

SAMPLE TEMPLATES GLOSSARY

QEP Instructional Specialist (QIS)—See pages 9-11 in the *QEP Instructional Specialist Guide* (http://www.ctcd.edu/home_qep3.htm)

Unit (drop down menu)—A Unit is your department, your site, or a special unit comprised of several sites and/or departments. Also, a Unit generally is responsible for maintaining its own budget.

Course Titles/Syllabi-- (<http://www.ctcd.edu/index4d.htm>)

Baseline assessment—(http://www.ctcd.edu/home_qep3.htm) For the Fall Control Group semester, each faculty member (including all adjuncts) will be asked to administer one direct measurement of student learning (see also "Measurement Techniques"). Within each unit, the QIS may require that each faculty member use the same direct measurement (recommended) or may allow each faculty member to choose individual direct measurements. The faculty member is then responsible for administering that measurement in *at least* one class. More than one class may be involved; however, it is not required for Phase 1. This measurement must be completed by the end of the Fall Semester (December 15, 2004). Each faculty member will be responsible for keeping track of his or her measurement, including all data collection and results. Report of the measurement used and the results will be recorded in the Faculty Report submitted by each faculty member to the QIS by May 15, 2005. Each unit's QIS will compile all Faculty Reports, so each unit can analyze and evaluate individual faculty results that culminate in a Unit Assessment Report (UAR) (due May 31, 2005). The UARs are then submitted to the QCC which will in turn compile, analyze, and evaluate all UARs that will culminate in a CTC Report Card. This Report Card will describe to all CTC stakeholders the progress CTC is making in improvement of the quality of student learning (the main focus of CTC's QEP).

Measurement techniques— Measurement techniques (also known as Assessment methods) are the techniques you decide to use to determine how well the learning outcomes were achieved. A combination of qualitative, quantitative, direct, and indirect methods can be employed; however, according to best practices in academic assessment, it is imperative for faculty to include at least one or more direct methods of assessment. It is recommended that faculty use more than one type of measurement to ensure a holistic perspective. Examples of direct and indirect assessment methods are listed below. *This list is not all-inclusive.*

Direct Assessment Methods	Indirect Assessment Methods	Non-Measures
Exams: comprehensive or total number of course tests, assessed individually and compiled	Peer institutions comparison	Instruments designed for specialized program reviews
Writing proficiency exams	Job placement	Curriculum Review Reports
National achievement tests/Standardized tests	Retention rates/ transfer studies	Faculty publications or faculty recognition
Certification, licensure exams	Exit interviews of graduates and focus groups	Faculty/student ratios
Locally developed pre- and post tests	Graduate follow-up studies	Enrollment trends
Capstone Experiences	Length of time to attain degree	Student body diversity
Reflective journals	Curriculum/syllabus analysis	Grades and GPAs
Grading with scoring rubrics	Alumni, employer, or student surveys	Evaluation reports of individual programs submitted by program-specific and specialized accrediting agencies, visiting committees, or committees of external expert peers.
Portfolio Assessment		
Essay tests blind-scored by faculty across the dept, div, school	SAT scores	
External evaluation of performance during internships based on stated program objectives		

Final course or individual test letter grades or GPAs alone do NOT provide adequate feedback on student performance because grades represent the overall competency as opposed to specific strengths and weaknesses on specific learning outcomes. Student learning can best be improved if students know specifically which areas are strengths and which areas need improvement, so appropriate action can be taken. Also, if the grading system is tied to rubrics, that can be useful in identifying areas for improvement. Evaluators of other QEPs have cited "pre- and post- testing as particularly useful benchmarks by which to measure learning from entry to exit, and thereby to measure *value added*."

The measurement must include at least one direct measurement and may additionally include at least one indirect measurement. For example, if your unit uses Pre/Post tests as its baseline measurement, then you must consider the following:

- Which pre/post test to use (it must be the same or focus on similar topics)
- When to administer the test (sometime during first 2 weeks of semester and again during last 2 weeks of semester)
- Whether or not all faculty in department will use the same baseline assessment (at minimum, the same test must be used for the same class but may vary from instructor to instructor)
- Whether or not the pre/post test counts as a grade for the student

This information should be submitted in your description.

