

Part V: The Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan

Directions: Please include Part V with Parts I, II, and III on the same electronic device or with the same print document. It should *not* be combined with Part IV. Entitle it "QEP Impact Report."

Definition: The QEP Impact Report, submitted five years prior to the institution's next decennial review, is a report demonstrating the extent to which the QEP has affected outcomes related to student learning. It is part of the institution's Fifth-Year Interim Report.

Audience: The QEP Impact Report is reviewed by the Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports.

Elements: With each copy of the QEP Impact Report, include a copy of the Executive Summary of your institution's QEP submitted to the Commission following your institution's recent reaffirmation.

The Report itself should address the following elements:

1. a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the Quality Enhancement Plan;
2. a discussion of changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes;
3. a description of the QEP's impact on student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning, as appropriate to the design of the QEP. This description should include the achievement of identified goals and outcomes, and any unanticipated outcomes of the QEP; and
4. a reflection on what the institution has learned as a result of the QEP experience.

The report should not exceed ten pages, excluding the Executive Summary but including the narrative, all appendices, and/or any other supporting documentation (whether in printed or electronic format).

QEP IMPACT REPORT

GOALS AND INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE QEP: The stated goal of Florida SouthWestern State College’s QEP was to enable first-time-in-college students to become self-reliant learners imbued with critical thinking skills. Once fully implemented, the QEP intended to (1) facilitate an increase in student retention rates, rates of persistence, and graduation rates, (2) foster increased rates of student satisfaction and student engagement through each implementation phase, (3) help faculty in applying newly obtained knowledge to their practices to promote critical thinking and enhance the likelihood of success for first-year students, and (4) help staff and administrators in applying practices that promote critical thinking and success to their interactions with first-year students.

DISCUSSION OF CHANGES MADE TO THE QEP AND THE REASONS FOR MAKING THOSE CHANGES: The intended plan outlined in the original QEP included a five-year timeline to make the Cornerstone Experience course a requirement with various subpopulations phasing in, leading up to all FTICs being required to successfully complete the course. During the 2013 Florida Legislative Session, the Florida Senate introduced a Senate Bill 1720 later realized as Florida Statute 1008.30(4)(a) which included revised requirements for the common placement test to enter a public postsecondary education degree program. The statute provides that a large number of students will now be exempt from college placement testing. Due to these legislative changes, placement testing would not serve the purpose it did in implementation year one and two for identifying the population with remedial needs. Therefore, the original implementation timeline was advanced so that the requirement for “All FTIC degree-seeking students” to take and successfully complete the course began in implementation year three (2014-2015) rather than waiting until Implementation Year four.

After implementation year one, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee revised the SENSE and CCSSE goals based on data trends. An increase of 5% over the previous year’s goals each year was deemed unrealistic. The subcommittee concluded that the new goal should be scoring 3% above the comparative “extra-large college” weighted scores for the given year. This way, the College would not be “competing against itself” to the point where it would not be able to show additional gains.

Based on a review of assessment data from AY 2014-2015, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee and the Cornerstone faculty re-evaluated the SmarterMeasure Learning Readiness Indicator and the California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTDI) vis-à-vis other available assessment tools. The faculty supported adoption of the Conley Readiness Index (CRI). Beginning fall 2015, CRI scores are reported as a measure of Success Strategy and Critical Thinking achievement.

QEP’S IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT OF IDENTIFIED GOALS AND OUTCOMES: As of the 2014-2015 academic year, all FTIC degree-seeking students were required to successfully complete SLS 1515.

Goal 1: Critical Thinking: As a result of successful completion of the SLS 1515 course, students will be able to: a) explore how background experiences impact their values and assumptions and explain how they influence personal relationships; b) demonstrate intellectual rigor and problem-solving skills by analyzing and evaluating information, generating ideas, and resolving issues; and c) apply intellectual traits, standards, and elements of reasoning in the context of their personal and academic lives.

