

**Delta State University
College of Education
Quality Enhancement Plan
Focus Group Results
Fall, 2003**

Topic 1 - Student Interaction

I. Topic Name – **Student Interaction**

II. Input- All information was gathered through input at COE Division meetings.

III. Current Practice- Student interaction is facilitated across all programs in the COE in the following ways:

Student organizations, group projects/assignments, classroom discussion structures, student conceptual sharing activities, role-playing, on-line discussion boards, cooperative learning activities, teaming exercises, and “capstone” experiences that are shared.

IV. COE Strengths – Strengths include:

Encouraging environment, appropriate modeling of ways to interact, opportunities provided for interaction in multiple venues, emphasis on reflection and sharing of understanding, small student-teacher ratio in most classes, and multiple field experiences that foster interaction.

V. COE Weaknesses – Weaknesses include:

Lack of documentation for some experiences, few rubrics for performance assessment, number of students in some classes, limited use of technology in some classes, and students’ feeling that all intellectual inquiry must be about “grades.”

VI. COE Goals for Improvement –

- A. Develop and implement a performance assessment system for all programs.
- B. Implement WebCT more fully to allow more interaction.
- C. Refine/Develop rubrics where needed.
- D. Explore strategies for increasing interaction in large classes.
- E. Seek additional avenues for students to present to classes, at conferences, to student groups, etc.

VII. Challenges –

The same challenges will apply to all goals-lack of time, limited financial resources, and limited faculty.

VIII. Resources Needed – See above. Also need release time for faculty to work on performance assessment development and resources for providing training for faculty.

- IX. Timeline – Goals:
 - A. Develop and implement over the next 2 years (03-04 and 04-05).
 - B. Some training opportunities during 03-04 with additional offerings in 04-05.
 - C. As part of A, training in rubric development will be offered in 03-04 with development occurring in 03-04 and 04-05.
 - D. On-going-----Dialogue will occur in sharing sessions within each division.
 - E. On-going---- Opportunities for further student involvement will be disseminated and explored by each division, as appropriate.

- X. Measurement strategy-production of documents where appropriate (i.e. performance assessment plan, syllabi, WebCT courses, rubrics, listing of students involved in student organizations and in making presentations, etc.) to verify accomplishment of goals. Minutes of meetings documenting dialogue for D and E will also be utilized. Results of student evaluations.

- XI. Responsibility for Assessment - Division chairs and the dean will be responsible for assessing the accomplishment of goals with the assistance of faculty, staff, and program coordinators.

Topic 2 – Feedback to Students

- I. Topic Name – **Feedback to Students**

- II. Input- All information was gathered through input at COE Division meetings.

- III. Current Practice includes: Use of processes of self-reflection with faculty reaction to provide feedback to students, opportunity for draft submission of papers and projects for feedback, individual conferences held with students to discuss progress, review of tests and other assignments to illustrate appropriate/inappropriate understandings, exit interviews for program candidates, and feedback during field experiences.

- IV. COE Strengths – Strengths include:
 Accessibility of faculty for feedback before class, after class, during office hours, and by appointment. Feedback provided through multiple means including written documents, verbal interactions, and electronic applications. Environment which encourages open dialogue with students.

- V. COE Weaknesses – Weaknesses include:
 Lack of documentation for some experiences, rubrics in use need refinement, feedback not always specific, processes for identifying students who

should be counseled to pursue other options needs to be strengthened/formalized.

VI. COE Goals for Improvement –

- A. Refine use of rubrics to inform students of progress and expectations.
- B. Explore ways to utilize Pipeline and other technology for feedback purposes.
- C. Review syllabi to ensure inclusion of appropriate feedback strategies.
- D. Provide professional development for faculty that focuses on feedback strategies.
- E. Establish processes for identifying students who should be counseled to pursue other fields of study.

VII. Challenges –

The same challenges will apply to all goals-lack of time for development, meeting with students, etc., limited financial resources, and limited faculty.

VIII. Resources Needed – See above. Release time for faculty to work on rubric development and resources for providing training for faculty.

IX. Timeline – Goals:

- A. Developed and Implemented over the next 2 years (03-04 and 04-05).
- B. On-Going ---beginning in 03-04 .
- C. Will take place during the performance assessment/rubric development (03-04 and 04-05)
- D. Some training opportunities during 03-04 with additional offerings in 04-05.
- E. Begin in 03-04 with full implementation in 04-05.

X. Measurement strategy-production of documents where appropriate (i.e. performance assessment plan, syllabi, rubrics, documentation from professional development, etc.), review of faculty use of technology for feedback, results from student evaluations.

XI. Responsibility for Assessment - Division chairs and the dean will be responsible for assessing the accomplishment of goals with the assistance of faculty, staff, and program coordinators.

Topic 3 - Advisement

I. Topic Name – **Advisement**

II. Input- All information was gathered through input at COE Division meetings.

III. Current Practice- Advisees are seen during preregistration and at other times across each semester, specific programs of study are provided to advisees and monitored by advisors, advisors communicate regularly with advisees regarding specific program requirements such as PRAXIS and maintain appropriate documentation for informing students of requirements.

IV. COE Strengths – Strengths include:

Faculty who see advisement as an important function for student and program success, appropriate documentation of all facets of the advising process, availability and involvement of all faculty in advisement, use of databases for tracking of students in some programs, level of consistency with advisement, willingness of faculty to function as an “advisor” to all students regarding professional growth issues, strong student participation in professional organizations which allows for professional advisement.

V. COE Weaknesses – Weaknesses include:

Little training for new faculty around advisement issues, little contact with freshmen majors, advisees who register with PINS granted from other entities on campus, inadequate coordination with community colleges regarding expectations of transfer students, unwieldy process for change in major, lag time in getting paperwork on students from admissions, inability to access BANNER transcripts to ensure student credits are accurate for graduation, and inconsistency in transcript evaluation processes.

