

## **QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN (QEP): GENERAL EDUCATION**

### **Section 1: Background**

College:	Technical College of the Lowcountry
Component Assessed:	General Education
Contact Person:	Chair of the Quality Enhancement Process Committee Ms. Andrea West, Co-chair of the QEP Subcommittee Dr. Lucille Cook Roth, Co-chair of the QEP Subcommittee
Documentation Location:	Arts and Sciences Division Office, 9/102

### **Section 2: Mission Statement of the Program/Service Being Assessed**

The College encourages faculty, staff, and administrators to be creative, innovative, and resourceful in an open atmosphere of shared values. Students find a support system designed to give them the opportunity to define and achieve their goals. Small classes, modern technology, distance learning classrooms, open computer labs and the ability of the College to respond to its communities give TCL students the competitive edge in entering the workforce. The College utilizes a community-based, student-centered approach as it creates a positive, open environment for learning and working, one guided by principles of fairness, trust, and respect and with an appreciation of cultural diversity.

### **Section 3: Description of the Program/Service Being Assessed**

The Technical College of the Lowcountry defines General Education as a set of institutional competencies for all associate degree graduates. These are as follows: 1) proficiency in the basic academic skills of reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills, and basic computer skills; 2) proficiency in problem solving and critical thinking; 3) the ability to acquire and use information; and 4) the ability to work with a variety of technologies.

Each of the College's associate degree and diploma programs has a basic core of general education courses. Courses/course competencies included in the general education core address/reinforce the basic competencies of reading, writing, speaking, computation, problem solving, acquiring and use of information, and/or the use of various technologies. Additionally, courses in the various majors at TCL, continually address/reinforce these core competencies.

Specific goals for the current academic year include: re-evaluate the implementation time line and adhere to the approved time line for the first five years of the QEP implementation; analyze the initial baseline data, publish results, identify changes to be made in the assessment process, implement changes for Fall 2006.

### **Section 4: Description of Current Assessment Studies**

The current assessment study includes examination of the implementation calendar; continued implementation of QEP process activities in accordance with the approved calendar; implementation of the QEP Committee as a standing committee.

Component	Outcomes Statement	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success
Examine the time line for the assessment of the College's four institutional competencies (IC)	The time line for the assessment of the IC will be adjusted to reflect alternative assessment schedule.	Evaluation of time line	Approval of time line by QEP Committee and the A&E Committee
Fully implement assessment model for Institutional Competency 1 (reading/writing; mathematics)	The direct and external assessments for reading/writing, mathematics will be fully implemented for 2005-2006.	Data analyzed for Fall 2005 and Spring 2006	Publication of data, analysis, and proposed changes for improvement identified/implemented
Implement the standing committee for QEP	A QEP Committee with chair will be appointed and in place July 1, 2005.	Committee Minutes	Committee will implement the annual QEP Process

### **Section 5: Major Findings of the Current Assessment Studies with Program/Service Changes That Resulted from Action Plans**

From the survey completed by faculty the resulting analysis showed that awareness of significance of assessment and its impact on the teaching/learning setting is critical. Increasing awareness of the importance of assessment and analysis of resulting data is critical for all participants-faculty, students, and administration. The Institutional Competency Day Conference (ICDC) training is adequate with no major changes needed. Participation in the ICDC does not create an unreasonable addition to the faculty workload. Consensus to continue the ICDC as one valid assessment process was evident. The results of the Spring 2006 ICDC will be shared in the 2005-2006 QEP Progress Report. The spring 2006 ICDC was held April 14, 2006, training for new assessors was conducted the week prior. Eighty-five percent of the writing samples met the reading/writing standard and fifteen percent failed to meet the standard. The ICDC results from 89 different writing samples had an mean of 46.98(See Appendix table 3). In the spring of 2006 the WorkKeys was administered to 59 students currently enrolled in MAT 110 or MAT 120 classes. The anticipated mean score for the assessment was 4.25, the overall average for this group was a 5.3 (See appendix table 4).

