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I. Executive Summary

The overall goal of the Florida A&M University (FAMU) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), entitled “Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking,” is to improve freshman level student learning in the area of critical thinking. Within the context of the FAMU QEP, enhancing student performance in critical thinking is synonymous with improving student learning. As part of the FAMU QEP, course curricula will be redesigned to include explicit critical thinking instructional and learning objectives with corresponding assessment instruments. Consistent with the FAMU Mission Statement, developing students’ critical thinking skills in and out of the classroom will improve student learning, and produce graduates who are more prepared for the challenges of college, career and society.

The FAMU QEP has a specific focus on English (ENC 1101/ENC 1102) and African-American history (AMH 2091/AFA 3104) courses, which are general education courses that most FAMU students take during their freshman year. With a focus on these four (4) courses, and by using the FAMU Critical Thinking Definition and the concepts of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Revised), the FAMU QEP will introduce changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment methods in order to increase the likelihood that freshman students who complete these courses will show measurable improvements in their critical thinking skills, which include the ability to:

- Gather, process and analyze information;
- Make critical judgments about the validity of information; and
- Effectively defend their positions regarding information.

Specific activities in and relating to these courses include:

- Writing critical essays; (assessed using newly developed University uniform critical thinking rubrics);
- Preparation and defense of case study analyses (assessed using newly developed University uniform critical thinking rubrics);
- Creation of a Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series; and
- Creation of a Freshman Summer Reading Program.

Improvements in student learning that result from implementation of the FAMU QEP will be measured by the anticipated positive and incremental changes in students’:

- Critical thinking skills (as measured by direct assessment instruments, such as critical thinking rubrics, the Measure of Academic Progress and Proficiency (MAPP) test and the Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT));
- Knowledge of English and African-American history concepts;
- Work products, as demonstrated by the improvements in their English and African-American history assignments.

Faculty development will be an important part of the implementation of the FAMU QEP. All University faculty, with specific emphasis on those who teach freshman students in ENC 1101/1102 and AMH 2091/AFA 3104 courses, will have the opportunity to participate in a series of faculty development activities designed to improve pedagogy and assessment of critical thinking skills. Accordingly, uniform and effective critical thinking pedagogy and assessment will be embedded into course curricula, which will accomplish the overall goal of enhancing students’ critical thinking skills, with an ultimate improvement in student learning.
II. Process Used to Identify and Develop the QEP

A. Identification of the QEP Topic.

The process used to identify a topic for the FAMU QEP consisted of a set of interrelated activities that allowed for broad-based involvement of various University stakeholder groups, and a detailed review and analysis of existing University assessment data. In addition to considering the historical mission of FAMU (see Appendix I), the results ultimately led to the selection of critical thinking as the topic area as described below.

1. Broad Based Involvement of University Stakeholders.

The process to develop the FAMU QEP formally began in August 2005 when the annual FAMU Faculty Planning Conference was used as the initial campus-wide forum for soliciting input from the faculty on the identification of a suitable QEP topic (conference agenda shown in Appendix II). During a conference workshop session, the 129 faculty members in attendance (of approximately 590 total) were arranged into 34 separate groups and were given a document (shown in Appendix III) entitled “Faculty Suggestions for Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Reaffirmation.” The groups were asked to submit two suggestions that addressed “…a course of action for institutional improvement crucial to enhancing educational quality and that is directly related to student learning.” As shown below in Figure 1, of the 68 total suggestions submitted (2 per group), the highest response was for the QEP topic to address Critical Thinking (24%). Technology ranked second with a response of 21% and Communication Skills third with 18%. Subsequent efforts, as described below, to select the QEP topic involved the use of these three general themes.

![Faculty Suggestions for a QEP for SACS Reaffirmation](image)

**Figure 1.** Summary of Faculty Suggestions for QEP Topic.
In February 2006, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs formally established the QEP Planning Committee, which was charged with the responsibility of guiding the overall efforts to select and develop the QEP topic (see Appendix IV for a list of the QEP Planning Committee members). Over the course of the 2006 calendar year, the QEP Planning Committee established the QEP Steering Committee, and various sub committees; these groups began developing strategies for obtaining campus-wide input and feedback during the development process (see Appendix V for a list of the key committees and their responsibilities). The QEP Steering Committee had campus-wide representation from various faculty, staff, students, and administrators and was chaired by Dr. Dreamal Worthen, Associate Professor of Agricultural Sciences.

At the August 2006 Faculty Planning Conference (conference agenda shown in Appendix VI), a plenary session entitled “Designing and Implementing a Quality Enhancement Plan” was held, featuring presentations by Dr. Virginia Caples of Alabama A&M University and Dr. Robert Armacast of the University of Central Florida. Both presenters shared insights from the successful QEP development processes at their respective institutions, and they addressed questions from the audience.

The 2006 Faculty Planning Conference was also used by the QEP Steering Committee to solicit responses from the faculty for pre-proposals (RFP) to aid in the selection of the QEP topic. The RFP instructions (shown in Appendix VII) requested that the pre-proposals focus on the eight topic areas listed below (compiled from responses to the faculty survey described above and suggestions from members of the QEP Steering Committee):

- Critical Thinking & Problem Solving
- Communication Skills
- Technology Enhancement
- Quantitative Reasoning
- Assessment
- Information Literacy
- Enhancement of Student Retention, Progression, and Graduation Rates
- Faculty Development

A total of seven pre-proposals were received as a result of the RFP. The QEP Steering Committee developed a scoring rubric, which was used to assess and select the top three proposals (listed below) in September 2006. The QEP Steering Committee deemed all three proposals appropriate as possible topics. The top three proposal topics were as follows: 1) Information Literacy, 2) Reading/Writing, 3. Critical Thinking.

The QEP Focus Group sub-committee developed and administered a survey to students and staff (support staff and administrators) as a means to obtain their input on the selection of the QEP topic. The survey (shown in Appendix VIII) asked the respondents to rate each of the eight aforementioned topics in terms of its usefulness as a potential QEP topic; rankings ranged from values of 1 (high importance) to 8 (low importance). Survey responses were collected from 1,466 students and 50 staff members; the results are shown below. Note that lower values correspond to areas of greater importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Mean</th>
<th>Student Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Retention</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Enhancement</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The QEP Focus Group also administered a survey (shown in Appendix IX) to alumni asking for their opinion on the eight topics presented to the staff and student groups. Survey responses were collected from 16 alumni, who were asked to rank the topics in order from 1 (highest importance) to 8 (lowest importance). The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Alumni Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Retention</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three highest ranked results from each focus group are listed below. As can be observed, all of the stakeholder groups identified the same three topics as areas of highest importance.

**2. Assessment of Institutional Data.**

The FAMU Office of University Assessment (OUA) is responsible for collecting and analyzing assessment results submitted by all instructional programs and educational support units on campus. These results are used to assist the University in its ongoing efforts to promote a culture of continuous improvement. To facilitate these activities, the OUA began publishing an annual report in 2005, which consists of a summary analysis of assessment activities conducted during the target academic year (http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?a=Assessment&p=AnnualReports).

The QEP Assessment sub-committee examined annual reports for the 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 academic years to help identify primary focus areas of student academic deficiency that exist within the University. Summaries of some of the committee’s pertinent findings from this review as they relate to the development of the FAMU QEP are described below.

**Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) Test Results.**

The Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) test is a direct measure of student abilities in four core areas (Critical Thinking, Reading, Writing and Mathematics) in the context of the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The test is designed to allow institutions to assess their general education outcomes in order to improve the quality of student learning and instruction. The MAPP test was first administered at FAMU in 2005 as part of a national pilot study, and again in the years 2006 and 2007 (2006 and 2007 MAPP test results are shown in Appendix X). The results for these years are briefly summarized below in terms of student performance.
The MAPP test will be used in future years as a component of the FAMU QEP as one of the direct measures of students’ critical thinking skills.

**Scaled Scores.** The online MAPP Comparison Data Guide provided by ETS (www.ets.org) compiles information about the performance of various groups of students taking the MAPP test. These groups of students are defined by the point in their academic career at which they are tested, and by the Carnegie classification of their colleges. In the Comparison Data Guide, there are five groups by academic career: entering freshmen (no credit hours completed), freshmen (1-30 hours completed), sophomores (31-60 hours completed), juniors (61-90 hours completed), and seniors (90 and more hours completed).

Since in the MAPP test 2007 administration, 592 (83.4%) of the 710 FAMU students included in the valid statistics were entering freshmen who had earned no credit hours, the focus here will be on reporting how well FAMU entering freshmen performed in 2007 as compared with a corresponding national sample. The important issue is the selection of an appropriate national sample for comparison. In the Comparison Data Guide, there are five groups by the Carnegie classification: doctoral/research universities, master’s institutions, baccalaureate colleges, associate’s colleges, and specialized institutions. Since FAMU is listed in the category of doctoral/research institutions in the Comparison Data, this is the group to which FAMU results were compared. There are a total of nine such universities (FAMU included), and the Data Guide provides the MAPP test norms for the nine universities averaged over a period of several years.

In Table 1, the norm-referenced mean scores (based on a 100-130 range) obtained by FAMU freshman students in 2006 and 2007 are compared against the 2007 national norm in each of the core areas (standard deviations are shown in parentheses). These results show that there was little difference between the national norm and FAMU’s performance in nearly all of the four skill dimensions. For 2007, the FAMU mean reading score of 116.1 was higher than the national norm of 115.7; in the other three skill dimensions, FAMU’s mean scores were lower than the corresponding national norms. The biggest gap occurred in Mathematics, where FAMU was one point lower than the national norm of 112.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FAMU 2006 (n = 102)</th>
<th>FAMU 2007 (n = 592)</th>
<th>National Norm (n = 10,290)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>108.4 (4.34)</td>
<td>109.1 (5.01)</td>
<td>109.3 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>113.9 (5.55)</td>
<td>116.1 (5.74)</td>
<td>115.7 (2.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>111.9 (4.06)</td>
<td>112.7 (4.16)</td>
<td>113.1 (1.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>109.9 (4.38)</td>
<td>111.1 (4.95)</td>
<td>112.1 (2.35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proficiency Classifications.** The 2007 MAPP results were also analyzed in terms of the level of student proficiency in Reading (Levels I and II), Critical Thinking (through essay writing), Writing (Levels I, II, III) and Mathematics (Levels I, II, III). These results show clear evidence of student deficiencies across the content areas. For example, as shown in Figure 2, at Reading Level I, 82% of the students performed at the proficient and marginal levels; however, this number showed a drastic decrease to 43% for Reading Level II. The results in the area of Critical Thinking were markedly worse, with only 7% of students scoring at the proficient and marginal levels and 93% scoring at the not proficient level. Similar results were obtained for Writing and Mathematics (not shown).
For Writing Level I, 85% of students were at the proficient and marginal levels, whereas the number was only 43% for Writing Level II. At Mathematics Level I, 70% of students were judged to be proficient or marginal, and for Levels II and III the results were 41% and 13%, respectively.

![Figure 2. Summary of 2007 MAPP Test Proficiency Results.](image)

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is a national survey designed to assess the level of student engagement in the learning process. The survey was administered to FAMU students for the first time in Spring 2005 using the following benchmarks to assess how well the University is engaging students: 1) Level of Academic Challenge; 2) Active and Collaborative Learning; 3) Student Faculty Interaction; 4) Enriching Educational Experiences; and 5) Supportive Campus Environment. Within the context of these benchmarks, the students were asked several questions that directly relate to critical thinking skills.

The FAMU NSSE survey results were analyzed based on a comparison to results obtained from select peer institutions and from a national student group who participated in the 2005 NSSE survey. Shown below in Table 2 are the results from freshman students on some of the survey items that specifically relate to critical thinking. While the results show that FAMU students generally compared favorably with the students at the selected peer institutions, on six of the nine items they scored below those in the national group. Of particular note is the observation that in items 11a, 11c and 11e, where the students were asked to evaluate the contribution made by the institution to their broad general education, and ability to write well and think critically, the scores are below the national group in all cases, and below the peer groups in one of three cases.
Table 2: Means Comparison of 2005 NSSE Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>FAMU</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>NSSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? (Broad General Education)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? (Writing Clearly and Effectively)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e</td>
<td>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? (Thinking Critically and Analytically)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NSSE, and the companion Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), will be used in future years as components of the FAMU QEP as indirect measures of student and faculty perceptions, respectively, of student learning in the area of critical thinking.

B. Topic Selection and Development.

During the Fall 2006 semester, the QEP Steering Committee presented the results of the various topic-identification activities to the University Leadership Team to facilitate the selection of the final topic. After careful consideration and deliberation, the Leadership Team selected critical thinking as the topic area for the FAMU QEP (see Appendix XI for notification), along with the following theme: “EPACT: Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking.” The QEP Steering Committee later shortened this original QEP theme to “Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking”. A summary of key events related to the development of the QEP is described below and in Table 3.

The QEP Steering Committee continued to meet regularly during the Spring 2007 and Summer 2007 semesters to further refine and develop the QEP topic. Key activities that occurred during the 2007-08 academic year included two campus-wide Lunch and Learn Series events sponsored by FAMU’s Teachers for a New Era initiative, a session on the QEP at the annual Faculty Planning Conference in August 2007 and two campus-wide Brown Bag Luncheons for faculty, staff and students. At the 2007 Faculty Planning
Conference, several members of the QEP Steering Committee facilitated a plenary session in which the QEP topic was presented (conference agenda shown in Appendix XII). During this session, the faculty had an opportunity to engage in a question/answer session with the facilitators and they were also asked to submit specific written comments and suggestions to guide the QEP development.

The first Brown Bag Luncheon, held on October 11, 2007, had approximately 31 participants representing a cross-section of the campus, and consisted of an open discussion centered around the topic “Motivating Critical Thinking – Attitudes and Perceptions.” This event provided a forum for faculty, staff and students to discuss their perspectives on how to best implement critical thinking instructional activities into the classroom (see Appendix XIII for meeting notice).

The second luncheon, entitled “Facilitating Critical Thinking,” was held on March 5, 2008 and had approximately 30 participants (see Appendix XIV for meeting notice). During this session, a draft of the QEP outline was presented to the cross-section of faculty, students and staff for discussion and suggestions for improvement. Specific suggestions from the luncheon participants on ways to improve and refine the QEP topic included the following: 1) the need to use effective assessment instruments, 2) the importance of using the case study approach to develop students’ critical thinking skills, and 3) the importance of including a faculty development component on Bloom’s (1964) taxonomy.

Over the course of the Summer 2008 and Fall 2008 semesters, several activities took place to complete the development of the QEP. At the 2008 Faculty Planning Conference (conference agenda shown in Appendix XV), five FAMU faculty members conducted a workshop where they presented examples of how case studies are currently utilized in their disciplines to teach critical thinking. At the same conference, Dr. Claudia Stanny, Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment at the University of West Florida, conducted a workshop entitled “Enhancing and Assessing Performance in Critical Thinking.”

In November 2008, a campus-wide QEP logo-design competition for students was held to facilitate additional student participation in the QEP development process (winning logo shown in Appendix XVIII). In January 2009, a campus-wide QEP Feedback Forum was held to provide University stakeholders with a final opportunity to provide feedback on the draft QEP document prior to submission to SACS-COC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Key Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Participation in SACS-COC Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>Faculty Surveys Administered at Annual Faculty Planning Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>Establishment of QEP Planning Committee and Appointment of QEP Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2006</td>
<td>Participation in SACS-COC Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>RFP Solicitation to Faculty and Staff at Annual Faculty Planning Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Surveys Administered to Focus Groups of Students, Staff and Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006 – Summer 2007</td>
<td>Review of Institutional Assessment Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>Selection of QEP Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>Presentation of QEP Topic to FAMU Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Teachers for a New Era Lunch and Learn Series “What is a QEP?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Teachers for a New Era Lunch and Learn Series “Ways to Implement FAMU’s QEP”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007 – Summer 2007</td>
<td>Development of Initial draft of QEP Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>Participation in SACS-COC Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>Presentation of QEP Topic and Outline of Plan at Annual Faculty Planning Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td>QEP Brown Bag Luncheon Entitled “Motivating Critical Thinking – Attitudes and Perceptions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>QEP Brown Bag Luncheon Entitled “Facilitating Critical Thinking”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>QEP Update to FAMU Industry Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>QEP “Boot Camp” (Faculty and Staff Workshop to Develop Draft of QEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td>Participation in SACS-COC Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Overview of QEP Presented at Annual Faculty Planning Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Presentations on Case Study Best Practices Given by FAMU Faculty Members at Annual Faculty Planning Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>QEP Assessment Workshop Given by Invited Speaker at Annual Faculty Planning Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>QEP “Boot Camp” (Faculty and Staff Workshop to Develop Draft of QEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>Student Competition to Design QEP Logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>QEP “Boot Camp” (Faculty and Staff Workshop to Develop Draft of QEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>Campus-wide QEP Feedback Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>QEP Document Submitted to SACS-COC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Desired Student Learning Outcomes

The overall goal of the FAMU QEP is to improve student learning (emphasis on freshman-level students) in the area of critical thinking. To this end, the following five QEP goals have been developed:

**QEP Goal #1:** Improve and assess students’ critical thinking skills.

**Student Learning Outcome #1 (SLO #1):** Students will be able to write and present critical essays demonstrating critical thinking skills on various topics of literary, sociological, political and/or historical significance.

**Student Learning Outcome #2 (SLO #2):** Students will be able to effectively analyze and defend an interdisciplinary case study with historical significance.

**Student Learning Outcome #3 (SLO #3):** Students will be able to identify and apply effective strategies for improving their critical thinking skills.

**Student Learning Outcome #4 (SLO #4):** Students will recognize when they need information and be able to locate, evaluate and effectively use appropriate information materials and resources.

**QEP Goal #2:** Enhance and assess faculty use of instructional strategies that develop students’ critical thinking skills.

