

Enhancement of Student Engagement in the Learning Process through Active and Collaborative Learning

Goals, Expected Outcomes, and Evaluation
Criteria
2006 – 2010

A Quality Enhancement Plan
for
Clarendon College
Clarendon, Texas

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PHILOSOPHY OF CLARENDON COLLEGE	2
MISSION STATEMENT	2
PURPOSES OF CLARENDON COLLEGE	3
<i>OPENING DOORS, CHANGING LIVES: STRATEGIC GOALS</i>	4
CONTEXT	5
BACKGROUND AND HISTORY	
Chronological Summary.....	7
Narrative of QEP History	7
Selection of the QEP Focus	13
Explanation of CCSSE Results	15
Benefits of QEP Implementation	18
GOAL 1	
Expected Outcomes.....	21
Action Plan / Strategies	
Year Zero	22
Year One	25
Year Two	29
Year Three	34
Year Four	39
Evaluation Criteria	42

Responsibilities	43
Estimated Budget	44
GOAL 2	
Expected Outcomes.....	45
Action Plan / Strategies	45
Evaluation Criteria	50
Responsibilities	50
Estimated Budget	50
CONCLUSION	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52
APPENDICES	
SACS Reaffirmation Leadership Team	53
QEP Committee Members	53
Literature Review of Best Practices	54
QEP Spring 2005 In-Service Agenda	59
QEP In-Service Participants.....	60
QEP In-Service Brainstorming Ideas	64
QEP Divisional Input	67

INTRODUCTION

As a major component of the reaffirmation evaluation process with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Clarendon College has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The focus of Clarendon College's QEP is enhancement of student engagement in the learning process through active and collaborative learning. This focus grew out of the College's longstanding commitment to a comprehensive assessment and improvement process.

In the Spring of 2004, Clarendon College had the unique opportunity to participate in the broad-based, national administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Student engagement, as defined in the CCSSE, is the amount of time and energy that students invest in meaningful educational practices. The CCSSE survey provides information about effective educational practices in community colleges and assists institutions in using this information to promote improvements in learning and persistence by the student.

Upon completion of the CCSSE by the student body, Clarendon College received an Institutional Report on the survey. This report led the QEP committee to the understanding that Clarendon College had an excellent opportunity to improve student engagement in the learning process through active and collaborative learning.

Once the QEP Committee identified a focus, the college community participated in a visioning exercise to generate ideas to enhance active and collaborative learning. From this input, the QEP Committee arrived at the following goals:

- Goal 1: Utilize recognized techniques of classroom instruction to engage students in active and collaborative learning.
- Goal 2: Upgrade classrooms to encourage active and collaborative learning.

Although the QEP's focus on active and collaborative learning is of recent origin, it is a natural extension of the College's goals for continued development. Student engagement in the learning process is integral to Clarendon College's Mission Statement, Purpose Statement, and the College's *Opening Doors, Changing Lives* Institutional Plan.

PHILOSOPHY OF CLARENDON COLLEGE

The faculty, Board of Regents, and administrators at Clarendon College are committed to the concept that our College be an open door to learning. With this goal in mind, we extend an educational opportunity to students of all ages who can profit from instruction. Every effort is made to provide equal access to the educational opportunities offered at Clarendon College without regard to race, creed, color, age, sex, national origin, or disability.

In keeping with this philosophy, Clarendon College recognizes and accepts the responsibility for providing curricula for university-bound students, for students seeking career opportunities in a variety of occupations, and for persons of the community seeking cultural enrichment, short-term skill training, or personal improvement opportunities. The College will seek to achieve these goals within the limits of its legal responsibilities and available fiscal resources.

MISSION STATEMENT

Clarendon College is a comprehensive community college committed to teaching and learning and to providing equal access to opportunities that assist in the holistic development of its constituents and community. In pursuit of that mission, the College provides academic transfer programs, workforce education programs, student services, developmental education courses, continuing education/community service courses, and diverse cultural enrichment opportunities.

PURPOSES OF CLARENDON COLLEGE

The purposes of Clarendon College are defined in the Texas Education Code, Section 130.003, and shall be to provide:

- (1) technical programs up to two years in length leading to associate degrees or certificates;
- (2) occupational programs leading directly to employment in semi-skilled and skilled occupations;
- (3) freshman and sophomore courses in arts and sciences;
- (4) continuing adult education programs for occupational or cultural upgrading;
- (5) compensatory education programs designed to fulfill the commitment of an admissions policy allowing the enrollment of disadvantaged students;
- (6) a continuing program of counseling and guidance designed to assist students in achieving their individual educational goals;
- (7) workforce development programs designed to meet local and statewide needs;
- (8) adult literacy programs and other basic skills programs; and,
- (9) such other purposes as may be prescribed by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board or the Clarendon College Board of Regents, in the best interest of postsecondary education in Texas.

Clarendon College exists to serve these purposes as they relate first to the local service areas, then to the State of Texas, and finally, to the nation. It has accepted the challenge of providing the resources, curricula, instructional support, and personnel required to best serve the many educational needs of its students.

OPENING DOORS, CHANGING LIVES: STRATEGIC GOALS

- STRATEGIC GOAL 1: Clarendon College will strive to provide quality educational programs and improve literacy in the workplace so that constituents will possess the knowledge to compete in a global economy, function as wise consumers, and be responsible citizens.
- STRATEGIC GOAL 2: Clarendon College will promote strategies that work to improve the teaching-learning environment and the teaching-learning process, and Clarendon College will work to respond to student needs by monitoring the economic and social patterns of the community, state, and nation and adjusting the learning environment accordingly.
- STRATEGIC GOAL 3: Clarendon College, in order to help create the appropriate teaching-learning environment, will provide facilities that are adequate, attractive, and secure, and a well-disciplined environment conducive to learning, free of drugs and violence to fulfill the educational purposes of the college.
- STRATEGIC GOAL 4: Clarendon College will work to improve student achievement, student success, success rates, and graduation rates in academic and technical programs.

CONTEXT

How do we define active learning?

Active learning encourages the student to be a participant in the learning process rather than passively absorbing information. To do so, the student reinforces what he or she is learning daily in a practical application to real-life situations so that acquired knowledge becomes a part of his or her life—not an abstract body of scholarship (Chickering and Gamson, 1987).

How do we define collaborative learning?

Collaborative learning usually involves students working in groups to seek solutions, find applications, design products, gain understanding. The group cooperates to ensure mutual comprehension of all members. The atmosphere is non-competitive. In addition, the teacher assumes a different role. Although some elements of the traditional classroom remain in collaborative learning (lecture, etc.), the teacher acts more as mentor than an instructor (Goodsell and Tinto, 1992).

What do we mean by engaged learning?

When students are engaged in learning, they accept responsibility for their learning. The concept is to create a life-long desire to think, solve problems, and use information as a tool to help them continue to learn. Engaged learning also fosters the ability to work successfully with others (Jones 1994).

What is meant by Team Building?

Team Building is an instructional strategy designed to create enthusiasm, trust, and mutual support among groups or teams of students. Team Building activities are designed to lead students to more efficient academic work among peers.

What is meant by Class Building?

Class Building is an instructional strategy designed to provide networking among all of the students in a class and creates a positive context within which teams can more effectively learn.

What is meant by Mastery?

Mastery is an instructional strategy designed to produce overall broad understanding of content and skills.

What is meant by Critical Thinking Skills?

Critical Thinking Skills are instructional strategies designed to promote thought and reflection, relational thinking, and analytical thinking from students.

What is meant by Information Sharing?

Information Sharing is an instructional strategy for sharing information within teams or among teams of students. Lessons using Information Sharing accentuate success among other instructional strategies.

What is meant by Communication Skills?

Communication Skills are instructional strategies designed to: regulate and facilitate communication among groups of students; aid groups of students reach a consensus while respecting other students' opinions; and build positive communication skills.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY

DATE	EVENT	PERSONNEL
Spring 2004	CCSSE survey administered	Clarendon College student body
Fall 2004	QEP Committee appointed	(see appendices)
Fall Semester 2004	QEP weekly meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research QEP focus • Plan community input in-service 	QEP Committee
November 5, 2004	“Texas Small Colleges’ Consortium: The Next Steps” CCSSE Workshop	Two QEP Committee members
December 4-8, 2004	SACS Annual Meeting	SACS Reaffirmation Leadership Team (Including one QEP Committee member)
January 12, 2005	Spring in-service: Visioning Exercise	College community (see appendices)
January 13, 2005	Spring in-service: Division Analysis	Instructors
Spring Semester 2005	QEP weekly meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research QEP • Write QEP 	QEP Committee
Spring Semester 2005	Reports from QEP Committee to college community on QEP progress	Board of Regents Faculty Senate
Summer 2005	Completion of QEP	
Fall 2005	Presentation of QEP to college community	Board of Regents Faculty Senate

NARRATIVE OF QEP HISTORY

The development of the QEP began in the Fall of 2004 as part of the SACS accreditation process. The President of Clarendon College appointed a committee composed of individuals from administration, faculty, and staff and

charged the members with investigating the learning environment at Clarendon College. Clarendon College, like all post-secondary institutions, provides quality education to students, but the purpose of QEP is to develop a college-wide plan to enhance and build upon student learning. The QEP gave the College an opportunity to examine its approaches to education and plan methodologies to improve that approach. The process of self-examination, research, planning, and implementation of the QEP will ensure that the students of Clarendon College continue to receive excellent opportunities to improve themselves and augment their educational experiences.