Measurement 1: Critical Thinking Journal: Outcome – By the end of each term, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a “3” (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the critical thinking rubric. **Results** – The students’ achievement of each rubric dimension was measured on a 4-point scale. Table 1 provides the percent of students scoring “3” or higher. **Goal was met.**
Table 1. SLS 1515 Critical Thinking Achievement by Rubric Dimension: Journal Assignment % of students scoring '3' or higher.

	Clarity	Accuracy	Relevance	Significance	Logic
Fall 2012	65%	81%	85%	76%	83%

	Clarity	Accuracy	Relevance	Significance	Logic
Spring 2013	67%	81%	53%	78%	83%
Fall 2013	79%	86%	89%	88%	88%
Spring 2014	80%	90%	92%	91%	92%
Fall 2014	79%	*	89%	88%	88%
Spring 2015	73%	*	85%	86%	86%
Fall 2015	78%	*	85%	86%	87%
Spring 2016	79%	*	87%	88%	89%
Fall 2016	88%	*	92%	91%	92%
Spring 2017	80%	*	92%	88%	89%

Measurement 2: Final Essay Assignment: Outcome – By the end of each term, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a “3” (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric. **Results** – The students’ achievement of each dimension of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale. Table 2 provides the percentage of students scoring “3” or higher for each dimension. **Goal was met.**

Table 2. SLS 1515 Critical Thinking Achievement by Rubric Dimension: Final Essay % of students scoring '3' or higher.

	Clarity	Accuracy	Relevance	Significance	Logic
Fall 2012	68%	80%	89%	79%	83%
Spring 2013	84%	88%	91%	92%	88%
Fall 2013	84%	91%	89%	87%	90%
Spring 2014	79%	96%	95%	93%	93%
Fall 2014	84%	*	94%	90%	94%
Spring 2015	81%	*	95%	90%	94%
Fall 2015	86%	*	95%	93%	95%
Spring 2016	85%	*	96%	93%	94%
Fall 2016	84%	*	100%	97%	100%
Spring 2017	85%	*	92%	91%	93%

Measurement 3: Critical Thinking using CCTDI & CRI: Outcome (CCTDI) –After completing the SLS 1515 course, students will have statistically significant improvement in all CCTDI Dispositions. **Results (CCTDI)** – Table 3 provides results since implementation. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 3. Change in means from pre-to-post. [For Tables 3 through 7: Shaded cells indicate statistically significant results. Red denotes decrease from pre-to-post. *Marginal significance (Johnson 2013)¹.]

	Truth-seeking	Open Mindedness	Inquisitiveness	Analyticity	Systematicity	Confidence in Reasoning	Maturity of Judgment
Fall 2012	1.1	0.7	0.7	1	0.8	1.6	1.2
Spring 2013	0.4	0.7*	0.1	1.2	0.8*	1.8	1.1
Fall 2013	0.5	0.0	-0.6	0.4*	0.0	1.4	-0.1
Spring 2014	1.1	0.8	0.0	1.2	0.8	1.7	1.1
Fall 2014	0.8	0.4*	-0.3	0.7	0.2	1.7	-0.2*
Spring 2015	0.9	1.0	0.1	1.3	0.4*	2.3	-0.0
Fall 2015	0.0	0.0	-0.4	0.5	-0.5	1.3	0.3
Spring 2016	0.8	0.4	0.0	1.1	0.6	2.0	0.3
Fall 2016	0.1	0.0	-0.1	0.5	-0.5	2.0	-0.3
Spring 2017	-0.3	0.1	-0.2	0.8	0.9	2.1	0.0

Outcome (CRI) – After completing the SLS 1515 course, students will have statistically significant improvement in all areas of the Key Cognitive Strategies areas of the CRI. **Results (CRI)** – Table 4 provides results since implementation of the CRI (fall 2015). All but one Key Cognitive Strategy has exhibited statistically significant results in all terms. The CRI was changed in spring 2017 such that the 10 Key Cognitive Strategies components were combined into five aptitudes, “Communication”, “Interpretation”, “Precision/Accuracy”, “Problem Formulation”, and “Research.” **Goal was met.**

Table 4. Change in percentage of students responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to Key Cognitive Strategies areas of the CRI.