**Outcome #1:** Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use pedagogical approaches appropriate for developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

**QEP Goal #3:** Enhance and assess faculty use of strategies for assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Outcome #1:** Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use strategies appropriate for assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**QEP Goal #4:** Enhance and assess faculty design of curriculum and curricular materials related to developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Outcome #1:** Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and design and select curricula and curriculum materials appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.

**QEP Goal #5:** Develop and assess an ongoing system for faculty development and communication with faculty to promote best practices for teaching and assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Outcome #1:** Faculty will participate in faculty development activities designed to enhance faculty use of instructional, assessment, and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.
Outcome #2: The use of uniform critical thinking skills assessment rubrics will increase in courses across the University’s curricula.

Outcome #3: Mechanisms will be developed and maintained for communicating with faculty about instructional, assessment and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.
IV. Literature Review and Best Practices

A. Critical Thinking.

“Critical thinking” has been defined many ways by many different scholars (Burbach, Matkin & Fritz, 2004; Aretz, Bolen & Debereux, 1997). However, it is universally accepted that critical thinking is the process of purposeful thinking that encompasses interpreting and understanding, analyzing, drawing inferences, evaluating, explaining, and self-regulation of and pertaining to concepts, issues, questions, and problems (Facione, 1998; Scriven & Paul, 2003). The ability to think critically influences one’s worldview and approach to life and learning.

Two basic precursors to critical thinking are comprehension and communication. These two skills are needed for interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation, evaluation, and creativity. Interpretation involves understanding, reading comprehension, and classification of concepts (Facione, 1998). Analysis entails identifying relationships among concepts, comparing and contrasting, identifying supporting information and unstated assumptions, and organizing information in a way that makes sense to the individual (Facione, 1998). Evaluation consists of assessing the facts or statements and the strength of the relationship between concepts, and judging the relevancy of the facts or statements (Facione, 1998). Inference refers to identifying relevant facts, developing alternatives, and drawing conclusions (Facione, 1998). Explanation is the statement of results and justification of reasoning used and the articulation of results and rationale in a cogent manner (Facione, 1998).

Another precursor to critical thinking is information literacy. Information literacy is defined by the American Library Association’s Presidential Committee on Information Literacy as “a set of abilities requiring individuals to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (ACRL, 2000). Literacy competencies are precursors to the attainment of critical thinking in that they arm students with the ability to be able to ask questions, find answers, and report results. Gaining information literacy skills sharpens critical thinking capabilities.

Critical thinking has been regarded by many employers as the highest non-value based competency expected of new college graduates behind the value-based competencies of honesty, integrity, and ethics (Burbach, Matkin, & Fritz, 2004). When approaching issues, questions, and problems in the workplace, critical thinkers tend to seek greater clarity, order the complexity of the situation, seek relevant information, reasonably select and apply judgment criteria, pay attention to detail, be persistent, and seek as much precision as possible. With the flattening of the world (Freidman, 2005) that is being precipitated by the internet’s role in a changing global market and economy, the ability to think critically is even more of a necessity.

Students’ ability to use critical thinking to advance professionally presupposes a mastery and illustration of the skills on academic and personal levels. From a professional perspective, enhanced critical thinking skills can lead to greater job opportunities and greater career advancement opportunities (Murphy, 2004). From an academic perspective, enhanced critical thinking skills can lead to greater mastery of course knowledge, higher grades and grade point averages, and application-based learning (Cheung, Rudowicz, Kwan & Yue, 2002). Personally, it allows a greater ability to assess
the speed and volume of information for use in making better decisions quickly; and improved written and oral communication, research, conflict management, problem solving, teamwork, self-management skills, and life-long learning, all of which will enhance one’s academic and professional careers. In addition to the academic and professional benefits of enhanced critical thinking skills, critical thinkers tend to be more inquisitive, well-informed, alert, confident in their self-reasoning ability, open-minded, flexible, empathic, honest, prudent in rendering judgment, and willing to change and admit when they are wrong (Facione, 1998).

B. Critical Thinking at Florida A&M University.

Definition of Critical Thinking. Faculty members at FAMU have always been engaged in the use of various critical thinking activities and methodologies, to varying degrees, across the curriculum. However, the University formalized its emphasis on critical thinking in 2005 as a result of a mandate by the Florida Board of Governors. In February 2005, the Florida Board of Governors mandated that each University through its board of trustees, develop and implement Academic Learning Compacts (ALC) to account for student achievement in baccalaureate degree programs. The student learning outcomes identified in the ALC must address three areas:

1. Content/discipline knowledge and skills;
2. Communication skills; and
3. Critical thinking skills.

In recognition of the importance of critical thinking to life and student learning, FAMU adopted a modified definition of critical thinking for the purposes of university assessment and the enhancement of student learning in the FAMU context. The FAMU General Education Assessment Committee has posited the following university-wide definition:

Critical thinking is the ability to understand, apply, analyze and solve problems, develop new knowledge, and think creatively. The FAMU General Education Assessment Committee has further stated that “students who complete the General Education Core at FAMU will be able to apply critical thinking to learning and real-world situations.” The General Education Assessment Committee has operationalized the concept of critical thinking by articulating that students will be able to: “1) draw conclusions after weighing evidence, facts and ideas; 2) clarify issues to resolve problems; 3) clarify unsupported claims using standards of credibility and expertise; 4) utilize available information to evaluate the credibility of a source, formulate an opinion and defend it; 5) apply logical operations; 6) neutralize fallacious reasoning and rhetoric; 7) distinguish between valid and invalid patterns of reasoning; 8) analyze the logical structure of arguments; and 9) perform basic analytic tasks-categorizing information, distinguishing between relevant and irrelevant data and predicting outcomes.”

Assessment of Critical Thinking. The methods of assessment that have been identified in the General Education Core are math problem sets in Liberal Arts Math I and II and College Algebra; math exams in the same courses, laboratory exercises and statistical analyses in all 1000-level science labs; position and literary papers in the Freshman Communicative Skills courses, the Honors Freshman Composition courses, and the Introduction to African-American History and The African American Experience courses.
Many researchers are trying to determine why critical thinking is so deficient among college students, and they are placing much of the onus on the universities themselves, whom they feel are failing to teach students how to think critically, be innovative and solve problems (Halpern, 1993; Jih, 2003; John J. Heldrich Center, 2005). Some attribute certain pedagogical approaches at universities that emphasize note-taking and the regurgitation of facts with students’ limited critical thinking skills to be part of the problem (Smilken, 2005). Other studies suggest that campuses have not identified what critical thinking really is and are consequently not effectively teaching it (McMahon, 2005). Therefore, it is no coincidence that FAMU and even a number of other SACS-COC member institutions, such as Norfolk State University, University of the Cumberlands, Eastern Kentucky University, Angelina College and Howard College, have chosen to focus on critical thinking for their QEPs.

Data collected from FAMU faculty members throughout the development of the QEP over the last three years show that faculty members agree with McMahon (2005) to a certain extent in that they have identified students’ limitations with critical thinking and have begun addressing the problems informally. Coinciding with the data collected from faculty, the mandate by the Florida Board of Governors for all state universities to implement ALCs that contain a critical thinking component (as described above) provides anecdotal evidence that students enrolled at other state universities in Florida were demonstrating deficiencies in critical thinking as well. Nevertheless, this has afforded FAMU the opportunity to formalize processes faculty were engaging across the campus, and has served as the backdrop for the development of the QEP. While the FAMU Office of University Assessment and the General Education Assessment Committee have delineated how critical thinking is defined and how it is currently being assessed, the FAMU QEP is a robust and comprehensive plan for enhancing student performance in the area of critical thinking at the freshman level. FAMU’s stakeholders firmly believe that when properly cultivated and applied, critical thinking can transform every dimension of academic life: how rules are formulated and promulgated, how professors relate to their students, how students are encouraged to relate to each other, and how reading, writing, speaking, and listening are cultivated in academic lessons to improve student learning (Scriven & Paul, 2003).

C. Critical Thinking Models.

Bloom’s Taxonomy.

The importance of critical thinking to the academic, professional and personal growth of students was acknowledged nearly a century ago with Dewey’s (1916, p. 188) assertion that students do not begin to think until they have engaged in the process of “wrestling with the conditions of the problem first hand,” and “seeking and finding [their] own way out”. Four decades after Dewey (1916), Bloom and Krathwohl (Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956) offered educators a way to classify and communicate about the way students “find their way out,” as Dewey puts it. Bloom’s taxonomy, as it is commonly referred, was developed to clarify the task of writing educational objectives and student learning outcomes. It identifies six (6) levels of learning outcomes in the cognitive domain - knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Bloom, Madeus, and Hastings (1981, p. 5) describe education as:

A process which changes the learners. Given this view, we expect each program, course and unit of education to bring about some significant change or changes in the students. Students should be different at the
end of a unit from what they were before it. Students who have completed a unit of education should be different from those who have not had it. Although it is true that some of the differences in a learner between the beginning and end of secondary school are to be attributed to maturation, growth, and the influences of varied experiences, we are here concerned with the changes produced by education and in the last analysis determined by the school, curriculum, and instruction.

FAMU’s objective to enhance student performance in critical thinking builds upon this premise. Echoing Bloom’s (1964) principle, FAMU’s objective is that ‘each of its programs, courses and units of education will bring about some significant change or changes in the students’ in a way that equips them for today’s global market.

While Bloom’s and Krathwohl’s (1956) foundational research proved extraordinarily useful in formalizing and establishing the University’s process for its critical thinking module, FAMU found more applicable conceptual support in its approach to building the structure for its critical thinking program in Anderson’s and Krathwohl’s (2001) revised version of Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy. Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) built upon Bloom’s 1956 model and focused on the active, on-going process of learning. Comparisons of the original and revised versions of Bloom’s taxonomy are shown below in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Description of Original and Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Bloom’s Taxonomy</th>
<th>Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Knowledge:</strong> Remembering or retrieving previously learned material.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Remembering:</strong> Retrieving, recognizing, and recalling relevant knowledge from long-term memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Comprehension:</strong> The ability to grasp or construct meaning from material.</td>
<td>2. <strong>Understanding:</strong> Constructing meaning from oral, written, and graphic messages through interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Application:</strong> The ability to use learned material, or to implement material in new and concrete situations.</td>
<td>3. <strong>Applying:</strong> Carrying out or using a procedure through executing, or implementing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Analysis:</strong> The ability to break down or distinguish the parts of material into its components so that its organizational structure may be better understood.</td>
<td>4. <strong>Analyzing:</strong> Breaking material into constituent parts, determining how the parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose through differentiating, organizing, and attributing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Synthesis:</strong> The ability to put parts together to form a coherent or unique new whole.</td>
<td>5. <strong>Evaluating:</strong> Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Evaluation:</strong> The ability to judge, check, and even critique the value of material for a given purpose.</td>
<td>6. <strong>Creating:</strong> Putting elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganizing elements into a new pattern or structure through generating, planning or producing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of the Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy with other Critical Thinking Models.

In addition to the original and revised Bloom’s taxonomy, several other models have been developed more recently to describe the various cognitive levels that are involved in critical thinking. Examples include the Reflective Judgment Model developed by King and Kitchener (1994) and Perry’s Theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development (Perry, 1970, 1981), which are summarized below in Table 5. Similar to the revised Bloom’s taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), the Reflective Judgment Model assumes that each successive stage is more complex than the previous one. While Bloom’s (1964) stages reflect the individual’s use of information, the Reflective Judgment Model describes how knowledge is acquired and then justified by an individual. Perry’s (1970, 1981) model is specifically applied to undergraduate college students and it also describes cognitive development as advancing though a series of successive stages. These nine stages describe student attitudes towards knowledge and they are grouped into four categories: Dualism, Multiplicity, Relativism, and Commitment to Relativism.
**Table 5: Critical Thinking Models.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perry’s Theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development</th>
<th>Reflective Judgment Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dualism:</strong> Students generally take the position that knowledge is certain and that there is a single correct answer; the world is viewed within the context of right/wrong or black/white.</td>
<td><strong>Stage 1:</strong> Knowledge is assumed to exist absolutely and concretely, and can be obtained with certainty by direct observation. There is absolute correspondence between what is believed to be true and what is true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiplicity:</strong> Students advance to the point of recognizing that uncertainty exists and that there are multiple perspectives to an issue. All opinions are considered to be equal.</td>
<td><strong>Stage 2:</strong> Knowledge is assumed to be absolutely certain or certain, but not readily available. It can be obtained directly through the senses or via authority figures. Beliefs are unexamined and unjustified or justified by their correspondence with the beliefs of an authority figure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relativism:</strong> Students learn to evaluate evidence and distinguish between strong and weak arguments. Knowledge is contextual/relative and requires one to take a position.</td>
<td><strong>Stage 3:</strong> Knowledge is assumed to be absolutely certain or temporarily uncertain. In areas of temporary uncertainty, only personal beliefs can be known until absolute knowledge is obtained. In areas of absolute certainty, knowledge is obtained from authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to Relativism:</strong> Students learn to make commitments based on the understanding that knowledge is contextual and relativistic. Knowledge learned from others is integrated with personal experiences/reflection when making decisions.</td>
<td><strong>Stage 4:</strong> Knowledge is uncertain and knowledge claims are distinctive to the individual since situational variables dictate that knowing always involves an element of ambiguity. Beliefs are justified by giving reasons and using evidence, but the arguments and choice of evidence are idiosyncratic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stage 5:</strong> Knowledge is contextual and subjective since it is filtered through a person's perceptions and criteria for judgment. Only interpretations of evidence, events, or issues may be known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stage 6:</strong> Knowledge is constructed into individual conclusions about ill-structured problems on the basis of information from a variety of sources. Interpretations that are based on evaluations of evidence across contexts and on the evaluated opinions of reputable others can be known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stage 7:</strong> Knowledge is the outcome of a process of reasonable inquiry in which solutions to ill-structured problems are constructed. The adequacy of those solutions is evaluated in terms of what is most reasonable or probable according to the current evidence, and it is reevaluated when relevant new evidence, perspectives, or tools of inquiry become available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the FAMU QEP is focused on the use of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy as the theoretical framework for enhancing students’ critical thinking skills, it is acknowledged that components of other critical thinking frameworks, such as those described above, may prove to be useful as well. Consequently, the faculty development component of the FAMU QEP will include workshop sessions on the use of the various critical thinking frameworks to develop instructional strategies, assessment rubrics, and curriculum materials.
Application of the Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy to FAMU’s QEP.

As described above, for purposes of the FAMU QEP, the revised Bloom’s taxonomy will be used as the theoretical framework because it is more compatible with describing student learning as an active and ongoing process. In addition, the levels of the revised taxonomy align well with the definition of critical thinking used by the FAMU General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC), “the ability to understand, apply knowledge, analyze and solve problems, develop new knowledge, and think creatively.” Table 6 connects FAMU’s definition with all levels of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy.

**Table 6: Connection of FAMU’s Critical Thinking Definition to Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMU GEAC Definition</th>
<th>Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Understand</td>
<td>Remembering, Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Knowledge</td>
<td>Remembering, Understanding, Applying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and Solve Problems</td>
<td>Analyzing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop New Knowledge</td>
<td>Evaluating, Creating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Creatively</td>
<td>Evaluating, Creating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A particularly useful feature of Bloom’s taxonomy is the hierarchical arrangement of cognitive abilities, which provides a straightforward method for educators to design instructional objectives and activities that link directly to desired student learning outcomes. Assignments (and assessment instruments) can be structured to develop and enhance students’ critical thinking skills at each cognitive level. The revised Bloom’s taxonomy will be utilized as part of the FAMU QEP to sharpen the University’s existing focus on developing and enhancing undergraduate students’ critical thinking skills, beginning with selected freshman courses, thus developing a more prepared individual for upper-division coursework and the challenges of college life, career and society. The revised Bloom’s taxonomy will be specifically used to guide the development of instructional and assessment instruments in the targeted courses. This will require faculty in these disciplines to receive in-depth training on the theory and use of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy to teach and assess critical thinking skills. Rubrics and other assessment instruments developed from the FAMU QEP initiatives will use the language and terminology associated with the revised Bloom’s taxonomy.

D. **Best Practices for Enhancing Critical Thinking Skills.**

**Enhancing Critical Thinking through Written Communication.**

Jhony Jhaimes (2005) conducted a study that explored the relationship between reaction papers, reflective writing, critical thinking and learning. In K-12 education, the opinion of students is not required in many written assignments; in fact, memorization is the focus, with examinations being administered based on the prescribed context. In college, students are often encouraged to write reaction papers (also known as responsive reflective papers, or critical essays), which requires students to express their own intelligent and informed opinions based on thoughtful reflection on and responses to claims made in the respective readings. Assigning reaction papers on the college level helps students to develop reflective skill and accordingly, to think critically about a topic. Therefore, it is important for professors to challenge their own assumptions about the ability of students to engage in reflective writing based on critical thinking. Accordingly, professors should give detailed guidance on the contents of a reaction paper or critical
essay, as this is a new activity for undergraduate students. Faculty development on pedagogical strategies for encouraging critical thinking through reflective and critical writing will broaden the campus-wide impact of the QEP and should result in an enhancement in student critical thinking and overall writing quality (Condon & Kelly-Riley, 2004).

Through the FAMU QEP focus on critical essays, as delineated in Student Learning Outcome #1, freshman students enrolled in first-year English courses will be equipped with foundational knowledge on how to think through and produce critical essays, as well as obtaining an understanding of the underlying principles of thinking critically in the writing process. This foundational focus should help students as they advance into the upper division.

Enhancing Critical Thinking through the Case Study Approach.

The case study approach is a specific, active and collaborative/cooperative learning strategy that will be used in the FAMU QEP. Dittenhofer (1992, p. 17) defines case studies as “real-life situation[s] that [are] intended to instruct through the use of associated situational material that identifies concepts that the instructor wishes to be brought to the attention of the student.” Case studies involve real or hypothetical scenarios in which students engage in problem identification, information analysis and evaluation, and decision-making. Wolfer and Baker (2000) posit that participating in theory-based simulation case studies enhances students’ critical thinking skills by forcing them to move from theory to application in a real life scenario. Case study teaching is also important for establishing an interdisciplinary campus curriculum; it challenges both students and faculty to leave the safety, security, and familiarity of their respective disciplines (Muhar, Vilsmaier, Glanzer, & Freyer, 2006).