Fortuitously, in the Spring of 2004 the student body at Clarendon College participated in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The CCSSE provided the college with data for five benchmarks: student engagement, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. One hundred fifty-two colleges across thirty states participated in the 2004 survey. Of the 152 institutions, seventy-five colleges were classified as small, and sixty-one were in rural areas. Thus, the survey gave us a legitimate basis to compare our performance with that of similar schools.

Using the results of the CCSSE as a starting point, the QEP committee researched both the learning environment at Clarendon College and the best practices of college instruction. In order to fully utilize the data collected in the CCSSE, two QEP Committee members attended the Fall 2004 “Texas Small Colleges’ Consortium: The Next Steps” conference at Galveston College,

Galveston, Texas. The trip also provided the opportunity to visit with QEP team members from other community colleges in Texas and discuss tactics used in determining direction for the plan and for assembling information to use in the initial stages of the College's QEP. With the ideas obtained from the conference, the committee began to concentrate its efforts toward identifying where we had the greatest opportunity to enhance student engagement and thus student learning.

Originally, we considered the spectrum of areas of student engagement, as proposed by the CCSSE: active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. However, the nature of the QEP is that it must be a focused plan that the institution is capable of initiating, continuing, and assessing. Thus, the QEP Committee discussed selecting a single focus. Concentrating on a single purpose – enhancement of student engagement in the learning process through active and collaborative learning – would both enhance student learning and narrow the scope of the QEP to reasonable parameters.

Having selected and narrowed the focus of the QEP, the committee turned its attention to obtaining community input. It was decided that two days of the Spring 2005 in-service would be devoted to a "visioning exercise" in which representatives from all sectors of the college community could have input into the QEP. The QEP committee narrowed the focus of this brainstorming session to four specific target areas:

- 1) classroom techniques

- 2) extracurricular academic involvement
- 3) environmental support
- 4) community involvement.

The two-day Spring 2005 in-service was used as the vehicle to introduce the College community to the premise of the QEP and to seek ideas from all sectors of the college, including students, regarding the direction of the QEP. The QEP would need acceptance from the people who would be most involved in implementation of and participation in the plan. Accordingly, the committee chose a process that would be inclusive of all affected by the QEP—students, faculty, adjunct faculty, staff, maintenance, administration, and regents. Our intent was for those who are part of the institution to claim ownership of the plan and have a vested interest in its success. Because of the unique situations of many of the adjunct faculty, a special evening meeting was organized with them to introduce the purpose and design of the QEP. Their contributions and concerns were then incorporated into those of the regular faculty.

The first day's session of the "visioning exercise" began with a presentation of the purpose of the QEP as well as definitions of terms such as "active and collaborative learning," "learning environment," and "engaged learning." At that time, the committee solicited comments and questions from the participants about the approach we had adopted for compiling the QEP. We addressed concerns and answered questions about the proposed focus of the plan. This explanation of the QEP's purpose generated both interest and excitement among the participants. We then divided into break-out groups to

engage in the second part of the day's activities, brainstorming ways to facilitate active and collaborative learning.

These break-out groups were not comprised exclusively of individuals from a particular cohort of the College community. The dissimilar composition of the groups allowed for interaction and better comprehension of the interests and needs of the assorted areas of the college. The groups generated ideas related to active and collaborative learning. No idea was to be rejected because it appeared ineffective or extraneous. The only limitation placed on each group was time.

Once the groups compiled their thoughts, a member from each group presented and discussed the collective ideas of the group to the audience. When presentations ended, each idea contributed was voted upon by the entire assemblage of the College community for possible inclusion or exclusion from the QEP. Duplications and irrelevant ideas were thus eliminated.

The second day of the visioning workshop involved faculty. Following additional discussion about active and collaborative learning, the faculty divided into instructional divisions: Business and Technology, Liberal Arts, and Science and Health. Division members reexamined the list of proposals to determine relevance to their disciplines. As a committee, we understood that a panacea approach to active and collaborative learning did not and does not exist. Thus our intention was not to impose a single methodology to which all must comply, but to develop flexible parameters tolerant of individual styles of teaching. The session involving areas of common interest among the faculty was intended to

allow people teaching in those areas to examine what might or might not be feasible for their respective departments.

The results of departmental analyses of the remaining proposals from the visioning exercise provided a basis for the committee to proceed with the development of the QEP. Immediately apparent to us was the convergence toward even narrower goals than the committee had anticipated. Consequently, we reduced our goals within active and collaborative learning from four to two:

- 1) classroom techniques
- 2) environmental support.

The rationale for eliminating extracurricular academic involvement and community involvement was three-fold: 1) we could not determine a verifiable instrument for measuring the success or failure of the goals; 2) the faculty was not in accord about the feasibility of either goal into their particular disciplines making concrete measurement difficult and the faculty participation desired unlikely; 3) the QEP Committee was not sure how specifically these issues related to teaching and learning.

Having incorporated institutional research, a literature review of best practices, and community input, the QEP Committee began meeting weekly during the Spring 2005 semester to write the QEP. Upon completion in the Summer of 2005, the QEP was presented to the Board of Regents for their review. Although the committee tried to work within reasonable financial constraints, we recognized that funds would have to be allocated for the plan's successful operation. Since the Board had to budget costs for the QEP, we

believed their acceptance of the plan was essential. We also sought the Board's approval of the objectives of the plan. We wanted to be certain that our plan remained within the framework of the Board's concept of target goals for the college.

Finally, we presented the document to the faculty. Obviously, no plan, however ingeniously it might be conceived, will succeed without the support of those most directly involved in executing it. A few remaining faculty concerns were addressed, positive changes based upon their input were made, and then the QEP was adopted.

Through the process we have used, we believe we have created a realistic and workable plan to enhance learning at Clarendon College. By engaging the entire school from the inception of our planning, we now have a QEP that represents the ideas of all segments of the college and one in which all are willing to participate.

SELECTION OF THE QEP FOCUS

In the Fall of 2004, when the QEP Committee accepted the charge of identifying a focus for the plan, we reviewed available institutional research. The College had just received an Institutional Report from the administration of the CCSSE in the Spring. Thus, the QEP had student feedback on their perception of their experience at Clarendon College as well as baseline data on student performances that included: grade point averages, grade distributions, completion rates, number of withdrawals, persistence to degree completion, success in sequenced classes, and success in transfer to universities.

The QEP Committee began its work by reviewing the data collected in the CCSSE. The overall results from the administration of the 2004 CCSSE demonstrate that the faculty of Clarendon College is currently doing an outstanding job of conveying academic instruction. In all five areas of student engagement measured, Clarendon College performed near, and in some cases above, the benchmark set both by consortium colleges and the 2004 national average.

Although the CCSSE collects data on five areas pertaining to student engagement, the QEP had to be a focused plan that was attainable with the College's personnel and resources. Thus, the QEP Committee reviewed the CCSSE closely to find the one area where we had the greatest opportunity to make a measurable improvement in student engagement, thus enhancing student learning. Close inspection of the 2004 CCSSE results revealed that Clarendon College had a golden opportunity to enhance student engagement in the learning process through active and collaborative learning.

A review of the literature demonstrated the benefits of incorporating active and collaborative learning into traditional educational practices. Furthermore, the selection of this strategy to enhance student learning was feasible for the College, both in terms of personnel and funding. Student engagement in learning is integral to Clarendon College's Mission Statement, Purpose Statement, and the College's *Opening Doors, Changing Lives* Institutional Plan. Thus, the QEP's focus on active and collaborative techniques to enhance student engagement is a natural extension of where the College is already heading.

Additionally, this focus could easily be assessed. We already collect data on student performance that could be used as baseline data against which to assess the success of the implementation of active and collaborative learning strategies into our courses. Finally, this focus was well-received by all members of the College community.

EXPLANATION OF CCSSE RESULTS

The CCSSE survey is a tool that enables students to express in a quantifiable manner the nature of their academic experience. A positive academic experience is a product of many ingredients, one of which is the amount of time and energy that students invest in their academic work. Another fundamental aspect of positive academic experiences is focused learning outcomes. Student respondents indicate how much their coursework emphasized intellectual processes such as memorization, the application of theories and concepts to practical problems, analysis, synthesis and organization, making value judgments, and using learned information to perform new skills. The CCSSE asks students to respond to survey items in order to gauge how actively they are involved in their education. These survey items are organized into five benchmarks (2004 CCSSE Institutional Report).

