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Introduction
The following information is the compiled survey results for the Emerging Scholars training workshop conducted by Dr. Brian Barnes from the Foundation for Critical Thinking. The survey respondents were 25 of the 30* full-time and part-time Broward College faculty who are serving as Emerging Scholars during the 2015-2016 academic year. The Office of the QEP determined the survey questions based on data collected from previous workshops conducted by Dr. Barnes and with the goal of continuous improvement in mind.

The survey results will be shared with Emerging and Certified Scholars and will be used for future workshop planning.

*One of the 30 Emerging Scholars participated in the Certified Scholars training because she had already attended this training during the 2014-2015 academic year.

As a result of the workshop, I am better prepared to:

Average Rating: On a scale of 1 (None) – 5 – (A Great Deal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in a meaningful conversation with a Certified Scholar about the Intellectual Standards</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply the Intellectual Standards to my discipline of study</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in a meaningful conversation with a Certified Scholar about the Elements of Thought (Reasoning)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply the Elements of Thought (Reasoning) to my discipline of study</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate some of the pedagogical ideas exemplified during training into my classroom and/or online learning environment</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what degree did the presentation:

Average Rating: On a scale of 1 (None) – 5 – (A Great Deal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide valuable teaching and learning strategies related to critical thinking</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare me to serve as a QEP Emerging Scholar</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet my expectations</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate the quality of the training session.

On a scale of 1 (Very Poor) – 5 – (Very Good)

![Quality Rating Graph]

Describe one or two things you liked about the training session.

- I liked how the training was interactive and the lecturer did not lecture the entire time.
- Third person critique of two person exchange of "logic of education"
- The booklets were helpful and the presenter was good.
- The eight elements of thought; I will apply them into my classes.
- The facilitator guided the process as if he were teaching his course.
- Interaction with peers. The whole concept of teaching "critical thinking"
- I was able to relate the material covered into my classes
- Interaction with other professors from different disciplines, who share the same problems we have with the students.
- The group work and the lunch.
- I liked all of the hands-on activities and the opportunity to reflect upon how I can directly relate these principles to my discipline.
- The interaction during the activities.
- I liked the peer review aspect however, it got a bit redundant.
- I enjoyed some of the writing and the examples that were provided. I enjoyed the initial explanations of the Elements of thought.
- The organization of time and Brian's leadership were good. (Good food too!)
• One thing that I liked about the training session is the sharing of ideas amongst the members of your own group, and also the sharing of thoughts in rotation with members of different groups.

• Brian was very knowledgeable and engaged the faculty

• Occasional interactive and individual reflective activities

• The information was substantive.

• We weren't just talking about our own experiences or our own use of the terminology; we were actually learning new definitions.

• I very much appreciate the teaching techniques. This is, very likely, the best training workshop I have attended at Broward.

• There was a good balance of lecture and hands on activities which helped to utilize time efficiently.

• I enjoyed the interactions with fellow scholars and meeting new people from other campuses and disciplines. I also liked that the activities we practiced in the session are activities we can incorporate in our courses.

• I enjoyed participating in the group activities and in the writing activities. I have already tried out a few of the ideas in the first few days of class this semester.

• The guided activities and the booklet with the QEP information.

• Its applicability to practically any discipline. Though I thought that the workshop could be interactive in different ways, I do believe that those professors unfamiliar with critical thinking strategies did get something out of it.

• Tools for Q-s on Q-s, Group projects varieties

Now that you have had a “crash course” in the Paul-Elder model of critical thinking, what are some of your reflections?

• The incorporation of students interacting is the best practices of student learning and giving the students time to think critically and being able to verbalize their thinking.

• It will take some time to process this and implement it (and outside) in the classroom

• I think it's a useful tool and I look forward to figuring out how to see it in action.

• The intellectual standards that should be applied to the elements of reasoning

• The process of thinking about thinking provides a process to document the thinking.

• I need to go home to study and reflect. I am not confident about the components of the model.

• The crash course helped me to understand critical thinking in more practical way which helps me to use these teaching strategies in my classes more often.
Without knowing the "technical" words, I had all these types of questions and elements of critical thinking in my teaching methods since the 80s.

Is good to learn the "language", but the results I believe are the same.

It can be used to help students better understand course material. However, the students will have to be strongly encouraged to use it because it is not a simple system.

I think many of us are already doing much of this in our classrooms, but now we have a framework in which to report it, both to quantify the value to the institution as well as to inform our own instruction.

Good model. I teach philosophy, logic, and ethics, so I am used to prepare assignments where critical thinking is somehow required.

I'm excited to see how we can put these theories into practice!

I will definitely use some of the concepts in my courses. I will not use all of them at once.

It seems to be a useful model, as long as it is recognized as only a model, not the objective standard of critical thinking. Brian did a good job both promoting/explaining the Paul-Elder model and acknowledging that other models of critical thinking are also useful.

Clarity, relevance, and the depth are the main components that need to be focused in the crash course.