Faculty members believe case-based instruction and the use of case studies to be one of the most effective teaching methods for developing students’ critical thinking and deepening their understanding (Braun, 2004). From the student perspective, student attendance is better when case studies are used rather than lectures; students also report that course content is more enjoyable and easier to remember (Finney & Pike, 2008). Finney and Pyke (2008) reported content relevance in case study teaching with respect to the positive effects on student motivation when students have active connections with alumni from a workplace environment. By associating and identifying concepts of interest illustrated in a case scenario from a relevant environment, students’ critical thinking skills are honed in the stepwise method prescribed in Bloom’s taxonomy, such that they are able to match the “practical know-how with theoretical know-why” (Braun, 2004, p. 233).

To achieve Student Learning Outcome #2 of the FAMU QEP, case studies will be incorporated into the curricula of African-American history courses in order to provide freshman students with opportunities for enhancing their higher order critical thinking skills. Interdisciplinary groups of faculty will annually select case studies that will be used in the targeted courses. Students will be required to develop written analyses of the case studies, which will be assessed using a uniform critical thinking rubric.
Enhancing Critical Thinking through Information Literacy.

“Information literacy” is a term which has emerged as “a way to describe how one manages the exponential increase in information, now available instantaneously, in this age of computerized access” (Albitz, 2007). In August 2006, information literacy was suggested by FAMU faculty as one of eight (8) topics for the FAMU QEP. Although critical thinking was ultimately selected, it became clear in the QEP development process that information literacy is essential to enhancing performance in critical thinking information literacy and impacting student learning.

Technology continues to increase the volume and complexity of data and information, and students have unlimited access to data, which are assertions that are assumed to be factual because of their source (e.g., “I read it in the newspaper,” or “I found it on the Internet”). Data themselves are not always useful. However, when data are structured, organized, processed, or presented in a specific context which renders them useful, then those data become information. Christina Doyle (1994, p. 4081) offers that:

- Critical thinking and information literacy skills need to be consciously merged. They must become part of the assessment criteria for American students. While critical thinking skills provide the theoretical basis for the process, information literacy provides the skills for practical, real world application. Students need to acquire competence with critical thinking and information literacy in skills which are part of the core curriculum. These experiences must simulate real life situations closely, because “real life” is what education purports to prepare students for.

In fact, in describing what it means to be information literate, Doyle (1994) explicitly uses many of the descriptors of Bloom’s Taxonomy, both original and revised; other Bloom’s descriptors are implied through usage. She says that an information literate student:

- Recognizes (understands) that accurate and complete information is the basis for intelligent decision making;
- Evaluates information;
- Formulates questions based on information needs (analysis, analyzing)
- Organizes information for practical application;
- Integrates new information into an existing body of knowledge (synthesis, evaluating); and
- Uses information in critical thinking and problem solving (synthesis, creating) (Doyle, 1994, p. 3).

Accordingly, enhancing students’ information literacy skills, and consequently, their critical thinking skills, is an expected outcome of the FAMU QEP, as stated in Student Learning Outcome #4. This outcome will be achieved in the FAMU QEP by providing students with collaborative information literacy experiences in the library and classroom that will enable them to locate, evaluate, and effectively use materials to meet their information needs. Library faculty will provide information literacy instruction to students enrolled in freshman English courses each semester. Student learning will be measured by assessing students on their knowledge of information covered in the information literacy sessions and by assessing how well students use and appropriately cite available information resources to complete in-class assignments.
Enhancing Critical Thinking through Faculty Development.

Effective faculty development increases faculty morale, strengthens faculty vitality, and highlights faculty commitment, which in turn contributes to the accomplishment of institutional and student learning goals (Kang & Miller, 2000). Accordingly, faculty development will be essential to achieving the overarching goal of the FAMU QEP to improve student learning in the area of critical thinking. This need for faculty development in connection to the FAMU QEP is also highlighted by a review of the literature, which shows that faculty members often do not have the formal training to teach students to think critically (Paul, 2005).

Despite the fact that faculty members are indeed the experts in their respective fields, Paul (2005) and others have found that their expertise in teaching students to think critically pales in comparison to their knowledge of their subject areas. In fact, Paul (2005, p. 27) states, “Most college faculty at all levels lack a substantive concept of critical thinking... Most college faculty don’t realize they lack a substantive concept of critical thinking. They believe that they sufficiently understand it and assume they are already teaching critical thinking to students.” Similarly, Huber (1999, p. 1), states “For most faculty members in higher education,” “discussions about teaching and learning tend to be fugitive affairs. Our colleagues may care deeply about their courses, their students, and their department’s curriculum, but do not usually see their own teaching and learning as a matter for scholarly inquiry and communication.”

These sentiments are supported by observations made during the development of the FAMU QEP. During this process, many FAMU faculty members who submitted surveys to aid in the selection of the QEP topic, and those who participated in events such as the QEP Boot Camps and QEP Brown Bag Luncheons, articulated the need for enhanced student critical thinking, while also asserting that they were including critical thinking in their courses. However, upon further discussion, it was evident that individual faculty members had their own operational definitions of critical thinking, in terms of what it is, what it is not, and whether it can be taught. Many faculty were also unaware that FAMU had adopted its own operational definition of critical thinking.

The faculty development component of the FAMU QEP (Goals #2, #3 and #4) will promote student learning by ensuring that faculty who teach freshman students in English and African-American history courses are aware of and utilize uniform and effective methods of teaching and assessing students’ critical thinking skills. Faculty will receive training from FAMU and external experts on how to incorporate critical thinking best practices, such as writing assignments and the case study approach, into their course curricula. They will also learn how to design and use effective instruments for assessing critical thinking skills, such as rubrics and tests. In addition to the focus on improving student learning at the freshman level, the FAMU QEP also seeks to impact and enhance student learning at all levels of the University. Goal #5 of the FAMU QEP will support this initiative by establishing an ongoing campus-wide critical thinking faculty development program. Faculty in all disciplines throughout the University will be encouraged to participate in the faculty development program and to incorporate the learned instructional and assessment best practices into their course curricula.
E. Conclusion.

The concept of student learning in postsecondary education has emerged as an issue of critical importance (Head, 2008). The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools - Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) defines student learning as “changes in knowledge, skills, behaviors, or values.” Florida A&M University has defined critical thinking as “the ability to understand, apply, analyze, and solve problems, develop new knowledge, and think creatively.” Therefore, improving student learning is inherent in FAMU’s QEP of “Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking” due to the anticipated positive, incremental changes in students’: 1) critical thinking skills and their precursor skills of comprehension, communication and information literacy; 2) knowledge of English and African-American history concepts; and 3) work products, as demonstrated by the improvements in their English and African-American history assignments and their performance on direct assessment instruments that measure critical thinking skills. Thus, within the context of the FAMU QEP, enhancing students’ critical thinking skills is synonymous with improving student learning. FAMU is preparing its students to be the new millennium citizens with critical thinking skills and abilities to process information and reach independent, reflective, and informed decisions that are necessary learning outcomes in a world where citizens are bombarded with multiple perspectives on any given issue (Donald, 2002; Pithers, 2000).
V. QEP Framework and Anticipated Benefits to the University

The preceding literature review and discussion were used to develop the framework for the FAMU QEP, which is summarized as follows:

A. QEP Framework.

Critical thinking skills can be taught. Well-designed instructional methods and activities can be utilized as a means for teaching and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills. The FAMU QEP will promote the development and usage of specific in-class critical thinking assignments in lower-division English and African-American history courses. While a myriad of effective instructional strategies can be implemented to enhance critical thinking, the FAMU QEP will enhance critical thinking through the use of written communication, the case study approach and information literacy; as part of the continuous assessment of the FAMU QEP, other strategies may be employed. The QEP Assessment sub-committee and the Department of English Composition Committee have developed a sample course syllabus for ENC 1101, which reflects how specific critical thinking instructional and learning objectives will be embedded in course curricula (sample course syllabus shown in Appendix XVI).

The English and African-American history courses were selected for inclusion in the FAMU QEP because they are required for all freshman students at the University. Enrollment data for these courses are shown below in Table 7 for the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters.

Table 7: Course Enrollment Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Semester</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2008 Semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman Enrollment (% of total Course Enrollment)</td>
<td>Number of Course Sections</td>
<td>Number of Instructors</td>
<td>Freshman Enrollment (% of total Course Enrollment)</td>
<td>Number of Course Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENC 1101</td>
<td>1416 (98%)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>427 (95%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENC 1102</td>
<td>374 (81%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1270 (90%)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMH 2091</td>
<td>1189 (86%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not taught during spring semesters</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA 3104</td>
<td>Not taught during fall semesters</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>680 (79%)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching and assessment should be related. In order to make an accurate determination of the level and quality of the ability of FAMU students to think critically, it is important that direct assessment instruments are utilized that measure the targeted skill sets and abilities. The FAMU QEP will facilitate the development of rubrics by faculty and staff members for use in assessing all critical thinking related course assignments in the targeted courses (see Appendix XVII for a copy of a sample critical thinking rubric that was developed by the QEP Assessment sub-committee). In addition, the FAMU QEP faculty development program will also
educate faculty with respect to the content and scope of University-wide assessment instruments, such as the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Performance (MAPP) test.

The FAMU QEP will also utilize a recently developed instrument, the Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) to assess student learning. The CAT is a direct assessment instrument developed by faculty and staff members at Tennessee Tech University that is designed to assess and promote the improvement of critical thinking and real-world problem solving skills (http://www.tntech.edu/cat/). The CAT is a one-hour short answer essay test that will be administered to freshman students at the beginning of the academic year as a pre-test and again at the conclusion of the freshman year (after the students complete ENC 1101, ENC 1102 and AMH 2091/AFA 3104) as a post-test to evaluate and document improvements in students’ critical thinking skills over the course of the freshman year.

FAMU has adopted a definition of critical thinking for General Education learning outcomes.

The FAMU QEP will promote the use and application of a common definition of critical thinking across the curriculum. The FAMU General Education Assessment Committee definition of critical thinking is: “the ability to understand, apply knowledge, analyze and solve problems, develop new knowledge, and think creatively.”

The critical thinking skills of FAMU students should be enhanced.

Review and analysis of internal University data, and information obtained from faculty, students and staff via direct and indirect methods of opinion solicitation, indicate that the current ability of FAMU students to effectively think critically is below University expectations. The selected focus area of the FAMU QEP is targeted to specifically address is issue.

The Revised Bloom’s taxonomy provides concepts and language that relate learning outcomes to FAMU’s definition of critical thinking.

The FAMU QEP will promote the use of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy as a tool for conceptualizing and coordinating the University’s existing (FAMU GEAC) and new (FAMU QEP) approaches to enhancing student learning in the area of critical thinking.

Faculty Development on critical thinking and related pedagogy will be vital to successful achievement of student learning outcomes.

The FAMU QEP will facilitate and augment the University’s efforts to provide faculty with the necessary resources and opportunities to enhance their ability to effectively teach and assess students’ critical thinking skills.

Critical essays and case studies are effective in promoting critical thinking.

Results from successful literature studies utilizing critical essays and the case study approach to enhance student critical thinking skills will be utilized to direct and guide efforts supported by the FAMU QEP.
B. Anticipated Benefits to the University.

Successful implementation of the FAMU QEP will provide several benefits to the University, including the following:

1. The course curricula for freshman English and African-American history courses will be modified to include an explicit focus on improving student learning in the area of critical thinking.

2. Improved student learning and performance on course assignments and tests that assess critical thinking skills.

3. Improved faculty pedagogical approaches for teaching critical thinking skills in general education English and history courses, which should lead to enhanced student learning in the classroom.

4. Adoption of uniform instruments for assessing students’ critical thinking skills, which will enhance open communication of course expectations between faculty and students.

5. Establishment of a web-based critical thinking repository to aid students in enhancing their critical thinking skills.

6. Establishment of a Critical Thinking Newsletter to enhance open communication regarding best practices available for enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

7. Establishment of a critical thinking faculty development program, which should also lead to enhanced student learning in the classroom.
### VI. Actions to be Implemented

A. The following charts contain descriptions of key QEP activities that will be implemented to impact student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Improve and Assess Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.</th>
<th>Objective: Provide Intentional Opportunities (In and Out of Class) for Students to Enhance Critical Thinking Skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SLO #1): Students will be able to write and present critical essays demonstrating critical thinking skills on various topics of literary, sociological, political and/or historical significance.</td>
<td>Freshman Communicative Skills I (ENC 1101): A critical thinking rubric will be used to assess diagnostic critical essays assigned at the beginning (pre-assessment) and end (post-assessment) of the semester. Students will be expected to show an increase in the scores obtained on the pre- and post-assessment assignments to demonstrate an improvement in their critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman Communicative Skills II (ENC 1102): A critical thinking rubric will be used to assess critical essays assigned at the beginning (pre-assessment) and end (post-assessment) of the semester. Students will be expected to show an increase in the scores obtained on the pre- and post-assessment assignments to demonstrate an improvement in their critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman Communicative Skills II (ENC 1102): A critical thinking rubric will be used to assess critical essays written on a literary work, where the students will be required to analyze and evaluate the work, and present their opinions and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SLO #2): Students will be able to effectively analyze and defend an interdisciplinary case study with historical significance.</td>
<td>Introduction to African-American History (AMH 2091) or The African-American Experience (AFA 3104): Students are required to complete one of these courses to fulfill the University’s social science general education requirement. A uniform critical thinking rubric will be used to assess written case study analyses on topics of historical significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Goal 1: Improve and Assess Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

**Objective:** Provide Intentional Opportunities (In and Out of Class) for Students to Enhance Critical Thinking Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Targeted Participants</th>
<th>Responsible Unit(s)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SLO #3): Students will be able to identify and apply effective strategies for improving their critical thinking skills.</td>
<td><strong>Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series:</strong> Seminar presentations highlighting successful critical thinking strategies, and related topics, will be conducted each semester. Students will be given assignments in their English courses to assess their mastery of the covered topics.</td>
<td>Freshman students.</td>
<td>QEP Director/staff, speakers and English faculty.</td>
<td>There will be a minimum of three presentations each semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series:</strong> At least one nationally recognized speaker will be invited to visit the campus each year to deliver a lecture on topics that promote and stimulate students’ critical thinking skills. Students will be required to write critical essays on the talks, which will be assessed using a critical thinking rubric in their English courses.</td>
<td>Freshman students.</td>
<td>QEP Director/staff, speakers and English faculty.</td>
<td>This activity will occur during the spring semesters each academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Freshman Summer Reading Program:</strong> Incoming freshman students will be required to read an assigned text during the summer prior to enrolling for the fall term. During the fall Welcome Week, the students will be organized into several groups to facilitate discussion and analysis of the assigned text. Students will be required to write critical essays on the texts, which will be assessed using a critical thinking rubric in their English courses.</td>
<td>Freshman students.</td>
<td>Division of Student Affairs, English faculty.</td>
<td>This activity will occur during August of each academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Information Literacy Workshop:</strong> Students enrolled in ENC 1101 and ENC 1102 will participate in Information Literacy Workshops facilitated by the University Library faculty. The workshops will teach students how to recognize when information is needed and equip them to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information.</td>
<td>Freshman students.</td>
<td>Library faculty, English faculty.</td>
<td>This activity will occur during the first two weeks of each semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Goal 1: Improve and Assess Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

### Objective: Use Direct and Indirect Assessment Tools to Measure Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Targeted Participants</th>
<th>Responsible Unit(s)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAMU will accurately assess students’ critical thinking skills. The assessment results will be used to guide improvement of student learning at the University.</td>
<td><strong>Measure of Academic Proficiency and Performance (MAPP) Test:</strong> The MAPP test is a direct assessment instrument that will be administered annually during the fall semester to freshman (pre-test) and senior (post-test) students. A comparison of results obtained from the pre- and post-assessment tests will be used as a means for evaluating and documenting improvements in students’ critical thinking skills.</td>
<td>Freshman and senior students.</td>
<td>Office of University Assessment.</td>
<td>The MAPP test will be administered annually to freshman and senior students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT):</strong> The CAT is a direct assessment instrument developed by faculty and staff members at Tennessee Tech University that is designed to assess and promote the improvement of critical thinking and real-world problem solving skills (<a href="http://www.tntech.edu/cat/">http://www.tntech.edu/cat/</a>). The CAT is a one-hour short answer essay test that will be administered to freshman students at the beginning of the academic year as a pre-test and again at the conclusion of the freshman year (after the students complete ENC 1101, ENC 1102 and AMH 2091/AFA 3104) as a post-test to evaluate and document improvements in students’ critical thinking skills over the course of the freshman year.</td>
<td>Freshman students.</td>
<td>QEP Director, staff and faculty evaluators.</td>
<td>The CAT test will be administered during the first month of the fall semester and again during the latter part of the spring semester of each academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE):</strong> The NSSE instrument will be administered in years 2 and 5 during the spring semester to freshman and senior students as an indirect measurement of students’ critical thinking skills.</td>
<td>Freshman and senior students.</td>
<td>Office of University Assessment.</td>
<td>The NSEE will be administered years 2 and 5 to freshman and senior students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE):</strong> The FSSE instrument will be administered annually to faculty members as an indirect measurement of students’ critical thinking skills.</td>
<td>University faculty.</td>
<td>Office of University Assessment.</td>
<td>The FSSE will be administered annually to faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 2: Enhance and Assess Faculty Use of Instructional Strategies that Develop Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