CCSSE benchmarks are groups of conceptually related items that address key areas of student engagement, learning, and persistence. CCSSE's five benchmarks denote areas that educational research has shown to be important in quality educational practice. The five benchmarks of effective educational practice in community colleges are active and collaborative learning, student

effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. The national average score for the five benchmarks is 50. These benchmarks are tools that can be used to compare college performance across benchmarks, to the full CCSSE population of community colleges (2004 CCSSE Institutional Report).

The CCSSE report also groups data by consortia. A consortium is a group of five or more colleges in a district, system, or state – or another group with common interests or challenges. Consortium members share reports. Thus, the CCSSE report allowed Clarendon College to compare our student body responses not only to the responses of students from all 2004 community colleges, but also to the responses of similarly sized institutions that were likewise rural and shared other meaningful variables with us (2004 CCSSE Institutional Report).

The data that went into the measurement of this benchmark included student responses to questions that gauged involvement in their academic experience. Students were given the opportunity to mark *Very Often*, *Often*, *Sometimes*, or *Never* in response to the following survey items: In your experiences at this college during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

- 4a) Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
- 4b) Made a class presentation
- 4f) Worked with other students on projects during class

- 4g) Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- 4h) Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)
- 4i) Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course
- 4r) Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.) (2004 CCSSE Institutional Report).

The chart below, taken from Clarendon College’s 2004 CCSSE report, illustrates why the QEP Committee saw our greatest opportunity to enhance student engagement in the learning process through active and collaborative learning:

Active & Collaborative Learning Benchmark

	Clarendon College	Consortium	2004 Colleges
All Students	45.0	49.7	50.0
0 to 29 Credits	44.1	47.2	47.2
30+ Credits	47.0	54.8	55.4

Again, the benchmark for all students in the 2004 CCSSE is 50. The data collected from students of Clarendon College is further subdivided into responses from freshmen (less than 30 total credit hours completed) and sophomore students (more than 30 total credit hours completed) (2004 CCSSE Institutional Report).

This benchmark – active and collaborative learning – stood out from the others as offering the College its greatest opportunity to improve upon our

excellent reputation and record as an educational facility. The QEP Committee became convinced of the need to close the gaps between our student body responses and those of our small, rural school consortium (2004 CCSSE Institutional Report).

BENEFITS OF QEP IMPLEMENTATION

Many college instructors adhere to a lecture-led model of teaching: knowledge is a product to be distributed to our students from the warehouse of instructor knowledge. Students have been expected to accept what we make available to them. This paradigm disseminates information and measures success or failure by the student's ability to communicate that information back to the teacher successfully. The flaw in this approach has been the lack of engaged learning on college campuses.

Much of the typical lecture-led or teacher-led learning is a passive process for the student. Active and collaborative learning facilitates participation by the student in the learning process. "Active Learning" is, in short, anything that students do in a classroom other than passively listening to an instructor's lecture. The term "cooperative learning" is a subset of active learning activities which students do as groups of three or more. Cooperative learning strategies employ more formally structured groups of students which are assigned complex tasks including activities such as group exercises, research projects, or presentations. Cooperative learning also should be distinguished from another term, "collaborative learning", which refers to those classroom strategies which have the instructor and the students participating equally in the learning process.

Through these methods the student then will become much more engaged in learning and will, of necessity, take a more active and responsible role in the learning process.

More recent theories of education stress the need for engaged learning. Thus, Clarendon College's QEP is a shift toward a setting where the student is engaged in the learning process rather than just passively listening. To be sure, the instructor remains in control of the classroom; but in such a setting, the teacher and students are collaborative in building comprehension (Wirth-Cauchon 1995).

Research into the subject of active and collaborative learning has provided us with insight into the value of the methodology. Simplistically stated, active learners are engaged learners who are participating in their learning rather than passively absorbing information. This represents a shift from the typical teacher-centered classroom to a role for teachers to act more as facilitators than experts disseminating knowledge.

The instructors at Clarendon College already adhere to standards of excellence in student education. This QEP is a vehicle that will allow us to build upon that tradition of success and reach toward even higher standards. The practices of active and collaborative learning will be incorporated into the traditional methodology. These proven instructional techniques will not negate instructors' modes of teaching, nor will the changes imply dissatisfaction with the existent styles of instruction. Rather, the incorporation of these new paradigms into existing pedagogy will serve to enhance the student's educational

experience at Clarendon College. Our QEP is a cooperative effort that will enrich instructional skills and student experiences.

The focal point of our efforts has been the students: we must instruct the students in an effective and inviting atmosphere. Our purpose, the purpose of the QEP, is for the faculty and all supporting components of the college to guide the students' understanding that knowledge is more than the accumulation of facts and statistics that may or may not have pragmatic application to their lives. Actively engaging the students in their learning by making available to them collaborative experiences within the classroom can realistically change their attitudes toward the educational process. Our aim is to make our students eager to enter the classroom door.

Accordingly, we envision our QEP's promoting a learning atmosphere predicated on the following broad concepts:

- developing critical thinking skills
- developing communication skills—oral and written
- developing teaching strategies that are multi-tiered to meet individual learning styles
- developing students' abilities to correlate old and new knowledge
- developing students' abilities to apply acquired knowledge to everyday situations

GOAL ONE

GOAL 1: Utilize recognized techniques of classroom instruction to engage students in active and collaborative learning.

RELATED TO STRATEGIC GOALS: 1, 2, 4

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

- a) The number of students who report contributing or asking questions during class discussions will increase.
- b) The number of students who report making a class presentation will increase.
- c) The number of students who report working with classmates on a project during class will increase.
- d) The number of students who report working with classmates outside of class on a project or assignments will increase.
- e) The number of students who report tutoring or assisting other students will increase.
- f) The number of students who report participating in a community-based project as part of a regular course will increase.
- g) The number of students who report discussing ideas from readings or classes with others (non-classmates) will increase.
- h) At least 36% of all full-time first-time-in-college students will receive a degree or certificate or transfer within four years.
- i) At least 15% of all part-time first-time-in-college students will receive a degree or certificate or transfer within five years.
- j) The number of completers (degree/certificate) will increase one percent per year over the previous three year average.
- k) At least 88.75% of postsecondary students completing more than 23 semester credit hours during each academic year will achieve a "C" average (2.00 GPA) or better.

ACTION PLAN / STRATEGIES:

ACADEMIC YEAR 2005 – 2006 – YEAR ZERO (Y0) Spring 2006

January 2006 – Y0

a) Clarendon College Spring 2006 In-Service kick-off training for QEP implementation and formation of Collaborative and Active Learning Pilot group.

b) Formation of Collaborative and Active Learning Pilot group (8 members.)

c) Pilot group 1 (P1) provided literature for use in training, modeling and demonstration of instructional strategies.

d) P1 receives six (6) hours of training in Class Building instructional strategies.

e) P1 models and demonstrates Class Building instructional strategies.

f) Curriculum Committee begins process of identifying sequenced courses to be used in QEP evaluation.

g) Institutional Effectiveness committee gathers baseline data required for QEP evaluation.

h) Curriculum Committee begins review of faculty evaluation system for inclusion of active and collaborative learning measures

February 2006 –Y0

i) Pilot group 1 (P1) receives six (6) hours of training in Teambuilding instructional strategies.

j) P1 models and demonstrates Teambuilding instructional strategies.

k) Curriculum Committee completes sequenced course identification for QEP Evaluation.

l) Institutional Effectiveness Committee completes analysis of baseline data for QEP evaluation.

m) Curriculum Committee completes review of faculty evaluation system.

n) P1 identifies course from sequenced course identification for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.

o) P1 receives six (6) hours of training in Subject Mastery instructional strategies

p) P1 models and demonstrates Subject Mastery instructional strategies.

q) P1 identifies course objectives for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.

r) P1 begins course outline and syllabus for Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategy implementation for Fall 2006.

March 2006 –Y0

s) Pilot group 1 (P1) receives six (6) hours of training in Information Sharing instructional strategies.

t) P1 models and demonstrates Information Sharing instructional strategies.

u) P1 receives six (6) hours of training in Critical Thinking Skills instructional Strategies.

v) P1 models and demonstrates Critical Thinking Skills instructional strategies.

April 2006 – Y0

w) Pilot group 1 (P1) receives six (6) hours of training in Decision Making instructional strategies.

x) P1 models and demonstrates Decision Making instructional strategies.

y) P1 second reading and evaluation of trial course outline and syllabus for collaborative and active learning instructional strategy implementation.

z) P1 reports first semester activities to Faculty Senate.

aa) P1 submits course outlines and syllabi to Curriculum Committee.

bb) P1 prepares evaluation report of first semester activities for QEP Leadership Team.

May 2006 – Y0

cc) Pilot group 1 (P1) submits evaluation report on first semester activities to QEP Leadership Team.

June 2006 – Y0

dd) QEP Leadership Team Reports to College Administration on first semester of QEP activities.

ee) Pilot group 1 (P1) prepares course detail for Fall 2006 implementation.

