

EDISON STATE COLLEGE

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN (QEP)

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR 1: 2012-2013

ANNUAL REVIEW

For additional details or further analysis not provided in the report please contact

Dr. Eileen DeLuca, Dean, College and Career Readiness and QEP Director

(ecdeluca@edison.edu, 239-985-3498)

Or

Dr. Kevin Coughlin, Registrar and Director of Course-Level Assessment

(kcoughlin@edison.edu, 239-489-9027)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE QEP SUBMITTED TO SACSCOC

The goal of Edison State College's proposed QEP is to enable first-time-in-college students to become self-reliant learners imbued with critical thinking skills.

To promote personal growth and academic success, Edison State College (ESC) proposes a three-credit course for first-time degree-seeking students titled SLS 1515 Cornerstone Experience. Emphasizing critical thinking, self-reliance, and persistence, the course will empower students with knowledge-based skills and enhance their capacity to apply critical thinking to their professional and personal lives, supporting success in their studies at ESC and beyond. For faculty and staff, this Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) includes a comprehensive suite of professional development experiences that will foster a common understanding of critical thinking and engender an appreciation for the strengths and needs of first-year students.

Over a two-year period beginning in August 2008, faculty, students, administrators, staff and consultants participated in internal and external research to identify the QEP topic that would have the greatest impact on student learning. Included in the process was a nine-month, externally guided self-study using the Foundations of Excellence® (FOE) in the First College Year assessment model. In April 2009, the QEP focus emerged as a unique version of a first-year experience (FYE) course infused with critical thinking.

The QEP is aligned with the College's mission of inspiring learning and preparing students for responsible participation in a global society. Beginning January 2012, the course will facilitate students' learning not just about the course topics, but also about the College, their peers, themselves and their individual abilities. The curriculum is grounded in four foundational frameworks: Critical Thinking, Applied Learning, Relevancy and Success Strategies. While students will be introduced to all of ESC's general education competencies, they will specifically explore issues about the nature and techniques of critical thought as a way to establish a reliable basis for claims, beliefs, and attitudes based on the Paul and Elder Elements of Reasoning and the Universal Intellectual Standards model adopted by faculty. The course requirement for all degree-seeking FTIC students will be phased in over a five-year period.

Course content and student learning outcomes emerged from best-practice literature review and the FOE self-study, and are tailored to what is unique to the student experience at ESC. The QEP Committee was guided by expert assistance from the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina.

Student success will be enhanced by faculty and staff training, ranging from understanding the first-year student to topic-specific activities targeting each of the four frameworks. Students will also benefit from the comprehensive and coordinated support initiatives of ESC's emerging first-year experience (FYE) program, Foundations of Self-Reliant Learning. While not specifically part of the QEP, this umbrella program will bolster the new student experience through an enhanced College orientation, an early alert system, and improved intake processes including admissions and advising.

The initial six-year, \$5.2 million QEP operating budget was determined to be offset by tuition due to enhanced retention and State FTE funding generated by Cornerstone Experience enrollment.

GOALS AND INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE QEP:

The goal of Edison State College's proposed QEP is to enable first-time-in-college students to become self-reliant learners imbued with critical thinking skills.

- a. Once fully implemented, the QEP will facilitate an increase in student retention rates, rates of persistence, and graduation rates.
- b. Through each phase of implementation, the QEP will foster increased rates of student satisfaction and student engagement.
- c. 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.
- d. 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.

DISCUSSION OF CHANGES MADE TO THE QEP AND THE REASONS FOR MAKING THOSE CHANGES:

While acknowledging that the QEP topic is “supported by a focus on both student learning outcomes and related environmental support,” the onsite team noted that the focus of the Cornerstone Experience course is “extremely broad and as a result will challenge the college for successful implementation.” In response, the QEP Implementation Committee and the SLS 1515 faculty have narrowed the scope of the QEP to focus course content and assessment efforts on two of the four Cornerstone Experience frameworks, namely *critical thinking* and *success strategies*. The QEP Implementation Committee and the SLS 1515 faculty agree that the student learning outcomes related to critical thinking and success strategies are the main focus of student learning in the course as expressed in the overall goal of the QEP: *Through the full implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan, Edison State College's first-time-in-college (FTIC) students will be self-reliant learners imbued with critical thinking skills.*

QEP'S IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT OF IDENTIFIED GOALS AND OUTCOMES:

During the 2012-2013 academic year, students testing into two or more developmental courses were required to complete SLS 1515. A total of 1,115 students completed the course.