	Construct	Organize	Analyze	Evaluate	Confirm	Monitor	Hypothesize	Strategize	Collect	Identify
F 2015	16.6%	12.7%	16.3%	14.4%	2.9%	6.7%	11.5%	8.9%	11.0%	12.5%

	Construct	Organize	Analyze	Evaluate	Confirm	Monitor	Hypothesize	Strategize	Collect	Identify
Sp 2016	17.7%	12.9%	13.7%	13.6%	4.6%	7.1%	14.0%	8.4%	9.3%	12.2%
F 2016	20.3%	15.4%	19.4%	18.1%	6.8%	11.1%	14.7%	11.2%	13.6%	13.3%
	Communication		Interpretation		Precision/Accuracy		Problem Formulation		Research	
Sp 2017	16.0%		11.4%		4.7%		10.2%		14.8%	

Goal 2: Success Skills: As a result of successful completion of the SLS 1515 course, students will be able to: a) develop strategies for effective written and verbal communications, use of technology, listening, reading, critical thinking, and reasoning; and b) demonstrate independence and self-efficacy through effective personal management, use of college resources and the development of positive relationships with peers, staff, and faculty.

Measurement 1: SmarterMeasure Learning Readiness Indicator / CRI: Outcome (SmarterMeasure) – After completing the Cornerstone Experience course, students will have significant improvement in the following indicators: “Personal Attributes,” “Life Factors,” “Technology Knowledge” and “Technology Competency.” Beginning fall 2015, the CRI was adopted to replace SmarterMeasure. *Results (SmarterMeasure)* – Table 5 provides the t-test results for all terms since implementation. There was a statistically significant improvement in “Technology Knowledge” in all terms. Other attributes exhibit mixed results. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 5. Change in means from pre-to-post for SmarterMeasure readiness indicators.

	Fall 2012	Sp 2013	Fall 2013	Sp 2014	Fall 2014	Sp 2015
Personal Attributes	-0.2	-1.0*	-0.5	-0.3	-0.7	-1.7
Technology Knowledge	3.8	4.2	3.1	3.9	3.0	2.3
Technology Competency	-0.1	2.0*	-1.0	2.1	0.0	0.6
Life Factors	-0.4	0.6	-0.2	0.2	-1.1	-1.5

Outcome (CRI 1) – After completing the SLS 1515 course, students will have statistically significant improvement in all areas of the Key Content Knowledge areas of the CRI. Note that the “Experience with Technology” was removed from this area of the CRI beginning spring 2017. *Results (CRI 1)* – Table 6 provides results since implementation of the CRI (fall 2015). In three of six indices, Key Content Knowledge areas have exhibited statistically significant results in all terms. The other three exhibit statistically significant results in some terms. **Goal was met.**

Table 6. Change in percentage of students responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to Key Content Knowledge.

	Attribution	Value	Challenge Level	Experience with Tech	Structure of Knowledge	Student Effort
Fall 2015	2.1%	-0.1%	7.5%	10.3%	3.8%	3.0%
Spring 2016	3.3%	2.8%	8.5%	14.7%	6.9%	5.0%
Fall 2016	4.1%	2.6%	11.4%	13.6%	7.4%	5.7%
Spring 2017	4.8%	10.0%	11.8%	*	7.5%	0.8%

Outcome (CRI 2) – After completing the SLS 1515 course, students will have statistically significant improvement in all areas of the Learning Skills areas of the CRI. *Results (CRI 2)* – Table 7 provides results since implementation of the CRI (fall 2015). In three of ten indices results are statistically significant in all terms. Other areas exhibit statistically significant improvement in some terms. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 7. Change in percentage of students responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to Learning Skills areas.