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2006 – 2007 – YEAR ONE (Y1)
Fall 2006**

August 2006 – Y1

- a) Pilot group 1 (P1) begins biweekly discussion group support meetings second week of August.
- b) QEP Leadership Team provides update during Fall 2006 Faculty In-Service.
- c) P1 demonstrates sample lessons during Fall 2006 Faculty In-Service.
- d) P1 implements instructional strategies in identified courses.

September 2006 Y1

- e) Pilot group 1 (P1) monthly report on implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.
- f) P1 continues bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.
- g) Professional Development committee and P1 meet to discuss modifications needed in the faculty evaluation.
- h) P1 begins peer evaluation process.
- i) P1 identifies additional courses to implement instructional strategies for Spring 2007.

October 2006 – Y1

- j) Pilot group 1 (P1) monthly report on implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.
- k) QEP Leadership Team report on Implementation progress to College

Administration.

l) P1 prepares course outline and syllabi for additional course.

m) P1 continues bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

n) Student evaluation of Instruction begins late October.

November 2006 – Y1

o) Pilot group 1 (P1) continues bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

p) Organizational meeting for faculty members interested in Instructional strategy training during Spring 2007 (Pilot group 2 – P2).

q) P1 prepares report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.

December 2006 –Y1

r) Pilot group 1 (P1) continues bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

s) P1 completes report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.

t) P1 reports on successes / problems / suggested modifications to QEP Leadership Team.

u) QEP Leadership Team reports on QEP Implementation to College Administration.

January 2007 –Y1

a) Two day Spring In-Service training on Collaborative and active training for all faculty members.

- b) Pilot group 1 (P1) continues implementation.
- c) Tier Group 1 (T1) is formed from self-identified faculty members (8 members.)
- d) T1 provided literature for use in training, modeling and demonstration of instructional strategies.
- e) T1 receives six (6) hours of training in Class Building instructional strategies
- f) T1 models and demonstrates Class Building instructional strategies.

February 2007 – Y1

- g) Tier group 1 (T1) receives six (6) hours of training in Teambuilding instructional strategies.
- h) T1 models and demonstrates Teambuilding instructional strategies.
- i) T1 identifies course from sequenced course identification for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.
- j) T2 receives six (6) hours of training in Subject Mastery instructional strategies
- k) T2 models and demonstrates Subject Mastery instructional strategies.
- l) T2 identifies course objectives for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.
- m) Pilot group 1 begins course outline and syllabus for Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategy additional course implementation for Fall 2008.
- n) T1 begins course outline and syllabus for

Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategy implementation for Fall 2008.

o) Institutional Effectiveness Committee begins analysis of Evaluation data from P1 Fall 2007 implementation.

March 2007 – Y1

p) Tier group 1 (T1) receives six (6) hours of training in Information Sharing instructional strategies.

q) T1 models and demonstrates Information Sharing instructional strategies.

r) T1 receives six (6) hours of training in Critical Thinking Skills instructional strategies.

s) T1 models and demonstrates Critical Thinking Skills instructional strategies.

t) Student evaluations of Instruction begin late March.

u) Institutional Effectiveness Committee completes analysis of evaluation data from P1 Fall 2006 implementation.

April 2007 – Y1

v) Tier Group 1 (T1) receives six (6) hours of training in Decision Making instructional strategies.

w) T1 models and demonstrates Decision Making instructional strategies.

x) T1 second reading and evaluation of trial course outline and syllabus for collaborative and active learning instructional strategy implementation.

y) P1 and T1 report activities to Faculty Senate.

z) T1 submits course outlines and syllabi to Program Coordinators.

aa) P1 submits additional course outlines and syllabi to Program Coordinators.

bb) P1 and T1 prepare evaluation report on semester activities for QEP Leadership Team.

May 2007 – Y1

cc) P1 and T1 submit evaluation report on semester activities to QEP Leadership Team.

dd) Institutional Effectiveness Committee presents evaluation report to QEP Leadership Team.

June 2007 – Y1

ee) QEP Leadership Team Reports to College Administration on QEP activities.

ff) Tier Group 1 (T1) prepares course detail for Fall 2007 implementation.

ACADEMIC YEAR 2007 – 2008 – YEAR TWO (Y2) Fall 2007

August 2007 –Y2

a) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1) begins bi-weekly discussion group support meetings second week of August.

b) QEP Leadership Team provides update during Fall 2007 Faculty In-Service.

c) T1 demonstrates sample lessons during Fall 2007 Faculty In-Service.

d) T1 implements instructional strategies in identified courses.

e) P1 continues implementation of Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategies in expanded course offerings.

September 2007 – Y2

f) Tier Group 1 (T1) monthly report on implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.

g) P1 and T1 continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

h) P1 and T1 begin peer evaluation process.

i) T1 identifies additional courses to implement instructional strategies for Spring 2008.

October 2007 – Y2

j) Tier Group 1 (T1) monthly report on implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.

k) QEP Leadership Team report on Implementation progress to College Administration.

l) T1 prepares course outline and syllabi for additional course.

m) P1 and T1 continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

n) Student evaluation of Instruction begins late October.

November 2007 –Y2

o) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1) continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

p) Organizational meeting for faculty members interested in Instructional strategy training during Spring 2008 (Tier Group 2).

q) P1 and T1 prepare report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.

December 2007 – Y2

r) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1) continues bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

s) P1 and T1 complete report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.

t) P1 and T1 report on successes / problems / suggested modifications to QEP Leadership Team.

u) QEP Leadership Team reports on QEP Implementation to College Administration.

January 2008 – Y2

a) QEP update provided to faculty by P1 and T1 during Spring In-Service training.

b) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1) continues implementation.

c) Tier Group 2 (T2) is formed from self-identified faculty members (8 members.)

d) T2 provided literature for use in training, modeling and demonstration of instructional strategies.

e) T2 receives six (6) hours of training in Class Building instructional strategies.

f) T2 models and demonstrates Class Building instructional strategies.

February 2008 – Y2

- g) Tier Group 2 (T2) receives six (6) hours of training in Teambuilding instructional strategies.
- h) T2 models and demonstrates Teambuilding instructional strategies.
- i) T2 identifies course from sequenced course identification for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.
- j) T2 receives six (6) hours of training in Subject Mastery instructional strategies.
- k) T2 models and demonstrates Subject Mastery instructional strategies.
- l) T2 identifies course objectives for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.
- m) Tier Group 1 (T1) begins course outline and syllabus for Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategy additional course implementation for Fall 2008.
- n) T1 begins course outline and syllabus for Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategy implementation for Fall 2008.
- o) Institutional Effectiveness Committee begins analysis of Evaluation data from P1 and T1 Fall 2007 implementation.

March 2008 – Y2

- p) Tier Group 2 (T2) receives six (6) hours of training in Information Sharing instructional strategies.
- q) T2 models and demonstrates Information Sharing instructional strategies.

- r) T2 receives six (6) hours of training in Critical Thinking Skills instructional strategies.
- s) T2 models and demonstrates Critical Thinking Skills instructional strategies.
- t) Student evaluations of Instruction begin late March.
- u) Community College Survey of Student Engagement 2008 begins late March.
- v) Institutional Effectiveness Committee completes analysis of evaluation data from P1 and T1 Fall 2007 implementation.

April 2008 – Y2

- w) Tier Group 2 (T2) receives six (6) hours of training in Decision Making instructional strategies.
- x) T2 models and demonstrates Decision Making instructional strategies.
- y) T2 second reading and evaluation of trial course outline and syllabus for collaborative and active learning instructional strategy implementation.
- z) P1, T1, and T2 report activities to Faculty Senate.
- aa) T2 submits course outlines and syllabi to Program Coordinators.
- bb) P1 and T1 submit additional course outlines and syllabi to Program Coordinators.
- cc) P1, T1, and T2 prepare evaluation report on semester activities for QEP Leadership Team.

May 2008 –Y2

- dd) P1, T1, and T2 submit evaluation report on

semester activities to QEP Leadership Team.

ee) Institutional Effectiveness Committee presents evaluation report to QEP Leadership Team.

June 2008 –Y2

ff) QEP Leadership Team Reports to College Administration on QEP activities.

gg) Tier Group 2 (T2) prepares course detail for Fall 2008 implementation.

ACADEMIC YEAR 2008 – 2009 – YEAR THREE (Y3)

Fall 2008

August 2008 –Y3

a) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1) and Tier Group 2 (T2) begin bi-weekly discussion group support meetings second week of August.

b) QEP Leadership Team provides update during Fall 2008 Faculty In-Service.

c) T2 demonstrates sample lessons during Fall 2008 Faculty In-Service.

d) T2 implements instructional strategies in identified courses.

e) T1 continues implementation of Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategies in expanded course offerings.

f) P1 begins full implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional strategies.

September 2008 – Y3

g) Tier Group 2 (T2) monthly report on

implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.

h) P1, T1 and T2 continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

i) P1, T1, and T2 begin peer evaluation process.

j) T2 identifies additional courses to implement instructional strategies for Spring 2009.