Goal 1: Critical Thinking: As a result of successful completion of the Cornerstone Experience 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; 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 the spring 2013 semester, 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 dimension (Clarity, Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic) of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale. Table 1 provides the overall means for each dimension by semester.

Table 1

SLS 1515 Overall Critical Thinking Means: Journal (with Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

Rubric Dimension	Overall Means (SD)		
	Fall 2012 (N= 3999*)	Spring 2013 (N=585)	Summer 2013 (N=463)
Clarity	2.73 (0.70)	2.82 (0.75)	2.91 (0.68)
Accuracy	2.94 (0.64)	3.04 (0.73)	3.16 (0.60)
Relevance	3.03 (0.63)	3.14 (0.72)	3.24 (0.71)
Significance	2.92 (0.69)	3.06 (0.74)	3.21 (0.71)
Logic	3.00 (0.66)	3.09 (0.72)	3.20 (0.64)

Note. Values are on a 4-point scale.

*In fall 2012 there were 10 journal entries and all 10 were used to demonstrate achievement. In spring and summer 2013 seven journal entries were assigned and only the final three were used for summative achievement.

Table 2 shows the percentage of students scoring "3" or higher for each dimension. In fall 2012, the stated goals for Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic were met. The number of students receiving a "3" or better for Clarity fell short of the stated goal (-5.41%) with Clarity being the dimension with the lowest of the overall means. In spring 2013, the stated goals for Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic were met. The number of students receiving a "3" or better for Clarity fell short of the stated goal (-3.50%) with Clarity being the dimension with the lowest of the overall means. In summer 2013, the stated goals were met for all domains, with Clarity being the dimension with the lowest overall means.

Table 2

SLS 1515 Critical Thinking Achievement by Rubric Dimension: Journal Assignment

Rubric Dimension	Percentage of Students Scoring "3" or higher		
	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
Clarity	64.59%	66.50%	73.22%
Accuracy	80.73%	80.51%	89.20%
Relevance	85.37%	82.56%	86.39%
Significance	75.79%	78.46%	85.31%
Logic	82.70%	83.25%	88.34%

Selected use of results:

- The use of Canvas has allowed each of the journal entries to be scored on an individual rubric.
- For spring 2013, the assignment was streamlined to include seven journal entries. Going forward, the final three entries will be used to measure the summative achievement towards this goal. Earlier journal scores would be considered "formative."

- Faculty continue to provide writing feedback and encourage students to have writing reviewed by instructional assistants to receive feedback on use of Standard English and clarity.
- Faculty engaged in a rubric standardization session on July 12, 2013 in an effort to measure the reliability of the rubric and reach a consensus about levels of performance.

Measurement 2: Final Essay Assignment

Outcome: By the end of the spring 2013 semester, 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 (Clarity, Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic) of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale. Table 3 provides the overall means for each dimension by semester.

Table 3

SLS 1515 Overall Critical Thinking Means: Essay (with Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

Rubric Dimension	Overall Means By Semester (SD)		
	Fall 2012 (N=332)	Spring 2013 (N=211)	Summer 2013 (N=145)
Clarity	2.77 (0.70)	3.12 (0.65)	2.97 (0.66)
Accuracy	2.98 (0.70)	3.12 (0.64)	3.10 (0.63)
Relevance	3.22 (0.69)	3.31 (0.65)	3.26 (0.68)
Significance	3.10 (0.74)	3.42 (0.66)	3.13 (0.70)
Logic	3.10 (0.75)	3.27 (0.66)	3.28 (0.61)

Note. Values are on a 4-point scale.