### **Section 6: Action Plan Objectives/Planning Initiatives Derived from Current Study**

During the August 2005 QEP Work Session the timeline proposal for implementation of assessments was discussed and the timeline for implementation revised as recommended by the Faculty (See Appendix Table 1). The timeline was revised and posted on the QEP file on the everyone server. Initial work on phase 3, Basic Use of Computers, will begin in the summer of 2006. The action plans for the QEP are summarized in the table below.

**Section 7: Resources Required/Cost**

Costs to support the Quality Enhancement Plan and the development and implementation of the direct and external assessments include:

Component	Outcomes Statement	Means of Assessment	Criteria for Success
Develop/implement assessment model for Institutional Competency 1 (basic use of computers)	The assessment model for basic use of computers will be piloted in fall 2006 and spring 2007.	Data analyzed for Fall 2006 and Spring 2007	Publication of baseline data based on pilots, training for scorers, weaknesses/strategies for improvement identified/implemented
Fully implement assessment model for Institutional Competency 1 (reading/writing; mathematics)	The direct and external assessments for reading/writing, mathematics will be fully implemented for 2006-2007.	Data analyzed for Fall 2006 and Spring 2007	Publication of data, analysis, and proposed changes for improvement identified/implemented
Examine the time line for the assessment of the College's four institutional competencies (IC)	The time line for the assessment of the IC will be adjusted to reflect alternative assessment schedule.	Evaluation of time line	Approval of time line by Assessment and Evaluation Committee
Implement the standing committee for QEP	A QEP Committee with chair will be appointed and in place July 1, 2006.	Committee Minutes	Committee will implement the annual QEP Process
Study questions resulting from ICDC work session See appendix table 4	The committee will implement results from recommendations.	2007-2008 ICDC	Publication of data, analysis, and proposed changes for improvement identified/implemented

**Technical College of the Lowcountry  
Quality Enhancement Plan  
Proposed Budget**

<b>Personnel</b>	
New Co-Chair Release Time	1300.00
Andrea West, Instructor, QEP Committee Co-Chair Release Time	1300.00
Clerical Support	9350.00
<b>Supplies</b>	
Office Supplies	500.00
Testing Supplies (CAAP)	3000.00
Travel	2000.00
<b>Total Annual Budget</b>	<b>\$17450.00</b>

## Section 8: Appendices

**Table 1: Time line for assessments**

✓ = Assessment scheduled either Fall Semester or Spring Semester

\* = Define skills for the particular competency

☆ = Planning of assessment during the year

Year	R/W (Samples) Spring Semester Even Years	R/W (CAAP) Spring Semester Odd Years In Variety of Classes	MAT (WkKeys) Fall Semester Even Years In MATH Classes	CPT Fall Semester Odd Years NON-math Classes	SPC Fall Semester Even Years Variety of Classes
2003-2004		✓			
2004-2005	✓	✓	✓		
2005-2006	✓		✓	*	
2006-2007		✓		☆	*
2007-2008	✓		✓	✓	☆
2008-2009		✓		✓	✓
2009-2010	✓		✓		✓
2010-2011		✓		✓	
2011-2012	✓		✓		✓
2012-2013***		✓		✓	
2013-2014	✓		✓		✓
2014-2015		✓		✓	

\*\*\* Approximately 2011-2012– the college-wide work on Institutional Competencies 2, 3, 4 should begin. Work on the QEP began in 2002 – so one decade will be invested in the assessment of the Institutional Competencies at this point.

**Table 2: 2006 Workkeys Results**

Class	Score	Associate Degree	Academic Program	M/F
MAT 110 02	5	yes	GNB	M
MAT 110 02	6	yes	AA	F
MAT 110 02	5	no	ACC	F
MAT 110 02	5	yes	GNB	F
MAT 110 02	6	yes	ECE	F
MAT 110 02	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 110 02	5	yes	AA	F
MAT 110 02	7	no	PAH	F
MAT 110 02	5	yes	AA	F
MAT 110 70	7	no	dual	F
MAT 110 70	5	yes	AS	F
MAT 110 70	5	no	PAH	F
MAT 110 70	6	no	GEN	F
MAT 110 70	6	no	GNB	M
MAT 110 70	5	no	dual	F
MAT 110 70	5	no	LAC	F
MAT 110 70	5	yes	GNB	F
MAT 110 70	5	no	dual	F
MAT 110 70	5	no	MOA	F
MAT 110 70	4	no	PAH	F
MAT 110 70	5	no	dual	F
<b>MAT 110 Average</b>	<b>5.38</b>			