	Collaborative Learning	General Study	Information Retention	Note Taking	Strategic Reading	Test Taking	Time Management	Goal Setting	Persistence	Self-Awareness
F 2015	6.9%	2.9%	11.8%	-1.0%	11.9%	8.2%	3.1%	2.0%	3.9%	2.8%
Sp 2016	9.4%	5.7%	11.6%	0.3%	8.9%	7.1%	3.1%	4.3%	5.3%	5.1%
F 2016	7.2%	6.4%	15.0%	1.4%	12.3%	8.7%	7.2%	6.0%	6.2%	4.8%
Sp 2017	12.7%	*	16.8%	2.8%	13.9%	9.6%	6.5%	5.8%	7.6%	7.3%

Measurement 2: Success Strategies Presentation: Outcome – By the end of each term, 70% of students that complete the course will achieve a “3” (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric. **Results** – The students’ achievement of each rubric dimension was measured on a 4-point scale. Table 8 provides the percentage of students scoring “3” or higher for each dimension. **Goal was met.**

Table 8. SLS 1515 Success Strategies by Rubric Dimension: Group Presentation % of students scoring '3' or higher. *A revised rubric was implemented in spring 2013 so scores are not comparable to fall 2012.

	Accuracy	Relevance and Demonstration of Application	Creativity	Effective Group Communication
Spring 2013	90%	90%	86%	86%
Fall 2013	94%	90%	86%	88%
Spring 2014	94%	94%	89%	90%
Fall 2014	93%	91%	87%	90%
Spring 2015	94%	94%	89%	92%
Fall 2015	92%	90%	83%	90%
Spring 2016	94%	92%	90%	92%
Fall 2016	90%	88%	86%	90%
Spring 2017	92%	89%	88%	92%

Measurement 3: Success Strategies Survey: Outcome –Upon completion of the SLS 1515 course, 75% of respondents will report usage or application for “Cognitive,” “Goal attainment” and “Campus engagement” survey items; 30% of respondents will report substantial improvement for the skills (non-Likert rating scale) items. **Results** –Table 9 provides results. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 9. Percent Respondents Reporting Substantial Improvement in Goal Attainment, Communication, & Cognitive Strategies.

	Arriving to class on time.	Attending class.	Reviewing the course schedule.	Using the calendar or lists.	Working on large projects incrementally.	Using small group communication skills.	Participating and asking questions when appropriate.	Forming a relationship with other students.	Meeting with the professor outside of class for help.	Thinking critically about texts and lectures.
Fall 2012	5%	10%	10%	18%	23%	35%	23%	20%	10%	36%
Spring 2013	7%	7%	20%	26%	27%	33%	33%	24%	28%	39%
Fall 2013	6%	7%	13%	20%	18%	21%	21%	18%	22%	19%
Spring 2014	12%	9%	22%	13%	29%	35%	36%	30%	36%	40%
Fall 2014	9%	9%	19%	22%	24%	31%	27%	29%	34%	30%
Spring 2015	11%	9%	21%	28%	32%	39%	34%	37%	43%	32%
Fall 2015	6%	6%	20%	24%	29%	34%	27%	27%	39%	32%
Spring 2016	11%	11%	16%	19%	23%	22%	22%	29%	33%	24%
Fall 2016	8%	7%	21%	28%	27%	29%	25%	28%	36%	28%
Spring 2017	12%	10%	16%	22%	27%	36%	25%	36%	38%	35%

Goal 3: Retention, Persistence, and Graduation: Fully implemented, the QEP will facilitate an increase in student retention rates, rates of persistence, and graduation rates.

Measurement 1: Within-Course Completion Rates: Outcome – Fully implemented, students will successfully complete the Cornerstone Experience at a rate of 80% with a “C” or better. **Results** – Table 10 provides success rates by campus and term. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 10. SLS 1515 Within-Course Success Rates (%Passing, A-C) by term.

	Charlotte	Collier	Hendry Glades	Lee	FSW Online	College Total
Fall 2012	74%	84%	87%	75%	~	77%
Spring 2013	83%	69%	53%	70%	~	70%
Fall 2013	80%	78%	77%	75%	~	76%
Spring 2014	76%	76%	75%	70%	~	73%
Fall 2014	85%	84%	90%	81%	~	82%
Spring 2015	79%	78%	77%	70%	~	73%

	Charlotte	Collier	Hendry Glades	Lee	FSW Online	College Total
Fall 2015	88%	88%	81%	82%	75%	84%
Spring 2016	76%	73%	79%	70%	77%	72%
Fall 2016	82%	84%	90%	83%	79%	83%
Spring 2017	76%	77%	84%	73%	79%	75%

Measurement 2: Term-to-term Retention: Outcome – Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, term-to-term retention will increase by 5% each year. **Results** – Table 17-19 provide term-to-term comparisons between the baseline year and implementation years using the 2012 requirement (Table 11), the 2013 requirement (Table 12), and 2014 requirement (Table 13). **Goal was partially met.**

Table 11. Comparison of term-to-term retention for students testing into two or more developmental areas (2012 requirement).