Table 4 shows the percentage of students scoring "3" or higher for each dimension. In fall 2012, the stated goals for Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic were met. The number of students receiving a "3" or higher for Clarity fell short of the stated goal (-2.29%), with Clarity being the dimension with the lowest of the overall means. In spring 2013, the stated goals for Clarity, Accuracy, Relevance, Significance, and Logic were met. Clarity and Accuracy had the lowest of the overall means. In summer 2013, the stated goals were met for all domains, with Clarity being the dimension with the overall lowest means.

Table 4

SLS 1515 Critical Thinking Achievement by Rubric Dimension: Final Essay

Rubric Dimension	Percentage of Students Scoring "3" or higher		
	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
Clarity	67.71%	84.43%	77.24%
Accuracy	80.12%	87.79%	85.52%
Relevance	88.86%	91.04%	91.72%
Significance	79.06%	91.51%	89.66%
Logic	82.83%	88.15%	91.72%

Selected Use of Results:

- Beginning in fall 2012, use of the Lee Campus Academic Success and College Prep Center labs became more “fluid.” Students with writing needs receive assistance in either lab.
- Faculty continue to provide writing feedback and encourage students to have writing reviewed by instructional assistants to receive feedback on use of Standard English and clarity.
- Faculty engaged in a rubric standardization session on July 12, 2013 in an effort to measure the reliability of the rubric and come to a consensus about levels of performance.

Measurement 3: Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory

Outcome: After completing the Cornerstone Experience course, students will have statistically significant improvement in the following Critical Thinking Dispositions: Truth Seeking, Open-Mindedness, Analyticity, Systematicity, Inquisitiveness, Confidence in Reasoning, and Maturity in Judgment.

Results: In fall 2012, the results of a correlated means t-test, post-test versus pre-test as well as means and standard deviations for pre- and post-tests by domain, showed statistically significant increases across all variables in the scores between the pre- and post-test administrations. Tables 5 below displays the differences in means and *t* values by domain. In fall 2012, the t-test showed statistically significant increases in all domains between the pre- and post-test administrations. In spring 2013, the t-test showed gains in all domains and statistically significant increases in Open-Mindedness, Analyticity, Systematicity, Confidence in Reasoning, and Maturity in Judgment between the pre- and post-test administrations. In summer 2013, the t-test showed gains in all domains and statistically significant increases in Analyticity, Systematicity, and Confidence in Reasoning between the pre- and post-test administrations.

Table 5
SLS 1515 CCTDI Pre-Post Test Results

Dimension	Fall 2012 (N= 366)			Spring 2013 (N=205)			Summer 2013 (N=146)		
	Mean Diff.	t	d	Mean Diff.	t	d	Mean Diff.	t	d
Truth Seeking	1.09	4.00*	0.17	0.40	1.09	0.06	0.81	1.71	0.11
Open-Mindedness	0.71	2.67*	0.13	0.72	2.24*	0.13	0.40	0.94	0.07
Analyticity	1.01	4.18*	0.19	1.15	3.46*	0.21	1.12	2.92*	0.21
Systematicity	0.78	2.81*	0.12	0.78	2.08*	0.11	1.05	2.69*	0.15
Inquisitiveness	0.70	2.40*	0.11	0.08	0.24	0.01	0.38	0.95	0.06
Confidence in Reasoning	1.60	5.97*	0.24	1.77	5.28*	0.27	2.64	5.79*	0.42
Maturity in Judgment	1.24	3.73*	0.16	1.09	2.89*	0.15	0.01	0.03	0.00

**Significant difference at the alpha = .05 level*

Selected Use of Results:

- In the Community of Practice meeting, faculty reviewed results for each domain and discussed ways to model and support the development of critical thinking dispositions in the SLS 1515 course.
- In the QEP Assessment meeting and the QEP Advisory meeting, the committees discussed how on both the CCTDI and through the recent General Education Competency TIM study, students demonstrated a need for further development in analyzing and critiquing information sources, judging the validity of information, and locating and properly citing sources. This is something that can be modeled and supported across the College.
- Faculty who attended the International Conference on Critical Thinking led Critical Thinking trainings through the TLC in fall 2012 and spring 2013. Three faculty attended a Critical Thinking Conference in summer 2013.