**Objective:** Implement Professional Development Opportunities to Improve Faculty Pedagogical Approaches to Teaching Critical Thinking Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Targeted Participants</th>
<th>Responsible Unit(s)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use pedagogical approaches appropriate for developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills. Increased use of best practices by faculty members will result in improved student performance on course assignments and tests.</td>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshops:</strong> Seminar presentations highlighting effective pedagogical approaches for teaching critical thinking and related topics, will be conducted throughout the academic year.</td>
<td>English and history faculty (primary target). All faculty (secondary target).</td>
<td>QEP Director and staff, invited speakers from on and off campus.</td>
<td>There will be a minimum of two presentations on pedagogy each academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 3: Enhance and Assess Faculty Use of Strategies for Assessing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

**Objective:** Implement Professional Development Opportunities to Improve Faculty Assessment of Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Targeted Participants</th>
<th>Responsible Unit(s)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use strategies appropriate for assessing students’ critical thinking skills. Improved student learning will result from increased use of effective critical thinking assessment instruments.</td>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshops:</strong> Seminar presentations highlighting effective methods for assessing critical thinking and related topics, will be conducted throughout the academic year.</td>
<td>English and history faculty (primary target). All faculty (secondary target).</td>
<td>QEP Director and staff, invited speakers from on and off campus.</td>
<td>There will be a minimum of two presentations on assessment each academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Goal 4: Enhance and Assess Faculty Design of Curriculum and Curricular Materials Related to Developing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

**Objective:** Implement Professional Development Opportunities to Improve Faculty Design of Curricula for Developing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Targeted Participants</th>
<th>Responsible Unit(s)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and design and select curricula and curriculum materials appropriate for developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills. Improved student learning will result from enhancements to course curricula.</td>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshops:</strong> Seminar presentations highlighting effective methods for designing and selecting curricula and curriculum materials will be conducted throughout the academic year.</td>
<td>English and history faculty (primary target). All faculty (secondary target).</td>
<td>QEP Director and staff, invited speakers from on and off campus.</td>
<td>There will be a minimum of two presentations on curriculum design each academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Goal 5: Develop and Assess an Ongoing System for Faculty Development and Communication with Faculty to Promote Best Practices for Teaching and Assessing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

**Objective:** Implement Professional Development Opportunities to Improve Faculty Design of Curricula for Developing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Targeted Participants</th>
<th>Responsible Unit(s)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will participate in faculty development activities designed to enhance faculty use of instructional, assessment, and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills. Improved student learning will result from the use and publicizing of uniform critical thinking skills assessment rubrics (and other best practices) across the University’s curricula.</td>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshops:</strong> Seminar presentations highlighting best practices for teaching and assessing students’ critical thinking skills, and curriculum design, will be conducted throughout the academic year. <strong>External Workshops and Conferences:</strong> Travel support will be provided to at least two faculty members to participate in external professional development conferences and workshops.</td>
<td>University faculty.</td>
<td>QEP Director and staff, invited speakers from on and off campus.</td>
<td>Travel schedules will be dictated by event dates. There will be a minimum of three campus-wide presentations each year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal 5:** Develop and Assess an Ongoing System for Faculty Development and Communication with Faculty to Promote Best Practices for Teaching and Assessing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

**Objective:** Implement a Campus-wide Faculty Professional Development Program and Increase Communication to Faculty of Best Practices for Enhancing Students’ Critical Thinking Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome/Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Key Activity</th>
<th>Targeted Participants</th>
<th>Responsible Unit(s)</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Newsletter:</strong> A newsletter highlighting best practices for teaching and assessing critical thinking skills will be created and disseminated to the campus community.</td>
<td>University faculty, students, administrators and support staff.</td>
<td>QEP Director and staff.</td>
<td>The newsletter will be distributed once during the fall and spring semesters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>University-based Critical Thinking Skills Resource Website:</strong> A repository of critical thinking resources will be created and maintained by the University for use by the campus community.</td>
<td>University faculty, students, administrators and support staff.</td>
<td>QEP Director and staff.</td>
<td>The website will be ready for use by the end of the first semester of the QEP implementation. It will be updated on a monthly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking Skills Day:</strong> A campus-wide event will be held annually to celebrate and highlight ongoing critical thinking activities at FAMU.</td>
<td>University faculty, students, administrators and support staff.</td>
<td>QEP Director and staff.</td>
<td>The event will take place once during the spring semester of each academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mechanisms will be developed and maintained for communicating with faculty about instructional, assessment and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills. Increased faculty awareness of best practices will result in an increase in usage of best practices in the classroom, and consequently an enhancement in student learning.
B. The following charts contain descriptions of key activities involved in implementation of the QEP from an institutional perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal: Successfully Implement the FAMU QEP.</th>
<th>Objective: Provide Sufficient Financial and Human Resources to Support the QEP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>QEP Budget:</strong> The Office of Academic Affairs will allocate an annual operating budget to support the QEP in accordance with the spending plan outlined in the QEP 5-year budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>End-of-Year Financial Reports:</strong> The QEP Director will generate annual financial reports detailing how allocated funds were spent, and detailing the impact of the funded activities on improving student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal: Successfully Implement the FAMU QEP.</th>
<th>Objective: Continuously Collect and Review the Assessment Data Generated from the QEP Activities and Implement Necessary Changes to the QEP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Communication with University Stakeholders:</strong> Regular updates on the QEP activities, including assessment results, will be presented to University stakeholders to solicit feedback on ways to improve the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Annual QEP Report:</strong> An annual report on the QEP activities, including assessment results, will be generated and presented to the QEP Advisory Committee, SACS Leadership Team and the University Administration for review and to generate feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A 5-year timeline of the proposed QEP activities is listed below. After year 1, the topics of the workshops and seminars will be changed to address existing needs as determined by the outcomes of the continuous QEP assessment process.

**Spring 2009 Schedule of Activities**

**January 2009**
- QEP Campus-wide Feedback Forum
- Submit QEP document to SACS-COC

**February 2009**
- Initial QEP Advisory Committee Meeting

**March 2009**
- SACS-COC Onsite Visit
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Strategies for Assessing Student Critical Thinking Skills* (Part I)
- Attend CAT Test Train the Trainer Workshop (Boulder, CO)

**April 2009**
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Pedagogical Approaches for Enhancing Student Performance in Critical Thinking* (Part I); this first workshop session will include a component on developing course syllabi.
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Designing Courses to Enhance Student Performance in Critical Thinking* (Part I)
- QEP Update to FAMU Student Government Association & FAMU Faculty Senate
- QEP Update to FAMU Board of Trustees

**Summer 2009 Schedule of Activities**

**May 2009**
- Begin QEP Pilot Study during Summer Semester
- Begin Mailing Instructions to Admitted Students about *Freshman Summer Reading Program*

**June 2009**
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Strategies for Assessing Student Critical Thinking Skills* (Part II)

**July 2009**
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Pedagogical Approaches for Enhancing Student Performance in Critical Thinking* (Part II)
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Designing Courses to Enhance Student Performance in Critical Thinking* (Part II)

**August 2009**
- Assess Results of QEP Pilot Study

**Fall 2009 through Fall 2013 Schedule of Activities**

**August**
- Welcome Week – *Freshman Summer Reading Program*
- QEP Update during the Annual Faculty Planning Conference
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Strategies for Assessing Student Critical Thinking Skills* (Part III)
- Faculty Development Workshop – Pedagogical Approaches for Enhancing Student Performance in Critical Thinking (Part III)
- Faculty Development Workshop – Designing Courses to Enhance Student Performance in Critical Thinking (Part III)
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**September**
- Information Literacy Sessions for Freshman Students and Faculty
- Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series – What is Critical Thinking?
- Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series – How to Write Critical Essays
- Pre-test Assessment of Critical Essays in ENC 1101 & ENC 1102
- Pre-test Assessment of Case Study Analyses in AMH 2091
- Administration of MAPP Test to Freshman and Senior Students
- Administration of CAT Test to Freshman Students (Pre-test Assessment)
- QEP Update to FAMU Student Government Association & FAMU Faculty Senate
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**October**
- Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series – How to Effectively Analyze Case Studies
- Faculty Development Workshop – Strategies for Assessing Student Critical Thinking Skills (Part IV)
- Faculty Development Workshop – Pedagogical Approaches for Enhancing Student Performance in Critical Thinking (Part IV)
- Faculty Development Workshop – Designing Courses to Enhance Student Performance in Critical Thinking (Part IV)
- Publication of QEP Critical Thinking Newsletter/QEP Update via FAMU TV20
- QEP Update to FAMU Administrative Leadership Team
- QEP Update to FAMU Board of Trustees
- QEP Update to FAMU Industry Cluster
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**November**
- Post-test Assessment of Critical Essays in ENC 1101 & ENC 1102
- Post-test Assessment of Case Study Analyses in AMH 2091
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**December**
- Review and Analyze Assessment and other Pertinent Data on Fall QEP Courses
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**Spring 2010 through Spring 2014 Schedule of Activities**

**January**
- Begin Implementation of Findings from Review of Fall Assessment Results
- Pre-test Assessment of Case Study Analyses in AFA 3104
- Pre-test Assessment of Critical Essays in ENC 1101 & ENC 1102
- Information Literacy Sessions for Students and Faculty
- Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series – Theory of Logic
- Faculty Development Workshop – Strategies for Assessing Student Critical Thinking Skills (Part V)
Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking

- Faculty Development Workshop – *Pedagogical Approaches for Enhancing Student Performance in Critical Thinking* (Part V)
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**February**

- Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series – *Effective Strategies for Writing Extended Essays*
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Designing Courses to Enhance Student Performance in Critical Thinking* (Part V)
- QEP Update to FAMU Student Government Association & FAMU Faculty Senate
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**March**

- Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series – *Examining Attitudes and Perceptions of African-American Students towards Foreign Students on Campus* (Sponsored by FAMU Office of International Education and Development)
- Invited Lecturer Series
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Strategies for Assessing Student Critical Thinking Skills* (Part V)
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**April**

- Post-test Assessment of Critical Essays in ENC 1101 & ENC 1102
- Post-test Assessment of Case Study Analyses in AFA 3104
- Administration of CAT Test to Freshman Students (Post-test Assessment)
- Administration of NSSE (years 2 and 5) and FSSE
- Publication of *QEP Critical Thinking Newsletter/QEP Update via FAMU TV20*
- Annual *Critical Thinking Day*
- QEP Update to FAMU Administrative Leadership Team
- QEP Update to FAMU Industry Cluster
- QEP Update to FAMU Board of Trustees
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**May**

- Review and Analyze Assessment and other Pertinent Data on Spring QEP Courses
- Complete and Submit Annual QEP Report to SACS Leadership Team and the University Administration for review and feedback
- QEP Advisory Committee Meeting/Submit Monthly QEP Update to SACS Leadership Team/Administration

**Summer 2010 through Summer 2014 Schedule of Activities**

**May**

- Begin Mailing Instructions to Admitted Students about *Freshman Summer Reading Program*

**June**

- Begin Implementation of Findings from Review of Annual Assessment Results
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Topic TBD*

**July**

- Faculty Development Workshop – *Topic TBD*
- Faculty Development Workshop – *Topic TBD*
**VIII. Broad Based Involvement of University Stakeholders in Implementation of the FAMU QEP**

Successful implementation of the FAMU QEP will require involvement from all University stakeholders. Provided below in Table 8 are summaries of how key University stakeholders will be involved in the QEP implementation process.

**Table 8: Broad Based Involvement in QEP Implementation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Method of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Student involvement will be achieved by a variety of mechanisms, including the following: updates on the progress of the QEP will be given at meetings of the Student Government Association (SGA) at least once during each semester; students enrolled in the targeted courses will complete surveys at the end of each semester to provide feedback on the QEP activities; students who attend the seminar sessions will complete surveys; and a SGA representative will serve on the QEP Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty will be involved in all phases of the implementation. Regular updates on the progress of the FAMU QEP will be given to faculty during activities such as monthly Faculty Senate meetings, the Annual University Faculty Planning Conference, and College and Schools faculty meetings. In addition, faculty will be provided with information via electronic sources via the website and an electronic QEP Newsletters. Feedback from faculty will be solicited in the form of faculty questionnaires and surveys. The FAMU QEP website will also be equipped to allow faculty to provide feedback on the QEP on a regular basis. A Faculty Senate representative will serve on the QEP Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>The University administration will be involved in all phases of the QEP implementation. The QEP is housed in the Office of Academic Affairs and the QEP Director reports directly to the Associate VP for Institutional Effectiveness. The QEP Director will develop monthly written updates for review by the administration and SACS Leadership Team and an annual QEP report will be developed and presented to the University administration and SACS Leadership Team for feedback. The QEP Director and the University administration will conduct regular reviews of the resource allocations to ensure that the QEP is properly funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>University support staff will receive copies of all QEP publication materials and their input will be solicited in the form of surveys and questionnaires distributed at the QEP events, such as the annual Critical Thinking Day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>The University Office of Alumni Affairs will be used to involve alumni in the QEP implementation. The Alumni Affairs Director will serve on the QEP Advisory Board and that office will use its existing communication mechanisms to provide updates and solicit feedback (via surveys and questionnaires) from alumni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Updates on the progress of the QEP will be given at BOT meetings at least once each semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Partners</td>
<td>The FAMU Industry Cluster will be used as the mechanisms for involving the University’s corporate partners. The Cluster meetings are held on campus twice per year; QEP updates and feedback solicitations will be given at these events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>The University QEP website and the University public TV station, FAMU TV20, will be used as the primary means for informing the general public about ongoing QEP activities. The QEP Director will conduct at least one interview per year on FAMU TV 20. Community feedback will be solicited via the FAMU website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The FAMU QEP will be housed in the Office of Academic Affairs. Day-to-day management will be the responsibility of a QEP Director, who will report directly to the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness. The key components of the QEP organizational structure are described below and in Figure 3.

- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs – Responsible for all academic activities at the university.
- SACS Accreditation Liaison and SACS Leadership Team – Coordinates all SACS-related activities for the University.
- Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness – Supervises the activities of the QEP Director; serves as the main contact between the Provost/SACS Leadership Team and the QEP Director and other personnel working on the QEP activities. This individual will also serve as a resource on matters related to plans of operation, budget, assessment and modifications of the QEP.
- QEP Director – Reports directly to the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and is responsible for overseeing the development, implementation and assessment of the FAMU QEP.
- QEP Advisory Committee – Has an advisory role and will work with the QEP Director to monitor the programs and activities that are needed to complete and document the progress of the QEP. The committee will also make recommendations for strengthening and enhancing the plan.
- Coordinator of Administrative Services – Performs administrative tasks associated with QEP implementation.
- Faculty Development Coordinator – Schedules and coordinates faculty development workshops and related activities.
- Department-Level Critical Thinking Coordinators – Coordinate the critical thinking activities in the respective departments.
- Assessment/Survey Coordinator – Responsible for facilitating all activities related to the collection and analysis of assessment data.
- Research Assistant – Responsible for providing assistance with data collection and analysis.
- Technology/Web Support Specialist – Provides technical and web support.
Figure 3. QEP Organizational Structure.
X. Resources

Florida A&M University has committed $2.1 million from the budget of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to the first five years of the QEP as described below.

Budget Narrative

Payroll-related:
A. QEP Director: This position will be filled by a full-time faculty member who will devote an effort of 80% towards the QEP. The estimated 12-month salary is $97,600 (plus $26,352 in fringe benefits) beginning in year 2009-2010. The salary for the second through fifth years of the program includes a 3% salary increase.

B. Coordinator of Administrative Services: The Coordinator of Administrative Services will dedicate 100% effort towards the QEP. The estimated annual salary is $42,000 (plus $11,340 in fringe benefits) beginning in year 2009-2010. The salary for the second through fifth years of the program includes a 3% salary increase. These funds will be obtained from the University Title III Program.

C. Department Level Coordinators: Stipends will be awarded to faculty to serve as Critical Thinking Coordinators. A total of four faculty members from the Departments of English (3 persons) and History (1 person) will each be awarded stipends in the amount of $6,000 per semester at a total annual cost of $48,000. These funds will be obtained from the University OPS budget.

D. Faculty Development Coordinator: One faculty member will receive a stipend to serve as the Faculty Development Coordinator at a total annual cost of $6,000 ($3,000 per semester). These funds will be obtained from the University OPS budget.

E. Assessment Coordinator: One faculty member will receive a stipend to serve as the Assessment Coordinator at a total annual cost of $6,000 ($3,000 per semester). These funds will be obtained from the University OPS budget.

F. Graduate Assistants: A total of four Graduate Assistants will be employed at an annual total cost of $48,000 (each employed $12.00 per hour, 20 hours/week for 50 weeks).

G. Technology/Web Support Specialist: One individual will be employed at a total annual cost of $50,000 ($25.00 per hour, 40 hours/week for 50 weeks).

Assessment, Education and Training:

• Assessment Instruments (CAT, NSSE, FSSE, MAPP): Cost for assessment is based on the cost of the following tools and selected student sampling for a total of $25,100 for years 1,3 and 4 and $32,600 for years 2 and 5:
  o CAT (1000 Freshmen @ $5.00 per student; administered twice per year) - $10,000
  o NSSE - $7,500 (to be administered in years 2 and 5 only).
  o FSSE - $1,100
  o MAPP Online Version (500 Freshmen, 200 Seniors @ $20.00 per student; includes optional essay component) – $14,000

• Travel: A total of $10,000 is annually allocated to support travel to attend five conferences and workshops.
• **Faculty Development Workshops**: A total of $10,000 is annually allocated to support on-campus faculty development workshops.

• **Invited Speakers/Consultants**: A total of $10,000 is annually allocated to cover the costs associated with inviting speakers to visit the campus for the *Freshman Seminar Series* and to hire consultants.

• **Software**: A total of $20,000 is allocated to purchase software to support instruction, assessment, and training activities in years one and four.

**Communication:**

• **Publication materials (newsletters, flyers, etc.):** $3,000 annually.

• **Forums/Outreach Programs:** $3,000 annually.

**Equipment:**

• **Faculty laptops**: Ten laptops will be purchased in years 1 through 4 for use by faculty involved with the FAMU QEP. The cost of each laptop is estimated at $1,000 for a total of $40,000 (40 laptops total).