	AY 2011-12	AY 2012-13	AY 2013-14	AY 2014-15	AY 2015-16	AY 2016-17
Fall	743	662	842	527	531	480
Spring	561, (75.5%)	505, (76.3%)	687, (81.6%)	443, (84.1%)	433, (81.5%)	401, (83.5%)

Table 12. Comparison of term-to-term retention for students testing into any one developmental area (2013 requirement).

	AY 2011-12	AY 2012-13	AY 2013-14	AY 2014-15	AY 2015-16	AY 2016-17
Fall	1544	1456	1671	1153	1065	732
Spring	1190, (77.1%)	1123, (77.1%)	1345, (80.5%)	960, (84.1%)	884, (83.0%)	608, (83.1%)

Table 13. Comparison of term-to-term retention for students not testing into any developmental courses (2014 requirements).

	AY 2014-15	AY 2015-16	AY 2016-17
Fall	1160	1199	1484
Spring	935, (80.6%)	1040, (86.7%)	1224, (82.5%)

Measurement 3: Year-to-year Retention: Outcome – Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, year-to-year retention will increase by 3% each year. **Results** – Tables 20-22 provide year-to-year comparisons between the baseline year and implementation years using the 2012 requirement (Table 14), the 2013 requirement (Table 15), and 2014 requirement (Table 16). **Goal was partially met.**

Table 14. Comparison of yr-to-yr retention for students testing into two or more developmental areas (2012 requirement).

	AY 2011-12	AY 2012-13	AY 2013-14	AY 2014-15	AY 2015-16
Fall	743	662	842	527	531
Fall	368, (49.5%)	339, (51.2%)	432, (51.3%)	303, (57.5%)	290, (54.6%)

Table 15. Comparison of yr-to-yr retention for students testing into any one developmental area (2013 requirement).

	AY 2011-12	AY 2012-13	AY 2013-14	AY 2014-15	AY 2015-16
Fall	1544	1456	1671	1153	1065
Fall	790, (51.2%)	737, (50.6%)	869, (52.0%)	680, (59.0%)	614, (57.7%)

Table 16. Comparison of yr-to-yr retention for students not testing into any developmental courses (2014 requirements).

	AY 2014-15	AY 2015-16
Fall	1160	1199
Spring	678, (58.4%)	756, (63.1%)

Measurement 4: Cohort Graduate Reports: Outcome – This analysis will use the cohort graduation rate associated with students that entered FSW as FTIC compared with AY 10-11, where (a) cohorts from AY 12-13 150% graduation rate will increase by 10%, (b) cohorts from AY 13-14 and AY 14-15 150% graduation rate will increase by 10%, and (c) cohort from AY 15-16 150% graduation rate will increase by 10%. **Results** – Table 17 provides the cohort graduation rates at the two-year mark and three-year mark

(150%). Two-year graduation rates have increased from 1.6% to 2.2% over the study while three-year (150%) rates are up from 9.6% to 15.8%. **Goal was not met.**

Table 17. Comparison of cohort graduation rates for FTIC degree-seeking, non-transfer students.

	2yr Graduation rate	3yr Graduation rate
AY 2010-2011	37/2382, (1.6%)	228/2382, (9.6%)
AY 2011-2012	38/2262, (1.7%)	199/2262, (8.8%)
AY 2012-2013	36/1930, (1.9%)	169/1930, (8.8%)
AY 2013-2014	82/2291, (3.6%)	231/2291, (10.1%)
AY 2014-2015	51/2315, (2.2%)	365/2315, (15.8%)

Measurement 5: Course Outcome and Student Effort & Involvement Items from SIR II (#29-33 and 34-36): *Outcome* – Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions. *Results* – Table 18 provides the means for SLS 1515 and comparative four-year institutions. **Goal was met.**

Table 18. SIR II Means: SLS 1515 and Comparative Four-Year Institutions. Values are on a 5-point scale.