VI. COE Goals for Improvement –

- A. Establish a structure within each division for faculty to share advisement problems/resolutions
- B. Explore ways to better use technology in the advisement process.
- C. Develop strategies for better communication with all student advisees, with special emphasis on non-traditional students.
- D. Meet with counselors from community colleges to review the articulation agreement and discuss problem areas.
- E. Collect and analyze information from students regarding their advisement experiences in the COE.
- F. Develop strategies for working with the Registrar and Admissions to resolve problems surrounding applications, majors, transcripts (access and evaluation), PIN numbers, etc.

VII. Challenges –

The same challenges will apply to all goals-lack of time, limited financial resources, and limited faculty.

VIII. Resources Needed – See above. Assistance in technology development.

- IX. Timeline – Goals:
 - A. Summer 04.
 - B. On-Going -----Begin in 03-04.
 - C. On-Going ---- Begin process in all divisions in Jan. 04.
 - D. Spring 04
 - E. Complete analysis of information in Summer 04
 - F. Begin dialogue in Spring 04

- X. Measurement strategy-Documents demonstrating strategies initiated for A,C, and F, minutes from meetings with DSU staff and community college counselors, examples of technology applications used, results of student survey on advisement.

- XI. Responsibility for Assessment - Division chairs, directors and the dean will be responsible for assessing the accomplishment of goals with the assistance of faculty, staff, and program coordinators.

Topic 4 - Engagement

I. Topic Name – **Engagement**

II. Input- All information was gathered through input at COE Division meetings.

III. Current Practice- Extensive, sequential field experiences including practicum and internship structures, use of performance portfolios, community service activities in some classes and with student organizations, use of WebCT and email.

IV. COE Strengths – Strengths include:
 Wide variety of experiences for students throughout all programs, structured field experiences with specified outcomes, “capstone” experience in most programs, strong expectation of computer literacy for students exiting all programs, assignments requiring student research and use of data bases in many programs, use of national standardized examinations to ensure appropriate skills, knowledge, and dispositions of exiting students.

V. COE Weaknesses – Weaknesses include:
 Quality of some field experience placements, late start with research efforts and professional involvement of undergraduates, lack of effective modeling of technology use in all appropriate classes.

VI. COE Goals for Improvement –
 A. Establish/identify a strong “capstone” experience in each program.
 B. Explore additional ways to ensure quality field experiences for all students.

- C. Strengthen sequence and outcomes of field experiences in all programs prior to practicum/internship.
- D. Infuse professional reflection as a regular activity within all field experiences.
- E. Establish an opportunity for service learning in each program of study.

VII. Challenges –

The same challenges will apply to all goals-lack of time, limited financial resources, and limited faculty. Additionally, the greatest challenge for this topic will be locating and orienting appropriate field placement collaborations for all students.

VIII. Resources Needed – See above. Professional development funds will also be needed to assist faculty in developing additional ways to utilize reflection and ways to formalize service learning opportunities.

IX. Timeline – Goals:

- A. Summer 04.
- B. On-Going -----Begin in 03-04.
- C. Fall 04.
- D. Fall 04
- E. Development in 04-05 with initial implementation in 05-06

X. Measurement strategy-Documents demonstrating “capstone” experiences and service learning opportunities for each program, documentation of dialogue/decisions with field placement locations regarding strengthening field experiences, listing of sequence and reflective practice from field experiences.

XI. Responsibility for Assessment - Division chairs, directors and the dean will be responsible for assessing the accomplishment of goals with the assistance of faculty, staff, and program coordinators.

Topic 5 – Acquisition of Knowledge

I. Topic Name –**Acquisition of Knowledge**

II. Input- All information was gathered through input at COE Division meetings.

III. Current Practice- Technology integration in most courses, technology used for instructional delivery, communication, and assignments, faculty all basically “computer literate,” students expected to use technology effectively, programs emphasize learning as an enhancement to “quality of life” for students.

IV. COE Strengths – Strengths include:

Technology “hardware” available in Ewing, good support of technology by COE technology center staff, access to classroom equipment, working toward infusion

of ISTE standards for technology in all classes, new “model classrooms,” availability of Teaching and Learning Center.

V. COE Weaknesses – Weaknesses include:

Need for additional faculty technology training that is easily accessible, need specialized technology for specific programs of study to create “state of the art” experiences for students(CAD-FCS, Exercise Science, etc.), lack of lab setting for classrooms/programs housed in Wyatt, concern that students “grades, don’t match skill level” and that students fail to see value of “lifelong learning.”

VI. COE Goals for Improvement –

- A. Collaborate with technology personnel to provide training opportunities for faculty.
- B. Seek funding sources for specialized technology to meet programmatic needs and for lab resources for Wyatt.
- C. Explore ways to use competencies as the basis for program completion to ensure greater alignment between career expectations and student skills, knowledge, and dispositions.

VII. Challenges –

The same challenges will apply to all goals-lack of time, limited financial resources, and limited faculty.

VIII. Resources Needed – See above.

IX. Timeline – Goals:

- A. On-Going –training offered each semester
- B. On-Going -----Begin in 03-04.
- C. Begin development in 03-04 as part of performance assessment system with implementation in 04-05.

X. Measurement strategy-Documentation on the number of training sessions offered and number of faculty who attended sessions, documentation of budget hearing requests, letters, grants, etc., requesting funding for technology, performance assessment system with competencies listed.

XI. Responsibility for Assessment - Division chairs, directors and the dean will be responsible for assessing the accomplishment of goals with the assistance of faculty, staff, and program coordinators.