October 2008 – Y3

k) Tier Group 2 (T2) monthly report on implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.

l) QEP Leadership Team report on Implementation progress to College Administration.

m) T2 prepares course outline and syllabi for additional course.

n) P1, T1 and T2 continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

o) Student evaluation of Instruction begins late October.

November 2008 –Y3

p) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1) and Tier Group 2 (T2) continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

q) Organizational meeting for remaining faculty members. interested in Instructional strategy training during Spring 2009. (Pilot group 4)

r) P1, T1 and T2 prepare report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.

December 2008 – Y3

- s) Pilot group 1 (P1), Tier Group 1 (T1) and Tier Group 2 (T2) continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.
- t) P1, T1, and T2 complete report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.
- u) P1, T1, and T2 report on successes / problems / suggested modifications to QEP Leadership Team.
- v) QEP Leadership Team reports on QEP Implementation to College Administration.

January 2009 – Y3

- a) QEP update provided to faculty by P1, T1 and T2 during Spring In-Service training.
- b) Pilot group 1 (P1), Tier Group 1 (T1) and Tier Group 2 (T2) continues implementation.
- c) Tier Group 3 (T3) is formed from self-identified faculty members (8 – 12 members.)
- d) T3 provided literature for use in training, modeling and demonstration of instructional strategies.
- e) T3 receives six (6) hours of training in Class Building instructional strategies.
- f) T3 models and demonstrates Class Building instructional strategies.

February 2009 – Y3

- g) Tier Group 3 (T3) receives six (6) hours of training in Teambuilding instructional strategies.

h) T3 models and demonstrates Teambuilding instructional strategies.

i) T3 identifies course from sequenced course identification for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.

j) T3 receives six (6) hours of training in Subject Mastery instructional strategies.

k) T3 models and demonstrates Subject Mastery instructional strategies.

l) T3 identifies course objectives for implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning instructional strategies.

m) Tier group 2 (T2) begins course outline and syllabus for Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategy additional course implementation for Fall 2009.

n) T3 begins course outline and syllabus for Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategy implementation for Fall 2008.

o) Institutional Effectiveness Committee begins analysis of Evaluation data from P1, T1 and T2 Fall 2008 implementation.

March 2009 – Y3

p) Tier Group 3 (T3) receives six (6) hours of training in Information Sharing instructional strategies.

q) T3 models and demonstrates Information Sharing instructional strategies.

r) T3 receives six (6) hours of training in Critical Thinking Skills instructional strategies.

s) T3 models and demonstrates Critical

Thinking Skills instructional strategies.

t) Student evaluations of Instruction begin late March.

u) Institutional Effectiveness Committee completes analysis of evaluation data from P1, T1 and T2 Fall 2008 implementation.

April 2009 – Y3

v) Tier Group 3 (T3) receives six (6) hours of training in Decision Making instructional strategies.

w) T3 models and demonstrates Decision Making instructional strategies.

x) T3 second reading and evaluation of trial course outline and syllabus for collaborative and active learning instructional strategy implementation.

y) P1, T1, T2, and T3 report activities to Faculty Senate.

z) T3 submits course outlines and syllabi to Program Coordinators.

aa) P1, T1, and T2 submit additional course outlines and syllabi to Program Coordinators.

bb) P1, T1, T2, and T3 prepare evaluation report on semester activities for QEP Leadership Team.

May 2009 –Y3

cc) P1, T1, T2, and T3 submit evaluation report on semester activities to QEP Leadership Team.

dd) Institutional Effectiveness Committee presents evaluation report to QEP Leadership Team.

June 2009 –Y3

ee) QEP Leadership Team Reports to College Administration on QEP activities.

ff) Tier Group 3 (T3) prepares course detail for Fall 2008 implementation.

ACADEMIC YEAR 2009 – 2010 – YEAR FOUR (Y4) Fall 2009

August 2009 –Y4

a) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1), Tier Group 2 (T2) and Tier Group 3 (T3) begin bi-weekly discussion group support meetings second week of August.

b) QEP Leadership Team provides update during Fall 2009 Faculty In-Service.

c) T3 demonstrates sample lessons during Fall 2009 Faculty In-Service.

d) T3 implements instructional strategies in identified courses.

e) T2 continues implementation of Collaborative and Active learning instructional strategies in expanded course offerings.

f) T1 begins full implementation of Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional strategies.

September 2009 – Y4

g) Tier Group 3 (T3) monthly report on implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.

h) P1, T1, T2, and T3 continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

i) P1, T1, T2, and T3 begin peer evaluation

process.

j) T3 identifies additional courses to implement instructional strategies for Spring 2010.

October 2009 – Y4

k) Tier Group 3 (T3) monthly report on implementation of instructional strategies to QEP Leadership Team.

l) QEP Leadership Team report on Implementation progress to College Administration.

m) T3 prepares course outline and syllabi for additional course.

n) P1, T1, T2, and T3 continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

o) Student evaluation of Instruction begins late October.

November 2009 –Y4

p) Pilot group 1 (P1) and Tier Group 1 (T1), Tier Group 2 (T2) and Tier Group 3 (T3) continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

q) P1, T1, T2 and T3 prepare report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.

December 2009 – Y4

r) Pilot group 1 (P1), Tier Group 1 (T1), Tier group 2 (T2) and Tier group 3 (T3) continue bi-weekly discussion group and support meetings.

s) P1, T1, T2, and T3 complete report on successes / problems / suggested modifications for QEP Leadership Team.

t) P1, T1, T2, and T3 report on successes / problems / suggested modifications to QEP Leadership Team.

u) QEP Leadership Team reports on QEP Implementation to College Administration.

January 2010 – Y4

v) QEP update provided to faculty by P1, T2, T2, and T3 during Spring In-Service training.

w) Pilot group 1 (P1), Tier group 1 (T1), Tier group 2 (T2) and Tier group 3 (T3) continue implementation.

February 2010 – Y4

x) Institutional Effectiveness Committee begins analysis of Evaluation data from P1, T1, T2 and T3 Fall 2009 implementation.

March 2010 – Y4

y) Student evaluations of Instruction begin late March.

z) Institutional Effectiveness Committee completes analysis of evaluation data from P1, T1, T2 and T3 Fall 2009 implementation.

April 2010 – Y4

aa) P1, T1, T2, and T3 report activities to Faculty Senate.

bb) P1, T1, T2, and T3 submit additional course outlines and syllabi to Curriculum Committee.

cc) P1, T1, T2, and T3 prepare evaluation report on semester activities for QEP Leadership Team.

May 2010 –Y4

dd) P1, T1, T2, and T3 submit evaluation report on semester activities to QEP Leadership Team.

ee) Institutional Effectiveness Committee presents evaluation report to QEP Leadership Team.

June 2010 –Y4

ff) QEP Leadership Team Reports to College Administration on QEP activities.

gg) QEP Leadership Team prepares and submits report on QEP Activities to College Administration and SACS.

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

- a) The number of students who report contributing or asking questions during class discussions will be at or higher than the 2006, and 2008 CCSSE consortium benchmarks.
- b) The number of students who report making a class presentation will be at or higher than the 2006, and 2008 CCSSE consortium benchmarks.
- c) The number of students who report working with classmates on a project during class will be at or higher than the 2006, and 2008 CCSSE consortium benchmarks.
- d) The number of students who report working with classmates outside of class on a project or assignments will be at or higher than the 2006, and 2008 CCSSE consortium benchmarks.
- e) The number of students who report tutoring or assisting other students will be at or higher than the 2006, and 2008 CCSSE consortium benchmarks.
- f) The number of students who report participating in a community-based project as part of a regular course will be

at or higher than the 2006, and 2008 CCSSE consortium benchmarks.

g) The number of students who report discussing ideas from readings or classes with others (non-classmates) will be at or higher than the 2006, and 2008 CCSSE consortium benchmarks.

h) At least 36% of all full-time first-time-in-college students will receive a degree or certificate or transfer within four years.

i) At least 15% of all part-time first-time-in-college students will receive a degree or certificate or transfer within five years.

j) The number of completers (degree/certificate) will increase one percent per year over the previous three year average.

k) At least 88.75% of postsecondary students completing more than 23 semester credit hours during each academic year will achieve a "C" average (2.00 GPA) or better.

MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY:

a.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

b.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

c.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

d.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

e.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

f.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

g.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

h.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

i.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

j.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

k.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Program Coordinators, Instructors.

ESTIMATED BUDGET:

QEP Year	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Academic Year	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
Budget	\$2,000*	\$2,000*	\$2,000*	\$2,000*	\$3,700*

*- \$5,000 of professional development budget will be committed annually to support QEP training expenses such as travel and Instructional Television

GOAL TWO

GOAL 2: Evaluate, update, and/or expand classroom teaching equipment and teaching resources to meet the instructional needs to incorporate Collaborative and Active Learning strategies.