Goal 2: Success Skills: As a result of successful completion of the Cornerstone Experience course, students will be able to: a) develop strategies for effective written and verbal communications, use of technology, listening, reading, critical thinking, and reasoning; 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

Outcome: After completing the Cornerstone Experience course, students will have significant improvement in the following indicators: Personal Attributes, Life Factors, Technology Knowledge and Technology Competency.

Results:

A correlated means t-test, post-test versus pre-test as well as means and standard deviations for pre- and post-tests by domain were derived. Table 6 provides the results for fall 2012, spring 2013 and summer 2013.

In fall 2012, there was a statistically significant improvement in Technology Knowledge. There was a slight decrease in one area, Personal Attributes, and statistically significant decreases in two areas: Technology Competency and Life Factors. In spring 2013, there were statistically significant improvements in Technology Knowledge and in Technology Competency. There was a slight increase in Life Factors. There was a statistically significant decrease in one area: Personal Attributes. In summer 2013, there were increases in all domains and statistically significant improvements in Life Factors, Technology Knowledge and in Technology Competency.

Table 6
SLS 1515 SmarterMeasure Pre-Post Test Results

Dimension	Fall 2012 (N= 293)			Spring 2013 (N= 195)			Summer 2013 (N=167)		
	Mean Diff.	t	d	Mean Diff.	t	d	Mean Diff.	t	d
Personal Attributes	-0.17	-0.44	0.02	-0.98	-2.01*	0.12	0.82	1.81	0.10
Tech. Knowledge	3.77	7.04*	0.31	4.22	6.37*	0.34	3.06	4.74*	0.24
Tech. Competency	-0.07	-0.09*	0.00	2.02	2.29*	0.14	2.97	3.17*	0.25
Life Factors	-0.42	-0.79*	0.04	0.57	0.86	0.06	2.08	3.57*	0.23

**Significant difference at the alpha = .05 level*

Selected use of results:

- Peer Architects were provided technology training prior to the spring 2013 semester.
- The FYE/Academic Success Department purchased 4 Canon Cameras, 4 Dell Laptops and will purchase a MacBook Pro for student use for projects requiring technology.
- Beginning spring 2013, new requirements for the Edison GPS Assignment (as a digital presentation) will promote the use of technology among students.
- Ten headsets were purchased for each campus for student use on the SmarterMeasure assessment and general usage for audio files.
- The FYE Department worked with all campuses and centers to ensure technology workshops and support are available college-wide. Due to the popularity of these workshops and support, the College's Academic Success Centers are designing additional college-wide academic technology workshops for 2013-2014.

Measurement 2: Success Strategies Presentation

Outcome: By the end of the spring 2013 semester, 70% of students that complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric.

Results:

In fall 2012, the students' achievement of each dimension on the original rubric (Completion of the problem-solving template, Timeline for Project Completion, Demonstration of Effective Group Communication Skills, and Presentation) was measured on a 4-point scale. The goal was met for all of the rubric dimensions. However, the faculty consensus was that the rubric dimensions were not aligned to the assignment guidelines. In December 2012, a faculty group revised the assignment guidelines and developed a new rubric. Beginning spring 2013, the students' achievement of each dimension (Accuracy, Relevance and Demonstration of Application, Creativity, Effective Group Communication) of the rubric was measured on a 4-point scale. Table 7 shows the overall means by each rubric dimension.

Table 7

SLS 1515 Overall Means: Group Presentation (with Standard Deviations in Parentheses)

Rubric Dimension	Overall Means By Semester (SD)		
	Fall 2012	Spring 2013 (N=187)	Summer 2013 (N=151)
Accuracy	*	3.28 (0.63)	3.32 (0.70)
Relevance and Demonstration of Application	*	3.23 (0.67)	3.48 (0.70)
Creativity	*	3.21 (0.70)	3.40 (0.57)
Effective Group Communication	*	3.26 (0.76)	3.62 (0.67)

Note. Values are on a 4-point scale.