		F 2012	Sp 2013	F 2013	Sp 2014	F 2014	Sp 2015
Course Outcome (29, 30, 31, 32, 33)	Florida SouthWestern	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.2	3.9	4.1
	Comparative 4-Yr Institution	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
Student Effort & Involvement (34, 35, 36)	Florida SouthWestern	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9
	Comparative 4-Yr Institution	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7

Beginning in fall 2015, the SIR II was replaced by the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI), which itself was replaced in fall 2016 by the Student Opinion Survey (SOS). Results are shown in Table 19.

Table 19. SEI Positive response: SOS percentage responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”.

	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
SEI #1	96%	99%	*	*
SEI/SOS SLS-Specific #1	95%	95%	90%	93%
SEI/SOS SLS-Specific #2	97%	97%	98%	99%

Goal 4: Student Satisfaction and Engagement: Through each phase of implementation, the QEP will foster increased rates of student satisfaction and engagement. The success measure is demonstrated through the quality of student/student, student/faculty, and student/college engagement.

Measurement 1: Engaged Learning Items from SENSE Survey (19a, b, e, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o, q, 20d2, f2, and h2): *Outcome* – At the end of each academic year, the college’s scores in the Engaged Learning benchmark will be 3% above the comparative “extra-large college.” *Results* – Table 20 provides results of the FSW’s weighted scores compared with “extra-large college.” **Goal was partially met.**

Table 20. FSW SENSE Survey Results. E_w: FSW weighted score, XLC_w: extra-large college weighted score. *Baseline scores before implementation of FYE Course and Program are E_w: 49, XLC_w: 49, with 0% difference.

	Engaged Learning Benchmark		
	E _w	XLC _w	% Difference
Fall 2012	51.4	49.3	4%
Fall 2013	53.5	49.7	8%
Fall 2014	52	50	4%
Fall 2015	49.2	48.6	1%
Fall 2016	47.3	48.8	-3%

Measurement 2: Student/Faculty Interaction Items from CCSSE Survey (4k, l, m, n, o, and q): Outcome – At the end of each academic year, the College’s scores in the Student-Faculty Interactions items will be 3% above the comparative "extra-large college" weighted scores. *Results* – Table 21 provides FSW’s weighted score compared with that of “extra-large college” weighted scores. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 21. FSW CCSSE Survey Results. *E_w*: FSW weighted score, *XLC_w*: extra-large college weighted score.

	Student / Faculty Interaction Benchmark		
	<i>E_w</i>	<i>XLC_w</i>	% Difference
2013	50.0	48.6	3%
2014	48.6	48.2	1%
2015	48.4	47.9	1%
2016	50.2	47.7	5%
2017	50.0	48.2	2%

Measurement 3: Subset of Active & Collaborative Learning Items from CCSSE Survey (4f, g, h, and r) and SIR II (11-15): Outcome – Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions. *Results* – Table 22 provides FSW’s weighted score in compared with that of “extra-large college” weighted scores. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 22. FSW CCSSE Survey Results. *E_w*: FSW weighted score, *XLC_w*: extra-large college weighted score.

	Active & Collaborative Learning Benchmark		
	<i>E_w</i>	<i>XLC_w</i>	% Difference
2013	49.3	49.7	-1%
2014	48.9	49.5	-1%
2015	49.1	49.8	-1%
2016	52.2	49.5	5%
2017	52.6	50.0	3%

Measurement 4: Qualitative Data from Focus Group Responses: Outcome – Focus group responses were analyzed and discussion of student satisfaction and engagement will be coded. *Results* – Table 23’s codes are grouped into concepts and categories that lead faculty/staff to understand the elements of the course and extracurricular activities that increased students’ satisfaction and engagement.

Table 23. Major Categories from Focus Group Responses.