**General and Administrative:**

• **General administrative costs**: A total of $10,000 is allocated annually to cover the costs associated with photocopying and reproduction, office supplies, postage, etc.
## Five-Year QEP Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Director (salary and f.b.)</td>
<td>$123,952.00</td>
<td>$127,670.56</td>
<td>$131,500.68</td>
<td>$135,445.70</td>
<td>$139,509.07</td>
<td>$658,078.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord. Admin. Svcs.(salary and f.b.)</td>
<td>$53,340.00</td>
<td>$54,940.20</td>
<td>$56,588.41</td>
<td>$58,286.06</td>
<td>$60,034.64</td>
<td>$283,189.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Stipends (6 Coordinators)</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
<td>$240,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Web Support Specialist</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$335,292.00</td>
<td>$340,610.76</td>
<td>$346,089.09</td>
<td>$351,731.76</td>
<td>$357,543.71</td>
<td>$1,731,267.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment, Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Instruments (CAT, MAPP, NSSE, FSSE)</td>
<td>$25,100.00</td>
<td>$32,600.00</td>
<td>$25,100.00</td>
<td>$25,100.00</td>
<td>$32,600.00</td>
<td>$140,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Workshops</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Speakers/Consultants</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$65,100.00</td>
<td>$62,600.00</td>
<td>$55,100.00</td>
<td>$65,100.00</td>
<td>$62,600.00</td>
<td>$310,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Materials</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums/Outreach Programs</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop Computers</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying, Office Supplies, etc.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$426,392.00</td>
<td>$429,210.76</td>
<td>$427,189.09</td>
<td>$442,831.76</td>
<td>$436,143.71</td>
<td>$2,161,767.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XI. Assessment

Overview

The QEP assessment plan describes the process that will be used to monitor, document and evaluate: a) the impact of the FAMU QEP on student learning; and b) the effectiveness of the implementation of the FAMU QEP from an institutional perspective. The QEP Director will supervise the implementation of the QEP assessment plan, with assistance from the Director of University Assessment and the QEP Assessment Coordinator.

Existing University Assessment Program

Assessment at FAMU is a core component of the institutional culture and is grounded in the values set forth in the University mission statement. The FAMU assessment program seeks to improve the quality of student learning, both within and outside the classroom, and produce life-long learners, by taking a bottom-up approach that begins at the individual course level, proceeds to the program/divisional level and culminates with an institutional level assessment. It is an inclusive, participatory, and collaborative process that generates data to be used for multiple purposes that include, but are not limited to, student engagement, student learning outcomes, curricular revision, pedagogy improvements, accreditation expectations, and public accountability.

FAMU has adopted the “FAMOUS” assessment planning and implementation model to ensure that at all levels of the University, a uniform process is used for planning assessment activities and documentation of results. The “FAMOUS” approach involves six sequential steps, which are each represented by a letter in the acronym.

Step 1: Formulate statements of outcomes/objectives aligned to the institutional mission/goals.
Step 2: Ascertain criteria for success.
Step 3: Measure performance using direct and indirect methods.
Step 4: Observe and analyze results for congruence between expected and actual outcomes.
Step 5: Use the results to effect improvement of instructional programs and services.
Step 6: Strengthen programs and services by continuously evaluating, planning, allocating resources and implementing new approaches.

QEP Assessment Plan

The “FAMOUS” model will be used to assess the FAMU QEP with respect to student learning and implementation as described below in Figure 4 and the accompanying charts. Assessment data will be collected and analyzed during the fall and spring semesters. At the conclusion of each academic year the assessment results will be used to compile an annual QEP report, which will be used to guide the continuous improvement of the FAMU QEP.
Figure 4. Overview of the FAMU QEP Assessment Plan.
A. Assessment of Impact of FAMU QEP on Student Learning.

The impact of the FAMU QEP on student learning will be assessed with respect to the objectives and outcomes that are related to each of the five QEP goals.

**QEP Goal #1:** Improve and assess students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Provide intentional opportunities (in and out of class) for students to enhance critical thinking skills.

- **Student Learning Outcome #1 (SLO #1):** Students will be able to write and present critical essays demonstrating critical thinking skills on various topics of literary, sociological, political and/or historical significance.

- **Student Learning Outcome #2 (SLO #2):** Students will be able to effectively analyze and defend an interdisciplinary case study with historical significance.

- **Student Learning Outcome: #3 (SLO #3):** Students will be able to identify and apply effective strategies for improving their critical thinking skills.

- **Student Learning Outcome #4 (SLO #4):** Students will recognize when they need information and be able to locate, evaluate and effectively use appropriate information materials and resources.

**QEP Goal #2:** Enhance and assess faculty use of instructional strategies that develop students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty pedagogical approaches to teaching critical thinking skills.

- **Outcome #1:** Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use pedagogical approaches appropriate for developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

**QEP Goal #3:** Enhance and assess faculty use of strategies for assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty assessment of students’ critical thinking skills.

- **Outcome #1:** Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use strategies appropriate for assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**QEP Goal #4:** Enhance and assess faculty design of curriculum and curricular materials related to developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty design of curricula for developing students’ critical thinking skills.
Outcome #1: Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and design and select curricula and curriculum materials appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.

QEP Goal #5: Develop and assess an ongoing system for faculty development and communication with faculty to promote best practices for teaching and assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

Objective: Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty design of curricula for enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

Outcome #1: Faculty will participate in faculty development activities designed to enhance faculty use of instructional, assessment, and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.

Outcome #2: The use of uniform critical thinking skills assessment rubrics will increase in courses across the University’s curricula.

Outcome #3: Mechanisms will be developed and maintained for communicating with faculty about instructional, assessment and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.
**QEP Goal #1:** Improve and assess students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Provide intentional opportunities (in and out of class) for students to enhance critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #1: Students will be able to write and present critical essays demonstrating critical thinking skills on various topics of literary, sociological, political and/or historical significance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success | **Direct Measure(s)**
  - At least 80% of freshmen enrolled in Freshman Communicative Skills I (ENC 1101) and Freshman Communicative Skills II (ENC 1102) will show an average increase of 1 point (on a 4-point scale) on critical essays assessed from the beginning (pre-assessment) to the end (post-assessment) of the semester. The critical essays will be assessed using the University’s uniform rubric designed to measure critical thinking skills.
  - At least 80% of freshmen enrolled in Freshman Communicative Skills II (ENC 1102) will obtain a minimum mean score of 3 (on a 4-point scale) on a critical essay critiquing a literary work. The critical essays will be assessed using the University’s uniform rubric designed to measure critical thinking skills.
  
  **Indirect Measure(s)**
  - On the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) section measuring mental activities (analyzing, synthesizing, and making judgment); the average rating will increase by 0.5 points on a scale of 1 to 4. This will be an increase compared to the 2008 NSSE results mental activities average 2.91. |
| Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | **Direct Measure(s)**
  - Students enrolled in ENC 1101 and ENC 1102 will be assessed on critical essays written at the beginning (pre-assessment) and end of each semester (post-assessment).
  
  **Indirect Measure(s)**
  - The NSSE will be administered to freshman and senior students. |
| Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| Step 6: Strengthen Program | The instructional and assessment activities will be continuously monitored and modified to improve student learning. |
### QEP Goal #1: Improve and assess students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Provide intentional opportunities (in and out of class) for students to enhance critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #2: Students will be able to effectively analyze and defend an interdisciplinary case study with historical significance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success** | Direct Measure(s)  
- At least 80% of the students completing African-American history courses (AMH 2091 or AFA 3104) will obtain a minimum mean score of 3 (on a 4-point scale) on a written interdisciplinary case study analysis scored with the University’s uniform rubric designed to measure critical thinking skills.  
Indirect Measure(s)  
- On the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) section measuring mental activities (analyzing, synthesizing, and making judgment), the average rating will increase by 0.5 points on a scale of 1 to 4. This will be an increase compared to the 2008 NSSE results mental activities average of 2.91. |
| **Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment** | Direct Measure(s)  
- Students enrolled in AMH 2091/AFA 3104 will be required to submit a written analysis of a case study.  
Indirect Measure(s)  
- The NSSE will be administered to freshman and senior students. |
<p>| <strong>Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results</strong> | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| <strong>Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement</strong> | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| <strong>Step 6: Strengthen Program</strong> | The instructional and assessment activities will be continuously monitored and modified to improve student learning. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #3: Students will be able to identify and apply effective strategies for improving their critical thinking skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Measure(s)</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate enhanced critical thinking skills based on a minimum 3 point mean score gain between the pre and post test scores in the critical thinking skills dimension of the Measures of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP). The mean critical thinking score ranges from 100 to 130. The 2008 MAPP results will be used as the baseline. Students will demonstrate enhanced critical thinking skills based on at least a 5% mean score gain between pre and post test scores on the Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Measure(s)</td>
<td>At least 80% of students participating in the Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series will confirm in a Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar Series Feedback Form completed after each event that they find the information stimulating and agree/strongly agree that these opportunities have enhanced their critical thinking skills. At least 80% of the student participants responding to a Critical Thinking Skills Seminar Questionnaire will rate the overall quality of the presentation, the completeness of the information shared, the effectiveness of the presentation, the usefulness of the presentation, and the presenters' knowledge of the subject matter as “good/excellent.” At least 80% of students attending the Invited Lecturer Series will confirm in a Feedback Form completed after the event that they find the information stimulating and agree/strongly agree that the presentation enhanced their critical thinking skills. At least 80% of incoming freshmen will participate in the University’s Freshman Summer Reading Program will confirm in a Freshman Summer Reading Program Feedback Form completed during Welcome Week that they find the event stimulating and agree/strongly agree that these opportunities have enhanced their critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Ascertaining Criteria for Success</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Measure(s)</td>
<td>The MAPP test will be administered annually to freshman and senior students. The CAT test will be administered to freshman students at the beginning of the academic year as a pre test and again at the conclusion of the freshman year as a post test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Measure(s)</td>
<td>The QEP Director and Advisory Committee will work in conjunction with the Student Government Association to select the invited speaker and coordinate the event. The QEP Director and staff will schedule and coordinate the presentations, which will primarily be given by FAMU faculty and staff experts. The QEP Director and staff will administer and collect the feedback forms and questionnaires at the conclusion of each event. Incoming freshman students will be required to read a selected novel prior to participating in Welcome Week, where several seminar sessions will be held to facilitate discussion of the novel. The FAMU Office of Student Affairs will coordinate this activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Measure(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Measure(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4    | **Observe and Summarize Results**  
The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| 5    | **Use of Results for Improvement**  
Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| 6    | **Strengthen Program**  
The instructional and assessment activities will be continuously monitored and modified to improve student learning. |
### QEP Goal #1: Improve and assess students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Provide intentional opportunities (in and out of class) for students to enhance critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome #4: Students will recognize when they need information and be able to locate, evaluate and effectively use appropriate information materials and resources.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success** | **Direct Measure(s)**  
- At least 50% of freshmen enrolled in Freshman Communicative Skills I (ENC 1101) and Freshman Communicative Skills II (ENC 1102) will participate in an *Information Literacy Workshop* conducted by the University Library each semester.  
- At least 80% of freshmen who complete the *Information Literacy Workshop* will score a minimum of 70% on an information literacy test.  
**Indirect Measure(s)**  
- At least 80% of student participants responding to a *Student Information Literacy Questionnaire* will report that they are “satisfied/highly satisfied” with the level of their information literacy skills.  
- At least 80% of the faculty participants responding to a *Faculty Information Literacy Questionnaire* will rate the overall quality of the *Information Literacy Workshop*, the completeness of the information shared, the effectiveness of the presentation, the usefulness of the presentation, and the presenters’ knowledge of the subject matter as “good/excellent.” |
| **Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment** | **Direct Measure(s)**  
- The library staff will conduct information literacy workshops for sections of Freshman Communicative Skills I (ENC 1101) and Freshman Communicative Skills II (ENC 1102) taught during the fall and spring semesters.  
- The University library staff will administer the information literacy test to the students at the conclusion of each workshop.  
**Indirect Measure(s)**  
- The library staff will administer and collect the student and faculty questionnaires at the conclusion of each workshop. |
| **Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results** | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| **Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement** | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| **Step 6: Strengthen Program** | The instructional and assessment activities will be continuously monitored and modified to improve student learning. |
### QEP Goal #2: Enhance and assess faculty use of instructional strategies that develop students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty pedagogical approaches to teaching critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #1: Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use pedagogical approaches appropriate for developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>- At least two <a href="#">Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshops</a> will be convened each academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All course syllabi from freshman English and African-American history courses will be collected and reviewed. At least 85% of syllabi collected will show evidence of embedded critical thinking content as presented at the workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At least two learning modules will be developed for providing faculty with training activities that support their ability to teach and assess student critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At least 70% of faculty completing the learning modules will pass the assessment test given at the completion of the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Measure(s)**

- At least 80% of participants responding to the [Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshop Evaluation](#) will rate the overall quality of the presentations, the completeness of the information shared, the effectiveness of the presentation, the usefulness of the presentation, and the presenters’ knowledge of the subject matter as “good/excellent.”
- On the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) section measuring the extent that faculty engage students in their courses in mental activities (analyzing, synthesizing, making judgments, and applying), the average rating will increase by 5%. The FSSE will be administered at FAMU for the first time in year 1 of the QEP implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Ascertaining Criteria for Success</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>- The QEP Director and staff will schedule and coordinate the workshops, which will be given by invited speakers and FAMU faculty and staff experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The QEP Director and staff will collect and evaluate course syllabi from faculty each semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A team of FAMU faculty experts will develop the learning modules and they will be made available to the faculty via the university website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The results of the assessment tests will be collected and analyzed by the QEP Director and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Measure(s)**

- The QEP Director and staff will administer and collect the evaluation forms at the conclusion of each event. |
- The FSSE will be administered annually to faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>The professional development activities will be continuously monitored and modified to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 4:** Observe and Summarize Results

**Step 5:** Use of Results for Improvement

**Step 6:** Strengthen Program

---

**Note:**

- Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshops
- FSSE (Faculty Survey of Student Engagement)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>QEP Goal #3:</strong></th>
<th>Enhance and assess faculty use of strategies for assessing students’ critical thinking skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
<td>Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty assessment of students’ critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formulate Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome #1:</strong></td>
<td>Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and use strategies appropriate for assessing students’ critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ascertain Criteria for Success</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>At least 80% of the sections of freshman English and African-American history courses will use the University’s uniform critical thinking rubric to assess students’ critical thinking skills on critical essay and case study assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>Samples of students’ work evaluated by faculty using the critical thinking rubric will be assessed for compliance with set standards by the QEP Assessment Coordinator. At least 75% of faculty will meet set standards designed to assess their ability to evaluate students’ critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>The QEP Director and staff will collect and evaluate the course syllabi and rubrics from faculty each semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Measure(s)</strong></td>
<td>The QEP Director and staff will collect samples of graded students work each semester for evaluation by the QEP Assessment Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observe and Summarize Results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use of Results for Improvement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengthen Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development activities will be continuously monitored and modified to improve student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QEP Goal #4:** Enhance and assess faculty design of curriculum and curricular materials related to developing and enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty design of curricula for developing students’ critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #1: Faculty will demonstrate an awareness of and design and select curricula and curriculum materials appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Step 2:** Ascertain Criteria for Success | **Direct Measure(s)**  
- At least 80% of the sections of freshman English and African-American history courses will have critical thinking content explicitly embedded into the course curriculum.  
**Indirect Measure(s)**  
- At least 80% of faculty participants responding to the *Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Workshop Evaluation* will rate the overall quality of the presentations, the completeness of the information shared, the effectiveness of the presentation, the usefulness of the presentation, and the presenters’ knowledge of the subject matter as “good/excellent.” |
| **Step 3:** Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | **Direct Measure(s)**  
- The QEP Director and staff will collect and evaluate course syllabi from faculty each semester.  
**Indirect Measure(s)**  
- The QEP Director and staff will administer and collect the evaluation forms at the conclusion of each event. |
| **Step 4:** Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| **Step 5:** Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| **Step 6:** Strengthen Program | The professional development activities will be continuously monitored and modified to improve student learning. |
QEP Goal #5: Develop and assess an ongoing system for faculty development and communication with faculty to promote best practices for teaching and assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty design of curricula for enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #1: Faculty will participate in faculty development activities designed to enhance faculty use of instructional, assessment, and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success | Direct Measure(s)  
- The number of University faculty who participate in critical thinking development activities will increase annually by 5%, beginning with an initial participation in year 1 of 15% of the total faculty.  
Indirect Measure(s)  
- At least 80% of participants responding to the *Critical Thinking Skills Faculty Development Evaluation* will rate the overall quality of the development activities, the completeness of the information shared, the effectiveness of the presentations and publications, the usefulness of the presentation and publications, and the presenters' knowledge of the subject matter as “good/excellent.” |
| Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | Direct Measure(s)  
- The QEP Director and staff will track faculty participation in development activities.  
Indirect Measure(s)  
- The evaluations forms will be administered and collected at each event and via the university website. |
| Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| Step 6: Strengthen Program | The survey responses will be evaluated on a continuous basis. |
**QEP Goal #5:** Develop and assess an ongoing system for faculty development and communication with faculty to promote best practices for teaching and assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty design of curricula for enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #2: The use of uniform critical thinking skills assessment rubrics will increase in courses across the University’s curricula.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Step 2:** Ascertain Criteria for Success | Direct Measure(s)  
- The number of faculty who use of the uniform critical thinking rubrics in their courses will increase annually by 2%. The Fall 2009 data will be used as the baseline data. |
|                           | **Indirect Measure(s)**  
- At least 80% of faculty respondents to a *Critical Thinking Rubric Feedback Form* will indicate that the overall quality and usefulness of the rubrics are “good/excellent.” |
| **Step 3:** Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | Direct Measure(s)  
- The QEP Director and staff will work with the Office of University Assessment to conduct an annual campus-wide survey of the use of critical thinking rubrics in courses. |
|                           | **Indirect Measure(s)**  
- The QEP Director and staff will administer and collect the feedback forms via the university website. |
| **Step 4:** Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| **Step 5:** Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| **Step 6:** Strengthen Program | The assessment results will be evaluated on a continuous basis. |
**QEP Goal #5:** Develop and assess an ongoing system for faculty development and communication with faculty to promote best practices for teaching and assessing students’ critical thinking skills.