*A revised rubric was implemented in spring 2013, so scores are not comparable to fall 2012.

As demonstrated in Table 8 below, the goal was met for all of the rubric dimensions in spring and summer 2013.

Table 8

Percentage of Students Who Scored "3" or Higher on the Group Presentation: By SLS 1515 Success Strategies Rubric Dimension and Semester

Rubric Dimension	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
Accuracy	*	90.37%	88.08%
Relevance and Demonstration of Application	*	89.84%	89.40%
Creativity	*	86.10%	97.35%
Effective Group Communication	*	86.02%	94.70%

*A revised rubric was implemented in spring 2013, so scores are not comparable to fall 2012.

Selected use of results:

- Group communication workshops were implemented in spring 2013 and will continue to be offered by the FYE Office for AY 2013-2014

Measurement 3: Success Strategies Survey

Random sample of Final Essay assignments were analyzed and discussion of success strategies were coded. The codes were grouped into concepts and categories that lead faculty will use to describe the success strategies that appear most salient among respondents. The concepts and categories were used to develop a survey instrument to be used with students in subsequent semesters for self-report of acquisition and application of success strategies. Baseline data were collected in 2012-2013.

Results: The categories derived from the analysis included Cognitive Strategies, Goal Attainment Strategies, Communication Strategies, and Communication. Table 9, 10, 11, and 12 below display the results to the "Choose all that Apply," Likert Scale, and Rating Scale items.

Table 9

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Utilization of Cognitive and Goal Attainment Strategies

	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
Support Service			
Academic Success Centers	92.5%	94.6%	82.0%
Career Services	47.5%	55.4%	54.0%
Peer Mentoring	40.0%	60.7%	58.0%
Peer Tutoring	27.5%	37.5%	34.0%
FYE Staff or Academic Coaching	40.0%	75.0%	62.0%
Advising Staff	55.0%	69.6%	76.0%
Financial Aid Staff	50.0%	60.7%	72.0%
Library Staff	60.0%	67.9%	66.0%

Selected use of results:

- Using these baseline data, the QEP Assessment committee has set a goal of 75% of respondents reporting use of cognitive and goal attainment strategies.
- The QEP subcommittees have discussed how the data supported the need for additional positions for the academic success centers.

Table 10
Percentage of Respondents Reporting Participation in Campus Engagement Activities

Activity Type	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
FYE Activities	38.2%	78.9%	68.8%
Student Life Activities	67.6%	61.4%	64.6%
Academic Success and FYE Workshops	44.1%	63.2%	89.6%
Clubs	26.5%	29.8%	10.4%
Service Saturday	35.3%	26.3%	0.0%
Intramural sports	5.9%	7.0%	4.2%
Career Events	58.8%	29.8%	6.3%
Lighthouse Commons Activities or Events	11.8%	21.1%	20.8%

Selected use of results:

- Using these baseline data, the QEP Assessment committee has set a goal of 75% of respondents reporting campus engagement in each area.
- The QEP subcommittees have discussed how the data supported the need for additional positions for the academic success centers.

Table 11
Percentage of Students Reporting Substantial Improvement in Skills Associated with Goal Attainment, Communication, and Cognitive Strategies by Semester

Success Strategy	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
Arriving to class on time	5.0%	7.3%	6.3%
Attending class	10.0%	7.3%	4.2%
Reviewing the course schedule	10.3%	20.4%	18.8%
Using the calendar or lists	17.5%	25.9%	25.0%
Working on large projects incrementally	22.5%	27.3%	20.8%
Using small group communication skills	35.0%	52.9%	25.0%
Participating and asking questions when appropriate	22.5%	52.9%	26.7%
Forming a relationship with other students	20.0%	24.1%	22.2%
Meeting with the professor outside of class for help	10.3%	27.8%	20.0%
Thinking critically about texts and lectures	35.9%	38.9%	20.0%

Selected use of results:

- Using these baseline data, the QEP Assessment committee will disseminate results to faculty and focus on the areas where the course appears to have the greatest impact (i.e. Using small group communication skills, thinking critically about texts and lectures, participating and asking

questions when appropriate). Additionally, faculty will be encouraged to provide a greater impact in areas that are related to supporting the course goals (i.e. Forming a relationship with other students, meeting with the Professor outside of class for help).