RELATED TO STRATEGIC GOALS: 2, 3

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

- a) Teaching equipment and teaching resources will be adequate and of a sufficient quality to support Team Building instructional strategies.
- b) Teaching equipment and teaching resources will be adequate and of a sufficient quality to support Class Building instructional strategies.
- c) Teaching equipment and teaching resources will be adequate and of a sufficient quality to support Mastery instructional strategies.
- d) Teaching equipment and teaching resources will be adequate and of a sufficient quality to support Critical Thinking Skills instructional strategies.
- e) Teaching equipment and teaching resources will be adequate and of a sufficient quality to support Information Sharing instructional strategies.
- f) Teaching equipment and teaching resources will be adequate and of a sufficient quality to support Communication Skills instructional strategies.

ACTION PLAN / STRATEGIES:

**Academic Year 2005 – 2006 – Year Zero (Y0)
February 2006 – Y0**

- a) Curriculum Committee and Pilot group 1 (P1) evaluates Teaching equipment and Teaching resources necessary to support Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional Strategies.

March 2006 – Y0

b) Curriculum Committee and P1 prepare teaching equipment and teaching resources report.

c) Curriculum Committee and P1 complete teaching equipment and teaching resources report.

April 2006 – Y0

d) Curriculum Committee and P1 present teaching equipment and teaching resources report to QEP Leadership team.

e) QEP Leadership team submits budget recommendation to Dean of Instruction for teaching equipment and teaching resources.

May 2006 – Y0

f) QEP Leadership team presents teaching equipment and teaching resources report to College Administration.

Academic Year 2006 – 2007 – Year One (Y1)

August 2006 – Y1

a) Teaching equipment and teaching resources plan Year 1 (Y1) implemented.

November 2006 – Y1

b) Curriculum Committee and Pilot group 1 (P1) evaluate future Teaching equipment and Teaching resources necessary to continue support for Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional Strategies.

March 2007 – Y1

c) Curriculum Committee and P1 prepare teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report.

d) Curriculum Committee and P1 complete teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report.

April 2007 – Y1

e) Curriculum Committee and P1 present teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report to QEP Leadership team.

f) QEP Leadership team submits budget recommendation to Dean of Instruction for teaching equipment and teaching resources.

May 2007 – Y1

g) QEP Leadership team presents teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report to College Administration.

Academic Year 2007 – 2008 – Year Two (Y2)

August 2007 – Y2

a) Teaching equipment and teaching resources plan Year 2 (Y2) implemented.

November 2007 – Y2

b) Curriculum Committee and Pilot group 1 (P1) evaluate future Teaching equipment and Teaching resources necessary to continue support for Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional Strategies.

Spring 2008

March 2008 – Y2

c) Curriculum Committee and P1 prepare teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 2.

d) Curriculum Committee and P1 complete teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 2.

April 2008 – Y2

e) Curriculum Committee and P1 present teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 2 to QEP Leadership team.

f) QEP Leadership team submits budget recommendation to Dean of Instruction for teaching equipment and teaching resources.

May 2008 – Y2

g) QEP Leadership team presents teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report to College Administration.

Academic Year 2008 – 2009 – Year Three (Y3)

August 2008 – Y3

a) Teaching equipment and teaching resources plan Year 3 (Y3) implemented.

November 2008 – Y3

b) Curriculum Committee and Pilot group 1 (P1) evaluate future Teaching equipment and Teaching resources necessary to continue support for Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional Strategies.

Spring 2009

March 2009 – Y3

c) Curriculum Committee and P1 prepare teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 3.

d) Curriculum Committee and P1 complete teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 3.

April 2009 – Y3

e) Curriculum Committee and P1 present teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 3 to QEP Leadership team.

f) QEP Leadership team submits budget recommendation to Dean of Instruction for teaching equipment and teaching resources.

May 2009 – Y3

g) QEP Leadership team presents teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report to College Administration.

**Academic Year 2009 – 2010 – Year Four (Y4)
August 2009 – Y4**

a) Teaching equipment and teaching resources plan Year 4 (Y4) implemented.

November 2009 – Y4

b) Curriculum Committee and Pilot group 1 (P1) evaluate future Teaching equipment and Teaching resources necessary to continue support for Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional Strategies.

**Spring 2010
March 2010 – Y4**

c) Curriculum Committee and P1 prepare teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 4.

d) Curriculum Committee and P1 complete teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 4.

April 2010 – Y4

e) Curriculum Committee and P1 present teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report 4 to QEP Leadership team.

f) QEP Leadership team submits budget recommendation to Dean of Instruction for teaching equipment and teaching resources.

May 2010 – Y4

g) QEP Leadership team presents teaching equipment and teaching resources follow-up report to College Administration.

**Academic Year 2010 – 2011 – Year Five (Y5)
August 2010 – Y5**

- a) Teaching equipment and teaching resources plan Year 5 (Y5) implemented.

November 2010 – Y5

- b) Curriculum Committee and Pilot group 1 (P1) evaluate future Teaching equipment and Teaching resources necessary to continue support for Collaborative and Active Learning Instructional Strategies.

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

- a) The rating for learning environment from the Student evaluation of instruction will be 3.5 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high.
- b) The rating for learning environment from the Classroom Observation and Peer Evaluation will be 3.5 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high.
- c) The rating for learning environment from the Faculty Self Evaluation will be 3.5 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high.

Major Responsibility

- a.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Instructors
- b.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Instructors
- c.) Dean of Instruction, Division Directors, Instructors

ESTIMATED BUDGET:

QEP Year	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Academic Year	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Budge	\$7,500	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$10,000

CONCLUSION

This Quality Enhancement Plan represents the collective effort of faculty, administrators, staff, and students at Clarendon College. From a collective effort of participation in the CCSSE Survey and a visioning workshop, a theme emerged that supported the “Enhancement of Student Engagement in the Learning Process through active and collaborative learning”. The QEP Committee took this information and came up with a set of goals, a map, indicating the destination the College seeks to reach and the methods and means by which it will do so.

The QEP is both a commitment and a quest. The work has just begun, and much work lies ahead in our journey to bring the College’s vision to a reality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

2004 CCSSE: Institutional Report (2004).

Chickering, Arthur W., and Gamson, Zelda F. (1987). "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education." AAHE Bulletin, 39 (7), 3-7.

"Engagement by Design: 2004 Findings" (2004). The Community College Survey of Student Engagement.

<http://www.ccsse.org/publications/CCSSE_reportfinal2004.pdf>

"Engaging Community Colleges: National Benchmarks of Quality: 2003 Findings" (2003). The Community College Survey of Student Engagement.

<<http://www.ccsse.org/publications/report2003.pdf>>

Goodsell, A., Maher, M., & Tinto, V. Eds. (1992). Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education. University Park: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment, The Pennsylvania State University.

Jones, Beau Fly, et al. (1994). "Meaningful, Engaged Learning." Designing Learning and Technology for Educational Reform. Naperville, IL: NCREL

<<http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/content/cntareas/math/ma2lindi.htm>>.

Marti, C. Nathan (2004). "Overview of the CCSSE Instrument and Psychometric Properties." The Community College Survey of Student Engagement.

APPENDICES

SACS REAFFIRMATION LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Dr. Myles Shelton – President
Tex Buckhaults – Dean of Instruction
Pam Denney – Business Instructor
Scarlet Estlack – Biology Instructor

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tex Buckhaults – Dean of Instruction
Jeff Rhodes – Dean of Students
Darlene Spier – Assistant to the President
Greg Henry – Director of Institutional Advancement
Scarlet Estlack – Biology Instructor
Larry Wiginton – Chemistry Instructor
Linda Thompson – English Instructor
Laban Tubbs – RFO Instructor
Martha Smith – Receptionist

LITERATURE REVIEW OF BEST PRACTICES

Astin, A.W. (1984). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, pp. 297–307.

Bailis, L.N. (2001). The national society for experiential education in service-learning. Developing and Implementing Service-Learning Programs. New Directions for Higher Education, vol. 114, (pp.61-78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barkley, E.F., Cross, K.P., & Major, C.H. (2005). Collaborative Learning Techniques. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Bean, J.C. (1996). Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Braxton, J.M., Milem, J.F., & Sullivan, A.S. (2000). The influence of active learning on the college student departure process: student integration and persistence. The Journal of Higher Education, 71 (5), 569-590.

Bingle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, 71 (3), 273-290.

Brisbin, R.A., & Hunter, S. (2003). Community leaders' perceptions of university and college efforts to encourage civic engagement. The Review of Higher Education, 26(4), 467-486.

Brookfield, S.D., & Preskill, S. (1999). Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques for democratic collaborative learning classrooms. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruffee, K.A. (1995). Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Chia-Jung, T. (1993). Teaching preparation of oral presentations. Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 23(1). 73-79.

Chickering, A.W., and Gamson, Z.F. (1987). "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education." *AAHE Bulletin*, 39(7), 3–7.

DeLong, M. & Winter, D. (1998). Addressing difficulties with student-centered instruction. Primus, 8(4). 340-364.

Dufresne, R. J., Gerace, W. J., Leonard, W. J., Mestre, J. P., & Wenk, L. (1996). Classtalk: A classroom communication system for active learning. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 7(2). 3-47.