**Objective:** Implement professional development opportunities to improve faculty design of curricula for enhancing students’ critical thinking skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #3: Mechanisms will be developed and maintained for communicating with faculty about instructional, assessment and curricular strategies appropriate for developing students’ critical thinking skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success | **Direct Measure(s)**  
- A QEP Critical Thinking Newsletter will be created and published at least once each semester.  
- A University-based Critical Thinking Skills Resource website will be created and regularly updated for use by faculty, staff and students.  
- At least one “Critical Thinking Day” will be held each academic year.  
**Indirect Measure(s)**  
- At least 80% of faculty respondents to the online Critical Thinking Resources Survey instrument will indicate that the information contained in the newsletter enhanced their knowledge and awareness of best practices for teaching critical thinking skills.  
- At least 80% of respondents to the Critical Thinking Day Survey instrument will rate the overall quality and usefulness of the event as “good/excellent.” |
| Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | **Direct Measure(s)**  
- The newsletter will be disseminated via the University website and email system and at QEP functions.  
- The website will be housed on the University server and updated monthly.  
- The QEP Director and staff will coordinate the event.  
**Indirect Measure(s)**  
- The QEP Director and staff will administer and collect the survey forms at the conclusion of each event. The website will be housed on the University server and updated monthly. |
| Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each academic year. |
| Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| Step 6: Strengthen Program | The assessment results will be evaluated on a continuous basis. |
B. Assessment of Institutional Implementation of the QEP.

Assessment of the FAMU QEP at the institutional level will be conducted to monitor and evaluate the institution’s effectiveness in implementing the QEP to enhance student learning. The assessment will be conducted with respect to the objectives and outcomes that are related to the Implementation Goal as described below.

Implementation Goal: To successfully implement the FAMU QEP.

**Objective #1**: Provide sufficient financial resources to support the QEP goals and objectives.

**Outcome #1**: A QEP operating budget will be allocated annually.

**Objective #2**: Provide sufficient administrative staff to support the QEP goals and objectives.

**Outcome #1**: A Quality Enhancement Program office will be established and staffed.

**Objective #3**: Collect and review the assessment data generated from the QEP activities.

**Outcome #1**: A QEP Advisory Committee will be established to provide oversight and feedback on the progress of the QEP.

**Outcome #2**: Regular updates on the QEP activities and assessment results will be presented to University stakeholders (including the Board of Trustees, Student Government Association, Alumni, Industry Cluster and Faculty Senate) to solicit feedback on ways to improve the QEP.

**Outcome #3**: An annual report on the QEP activities will be generated and presented to the QEP Advisory Committee, SACS Leadership Team and the University Administration for review and feedback.
**Implementation Goal:** To successfully implement the FAMU QEP.

**Objective #1:** Provide sufficient financial resources to support the QEP goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #1: A QEP operating budget will be allocated annually.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success | Direct Measure(s)  
  • The Office of Academic Affairs will allocate an annual operating budget to support the QEP in accordance with the spending plan outlined in the QEP 5-year budget.  
  • Annual end-of-year financial reports will reflect that at least 90% of the allocated budget was expended.  
Indirect Measure(s)  
  • The annual QEP report will include summaries of all QEP-funded activities.  
  • At least 70% of faculty participants responding annually to a Faculty Impressions of the FAMU QEP Survey Form will rate the level of institutional funding for the QEP as “good/excellent.” |
| Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | Direct Measure(s)  
  • The QEP Director will receive financial updates from the Provost’s Budget Director on a quarterly basis. The QEP Director will review the financial updates in consultation with the QEP Advisory Committee and SACS Leadership Team.  
Indirect Measure(s)  
  • An annual report outlining the QEP activities that took place over the past year will be written and distributed by the QEP Director and staff.  
  • Surveys will be administered to faculty members at the conclusion of each academic year. |
| Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each academic year. |
| Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| Step 6: Strengthen Program | The budgeting process will be evaluated on a continuous basis. |
### Implementation Goal:
To successfully implement the FAMU QEP.

### Objective #2: Provide sufficient administrative staff to support the QEP goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #1: A Quality Enhancement Program office will be established and staffed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Ascertained Criteria for Success</td>
<td><strong>Direct Measure(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Office of Academic Affairs will establish an administrative office in support of the QEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A QEP Director and staff will be hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indirect Measure(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The new office will be reflected in the official university organization structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment</th>
<th><strong>Direct Measure(s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Office of Academic Affairs will create a new administrative unit and provide office space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A new administrative staff position for the QEP Director will be created and filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indirect Measure(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Office of Academic Affairs will revise the existing organizational structure and make it available via the University’s website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |

| Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |

| Step 6: Strengthen Program | The effectiveness and productivity of the new program will be evaluated on a continuous basis. |
### Implementation Goal
To successfully implement the FAMU QEP.

### Objective #3
Collect and review the assessment data generated from the QEP activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #1: A QEP Advisory Committee will be established to provide oversight and feedback on the progress of the QEP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success | Direct Measure(s)  
• The Office of Academic Affairs will establish a QEP Advisory Committee. |
| Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | Direct Measure(s)  
• The QEP Advisory Committee will be made up of faculty, students and staff representatives, who will meet quarterly to discuss the progress of the QEP and to make recommendations for improvement. |
| Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each semester and academic year. |
| Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| Step 6: Strengthen Program | The effectiveness and productivity of the QEP Advisory Committee will be evaluated on a continuous basis. |
### Implementation Goal: To successfully implement the FAMU QEP.

### Objective #3: Collect and review the assessment data generated from the QEP activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome #2: Regular updates on the QEP activities and assessment results will be presented to University stakeholders (including the Board of Trustees, Student Government Association, Alumni, Industry Cluster and Faculty Senate) to solicit feedback on ways to improve the QEP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Direct Measure(s) Updates will be presented to the various stakeholder groups at least once per semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment</td>
<td>Direct Measure(s) The QEP Director and staff will present updates at meetings of the stakeholder groups and collect feedback via feedback forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results</td>
<td>The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement</td>
<td>Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6: Strengthen Program</td>
<td>The feedback will be evaluated on a continuous basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Goal: To successfully implement the FAMU QEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective #3: Collect and review the assessment data generated from the QEP activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Formulate Outcome</th>
<th><strong>Outcome #3:</strong> An annual report on the QEP activities will be generated and presented to the QEP Advisory Committee, SACS Leadership Team the University Administration for review and to generate feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 2: Ascertain Criteria for Success | **Direct Measure(s)**
- An annual report will be submitted for review at the close of each academic year.
- The QEP Advisory Committee and SACS Leadership Team will provide written feedback on the annual report to the QEP Director at least one time each academic year. |
| Step 3: Measure Performance Using Direct and Indirect Methods of Assessment | **Direct Measure(s)**
- The QEP Director and staff will collect and analyze assessment data each semester and compile other pertinent information for use in preparing the annual report.
- The QEP Advisory Committee and SACS Leadership Team will provide written feedback within 30 days of receiving the annual report. |
| Step 4: Observe and Summarize Results | The results will be collected and summarized at the conclusion of each academic year. |
| Step 5: Use of Results for Improvement | Improvements will be implemented at the beginning of each academic year, beginning with year 2. |
| Step 6: Strengthen Program | The feedback will be evaluated on a continuous basis. |
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APPENDIX I:
Description of Florida A&M University

Historical Overview

Florida A&M University (FAMU) was founded in 1887 as the State Normal College for Colored Students. In 1905, management of the college was transferred from the Board of Education to the Board of Control, which served as an official designation of the college as an institution of higher education. The name was changed in 1909 to Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes (FAMC) and the following year, with an enrollment of 317 students, the college awarded its first degrees. In 1935, FAMC achieved the notable distinction of being the first Negro institution to become a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). In 1953, the college's name was changed by legislative action to Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University; between 1953 and 1968 the Schools of Pharmacy, Law, Graduate Studies, and Nursing were created. In the 1980s, the University grew to 11 schools and colleges, and a Division of Graduate Studies, Research, and Continuing Education and was granted the authority to offer its first Ph.D. Degree in 1984 in the area of Pharmacology. From 1985 to 2003, FAMU experienced significant growth in student enrollment, increasing from approximately 5,100 students in 1985 to 13,000 students in Fall 2003.

Today, FAMU is one of the three oldest public universities within the eleven-university State University System. Florida A&M University continues its destiny as a student-centered institution of higher learning and achieving Excellence with Caring remains the University’s ultimate goal. Florida A&M University offers a broad range of instruction, research and service programs at the undergraduate, professional, and graduate levels. As of Fall 2008, FAMU offers a variety of programs through six colleges, seven schools and the Environmental Sciences Institute. The University offers 62 bachelor's degrees, 39 master's degrees, 1 specialist degree, and 3 professional degrees. Eleven (11) doctoral degree programs are offered by FAMU: six PhDs in the FAMU/FSU College of Engineering, two PhDs in the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, one PhD in the College of Arts and Sciences, one PhD in the College of Education, and one PhD in the Environmental Sciences Institute.

As of Fall 2008, the University employed 598-ranked full-time instructional faculty. Of these faculty members, 160 were professors, 178 were associate professors, 185 were assistant professors, 74 were instructors and one eminent scholar.

The main campus is spread over 423 acres located in Tallahassee, the capital of Florida. The instructional off-campus sites consist of the College of Law in Orlando, Florida, a joint College of Engineering with Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida and the FAMU Pharmacy Building in Jacksonville, Florida. The Challenger Learning Center (CLC) located in downtown Tallahassee, Florida is a unique outreach program of the University, that provides secondary education students (primarily middle school age) an opportunity to explore science, mathematics, and engineering. The University has several centers and research projects that foster the land-grant segment of the mission. These include the Center for Water and Air Quality, the Center for Viticulture & Small Fruits Research, Public Health Entomology, Research and Biological Control along with the international agricultural activities in Africa, Asia, Caribbean and South America. Significant research is being conducted in the following research Centers: a) The Center
for Biological Control, b) The Center for Water Quality, c) The Center for Viticulture Sciences and Small Fruit located in Tallahassee, Florida, d) The Research and Extension Center, in Quincy, e) The Center for Domestic and International Agricultural Trade, Development Research and Training, and f) John A. Mulrennan, Sr., Public Health Entomology Research and Education Center, in Panama City. Through the Cooperative Extension/Outreach Programs and the International Agricultural Programs, these components provide assistance to stakeholders throughout the panhandle region, state and global marketplace.

Mission Statement

The mission of FAMU, as an 1890 land-grant institution, is to provide an enlightened and enriched academic, intellectual, moral, cultural, ethical, technological and student-centered environment, conducive to the development of highly qualified individuals who are prepared and capable of serving as leaders and contributors in our ever-evolving society. The University seeks and supports a faculty and staff of distinction, dedicated to providing outstanding academic preparation at the undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and professional school levels, with a particular emphasis on integrity and ethical conduct. FAMU is committed to inspirational teaching, exemplary research and meaningful public and community service through creative partnerships at the local, state, national and global levels. The University is also committed to the resolution of complex issues that will enhance humankind. While the University continues its historic mission of educating African Americans, persons of all races, ethnic origins and nationalities are welcomed and encouraged to remain life-long members of the university community. The University, through its diverse faculty and staff, provides a caring, nurturing, collegial and respectful environment.

Student Demographics

As of Fall 2008 (preliminary data), FAMU enrolled a total of 11,857 students: 88.64% were in full-time attendance and 11.36% attended part-time. The ethnic composition included 89.83% Black, 4.98% White, 1.21% Asian, 2.19% Hispanic, 1.10% Non-resident Alien and .70% of other ethnic origin. Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the students were female and 41% male. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the students were in-state residents and 15% were out-of-state. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of students attending FAMU were freshmen, 15% sophomore, 14% junior, 21% senior, 9% graduate, 10% professional and 2% unclassified. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the student population was enrolled in the lower division, 27% students upper division, 16% beginning graduate, 1% advanced graduate and 1% unclassified. As of Fall 2008 (preliminary data), the average age of students attending FAMU was 22.78: 13% were 18 years of age or younger, 40% ranged in age from 19-21 years, 28% ranged in age from 22-24 years, 12% ranged in age from 25-30 years and 7% were at least 31 years of age.

In 2007-08, approximately eighty-seven percent (87%) of students received some form of financial aid, with 76% of the $119,394,580 in total awards being need based. Our students are drawn from both rural and urban populations, with a slight majority being the first in their families to attend college. Consistent with our mission, the University is committed to providing high-quality instruction, scholarship, and service with continued focus on quality improvement in the area of student learning.
APPENDIX II:  
2005 Faculty Planning Conference Agenda

8:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.
Plenary Session VI
New Pharmacy Building, Room 103
Shelby Chipman, Ph.D.
Assistant Provost, Planning
SACS
Margaret Sullivan, Ph.D.
Director, SACS, FAMU
Introduction of Speaker
Henry N. Williams, Ph.D.
Director, Environmental Sciences Institute
Address
Larry Robinson, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Question-and-Answer Session

9:45 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.
Plenary Session VII
New Pharmacy Building, Room 103
Vivian Hobbs, Ph.D.
Director, SACS, FAMU
Presiding
SACS
Margaret Sullivan, Ph.D.
Director, SACS, FAMU
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Noon - 1:15 p.m.
Lunch
Grand Ballroom

1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Plenary Session VIII
Grand Ballroom
H. Creekmore Worthen, Ph.D.
Associate Provost, Agricultural Sciences
Presiding
FAMU’s Academic Learning Compacts:
Part A
Dorothy Minser, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor, Division of College and Universities
Policies and Procedures: Part B
Uche O’via, Ph.D.
Director of Assessment, Office of Academic Affairs
General Education Expected Learning Outcomes: Part C
Valencia F. Matthews, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Institutional Level Assessment Plan: Part D
Henry L. Williams, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Question-and-Answer Session

3:30 p.m. - 3:40 p.m.
Break

3:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Plenary Session IX
Grand Ballroom
Mary B. Orallo, Ph.D.
President, Faculty Senate
Member, Board of Trustees
Presiding
Counseling Center
Yolanda K. H. Bogan, Ph.D.
Interim Director, Counseling and Assessment Center

*Shuttle service provided
APPENDIX III:
Faculty Topic Solicitation Document

Florida A&M University
Faculty Planning Conference
August 17, 2005

Faculty Suggestions for Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Reaffirmation

SACS Core Requirement 2.12
“The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan and demonstrates that the plan is part of an ongoing planning and evaluation process.”
SACS Principles of Accreditation, p. 17

Definition of QEP
“The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a document developed by the institution that describes a course of action for institutional improvement crucial to enhancing educational quality that is directly related to student learning. The QEP is based upon a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of the institution in supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution.”
SACS Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, p. 5

Suggested Foci for FAMU’s QEP

* Suggested Focus #1:

* Rationale for Focus #1:

* Suggested Focus #2:

* Rationale for Focus #2:
APPENDIX IV:  
Original QEP Planning Committee Members

MEMORANDUM

TO:       Quality Enhancement Planning Committee
          Dr. Dreamal Worthen, Chairperson
          Dr. Richard Andrews
          Dr. Barbara Barnes
          Dr. Jason Black
          Mr. Andrew Chin
          Dr. Maurice Edington
          Dr. Larry Henderson
          Dr. Joe Ann Houston

FROM:     Debra Austin
          Provost and Vice President
          for Academic Affairs

DATE:     February 8, 2006

SUBJECT:  Quality Enhancement Planning Committee “SACS”

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Florida A&M University Quality Enhancement Planning Committee.

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a plan based upon a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of the learning environment for supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. The plan will be used to outline a course of action for institutional improvement by addressing one or more issues that contribute to institutional quality, with special attention to student learning. In an effort to ensure that we have a QEP that is reflective of the university, you have been chosen to serve on the committee responsible for its development.

As a member of this committee, your responsibility will be to design a plan that incorporates the four SACS Criteria listed below:

- Broad-based INVOLVEMENT of the campus community in QEP development;
- FOCUS on critical issues related to student learning;
- INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY for the initiation and continuation of the plan; and
- ASSESSMENT of the plan to evaluate progress.

EAMU IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/EQUAL ACCESS UNIVERSITY
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APPENDIX V:
Key QEP Committees (2005 – present)

**Steering Committee**
**Responsibilities:**
Guide the development and implementation of the QEP.

**Membership:**
Dr. Dreamal Worthen (Chair)
Dr. Micheal Thornton
Dr. Joe Ann Houston
Dr. Tiki Suarez
Dr. Veronica Yon
Dr. Cindy Hughes-Harris
Mr. Larry Henderson
Ms. Beverly Barrington
Dr. Willis Walter
Mr. Bart Walz
Dr. Barbara Barnes
Dr. Timothy Wise
Mr. Joe Roache
Ms. Lynda Peeples (Student)
Dr. Marcia Owens
Mr. Lorenzo Alexander
Dr. Uche Ohia
Dr. Dorothy Henderson
Dr. Dhyana Ziegler
Dr. Kirk Gavin
Dr. Chanta Haywood
Dr. Henry Williams
Mr. Andrew Chin
Dr. Maurice Edington
Mr. Pernes Griffin
Mr. Kellen Nixon
Dr. Shawnta Friday-Stroud
Dr. Ruth Swan
Dr. Gwendolyn Trotter

**Management Committee**
**Responsibilities:**
Ensure that an effective plan is developed and that communication occurs between the sub-committees.