Breaking it down with examples helped.

Interesting model but I still like Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive behaviors. His higher-order thinking behaviors also promote critical thinking.

I appreciate the model now much more than I have before. I would add some qualifications if I were teaching it in a critical thinking course, for instance, that clarity is a necessary condition for precision and that relevance is a necessary condition for logic, such that the terms are not mutually exclusive. But I can actually use the model now, whereas I wouldn't have felt comfortable doing so before.

I enjoyed the workshop. I have come to realize that I have already incorporated some of the ideas into my teaching, but would like the opportunity to further my ability in this area to better serve the students.

It will take some time to get used to the terminology and to approaching critical thinking in this structured way. I am looking forward to other trainings where we will hopefully get more practical ideas on how to apply the Paul-Elder model of critical thinking.

The ideas are going to be valuable as I move forward and attempt to increase the focus on critical thinking in my classes. There were some interesting new ideas and also new ways of thinking about old ideas.

That most faculty members have being doing these activities, however, not using the right language to identify and guide the process.

It's something I've been doing for years in my classes. I look forward to use it in more detail and with greater variability.
More structured approach in the process of Critical Thinking

It seems to be a useful model, as long as it is recognized as only a model, not the objective standard of critical thinking. Brian did a good job both promoting/explaining the Paul-Elder model and acknowledging that other models of critical thinking are also useful. Certain features of the literature and presentation remind me of that used by various small religious groups, and terms such as "Paulian" suggest a certain vernacular of the founding couple which raises a red flag in my mind. There were strong hints and a few outright statements about morality being a direct product of this model of critical thinking. Does the foundation push any particular moral standards? While writing this, I took some time to think further, then did a quick search on Richard Paul and Linda Elder and found this: http://www.courthousenews.com/2013/08/06/60015.htm. While not directly relevant to the quality of the critical thinking model, if Paul and Elder are guilty of sexual harassment, especially of the degree accused, it suggests a failure of this model to produce thinkers who act responsibly and with compassion. I do not know the current state of this lawsuit. While I see value in the Paul-Elder model and in the training structure provided by the Foundation for Critical Thinking (FCT), I encourage the QEP Scholar program organizers to continue exploring other models that are not tied to businesses like the FCT, which ironically seems to be ideologically motivated rather than intellectually motivated. Or, I may be wrong. I'll keep thinking about it and making observations! (Note their sister organization, The Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, has even more blatantly ideological and nearly religious overtones. As a diverse community here at BC, I suggest we should be cautious in this area.)

What, if any, were the limitations of the training session? (Other than needing more water)

Towards the end, even though the interactions were good, but there was a bit too much interacting towards the end when we were already tired from the 6 hours.

might have been more helpful to give a bit more time on the various tasks

It was just too long to sit there for 6 hours; too much to absorb and by the end I just couldn't think straight.

It was a lot to process in the time allotted. But a good start to understanding how to assist someone with developing the skills to think critically.

It might have been helpful to have the mini books ahead of time instead of coming in cold (which I did).

I think the training was too long and by end of fifth hour I could not function with the speed of the day.

The session was extremely long. Same information and activities could be condensed in less time.

It was far too long. Anything that happened after 4pm was not retained well.

It was a little long. I hit my limit at about 4.5 hours.

Too long. At the end, everybody was really tired.
• The session seemed entirely too long, especially since we did the same activities over and over. I think that if we're going to require the session to be that long, then we need to make sure that we're actually varying the activities.

• We should also be consistent regarding attending the class for the full duration. It it's required of one, it should be required of all.

• Brian could have been more concise in his answers and explanations, but he wasn't a bad presenter.

• His PowerPoint, on the other hand, was horribly formatted! Not a big deal, but not a strength either.

• The outcome would be more effective if the trainer have presented some more examples to verify the component of critical thinking.

• It was a very long day. It got very loud at times

• The lectures need to be chunked and the session (11:30-5:30) needs to include more active learning strategies.

• In answering questions, the presenter gave very few concrete examples. I would suggest that he have a set of ready examples to explain the distinctions among each of the concepts. Also, he repeated the word "right?" during many of his pauses, which was distracting. I am certainly not immune to such idiosyncrasies; I cycle them in and out of my own presentations. But I find it is helpful to know when I'm overusing one.

• I believe 6 hours of training is too long for 1 session. I believe the limitation should be set at 3 hours because like our students many of us have difficulty concentrating and focusing for more than a few hours. In other words, to maximize effectiveness, I believe setting the limit at 3 hours (the length of time of a 1 day per week class) should be the maximum time limit.

• The information presented was what was in the books. I would have wanted us to spend more time talking about the concepts/ideas rather than doing quick activities based on information that we could simply read.

• The length, but I realize that it was necessary in order to cover all the content.

• Random assignment of groups. The groups should be by discipline to better take advantage of the training.

• Brian was ok. Very often talked to us rather than with us.

• Ex-s for implementation of the strategies should be printed and given in hand-outs.