- The committee discussed the self-report aspect and the respondents' beliefs that they came to the course already having success strategies and/or had behaviors correlated with success. One aspect of the course is to engage students in self-discovery and critical reflection. Faculty will continue to engender these dispositions among the students.

Table 12

Percentage of Respondents Reporting Application of Success Skills by Rubric Dimension and Term

Success Strategy	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
Choosing a major	69.2%	56.9%	83.7%
Choosing a career goal	59.0%	68.6%	88.4%
Forming relationships	66.7%	72.5%	76.7%
Changing study habits	79.5%	80.4%	81.4%
Communicating with others	71.8%	80.4%	83.7%
Researching professors for future classes	56.4%	64.7%	67.4%
Appreciating diversity	61.5%	78.4%	81.4%

Selected use of results:

- Using these baseline data, the QEP Assessment committee has set a goal of 75% of respondents reporting using of communication and goal attainment strategies.

Goal 3: Once 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: Once fully implemented, students will successfully complete the Cornerstone Experience at a rate of 85% with a C or better.

Results: Table 13 below shows the pass rates by campus and semester. In fall 2012, the overall college pass rates were 8% below the stated goal of 85%. In spring 2013, the overall college pass rates were 14.99% below the stated goal of 85%. In summer 2013, the overall college pass rates were 2% above the stated goal of 85%.

Table 13
SLS 1515 Within-Course Success Rates (% Passing, A-C) by Term

Campus	Semester		
	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013
Charlotte	74.4%	82.8%	76.9%
Collier	83.9%	69.2%	93.3%
Hendry Glades	86.7%	52.6%	84.2%
Lee	74.9%	70.2%	87.0%
College Total	77.0%	70.1%	87.0%

Selected use of results:

- An early alert committee was implemented in fall 2012 to provide an additional network of support for students who required referrals to instructional assistants and academic coaches. For spring 2013, the Early Alert Committee created an updated Website and submission form. The Early Alert Committee has college-wide representation and in spring 2013 made progress towards providing consistent services college-wide.
- In January, a proposal was approved by the College's Curriculum committee to revise the course syllabus to state that successful completion of the course requires a grade of "C" or better.
- Based on the initial implementation data, the stated goal will be revised for 2013-2014.

Measurement 2: Term-to-term retention reports

Outcome: Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, term-to-term retention will increase by 5% each year.

- Baseline for students enrolled in two or more developmental studies, AY 11-12 and 12-13
- Baseline for students enrolled in any developmental studies, AY 13-14 and 14-15
- Baseline for students without developmental studies, AY 15-16

Results:

A Chi Square analysis was conducted for students who tested in two or more developmental studies courses and enrolled in 2011-2012 as compared to the students with the same criteria who enrolled in 2012-2013. An additional Chi Square analysis was conducted with students enrolled in fall 2012 who tested in two or more developmental studies courses and enrolled in SLS 1515, compared to students enrolled in fall 2012 who tested in two or more developmental studies courses, but did not enroll in SLS 1515. Table 14 below demonstrates that from fall 2011 to spring 2012, 73.39% of the students were retained. From fall 2012 to spring 2013, 74.02% of the students were retained (an increase of .63%, falling 4.37% short of the stated goal). Table 15 shows that those students who enrolled in the SLS 1515 were retained from fall to spring at a rate of 77.22%. Those that did not enroll in SLS 1515 were retained from fall to spring at a rate of 65.06%. There was a statistically significantly higher rate of retention for those students who enrolled in SLS 1515.