Research and best practices—This is the theoretical and practical literature that explains, discusses cause/effect, describes, and/or simply refers to any topic or aspect related to your Unit's goals, techniques, methods, assumptions, findings, and/or intervention(s). These can be very broad (i.e., discussions of assessment and accountability), very narrow (i.e., a case study of use of student conferences addressing feedback), or somewhere in between. We are required by SACS Guidelines to base our decisions on research and best practices. (See website for sample research articles).

Evidence and other relevant documents—This would refer to any survey instruments used by your Unit and a report of their results. This would also include a copy of the baseline measurements and their results (i.e., Pre/post tests, licensure rates, portfolios, etc.)

Intervention—As CTC's instructional focus in *Instructional Feedback*, your Unit's intervention must somehow relate to this focus. Example interventions may include the following (this list is not all-inclusive):

- Departmental surveys
- Negotiation between faculty member and students regarding feedback
- CATs and CoLTs (see Angelo's *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*)
- Individual conferences with students
- Increasing the amount of feedback given
- Varying the type of feedback given
- Closing the feedback loop (asking students to take active role in feedback)

Again, the Unit must consider whether each faculty member must use the same, agreed-upon Unit intervention or whether each individual faculty member may choose a different intervention. The intervention chosen will be described by the faculty member in his or her Faculty Report (due May 15, 2005). The QIS compiles and summarizes the descriptions in the Unit Assessment Report (due May 31, 2005). The QCC collects this information as part of the CTC Report Card to all stakeholders.

Unit goal—Each unit must decide what "improvement of student learning" will look like for its unit. For example, the unit may decide if 51% of the Faculty Reports indicate an improvement in student learning (as determined by the individual faculty members within that unit), then the unit has improved student learning. Or, a unit may decide if any one Faculty Report indicates an improvement in student learning, then the unit has improved student learning because *any* improvement is always better than no improvement. The Unit may choose to modify its Unit Goal after Phase 1 once results have been analyzed.

Supporting information/data—This would be a synthesis of your Unit's explanation of whether or not student learning has improved. The faculty members of your Unit should discuss the findings and discuss all possible reasons and explanations for those findings. For example, if it was determined through comparison of baseline measurements that the unit goal was not met, your Unit should point out the extenuating factors that may have influenced those findings (i.e., troop deployments, uncooperative participants, etc.) This discussion should be based as much as possible on objective factors as opposed to unsubstantiated guesses. It is highly recommended that you base your results on more than one source of information, as your Unit's finding will be best substantiated through use of multiple direct (i.e., tests) and indirect (surveys) methods, as opposed to using just one method.

Comparison with baseline—Once the variation has been determined and documented for the Fall 2004 semester, this variation should be compared to the Spring 2005 results. The same course (i.e., DSWR 0302) should be compared. It is also preferred that the same section (i.e., DSWR 0302.05) be compared, if possible.

Variation and analysis of variation—Your Unit should present comparative data to prove your Unit's findings. For example, your Unit used Pre/Post tests as the Baseline Measurement in Fall 2004. The Pre-test average score for DSWR 0302.05, administered September 1, was 43. The Post-test average score for DSWR 0302.05, administered December 1, was 72. A variation of 29 points is documented. In Spring 2005, the same Pre-test average score for DSWR 0302.05, administered January 20, was 47. The Post-test average score for DSWR 0302.05, administered May 1, was 78. A variation of 31 points is documented. The analysis of the variation will support the conclusion that the intervention used during the Spring 2005 semester contributed to improved student learning. Another example would be to compare the

Unit satisfaction rating results from the Fall 2004 semester to the Spring 2005 semester. An average higher rating would further substantiate (indirectly this time) improvement in student learning.

Next steps based on results—This is your Unit's opportunity to describe what it will do in the upcoming Fall 2005 semester. It is recommended that if student learning improved in your Unit, your Unit continue to implement the intervention used. On the other hand, if it has been determined that student learning did not improve, then your Unit should report what you believed caused that result (See Supporting Information/Data) and how your intervention will be modified. Remember, your Unit, along with all other Phase 1 Units, will share results during our QEP Forum (October 2005).