Ei, S. & Bowen, A. (2002). College students perceptions of student-instructor relationships. Ethics & Behavior, 12(2). 177-191.

Elwell, Marlene D., Bean, Martha S. 2001. The efficacy of service-learning for community college ESL students. Community-College-Review 28(4). 47-61.

Fink, L.D. (2003). Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Finkel, D. (1999). Enhancing student involvement and comprehension through group and class discussions. Journal of Excellence in College Teaching, 10(3). 33-49.

Fritschner, L. M. (2000). Inside the undergraduate college classroom: faculty and students differ on the meaning of student participation. Journal of Higher Education, 71 (3), 342, 21p, 5 charts

Goodsell, A., Maher, M., & Tinto, V. Eds. (1992). Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education. University Park: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment, The Pennsylvania State University.

Guarasci, R. (2001). Recentring learning: An interdisciplinary approach to academic and students affairs. Understanding the Role of Academic and Student Collaboration in Creating a Successful Learning Environment. New Directions for Higher Education, vol. 116, (pp. 101-109). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hartman, I. S. (1996). Interactive and cooperative methods: An extension to oral reports. Journal of College Science Teaching, 26. 107-109.

Hodge, G., Lewis, T., Kramer, K., & Hughes, R. (2001). Collaboration for excellence: Engaged scholarship at Collin County Community College. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25. 675-690.

Howard, J.R., & Baird, R. (2000). The consolidation of responsibility and students' definitions of situation in the mixed-age college classroom. The Journal of Higher Education, 71 (6), 700-721.

Hughes, C., Carter, E. W., Hughes, T. 2002. Effects of instructional versus non-instructional roles on the social interactions. Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 37 (2). 146-162.

- Karabenick, S. A. & Sharma, R. (1994). Perceived teacher support of student questioning in the college classroom: its relation to student characteristics and role in the classroom questioning process. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86(1). 90-103.
- Karides, M. & Misra, J. (1999). The mass class and teaching assistants: A case for discussion exercises. American Sociologist, 30(4). 72-90.
- King, K. M. (1994). Leading classroom discussions: Using computers for a new approach. Teaching Sociology, 22. 174-182.
- Kuh, G.D. (2001). Assessing What Really Matters to Student Learning: Inside the National Survey of Student Engagement. Change, 66, pp. 10–16.
- Kuh, G.D., & Hu, S. (2001). The effects of the student-faculty interaction in the 1990s. The Review of Higher Education, 24 (3), 309-332.
- Kuh, G.D., & Vesper, N. (1997). A comparison of student experiences with good practices in undergraduate education between 1990 and 1994. The Review of Higher Education, 21 (1), 43-61.
- Lake, D. A. (2001). Student performance and perceptions of a lecture-based course compared with the same course utilizing group discussion. Physical Therapy, 81(3). 896-903.
- Lazar, A. M. (1995). Who is studying in groups and why?: Peer collaboration outside the classroom. College Teaching, 43(2). 61-65.
- Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience. (2004). Washington, DC: NASPA and ACPA.
- Lundquist, C., Spalding, R.J., & Landrum, R.E. (2003). College student's thoughts about leaving the university: the impact of faculty attitudes and behaviors. College Student Retention Research, Theory & Practice, 4(2), 123-133.
- MacAlpine, J. M. K. (1999). Improving and encouraging peer assessment of student presentations. Assessment & Education in Higher Education, 24(1). 15-25.
- Moseley, M. [review] (1996). Bonwell, C. C. & Sutherland, T. E. (Editors) Using active learning in college classes: A range of options for faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning #67 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Novak, Cynthia C., Goodman, Lorie J. 1997. Safer contact zones: The call of service learning. Writing Instructor, 16. 65-77.

- O'Banion, T. (1997). A Learning College for the 21st Century. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.
- O'Byrne, K. (2001). How professors can promote service-learning in a teaching institution. Developing and Implementing Service-Learning Programs. New Directions for Higher Education, vol. 114, (pp.79-100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Outcalt, C.L., & Skewes-Cox, T.E. (2002). Involvement, interaction, and satisfaction: the human environment at HBCUs. The Review of Higher Education, 25 (3), 331-347.
- Payne, Christopher A., Bennett, Ellen B. 1999. Service-learning and changes in involvement preferences among undergraduates. NASPA-Journal 37(1). 337-348.
- Petress, K. (2001). The ethics of student classroom silence. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 28(2). 104-108.
- Reid, J., Forrestal, P., & Cook, J. (1989). Small group learning in the classroom. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Schullery, N. M. & Gibson, M. K. (2001). Working in groups: Identification and treatment of students' perceived weaknesses. Business Communication Quarterly, 64(2). 9-30.
- Sharan, S. (Ed.) (1994). Handbook of cooperative learning methods. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Shumer, R. (2001). Service learning is for everybody. New Directions for Higher Education, vol. 114, (pp.27-43). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Singh-Gupta, V. & Troutt-Ervin, E. (1996). Preparing students for teamwork through collaborative writing and peer review techniques. Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 23(2). 127-136.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. (1991). Research Findings on the Seven Principles. In Applying the Seven Principles for "Good Practice" in Undergraduate Education, New Directions for Teaching and Learning, (pp. 12–25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Speck, B.W. (2001). Why service-learning? Developing and Implementing Service-Learning Program. New Directions for Higher Education, vol. 114, (pp. 3-13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stein, R. F. and Hurd, S. (2000). Using Student Teams in the Classroom, A Faculty Guide. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Strom, P.S., & Strom, R.D. (2002). Overcoming limitations of cooperative learning among community college students. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26(4), 315-331.

The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984). Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Terenzini, P.T., Springer, L., Pascarella, E.T., & Nora, A. (1995). Academic and out-of-class influences on students' intellectual orientations. The Review of Higher Education, 19(1), 23-44.

Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition, second edition (2nd Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1998). Colleges as communities: talking research on student persistence seriously. The Review of Higher Education, 21 (2), 167-177.

Tsui, L. (2002). Fostering critical thinking through effective pedagogy: evidence from four institutional case studies. The Journal of Higher Education, 73 (6), 740-763.

Tucker, J.E. (1999). Tinto's model and successful college transitions. College Student Retention Research, Theory & Practice, 1(2), 163-162.

Windschitl, Mark (1998). Participant perspectives on the learning teams experience. Journal of College Student Development, 39(4), 373-82.

Yonhong, X., Hartman, S. Uribe, G., & Mencke, R. (2001). The effects of peer tutoring on undergraduate students' final examination scores in mathematics. Journal of College Reading and Learning, 32 (1). 22-31.

QEP In-Service Agenda

January 12, 2005

9:00am – Introduction

9:30am – Break-out Group Brainstorming

Nominate a chairperson

Nominate a secretary

Record ideas for each strategic goal

11:00am – Break

11:10am – Organizing Presentation

12:00pm – Lunch

1:00pm – Group Presentations

2:00pm – Break

2:10pm – Condensing Goals

2:40pm – Collaborative Consensus

QEP SPRING 2005 IN-SERVICE PARTICIPANTS

*Denotes individuals from QEP Committee. These individuals “floated” among the break-out groups as facilitators.

PARTICIPANTS	GROUP	COMMUNITY COHORT
Delbert Robertson	A	Board of Regents
Doug Lowe	A	Board of Regents
Dr. Charles E. “Chuck” Deyhle, Sr.	A	Board of Regents
Dr. William A. “Bill” Sansing	A	Board of Regents
Jack Moreman	A	Board of Regents
Jim Blackerby	A	Board of Regents
Mary Ellen “Susie” Shields	A	Board of Regents
Mike Butts	A	Board of Regents
Ruth Robinson	A	Board of Regents
*Greg Henry	B	Administration
*Tex Buckhaults	B	Administration
Annette Ferguson	B	Administration
Dr. Myles Shelton	B	Administration
Jaylene Watkins	B	Administration
Jewel Houston	B	Administration
Joe Kyle Reeve	B	Administration
Lindsey Been	B	Administration
Sharon Hannon	B	Administration
Toni Bryant	B	Administration
Will Thompson	B	Administration
*Darlene Spier	C	Staff
*Martha Smith	C	Staff
Annis Stavenhagen	C	Staff
Barbara Ford	C	Staff
Brandi Havens	C	Staff
Judy Green	C	Staff
Judy Newton	C	Staff
Wanda Smith	C	Staff
Adam Carrasco	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Amanda Tiedeman	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Beatrice Taylor	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Catherine Thomas	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Cynthia Jeter	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Donna Roys	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Gary Montgomery	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students