Learning & Acquisition	Academic & Affective Support	Campus/College Engagement
Concepts	Concepts	Concepts
Learning about College Resources	Valuing Faculty and Reporting Positive Interactions	Participating in College Activities but Needing More Choices
Gaining and Valuing “Self-Awareness”	Valuing and Critiquing GPS Assignment	Expanding Social Network and Experiencing Diversity
Learning “Time Management” and Course Success Strategies	Valuing Peer Architects	
Learning and Valuing Critical Thinking Skills	Critiquing Lack of Textbook Usage	
Valuing and Critiquing Journal Assignment	Valuing Group Project, Acquiring Presentation Skills and Gaining Confidence	

Goal 5: Faculty Application of New Knowledge: As the faculty complete the Cornerstone Experience Instructor professional development modules, they will apply newly obtained knowledge to their practices to promote critical thinking and enhance the likelihood of success for first-year students.

Measurement 1: Academic Challenge Items from CCSSE Survey (4p, 5b, c, d, e, f, 6a, c, 7, 9a): Outcome – At the end of each academic year, ESC/FSW scores in the Academic Challenge items will be 3% above the comparative "extra-large college" weighted scores. *Results* – Table 24 provides FSW’s weighted

score in the Academic Challenge benchmark compared with that of “extra-large college” weighted scores. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 24. FSW CCSSE Survey Results. *E_w*: FSW weighted score, *XLC_w*: extra-large college weighted score.

	Academic Challenge Benchmark		
	<i>E_w</i>	<i>XLC_w</i>	% Difference
2013	50.3	50.0	1%
2014	50.2	50.0	0%
2015	50.2	50.1	0%
2016	52.3	50.0	4%
2017	51.5	50.4	1%

Measurement 2: Professional Development Surveys: *Outcome* – Following completion of the professional development modules, 80% of trained faculty will report using critical thinking and first-year student success strategies as measured on Likert scale items. *Results* – Table 25 provides positive response rates by respondents in the survey. **Goal was met.**

Table 25. Faculty Professional Development Survey Results: Percentage of Respondents Applying Strategies.

Training Content	Fall 2012	Spring/Summer 2013	AY 2013-2014	AY 2014-2015	AY 2015-2016
Critical Thinking	79.0%	100.0%	92.9%	100.0%	100.0%
Success Strategies	79.0%	100.0%	92.9%	100.0%	100.0%

Measurement 3: SIR II Communication Items (6-10): *Outcome* – Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions. *Results* – Table 26 below provides the means for SLS 1515 and comparative four-year institutions. **Goal was met.**

Table 26. SIR II Means: SLS 1515 and Comparative Four-Year Institutions. Values are on a 5-point scale.

		Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Communication (6, 7, 8, 9, 10)	Florida SouthWestern	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.7
	Comparative 4-Yr Institution	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4

Goal 6: Staff Interactions with First-Year Students: As the staff and administrators complete the Cornerstone Experience Services professional development modules, they will apply practices that promote critical thinking and success to their interactions with first-year students.

Measurement 1: Staff and Administrators Professional Development Surveys: *Outcome* – Following completion of the professional development modules, 80% of trained staff and administrators applying critical thinking and first-year student success strategies as measured on Likert scale items. *Results* – Table 27 provides positive response rates by respondents in the survey. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 27. Staff/Administrator Professional Development Survey Results: Percentage of Respondents Applying Strategies.

Training Content	Fall 2012	Spring/Summer 2013	AY 2013-2014	AY 2014-2015	AY 2015-2016
Critical Thinking	69.0%	67.0%	75.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Success Strategies	69.0%	67.0%	75.0%	75.0%	100.0%

Measurement 2: Clear Academic Plan & Pathway Items from SENSE Survey (18d, e, g, f, and h): *Outcome* – At the end of each academic year, ESC/FSW scores in the Clear Academic Plan and Pathway items will be 3% above the comparative "extra-large college" weighted scores. *Results* – Table 28 provides FSW’s weighted score in the Clear Academic Plan and Pathway benchmark compared with that of “extra-large college” weighted scores. **Goal was partially met.**

Table 28. FSW SENSE Survey Results. Ew denotes FSW weighted score, XLCw denotes extra-large college weighted score, % Diff denotes percent difference between two scores. *Baseline scores before implementation of FYE Course and Program.