Class	Score	Associate Degree	Academic Program	M/F
MAT 120 01	5	yes	GNB	F
MAT 120 01	5	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 01	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 01	5	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 01	4	no	MOA	F
MAT 120 01	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 01	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 01	4	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 01	5	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 02	5	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 02	6	no	dual	M
MAT 120 02	7	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 02	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 02	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 02	4	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 02	4	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 02	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 02	6	yes	AS	F
MAT 120 10	3	no	CD	F
MAT 120 10	6	yes	GNB	F
MAT 120 10	4	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 10	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 10	5	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 10	5	yes	OST	F
MAT 120 10	6	yes	RAD	M
MAT 120 10	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 70	5	yes	OST	F
MAT 120 70	6	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 70	5	yes	AS	F
MAT 120 70	3	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 70	6	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 70	5	yes	OST	F
MAT 120 70	5	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 70	5	no	MOA	F
MAT 120 70	5	yes	AA	F
MAT 120 70	4	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 70	6	no	PAH	F
MAT 120 70	6	no	PAH	F
<b>MAT 120 Average</b>	<b>5.22</b>			

**Table 3: 2006 ICDC Results (Numerical)**

The QEP writing samples are submitted from students who indicate their goal as an associate degree and who have completed ENG 101 and at least 2/3 of the requirements for their program. Samples are graded holistically and are meaningful for the QEP in terms of meeting or not meeting the standard. For categories are used for differentiation with Poor (0-13) and Marginal (14-34) as not meeting the standard; Adequate (35-50) and Accomplished (51-64) samples meet the standard. Scores 0-34 indicate that the sample fails to meet the standard, while scores of 35 and above indicate that the sample meets the standard. The average score for each sample is the arithmetic mean for five scores provided by the five individual raters for each sample. The samples are graded against the rubric and scorers are provided the rubric and holistic scoring guide. The QEP focuses on the overall average, data is provided on the Division level at the request of the Division Deans and faculty.

	in/out class	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Score 5	Average
Industrial Technology							
A1	in	29	52	46	58	60	49
A2	in	32	52	40	38	42	40.8
A3	in	28	44	38	40	35	37
A4	in	52	31	46	38	38	41
A5	in	64	40	50	54	46	50.8
A6	in	62	46	38	64	46	51.2
A7	in	35	32	44	38		37.25
A8	in	58	46	52	60	62	55.6
A9	in	62	48	60	44	56	54
A10	in	44	32	48	54	56	46.8
A11	in	42	34	26	46	54	40.4
Industrial Technology							
Average							45.804
Arts and Sciences							
ENG 102 H1	out	54	24	40	42	42	40.4
ENG 102 H2	out	28	56	40	39	52	43
ENG 102 H3	out	42	56	38	50	56	48.4
ECD 243 I1	in	25	34	35	32		31.5
ECD 243 I2	in	40	14	41	16		27.75
ECD 251 J1	in	23	17	26	16	32	16
ECD 251 J2	in	37	11	31	56	48	36.6