**Membership:**
Dr. Maurice Edington (Chair)
Dr. Shawnta Friday-Stroud
Dr. Chanta Haywood
Dr. Marcia Owens
Dr. Barbara Barnes
Ms. Beverly Barrington
Dr. Dreamal Worthen
Ms. SaBrenna Reed (Student)

**Budget Sub-Committee**
**Responsibilities:**
Develop QEP budget.

**Membership:**
Ms. Pat Manning (Chair)
Mr. Herbert Bailey
Mr. Perry Herrington

**Publicity Sub-Committee**
**Responsibilities:**
Provide information and communication to the University community on the status of the QEP process.

**Membership:**
Ms. Diane Hall (Chair)
Ms. LaNedra Caroll
Mr. Kenneth Jones
Ms. Gina Kinchlow
Ms. Sharon Saunders
Ms. Jacqueline Hightower
Ms. Michelle Roberts
Mr. Jo Marsh (Student)
Ms. Christian Hodge (Student)
Ms. Robbyn Mitchell (Student)
Mr. Jonathan Sellars (Student)
Mr. Josephus Collins (Student)

**Focus Group Sub-Committee**
**Responsibilities:**
Ensure that the University community is engaged in the QEP process by providing information from focus groups to the QEP Steering Committee and SACS Leadership Team.

**Membership:**
Mr. Timothy Wise (Chair)
Dr. Marcia Owens
Mr. David Gibson (Student)
### Drafting/Writing Sub-Committee

**Responsibilities:**
Develop draft of QEP document.

**Membership:**
- Dr. Chanta Haywood (Co-Chair)
- Dr. Shawnta Friday-Stroud (Co-Chair)
- Dr. Maurice Edington
- Dr. Marcia Owens
- Ms. Beverly Barrington
- Dr. Sonya Stephens
- Ms. SaBrenna Reed (Student)

### Alumni/Strategic Partners Sub-Committee

**Responsibilities:**
Ensure that alumni and businesses are provided with an opportunity to provide feedback to the QEP committee.

**Membership:**
- Dr. Dorothy Henderson (Chair)
- Ms. Carmen Cummings-Martin
- Mr. Kellen Nixon
- Dr. Dolores Dean
- Mr. Timothy Wise
- Mr. Morris Hawkins (Student)

### Library Sub-Committee

**Responsibilities:**
Maintain committee documents, drafts and resource materials.

**Membership:**
- Dr. Ruth Swan (Chair)
- Mr. Emmett Denny
- Ms. Gloria Woody
- Ms. Phyllis Broomfield
- Ms. Ophelia Chapman

### Technology Support Sub-Committee

**Responsibilities:**
Provide technical support and resources to the various QEP committees.

**Membership:**
- Dr. Dhyana Ziegler (Co-Chair)
- Mr. Joe Roache (Co-Chair)
- Dr. Reginald Perry
- Mr. Larry Henderson
- Dr. Jason Black
- Dr. Tiki Suarez
- Mr. Ronald Henry
- Mr. Ayinde Johnson

### Project Plan Sub-Committee

**Responsibilities:**
Provide an overall timeline for the QEP.

**Membership:**
- Ms. Beverly Barrington (Chair)
- Dr. Maurice Edington
- Mr. Larry Henderson
- Dr. Dhyana Ziegler
- Mr. Bart Walz

### Assessment Sub-Committee

**Responsibilities:**
Evaluate institutional data and documents.

**Membership:**
- Dr. Michael Thornton (Co-Chair)
- Dr. Uche Ohia (Co-Chair)
- Dr. Marcia Owens
- Dr. Ngozi Ugochukwu
- Dr. Gwendolyn Singleton
- Dr. Tiki Suarez
- Ms. Ashley Duprat (Student)
From: Lynada Peeples <lynadapeeples@yahoo.com>
Subject: ***SPAM ????Student Representatives
Date: December 4, 2006 3:10:49 PM EST
To: thomthor@gmail.com, larry.henderson@famu.edu, dworthen116@hotmail.com,
joseph.roache@famu.edu, jason.black@famu.edu, tiki.suarez@famu.edu, debra.austin@famu.edu,
jalblack@cs.famu.edu, marco.owens@famu.edu, uche.shia@famu.edu, diane.hall@famu.edu,
willis.walter@famu.edu, shawnta.friday@famu.edu, chyana.ziegler@famu.edu,
veronica.yon@famu.edu, maurice.edington@famu.edu, richard.andrews@earthlink.net,
jodie.gaines@famu.edu, dreamal.worthen@famu.edu, barbara.barnes@famu.edu,
joel.houston@famu.edu, charta.haywood@famu.edu, dorothy.henderson@famu.edu,
beverly.barrington@famu.edu, barb.walz@famu.edu, ruth.zwain@famu.edu,
lynadapeeples@yahoo.com, bertt.t@brdc.com, timothy.wise@famu.edu, vivian.hobbs@famu.edu,
alonzoc.alexander@famu.edu, peniers.griffin@famu.edu, andrew.chin@famu.edu, kirk.gavin@famu.edu,
harold.henderson@famu.edu, henry.williams@famu.edu, kellen.nixon@famu.edu

Greetings Committee Members,

Below you will find a list of students to serve on the various sub-committees for the Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee, as well as their contact information. I am still in the process of placing students in two sub-committees but here are the names I do have.

University Assessment Sub-Committee
Ms. Ashley Duprat
(561)340-9888 Call Phone
bomaidhe@beauty.net

Focus Groups Sub-Committee
Mr. David Gibson
Dr. Wise already has his information

CEP Performance Measures Sub-Committee
Mr. Vincent Evans
(904)603-3332
Vincent1@evans@famu.edu

Publicity Sub-Committee
Already has student representatives

Drafting/Writing Sub-Committee
Ms. Lynada Peeples
(813)486-0020
Lynadapeeples@yahoo.com

Alumni/Strategic Partners Sub-Committee
Morris Hawkins
(863)577-0988
morrisnewlnd@yahoo.com

I'll have students for the other sub-committees as soon as possible. Until then, the committee chairs can go ahead and contact their representatives and inform them of meeting times and other pertinent information. Thank you for your time and cooperation in this matter and I look forward to seeing you all at the next QEP Meeting.

With Rattler Pride,
APPENDIX VI:
2006 Faculty Planning Conference Agenda

8:15 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
Plenary Session IV: The Faculty's Role in Assessment of Student Learning
Presiding: Marcia Owens, J.D., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Environmental Sciences
Director, Teachers for a New Era

An Assessment Update
Presiding: Uche Okia, Ph.D.
Dean, University Assessment

9:00 a.m. - 10:50 a.m.
Plenary Session V: Designing and Implementing a Quality Enhancement Plan
Presiding: Michael Thornton, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Biology

QEP: Lessons Learned from other Institutions
Sally Sample, Ph.D.
Tennessee Community College

Virginia Coggs, Ph.D.
Alabama A&M University

Robert L. Armason, D.S.C.
University of Central Florida

Developing FAMU's QEP
Darwin Weathers, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Agriculture Research
Chair, FAMU QEP Committee

Larry Henderson
Chief Information Officer

Michael Thornton, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Biology

Maurice Edington, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Chemistry

10:50 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
Break

11:00 a.m. - Noon
Plenary Session VI: The Role of Academics in Institutional Effectiveness
Presiding: Veronica Yu, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, English

Speaker: Deborah Askins, Ed.D.,
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Question and Answer

Noon - 12:15 p.m.
Break (Transition to Grand Ballroom)

12:15 p.m. - 1:15 p.m.
Lunch
Grand Ballroom
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APPENDIX VII: Request for Pre-Proposals

Applicant: Florida A&M University

Date: September 1, 20XX

Purpose: The Florida A&M University (FAMU) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Steering Committee is seeking proposals for a new QEP. The steering committee will evaluate submitted proposals and make recommendations to the QEP steering committee for approval. Proposals are due by September 1, 20XX.

Proposals will be reviewed to determine the following:

- Relevance of the proposal to the QEP's objectives
- Potential for impact on student learning
- Feasibility of implementation

Proposals should be submitted to:

Florida A&M University QEP Steering Committee

105 North Campus Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32307

Contact: (850) 599-3100

Due Date: September 1, 20XX

For more information, please visit:

http://www.famu.edu/qep
APPENDIX VIII: Student/Staff Survey

Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking

FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY

SURVEY

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN (QEP) TOPIC

To the FAMU Staff and Students,

Your ideas are needed to assist FAMU with the SACS Reaffirmation Process. The QEP, Quality Enhancement Plan, is a crucial part of the SACS Reaffirmation Process that is now underway. Each University identifies, assesses, and completes a plan prior to the review of the SACS Team. This task QEP will embody a multiphase approach to improving the quality of a key aspect of the educational experience of our students.

The development of the QEP must engage the entire academic community, and must demonstrate comprehensive and thorough analysis of the effectiveness of the learning environment. The QEP should provide information about the institution’s mission and future goals, assess improvements that have strengthened the institution; analyze strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and initiatives pertaining to the future accreditation; discuss specific plans for accomplishing goals, and also include data and plans for evaluation.

As stated above, the QEP Committee needs to identify a topic for the study. At the 2005 Faculty Planning Conference, faculty members suggested a number of areas of focus for the FAMU QEP. You are invited to tell us how you rate each area in terms of effectiveness or topics.

Other topic areas will also be considered. Topics should be stated in a sentence, such as “Improving Technology in order to Enhance Student Learning.” If you would like to submit a topic(s), please email your ideas to qep@famu.edu on or before September 1, 2006.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact, Dr. Donald Wretham at 396-3440.

Turn Over to Complete the Survey

1. Are you:
   [ ] Student
   [ ] Staff (Please circle)

2. If you are a student, please indicate your classification and major:

3. If you are staff, please indicate division and number of years at FAMU:

   [ ] Central Thinking and Problem Solving
   [ ] Communication Skills
   [ ] Technology Enhancements
   [ ] Quantitative Reasoning
   [ ] Assessment
   [ ] Information Literacy
   [ ] Family Development
   [ ] Student Retention, Progression, and Graduation Rates

4. Do you believe that FAMU should consider a topic(s) not listed above?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

If Yes, please list the topic or topics.

Thank you for participating in this survey.
## APPENDIX IX: Alumni Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey.

If you have comments or questions, please mail them to 45204554 or call Dr. Dennis Woodard at (386) 500-5544.

### Alumni/Graduate Data

1. Degree(s) Earned and Year
2. Major(s)
3. General Alumni Chapter (If applicable)
4. Type of Employment/Currently Self-Employed
5. Employment after FAMU
6. Career and Job Satisfaction
7. Alumni/Graduate Experience
8. Contribution to FAMU

### Critical Thinking and Problem-Solving

- Communication Skills
- Technology Proficiency
- Quantitative Reasoning
- Information Literacy
- Family Involvement

### 1. Do you believe that FAMU should consider more research funding?
   - Yes
   - No

### 2. If yes, please list areas of interest.

### 3. If no, please explain.

---

**FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY**

**QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The Quality Assurance Program at Florida A&M University (FAMU) with the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) is committed to ensuring the quality of higher education programs and services. As the leader of the Program, Dr. Dennis Woodard is responsible for the development of the QAP to meet the standards and performance criteria of the Florida Department of Education.

The QAP is designed to assess and improve the quality of educational programs offered at FAMU. It includes six key elements: mission, planning, quality assurance, student learning, accountability, and evaluation.

At the 2005 Quality Assurance Conference, faculty members supported a number of initiatives to improve the quality of instruction and student learning. These initiatives include the development of faculty development programs, the implementation of new instructional technologies, and the enhancement of student support services.

The QAP is a continuous process that involves all members of the educational community, including faculty, staff, students, and alumni. It is designed to ensure that FAMU's educational programs meet the needs of all students and contribute to the overall mission of the institution.

**FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY**

**QAP: QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM**

**APPROVED BY THE**

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**November 2005**

---

**Thank you for participating in this survey.**
## APPENDIX X:
2006 and 2007 MAPP Results

### 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAPP</th>
<th>Measures of Academic Proficiency and Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Scaled Scores**

To show the ability of the group taking the test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University</th>
<th>Cohort Name: TEST DATE: 2006-12-12#000090039009500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviated Form A Paper</td>
<td>Close Date: 12/11/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. students tested: 102</td>
<td>Student Level: None, entering freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. students included in these statistics: 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. students excluded (see roster): 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>95% Confidence Limits* for Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>400 to 500</td>
<td>435.49</td>
<td>454 to 437</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Subscores:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>100 to 130</td>
<td>108.34</td>
<td>105 to 111</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>100 to 130</td>
<td>116.13</td>
<td>112 to 117</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>100 to 130</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>112 to 113</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mathematics     | 100 to 130 | 111.9                           | 110 to 112        | 4.95            | 116             | 115             |
| Context-Based Subscores: |          |                                 |                   |                 |                 |                 |
| Humanities      | 100 to 130 | 112.32                          | 112 to 114        | 5.57            | 113             | 117             |
| Social Sciences | 100 to 130 | 111.49                          | 111 to 113        | 4.90            | 110             | 115             |
| Natural Sciences| 100 to 130 | 113.43                          | 113 to 114        | 5.06            | 110             | 113             |

**2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAPP</th>
<th>Measures of Academic Proficiency and Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Total Score | 400 to 500 | 435.49 | 454 to 437 | 13.55 | 435 | 435 | 442 |
| Skills Subscores: |          |         |            |       |     |     |
| Critical Thinking | 100 to 130 | 108.24 | 105 to 110 | 5.91 | 106 | 112 |
| Reading         | 100 to 130 | 116.13 | 112 to 117 | 5.74 | 112 | 121 |
| Writing         | 100 to 130 | 111.7  | 112 to 113 | 4.70 | 110 | 113 |
| Mathematics     | 100 to 130 | 111.9  | 110 to 112 | 4.95 | 116 | 115 |
| Context-Based Subscores: |          |         |            |       |     |     |
| Humanities      | 100 to 130 | 112.32 | 112 to 114 | 5.57 | 113 | 117 |
| Social Sciences | 100 to 130 | 111.49 | 111 to 113 | 4.90 | 110 | 115 |
| Natural Sciences| 100 to 130 | 113.43 | 113 to 114 | 5.06 | 110 | 113 |

**The confidence limits are based on the assumption that the questions contributing to each scaled score are a sample from a much larger set of possible questions that could have been used to measure those same skills. If the group of students taking the test is a sample from some larger population of students eligible to be tested, the confidence limits include both sampling of students and sampling of questions as factors that could cause the mean score to vary. The confidence limits indicate the precision of the mean score of the students actually tested, as an estimate of the "true population mean" - the mean score that would result if all the students in the population could somehow be tested with all possible questions. These confidence limits were computed by a procedure that has a 95 percent probability of producing upper and lower limits that will surround the true population mean. The population size used in the calculation of the confidence limits for the mean scores in this report is 102.**
From: Debra Austin  
Sent: Tue 11/28/2006 12:04 PM  
To: Helen I. Worthen; 'Dreamal' Worthen  
Subject: QEP Topic  

Dear Dr. Worthen:

I presented the Leadership Team with the November 27 memo from you regarding the proposed Quality Enhancement Plan topics. The recommendation is to go with #5, "Enhancing critical thinking in the content areas through the utilization of information technology."

Since the proposed slogan is too wordy, the topic itself was shortened to use "EPACT: Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking." Please know that the utilization of information technology is still important and should be included in the description of the QEP, just not in the title itself.

Should you have any questions, comments, or concerns, please be sure to let me know.

Sincerely,

Debra Austin
### APPENDIX XII:
#### 2007 Faculty Planning Conference Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Co-sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:45 a.m.–Noon</td>
<td>Plenary Session II: Enhancing Student Learning; Metacognition</td>
<td>Diane Hall, Director, School of Journalism and Graphic Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker: Saundra McGee, Ph.D., Associate Dean, University College, Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon-12:10 p.m.*</td>
<td>Break (Transition to Grand Ballroom)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 p.m.-1:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 p.m.-1:30 p.m.*</td>
<td>Break (Transition to Lee Hall Auditorium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40 p.m.-2:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Plenary Session III: FAMU’s Reaffirmation of Accreditation through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS): Everything Faculty Need to Know</td>
<td>Merline Langley, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, Vivian Hobbs, Ph.D., Director, FAMU SACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAMU SACS Leadership Team: Shawana Friday-Stroud, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Business and Industry, Vern Harper, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Business and Industry, Walter Mercer, Ph.D., Professor, College of Education, Gita Pitts, Ph.D., Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 p.m.-2:55 p.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 p.m.-4:25 p.m.</td>
<td>Plenary Session IV: SACS Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Theme: EFCT: Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Doreen Worthen, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Maurice Edington, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, Shawana Friday-Stroud, Ph.D., Professor, College of Business and Industry, Mericia Owens, J.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Environmental Sciences Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shuttle Service Provided*
### APPENDIX XIII:
2007 Brown Bag Luncheon Notice

**Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)**

**Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking**

SACS Core Requirement 2.12

---

**BROWN BAG Lunch Series**

**Fall 2007**

The FAMU SACS/QEP committee is sponsoring a series of Brown Bag lunch discussions to provide an opportunity for faculty, staff, and students to come together to discuss critical thinking topics designed to educate and enlighten. All faculty, staff, students and administrators are encouraged to attend.

*Lunch will be Provided*

**Thursday, October 11, 2007**

*Brown Bag Topic: Motivating Critical Thinking - Attitudes and Perceptions*

The purpose of this lunch is to provide an opportunity for participants to talk about their experiences motivating critical thinking and share ideas in which critical thinking is promoted in our teaching, mentoring and learning.

**Note:** This session will also include a discussion on establishing **Reading Groups** for the book *Five Minds for the Future* by Howard Gardner.

**Thursday, November 8, 2007**

*Brown Bag Topic: Teaching Inductive Reasoning*

This lunch will facilitate discussion on teaching strategies which can be used in the classroom to help students extend knowledge and form appropriate conclusions using inductive reasoning.

---

**LUNCH WILL BE PROVIDED**

Critical Thinking

"The ability to understand, apply knowledge, analyze and solve problems, develop new knowledge, and think creatively."