Jean McAlpine	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Jeri Ragsdale	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Jonathan Delong	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Jonathan Lambright	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Josh Gibson	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Kimberly Hill	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Lea Morris	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Mary Estrada	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Matthew Brown	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Megan Poole	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Ryan Thavaradhara	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Sheila Tabor	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Tammie Blue	D	Commuter (Part-time) Students
Heather Dean	E	Pampa Student Government
Jennifer Greer	E	Pampa Student Government
Josh Gibson	E	Pampa Student Government
Michael Brown	E	Pampa Student Government
Palma Dorn	E	Pampa Student Government
Shelby McGahen	E	Pampa Student Government
Tabitha Winkler	E	Pampa Student Government
Amanda Ortega	F	Clarendon Student Government
Brandi Martindale	F	Clarendon Student Government
Kellie Sanders	F	Clarendon Student Government
Kevin Green	F	Clarendon Student Government
Kristin King	F	Clarendon Student Government
Sarah Olson	F	Clarendon Student Government
Tara Haney	F	Clarendon Student Government
Whitney Warrior	F	Clarendon Student Government
Anita Simpson	G	Maintenance
Bobby Ellerbrook	G	Maintenance
Henry Hermesmeier	G	Maintenance
Liang Manhkong	G	Maintenance
Monica Lewis	G	Maintenance
Ronnie Lewis	G	Maintenance
Sandy Cox	G	Maintenance
Terry Ashcraft	G	Maintenance
Wayne Cole	G	Maintenance
*Linda Thompson	H	Pampa Faculty
Cliff Sandlin	H	Pampa Faculty
DeWayne Stephens	H	Pampa Faculty
Jan Haynes	H	Pampa Faculty
Jimidene Murphey	H	Pampa Faculty

Ken Wilson	H	Pampa Faculty
Math Instructor	H	Pampa Faculty
Russell Estlack	H	Pampa Faculty
*Larry Wiginton	I	Clarendon Faculty
*Scarlet Estlack	I	Clarendon Faculty
Cynthia Ewing	I	Clarendon Faculty
Darryl Perryman	I	Clarendon Faculty
Developmental English Instructor	I	Clarendon Faculty
Gay Tibbets	I	Clarendon Faculty
Pam Denney	I	Clarendon Faculty
Rusty Kennedy	I	Clarendon Faculty
Bill Huey	J	Clarendon Faculty
Brian Kuhnert	J	Clarendon Faculty
Charla Crump	J	Clarendon Faculty
Dr. Skip Frazier	J	Clarendon Faculty
Gene Denney	J	Clarendon Faculty
Michael Tibbets	J	Clarendon Faculty
Sharron Rust	J	Clarendon Faculty
Vickie Liles	J	Clarendon Faculty
*Laban Tubbs	K	Ag Sciences
Chad Smith	K	Ag Sciences
Doak Elledge	K	Ag Sciences
Johnny Treichel	K	Ag Sciences
Leslie Stoker	K	Ag Sciences
Bo Pagliasotti	L	Athletics
Briana Sperry	L	Athletics
Bryanna Hutton	L	Athletics
Cory Hall	L	Athletics
Justin Maness	L	Athletics
Matt Vanderburg	L	Athletics
Rusty East	L	Athletics
Tony Starnes	L	Athletics
Allan Dinsmore	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Bret Parker	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Carolyn Miranda	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Charles (Chuck) Stout	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Douglas Rapstine	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Gerald Monson	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Gloria Hawkins	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
James Anglin	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Jim D. Shreffler	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty

Jimmy Adams	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
John C. Stewart	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Katherine E Williams	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Laquita Edwards	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Larry Jones	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Linda Carol Corner	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Lizbeth Jones	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
M. Beth Shannon	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Mark Elms	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Mary E Sturgeon	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Nancy McCall	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Nanette Boykin	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Pamela Morlan	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Patricia M Wood	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Rex Glover	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Rosemary Baxter	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Rusty Hawkins	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Selena Jeffrey	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Wanda Caradwell	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty
Yancy K Vannoy	M	Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty

QEP BRAINSTORMING RESULTS FIRST DAY

Classroom Techniques

1. Assigned reading before a classroom debate
2. Present class with a problem and then divide the class into groups for discussion before making a presentation to the class.
3. Focus on questioning students in lecture
4. Focus on exploratory learning: let the students find their own answers
5. Turn in notes for extra credit on exams
6. On-line bulletin boards for traditional lecture courses
7. Consider going outdoors for lecture occasionally
8. "Smart classrooms"—technology equipped
9. Capstone classes
10. Scavenger hunts
11. Student presentations
12. Field trips
13. Group projects—short-term and semester
14. On-job training
15. Role playing
16. Peer teaching
17. Computer and library assignments
18. Students reading out loud
19. Internships
20. Open discussion
21. Debates
22. Work-place stimulation
23. Learning games
24. Simulated job interviews by human resources directors or college personnel
25. Research job possibilities online
26. Use technology like WebCT classroom system in more classes to complement in-class material; WebCT not just for online classes
27. Utilize publishers' websites more
28. Have students develop a business using cross-curriculum skills
29. Students collaborate to create real-world documents or projects to present to the college or workforce
30. Real college problems being solved
31. More cross-curriculum projects involving two or more teachers and classes

Environmental Support (Academic)

1. Cross-curriculum: e.g. creative writing and theater combine to write and produce a one-act play; co-teaching
2. Train faculty in active and collaborative learning
3. Better college orientation

4. Note-taking skills
5. Designate quiet study areas
6. Notebook for staff (also posted online) full of FAQs—links to web pages
7. Weekend hours for library; books at Pampa center
8. Improve registration
9. More accommodations for learning disabilities
10. Tutorial websites available on Clarendon College website
11. Communication between community colleges in areas—what other colleges offer, etc.
12. Support system for younger students
13. WebCT tutoring program (required before an online class)
14. Study groups with tutors available
15. Study group facilities set up in Bairfield and in the student lounge in Pampa
16. Student groups have convenient hours
17. Brown-bag tutoring
18. Use adjunct faculty (when available) to help out with study groups
19. Assess each student's study skills at the first of the semester and consider a campus-wide survey to use
20. Sample test bank or research papers or course reviews for students. Put on a new web page with the above examples prominently posted on the college's main menu
21. Resource manual for teachers with ideas for presentations, incorporating technology, research project suggestions, handsOn techniques, learning games, etc.

Environmental Support (Physical)

1. Classrooms arranged differently
2. Increase IT support and maintenance
3. Varied class time schedules
4. Campus appearance
5. Stimulating colors in the classroom
6. Evening custodians so can reduce learning disruptions and distractions in the day
7. Renovations of old library to combine student services
8. Extended student service hours
9. Reliable heating and cooling in the classrooms
10. Adequate seating and accommodations in the classroom: replace aging and broken student furniture
11. Resources for a career center
12. Daycare—through established daycare or by utilizing local churches
13. Providing training and assistance specifically for the faculty and staff and ensuring implementation of training in the work environment
14. Four-day scheduling in Pampa
15. ITV improvement
16. Campus map displayed prominently to minimize stress for first-time visitors

17. Room directories in foyers of buildings

Community Involvement

1. Extra credit for community services and provide students with a list of opportunities
2. Sophomore research to benefit and involve the community—e.g. history of Clarendon display
3. Job board listing for Panhandle area
4. Continuing education classes
5. Sports: teaching and coaching camps with college students as instructors
6. Outreach to elementary, junior high, and high school students
7. Brainstorming in classroom with students of campus and community projects—e. g. equine livestock center
8. Mentoring

Extracurricular Academic Involvement

1. Increase student travel opportunities. Enrich classes by offering travel opportunities to places lecture about—e.g. six-hour European history/travel block
2. Guest lecturers or distinguished lecturer series
3. Fine arts series
4. Artist in residence
5. Student ore involved on campus, particularly through service on committees

Other

1. Strategic marketing plan consistent on both campuses
2. Open door program
3. Snack areas available with working vending machines
4. Appoint someone to coordinate vending machines working
5. Make students aware the campus is their home and not to trash it
6. Make sure information on teachers' websites is not to large to download
7. Increase student involvement in making dorm room decisions
8. Implement child development program at Clarendon College
9. Partnership of students an open door ambassadors

SUMMARY OF THE IN-SERVICE BRAINSTORMING SECOND DAY

Business and Technology

1. Capstone project
2. Role playing
3. Learning games

Liberal Arts

1. Open discussion focusing on question students in lecture
2. Online bulletin boards for traditional lecture courses (where applicable)
3. “Smart” classrooms including technology in the classroom and where applicable WebCT or publishers’ websites to supplement information in class
4. Field trips
5. Role playing and learning games
6. Cross-curriculum projects involving two or more teachers and classes

Science and Health

Science

1. Group projects
2. Workplace simulation
3. Quizzes assigned in class (*added to the original list)

P.E.

1. Peer teaching
2. Open discussion
3. Guest lecturer (*added to the original list)

Math

1. Use technology like WebCT classroom system to complement in-class material
2. Have students collaborate to create real-world documents or projects to present to the college or workforce
3. “Smart classrooms—technology equipped

Agriculture

1. Field trips
2. Peer teaching
3. Guest lecturer (*added to the original list)

RFO

1. Computer and library assignments
2. Peer teaching
3. Debates

Nursing

1. Field trips
2. Learning games
3. Guest lecturer (*added to the original list)