	Clear Academic Plan and Pathway Benchmark		
	E _w	XLC _w	% Difference
Fall 2011*	48.9	47.6	3%
Fall 2012	48.9	48.0	2%
Fall 2013	53.8	47.5	13%
Fall 2014	57.6	50.0	15%
Fall 2015	56.8	46.9	21%
Fall 2016	42.9	47.4	-9%

REFLECTION

Throughout the five years of the QEP, a number of committees met regularly to review data to inform improvement. Annual reports were disseminated widely, discussed in stakeholder meetings and posted to the college Website (<https://www.fsw.edu/fye/qep/assessment>). The academic achievement data from five-year implementation demonstrate that SLS 1515 has had a positive effect on student learning, specifically in terms of their ability to think critically and utilize success strategies.

Through an analysis of the domains of both the assignment rubrics and the standardized assessment, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee has identified the following areas that prove challenging for students: (1) Though there have been improved scores in writing “Clarity,” this continues to be the dimension where students receive the lowest scores. (2) Though there have been improved scores, students continue to have low scores in information literacy and thinking critically about the validity and veracity of texts and lectures (“Truth-seeking”).

In response the College has made positive changes and continued promising practices to include: (1) Designing and implementing “Academic Journaling” workshops to support students’ academic writing on all campuses and centers. (2) Holding in-house critical thinking training and sending faculty to the International Conference on Critical Thinking. (3) Implementing “Truth-seeking” workshops for students. Information from the workshops includes: learning how to evaluate information, credibility of websites and searching for information on the Internet. (4) Implementing “Engendering Truth-seeking” workshops for faculty and staff.

The data supports the hypothesis that SLS 1515 and ancillary FYE Programming have had a positive effect on student retention, satisfaction and engagement. Additionally, students report gaining “self-awareness” that provides clarity for academic and career planning. Through an analysis of the qualitative data, the QEP Assessment Subcommittee has identified the following area that prove challenging for students: Engaging in campus events and activities due to scheduling challenges.

In response the College has made positive changes and continued promising practices to include: (1) Revising the course schedule so that the courses formerly offered at 5:30 p.m. to begin at 6:00 p.m. to allow evening students to attend workshops and support centers before class. Additionally, online workshops have been developed to support students with scheduling conflicts. New Student Programs, Student Life, the Academic Support Centers, and the Library now schedule workshops in the 5:00-6:00 p.m. time slot. (2) Increasing evening and weekend programming and service learning opportunities College-wide. (3) Restructuring “Early Alert” to be housed in the Advising Office. This has enhanced a case-based advising approach focused on student retention. (4) Restructuring the Academic Support Center and Library so that there is College-wide consistency of workshops and services. (5) Holding in-house training on supporting first-year students and sending faculty and staff to the Annual Conference on The First-Year Experience®. (6) Implementing new admissions/advising process that includes meta-major declaration, Career Source assessment, and a self-appraisal. (7) Contracting with CareerSource Southwest Florida job placement services, resume support, and interview preparation.

Through analysis of retention and graduation rates, there is a clear pattern of significant increases in by course participation in both term-to-term and year-to-year retention. While the initial graduation rates studies do not demonstrate significant differences since the implementation of the QEP, the most recent academic year does, and so a trend may be present although it is too early to determine at this point.

In response the College has made positive changes and continued promising practices to include: (1) The College President announced the new *Dedicate to Graduate* initiative in fall 2016. A *Dedicate to Graduate* implementation team to include faculty, staff and administrators from both Student and Academic Affairs was established to operationalize the goals of the Dedicate to Graduate initiative. The college's strategic directions, as well as individual department effectiveness goals, are aligned with the initiative. (2) The College partnered with Suncoast Federal Credit Union to offer Financial Literacy Workshops to students, faculty, and staff. Suncoast educators began leading workshops on each campus in fall 2016. (3) The college renewed support for the Cornerstone Experience course which will continue to be required for all FTIC degree-seeking students. The course is housed within the Academic Success Department which is overseen by an academic faculty department chair in the School of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences.