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	8	16	16
Fairbairn	2	2	1	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	8	8	15
Frye	2	1	1	3	4	2	3	4	2	3	1	2	2	2	4	4	1	3	4	1	3	3	3	3
Leedy	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	15	16	17
Morris	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	7	11	14
End of 2011-2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Change 1 For 2012-1	Change 2 For 2012-1	Change 3 For 2012-1
Aleman	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	8	19	21
Lee	1	1	1	2	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	8	19	19
Pletcher	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	13	14	16
Scofield	1	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	1	1	1	17	19
Decker	4	3	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	9	11
Fairbairn	2	2	1	2	2	4	2	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	2	3	2	3	7	15	18
Frye	2	2	1	3	4	2	3	4	2	3	1	2	2	2	4	4	1	3	4	2	4	9	11	13
Leedy	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	18	20	21
Morris	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	6	12	13

Baselines for Additional Participants **Before 2012-1**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**Change 1 For 2012-1**	**Change 2 For 2012-1**	**Change 3 For 2012-1**
Albright	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	4	11	19
Felder	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	8	16	18
Butler	2	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	3	2	5	13
Betz	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	21
Rose	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	8	19
End of 2012-1	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**Change 1 For 2012-2**	**Change 2 For 2012-2**	**Change 3 For 2012-2**
Aleman	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	8	10	18
Lee	1	1	1	2	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	8	19	19
Pletcher	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	4	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	13	14	16
Scofield	1	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	1	1	1	17	19
Decker	4	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	9	11
Fairbairn	2	2	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	2	3	2	3	7	15	18
Frye	2	2	1	3	4	2	3	4	2	3	1	2	2	2	4	4	1	3	4	1	4	9	11	13
Leedy	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	18	20	21
Morris	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	6	12	13
Albright	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	11	19
Felder	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	8	16	18
Butler	2	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	5	14
Betz	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	3	1	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rose	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	8	19
Baselines for Additional Participants **Before 2012-2**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**Change 1 For 2012-2**	**Change 2 For 2012-2**	**Change 3 For 2012-2**
Hawkins	1	4	2	3	2	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	1	4	1	15	20
Rhodes	2	3	2	2	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	8	10	19

End of 2012-2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Change 1 For 2013-1	Change 2 For 2013-1	Change 3 For 2013-1
Aleman	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	14	17	20
Lee	1	1	1	2	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	4	1	2	11	12	2
Pletcher	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	2	3	4	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	10	11	18
Scofield	2	2	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	5	9
Decker	4	3	1	2	2	1	3	4	3	1	3	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	11	13	17
Fairbairn	2	2	1	2	2	4	3	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	4	3	1	3	3	2	3	1	3	4
Frye	2	2	1	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	4	4	1	3	4	1	4	11	13	14
Leedy	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	8	9	16
Morris	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	6	6	8
Albright	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	15	18	3
Felder	2	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	4	3	3	2	9	17	16
Butler	2	3	4	1	3	3	3	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	2	3	3	4	16	16
Betz	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	3	1	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rose	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hawkins	1	4	2	3	2	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	4	1	15	20
Rhodes	2	3	2	2	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	8	10	19
Baselines for Additional Participants **Before 2013-1**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Change 1 For 2013-1	Change 2 For 2013-1	Change 3 For 2013-1
Drier	1	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	4	1	1	2	2	1	1	4	15	16	18
Zamani	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	9	17	18
Malone	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	15	21

Note: Highlighted numbers indicate change from previous term.

List of the 21 Learner-Centered Components

The Function of Content

1. Varied uses of content: In addition to building a knowledge base, instructor uses content to help students know why they need to learn content, acquire discipline-specific learning methodologies, use inquiry or ways of thinking in the discipline, and learn to solve real-world problems.
2. Level to which students engage in content
3. Use of organizing schemes
4. Use of content to facilitate future learning

The Role of the Instructor

5. Creation of an environment for learning through organization and use of material that accommodates different learning styles
6. Alignment of the course components-objectives, teaching or learning methods, and assessment methods – for consistency
7. Teaching or learning methods appropriate for student learning goals
8. Activities involving student, instructor, content interactions
9. Motivation of students to learn (intrinsic drive to learn versus extrinsic reasons to earn grades)

The Responsibility for Learning

10. Responsibility for learning
11. Learning to learn skills for the present and the future - including, for example: time management, self-monitoring, goal setting, how to do independent reading, and how to conduct original research
12. Self-directed, lifelong learning skills - including, for example: determining a personal need to know more, knowing who to ask or where to seek information, determining when need is met, and development of self-awareness of students' own learning abilities
13. Students' self-assessment of their learning
14. Students' self-assessment of their strengths and weaknesses

The Purposes and Processes of Assessment

15. Assessment within the learning process
16. Formative assessment (giving feedback to foster improvement)
17. Peer and self-assessment
18. Demonstration of mastery and ability to learn from mistakes
19. Timeframe for feedback

The Balance of Power

20. Flexibility of course policies, assessment methods, learning methods, and deadlines
21. Opportunities to learn

Blumberg, P. (2008) Developing Learner-Centered Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. For more information please contact Phyllis Blumberg at p.blumbe@usp.edu.