ECD 251 J3	in	35	35	30	13	32	29	
ENG 102 N1	out	38	50	46	64	35	46.6	
ENG 102 N2	out	15	46	25	50	40	35.2	
								Arts and Sciences Average 35.445
Business Technologies								
MGT 150 B1	out	17	29	42	30	14	26.4	
MGT 150 B2	out	36	58	58	64	48	52.8	
MGT 150 B3	out	44	54	54	34		46.5	
MGT 150 B4	out	48	38	44	27	42	39.8	
MGT 150 B5	out	58	20	31	42	56	41.4	
MGT 150 B6	out	44	62	29	40	48	44.6	
MGT 150 B7	out	50	40	44	34	48	43.2	
MGT 150 B8	out	40	30	28	29	42	33.8	
MGT 150 B9	out	46	44	23	11	42	33.2	
MGT 150 B10	out	60	60	62	32	58	54.4	
MGT 150 B11	out	41	32	20	37	33	32.6	
MGT 150 B12	out	58	60	44	44	48	50.8	
MGT 150 B13	out	58	32	50	52	62	50.8	
IST 220 C1	out	50	38	60	60	52	52	
IST 220 C2	out	28	48	58	42	37	42.6	
IST 220 C3	out	13	38	28	44	40	32.6	
IST 220 C4	out	40	40	50	56	37	44.6	
IST 220 C5	out	42	42	42	52	40	43.6	
IST 220 C6	out	58	33	33	21	30	35	
IST 220 C7	out	62	58	62	52	52	57.2	
OST 254 D1	out	60	46	48	PL	58	53	
OST 254 D2	out	56	44	52	52	58	52.4	
OST 254 D3	out	52	54	44	48	62	52	
OST 254 D4	out	64	42	58	54	44	52.4	
OST 254 D5	out	60	46	50	50		51.5	
OST 254 D6	out	52	56	44	38	52	48.4	
OST 254 D7	out	42	60	48	46		49	
OST 254 D8	out	56	62	40	58	42	51.6	
LEG E1	out	48	32	40	38	48	41.2	

LEG E2	out	33	30	37	8	58	33.2
LEG E3	out	58	52	30	17	58	43
LEG E4	out	36	52	44	60		48
LEG E5	out	58	62	56	62	56	58.8
CRJ K1	out	34	46	29	16	36	32.2
Business Technologies							44.841
Average							
Health Sciences							
NUR 274 L1	out	56	58	56	PL	56	56.5
NUR 274 L2	out	48	64	64	62	60	59.6
NUR 274 L3	out	0	32	30	44	64	34
NUR 274 L4	out	56	58	48	54	60	55.2
NUR 274 L5	out	60	42	48	56	54	52
NUR 274 L6	out	60	54	29	54	50	49.4
NUR 274 L7	out	46	56	64	54	56	55.2
NUR 274 L8	out	42	52	42	44	48	45.6
NUR 274 L9	out	56	48	62	44	32	48.4
NUR 274 L10	out	50	50	40	40	36	43.2
NUR 274 L11	out	62	56	52	56	64	58
NUR 274 L12	out	56	46	56			52.667
NUR 274 L13	out	48	64	48	54	56	54
NUR 274 L14	out	60	33	64	62	60	55.8
NUR 274 L15	out	44	54	50	28		44
NUR 274 L16	out	52	58	60	58	56	56.8
NUR 274 L17	out	52	58	44	62	56	54.4
NUR 274 L18	out	63	48	58	44	62	55
NUR 274 L19	out	60	64	64	50	54	58.4
NUR 274 L20	out	58	50	60	48	50	53.2
NUR 274 L21	out	60	27	35	40	50	42.4
NUR 274 L22	out	62	58	46	64		57.5
RAD 225 M1	out	60	NG	57	62	58	59.25
RAD 225 M2	out	48	62	62	34	34	48
RAD 225 M3	out	62	56	64	64	62	61.6
RAD 225 M4	out	60	64	64	62	62	62.4
RAD 225 M5	out	52	48	54	62	64	56

RAD 225 M6	out	58	62	52	56		57	
RAD 225 M8	out	64	64	60	58	54	60	
RAD 225 M9	out	56	44	37	54	44	47	
RAD 225 M10	out	62	60	60	51		58.25	
RAD 225 M12	out	51	58	62	49	48	53.6	Health Sciences Average 53.261
Average		47.943	46.372	46.138	45.619	49.107	<b>46.98</b>	<b>Overall Average</b>

**Table 4: Questions Arising From Discussion of ICDC Process**

1. Is it acceptable to compare in-class writing samples with out of class samples?
2. Can the process of gathering writing samples be improved?