---
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# Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

## Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking

SACS Core Requirement 2.12

---

## BROWN BAG Lunch Series

### Spring 2008

The FAMU SACS/QEP committee is sponsoring a series of *Brown Bag* lunch discussions to provide an opportunity for faculty, staff and students to come together to discuss critical thinking topics designed to educate and enlighten. All faculty, staff, students and administrators are encouraged to attend.

**LUNCH WILL BE PROVIDED**

**Wednesday, March 5, 2008**

### Brown Bag Topic: Facilitating Critical Thinking

This event will facilitate discussion on teaching strategies that can be used in the classroom to help students extend knowledge and form appropriate conclusions using inductive reasoning.

---

Critical Thinking

“The ability to understand, apply knowledge, analyze and solve problems, develop new knowledge, and think creatively.”
THURSDAY, AUGUST 14, 2008

Walter Mercer, Ph.D., Professor, College of Education

Gita Piter, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs

Review of FAMU's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP):
Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking (EPCT)
103 New Pharmacy Building
Dreamal Worthen, Ph.D., Presiding
Associate Professor, College of Engineering Sciences, Technology
and Agriculture

Presenters
Maurice Edington, Ph.D., Professor, College of Arts and Sciences

Genive Boston, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Arts and
Sciences

Andrew Chin, Assistant Dean, School of Architecture

Neil James, Ph.D., Professor, College of Engineering Sciences,
Technology, and Agriculture

Marisa Lewis, Pharm.D., School of Allied Health Sciences

Reginald Perry, Ph.D., Associate Dean, FAMU/FSU College of
Engineering

Question and Answer Period
Noon - 12:10 p.m.* Break (Transition to the Grand Ballroom)

12:15 p.m. - 1:15 p.m. Lunch

1:30 p.m. - 3 p.m. Plenary Session VI: Interactive Workshop on Critical Thinking
Grand Ballroom
Marlon Honeywell, Pharm. D.,
Associate Professor, College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical
Sciences

Presenter
Claudia J. Stanny, Ph.D.
Enhancing and Assessing Performance in Critical Thinking
Director, Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
Co-Director, Quality Enhancement Plan, University of West Florida

Shuttle service provided

Question and Answer Period
ENC 1101: Freshman Communicative Skills I
Department of English
Florida A & M University

Course Description:
ENC 1101 is the first of two 3-credit mandatory composition courses. Its purpose is to improve students’ oral and written communication skills as well as their research and critical thinking abilities through narration, exposition, and argumentation.

Required Text:

Additional Texts:
- Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary or American Heritage Collegiate Dictionary.

Performance Objectives:
In order to complete ENC 1101 with a grade of “C” or higher, the student must satisfy the following requirements:
1. Students must make a passing score of 3 or higher on a diagnostic essay that will be completed during the first week of the semester. If the student does not score at least a 3 on this pre-assessment essay, then he/she must attend the Writing Center for approximately twenty (20) hours, as partial fulfillment of ENC 1101.
2. Students must participate in class (homework, quizzes, exercises, discussions, etc.).
3. Students must write two 500-600 word out-of-class essays. (See instructor for choice of rhetorical patterns.)
4. Students must write one 600-1000 word out-of-class documented argumentative essay.
5. Students must write two 500 word timed essays. (Instructors may provide individual guidelines for revision of essays graded “C” or below.)
6. Students must attend one *Freshman Critical Thinking Seminar* and write a 250 word out-of-class reflective essay for each seminar, listing relevant facts that are remembered. Students must discuss their perceptions of the relevance of the information covered, and provide at least three ways in which they understand the information and its application while enhancing critical thinking skills. The essay will be assessed using the University’s uniform critical thinking rubric.
7. Students must satisfactorily complete all writing skills/grammar activities that are assigned.
8. Students must complete a final graded in-class essay during the final week of class that will also be assessed using the University’s uniform critical thinking rubric.

This course satisfies the General Education Expected Learning Outcomes for Communication:

COMMUNICATION COMPETENCIES
1. Read with literal comprehension
   - identify main ideas
   - list supporting details
   - explain the contextual meaning of words
2. Read with critical comprehension
   - state author’s purpose
   - describe author’s tone
   - detect bias in text
   - draw logical inferences and conclusions
2. Write expository essays
   2.1 Write critical/analytical essays
      • write position papers
      • provide impromptu written responses to questions about literary works
      • analyze various elements of literature, such as character analysis, theme, imagery, symbolism
      • write critical evaluation of non-literary texts and other genres (film, for example)
   2.2 Transmit ideas and information which conform to conventional standards of written English

In addition to the General Education Outcomes described above, this course also has expected critical thinking learning outcomes in accordance with the University’s working definition of critical thinking and as outlined in the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan entitled “Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking.”

FAMU’s Critical Thinking Definition: the ability to understand, apply, analyze and solve problems, develop new knowledge, and think creatively.

**Specific Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes based on revised Bloom’s Taxonomy:**

1. **Remembering:** Students will demonstrate the ability to recall previously learned material, specific facts and theories.

2. **Understanding:** Students will demonstrate an awareness of what the material means; demonstrate an understanding of work based on one’s knowledge of it.

3. **Applying:** Students will demonstrate the ability to use data, principles, theories learned to answer questions in a new environment; demonstrate the ability to apply what is learned and understood.

4. **Analyzing:** Students will demonstrate the ability to break down material into constituent parts, determining how the parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose through differentiating, organizing, and attributing.

5. **Evaluating:** Students will demonstrate the ability to make judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.

6. **Creating:** Students will demonstrate the ability to put elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; demonstrate the ability to reorganize elements into a new pattern or structure through generating, planning, or producing.

**Course Objectives:**
Mastery of CLAST Writing Skills
For the *CLAST Writing Skills (Essay and Grammar tests), the student must show mastery of grammar editing skills on an objective test and must write an essay showing evidence of the following skills:

1. Selecting a subject which lends itself to development,
2. Determining the purpose and the audience for writing,
3. Limiting the subject to a topic that can be developed within the requirement of time, purpose, and audience,
4. Formulating a thesis statement that focuses the essay,
5. Developing the thesis or main idea statement by
   a. providing adequate support that reflects the ability to distinguish between generalized and specific evidence,
   b. arranging the ideas and supporting details in logical pattern appropriate to the purpose and focus,
   c. writing unified prose in which all supporting material is relevant to the thesis or main idea statement, and
   d. writing coherent prose and providing effective transitional devices which clearly reflect the organizational pattern and the relationships of the parts;
6. Demonstrating effective word choice by
   a. using words that convey the denotative and connotative meanings
      required by context.
   b. avoiding inappropriate use of slang, jargon, clichés, pretentious
      expressions, and avoiding wordiness;

7. Employing conventional sentence structure by
   a. placing modifiers correctly,
   b. coordinating and subordinating sentence elements according to their
      relative importance,
   c. using parallel expressions for parallel ideas, and
   d. avoiding fragments, comma splices, and fused sentences;

8. Employing effective sentence structure by
   a. using a variety of sentence patterns and
   b. avoiding overuse of passive constructions;

9. Observing the conventions of standard American English grammar and usage by
   a. using standard verb forms,
   b. maintaining agreement between subject, verb, pronoun and antecedent,
   c. avoiding inappropriate shifts in tense,
   d. using proper case forms,
   e. maintaining a consistent point of view,
   f. using adjective and adverbs correctly, and
   g. making logical comparisons;

10. Using standard practices for spelling, punctuation, and capitalization;
    revising, editing, and proofreading units of discourse to ensure clarity, 
    consistency, and conformity to the conventions of standard written American 
    English.

*CLAST (College Level Academic Skills Test) is a state mandated 
achievement test that measures communication and mathematics 
skills. It includes four subtests: essay, English language skills, 
reading, and mathematics. The CLAST requirements for English 
(the essay and English language skills) can be satisfied either by 
passing the test or by exempting it.

Students who exempt must have earned a 2.5 GPA in ENC 1101 
and ENC 1102 or must have earned a minimum score of 21 on the 
English section of the ACT or 500 on the verbal section of the SAT. 
CLAST requirements must be met prior to a student earning 60 
semester hours.

**Also assessed with objective items.

Grade Computation: SEE INSTRUCTOR FOR SPECIFIC GRADE PERCENTAGES
Students will receive *75% for graded essays, 25% for miscellaneous activities (class 
participation, exercises, and other assignments).

*Students who fail to score 70% (3) or higher on the diagnostic essay will receive 5% for Writing 
Center attendance and 70% for graded essays. Students who are assigned to a specific 
laboratory are required to complete those hours on a weekly basis.

Conferences
Instructors’ office hours have been established to provide students with assistance, and students 
are encouraged to use them. Instructors also will inform students of any mandatory conferences 
that are required during the semester.
Attendance
Attendance is mandatory. For students who have Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes, four unexcused absences may result in failure of the course. For students who have Tuesday and Thursday classes, three unexcused absences may result in failure of the course. Excuses for absence must be submitted within _____ day(s) of the absence. An instructor may decide to count several tardies as an absence; thus students are encouraged to arrive to class on time.

Policy for LD Students
Faculty should follow University and BOR guidelines.

Grade of "I" (Incomplete)
Students may receive an "I" only if they meet the following criteria: (1) they are passing the course and have completed all course work except two essays; (2) they have a valid excuse for not having completed the required course work. When possible, students should provide instructor with proof of the crisis or emergency that prevents them from completing course work during the semester. This information needs to accompany change of grade requests submitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Students who receive an "Incomplete" MUST SEE THEIR ENC 1101 TEACHER TO MAKE UP WORK AND TO CHECK ON CHANGE OF GRADE CONCerns INVOLVING ENC 1101.

Semester Activities
ENC 1101 – Freshman Communicative Skills I

WEEK 1
Introduction to Course, Text(s) Guidelines
Diagnostic Essay (Pre-Assessment)

WEEK 2
Diagnostic Language Skills Test (Pre-Assessment)
Grammar Overview (Instructor’s Option)

WEEK 3 – 15
Instructor's choice of various rhetorical modes, language skills exercises, and assigned essays that are required to meet course objectives/requirements.

Each instructor is responsible for providing students with his/her tentative schedule of weekly activities and individual expectations regarding classroom conduct and other pertinent information.

FINAL EXAMINATION WEEK
Composition Studies will not be using the final examination week for testing purposes.

CRITERIA

I. ORGANIZATION
(0-Fail 3-Poor 6-Weak 9-Fair 12-Good 15-Excellent)
Effective introduction
Logical paragraph order
Clear transitions
Conclusion

II. DEVELOPMENT
(0-Fail 10-Poor 20-Weak 30-Fair 40-Good 50-Excellent)
Topic sentences
Plausible/Convincing support
Evidence of critical and insightful thinking
III. CONVENTION AND SENTENCE STRUCTURE  MAXIMUM POINTS - 25
(0-Fail  5-Poor  10-Weak  15-Fair  20-Good  25-Excellent)
Grammar
Mechanics- spelling, punctuation, capitalization
Word Choice- diction
Sentence Problems- fragments, run-ons, comma splices, wordiness, dangling modifiers
Evidence of proofreading

IV. MISCELLANEOUS  MAXIMUM POINTS - 10
Teacher Preference

Essay Prompts
Suggested prompts for in-class essays:

1. Some people believe that there are times when telling a lie is better than telling the truth. Write an essay persuading your friend to tell the truth or to lie based on a specific situation.

2. Today, there are several singing groups that some say are identical in sound, style, and performance. Select two such groups; compare and/or contrast their sound, style, and performance.

3. There are several inventions that make our lives easier. Select one invention that you could do not do without. Write an essay which describes how this invention has made your life easier. Make sure to include your understanding of how the invention works.

4. Our society has many legal documents that provide structure, procedure, and/or process in our civic lives. Write an essay which defends the one legal document you feel should be cherished by most people because of its extreme importance.
## APPENDIX XVII:
Sample Critical Thinking Rubric

**FAMU Critical Thinking Rubric**

**Draft**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Remembering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recall of previously learned material,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of specific facts, or of complete theories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Recalls all relevant facts.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Recognizes the information presented in</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a question and can remember answers that</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address the query.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Can define accurately all discipline-specific terms.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Recalls most relevant facts, but fails to recall</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some facts that are critical to the argument.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Recognizes most of the information presented in question format and can remember most answers that address the query.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Can define with some accuracy discipline-specific terms.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Recalls a few relevant facts, but fails to recall most facts that are critical to the argument.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Recognizes some of the information presented in question format and can remember some answers that address the query.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Can define a few of the discipline-specific terms.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Does not recall relevant facts and fails to recall facts that are critical to the argument.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Does not recognize the information being questioned and can not remember facts.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Can not define discipline-specific terms.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An awareness of what the material means,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows one to demonstrate understanding of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work based on one's knowledge of it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Can identify all the main ideas in written essays, reports, case studies, or problems.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Always recognizes relevant facts and uses them in proper content.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Always accurately expresses in one's own words all the key points of the presented content.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Can identify most of the main ideas in written essays, reports, case studies, or problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Most often recognizes relevant facts and usually uses them in proper content.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Most often expresses in one's own words most of the key points of the presented content.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Can identify some of the main ideas in written essays, reports, case studies, or problems.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. At times recognizes relevant facts and at times uses them in proper content.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. At times expresses in one's own words some of the key points of the presented content.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Can identify a few main ideas in written essays, reports, case studies, or problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Rarely recognizes relevant facts and rarely uses them in proper content.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rarely expresses in one's own words the key points of the presented content.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Can not identify any of the main ideas in written essays, reports, case studies, or problems.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Never selects relevant facts.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Does not express in one's own words the key points of the presented content.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Applying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data, principles, and theories learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to answer a question in a new environment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shows one can apply what is learned and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Consistently and accurately manipulates all relevant learned content to create new information, a new product or make an argument.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Always performs comprehensive tasks specific to learned course knowledge.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Employ all learned formulas, procedures, principles or themes accurately and appropriately in new contexts.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Consistently and accurately manipulates some of the learned content to create new information, a new product or make an argument.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Usually performs comprehensive tasks specific to learned course knowledge.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Employ most learned formulas, procedures, principles or themes accurately and appropriately in new contexts.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Consistently manipulates any of the learned content to create new information, a new product or make an argument.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. At times performs comprehensive tasks specific to learned course knowledge.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Employ a few learned formulas, procedures, principles, or themes but not always appropriately in new contexts.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Rarely manipulates any of the learned content to create new information, a new product or make an argument.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Never performs comprehensive tasks specific to learned course knowledge.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Employ very few formulas, procedures, principles, or themes but not always appropriately in new contexts.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Never manipulates any of the learned content to create new information, a new product or make an argument.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Never performs comprehensive tasks specific to learned course knowledge.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Does not employ formulas, procedures, principles, or themes accurately and appropriately in new contexts.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(4) Analyzing

breaks down material into its constituent parts so that its organizational structure may be understood.

A. Performs advanced analytical tasks such as interpretation of graphs, tables and/or the validity of arguments or reasoning.
B. Consistently classifies all information, concepts, principles and facts.
C. Consistently compares and contrasts all facts presented.

A. Performs intermediate analytical tasks such as predicting outcomes or analyzing logic structure.
B. Usually classifies most information, concepts, principles and facts.
C. Usually compares and contrasts most facts.

A. Performs basic analytical tasks such as categorizing information and distinguishing between relevant and irrelevant data or facts.
B. Infrequently classifies information, concepts, principles and facts.
C. Infrequently compares and contrasts facts.

A. Attempts to perform basic analytical tasks.
B. Rarely classifies information, concepts, principles and facts.
C. Rarely compares and contrasts facts.

A. Does not perform basic analytical tasks.
B. Never classifies information, concepts, principles and facts.
C. Never compares and contrasts facts.

(5) Evaluating

making judgements based on criteria through verifying and critiquing.

A. Accesses unsupported claims using standards of credibility and documentation.
B. Neutralizes fallacious reasoning and rhetoric by drawing attention to its flaws.
C. Persuasively and correctly judges an argument's completeness and validity.

A. Attempts to assess unsupported claims.
B. Recognizes some fallacious reasoning and rhetoric but is not able to neutralize them.
C. Somewhat correctly judges an argument's completeness and validity but with missing claims or facts.

A. Identifies unsupported claims but does not assess them.
B. Recognizes some fallacious reasoning and rhetoric but is not able to neutralize them.
C. Fails to judge an argument's completeness and validity.

A. Does not identify unsupported claims or assess them.
B. Does not recognize fallacious reasoning and rhetoric.
C. Fails to judge an argument's completeness and/or validity.

(6) Creating

shows ability to judge the value of material for a given purpose based on defined criteria and rationale; includes decision making and selection.

A. Combines content from many disciplines to develop solutions to unrelated problems and/or to create valid arguments.
B. Derives tentative explanations by utilizing deductive and/or inductive reasoning skills.
C. Draws all possible conclusions, insightfully that account for contradictory evidence, facts, and ideas.

A. Combines some content from multiple disciplines to develop solutions to unrelated problems and/or to create somewhat valid arguments.
B. Derives tentative explanations by utilizing deductive and/or inductive reasoning skills.
C. Draws most conclusions based on evidence, facts, and ideas but ignores opposing evidence.

A. Occasionally combines a limited amount of content from a few disciplines to develop conclusions or make an argument.
B. Derives tentative explanations by only utilizing inductive reasoning skills.
C. Draws some but not all conclusions after weighing evidence, facts, and ideas.

A. Infrequently combines a limited amount of content from a few disciplines but does not effectively develop solutions to unrelated problems or create valid arguments.
B. Rarely derives tentative explanations.
C. Draws conclusions but they are not based on evidence, facts and ideas.

A. Does not effectively develop solutions or create valid arguments.
B. Can not derive tentative explanations.
C. Does not present conclusions.

Average Rating

Accomplished: 3.40-4.00
Competent: 3.00-3.39
Developing: 2.69-2.99
Beginning: 2.40-2.59
Remedial: 0-2.39
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