Table 14

Term-to-Term Retention by Base Fall Term

		Not Retained Following Term	Retained Following Term	Totals
Fall 2011	Frequency	194	535	729
	Percent Overall	14.22	39.22	53.45
	Row Percent	26.61	73.39	
	Column Percent	54.04	53.23	
Fall 2012	Frequency	165	470	635
	Percent Overall	12.1	34.46	46.55
	Row Percent	25.98	74.02	
	Column Percent	45.96	46.77	
Total	Frequency	359	1005	1364
	Percent	26.32	73.68	100

$\chi^2 (1, N = 1364) = 0.069, p = .793$

Table 15

Fall 2012 Term-to-Term Retention by Participation in SLS 1515

		Not Retained Following Term	Retained Following Term	Totals
Not in SLS 1515	Frequency	55	101	156
	Percent Overall	8.69	15.96	24.64
	Row Percent	35.26	64.74	
	Column Percent	33.13	21.63	
Enrolled in SLS 1515	Frequency	111	366	477
	Percent Overall	17.54	57.82	74.65
	Row Percent	23.27	76.73	
	Column Percent	66.87	78.37	
Total	Frequency	166	467	635
	Percent	26.22	73.78	100

$\chi^2 (1, N=633) = 8.715, p < .003$

Selected use of results:

- Faculty added a required interaction with advisors (outside of class) as part of the GPS assignment.
- Group advising sessions were implemented and targeted at SLS 1515 students.

Measurement 3: Year-to-year retention reports

Outcome: Using AY 2011-12 baseline data, year-to-year retention will increase by 3% each year.

- Baseline for students enrolled in two or more developmental studies, AY 11-12 and 12-13
- Baseline for students enrolled in any developmental studies, AY 13-14 and 14-15
- Baseline for students without developmental studies, AY 15-16

Results:

A Chi Square analysis was conducted for students who tested in two or more developmental areas who enrolled in 2012-2013 as compared to those students who tested in two or more developmental areas who did not enroll in SLS 1515. Table 16 below demonstrates that from fall 2012 to fall 2013, 41.67% of the students who did not enroll in SLS 1515 were retained. From fall 2012 to fall 2013, 51.99% of the students were retained. There was a statistically significantly higher rate of retention for those students who enrolled in SLS 1515.

Table 16

Fall 2012-Fall 2013 Year to Year Retention by Participation in SLS 1515

		Not Retained Following Term	Retained Following Term	Totals
Not in SLS 1515	Frequency	91	65	156
	Percent Overall	14.38	10.27	24.64
	Row Percent	58.33	41.67	
	Column Percent	28.44	20.77	
Enrolled in SLS 1515	Frequency	229	248	477
	Percent Overall	36.18	39.18	75.36
	Row Percent	48.01	51.99	
	Column Percent	71.56	79.23	
Total	Frequency	320	313	633
	Percent	50.55	49.45	100

$$X^2(1, N=633) = 5.005, p = .0253$$

Measurement 4: Cohort graduate reports

Outcome: This analysis will use the cohort graduation rate associated with students that entered ESC as FTIC during AY 10-11.

- Cohorts from AY 11-12 and AY 12-13 who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline
- Cohorts from AY 13-14 and AY 14-15 who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline
- Cohort from AY 15-16 who graduate within 150% of the expected time required will increase by 10% when compared to the AY 10-11 baseline

Results: Cohort data will be available following AY 2013-2014.

Measurement 5: Course Outcome items from SIR II: 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and Student Effort and Involvement items: 34, 35 and 36

Outcome: Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.

Results: Table 17 below provides the means for SLS 1515 and comparative four-year institutions. For the fall 2012, spring 2013, and summer 2013 SIR II administrations, the overall mean score for the “Course Outcome” and “Student Effort and Involvement” exceeded the comparative mean for four-year institutions.

Table 17

SIR II Means: SLS 1515 and Comparative Four-Year Institutions

SIR II Items	Overall Means by Semester					
	Fall 2012		Spring 2013		Summer 2013	
	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution
<i>Course Outcome</i>						
Items 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33	4.2	3.8	4.3	3.8	4.2	3.8
<i>Student Effort and Involvement</i>						
Items 34, 35, and 36	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.18	3.74

Note. Values are means on a 5-point scale.

Selected use of results:

- The QEP Implementation Team developed a plan for selecting faculty to teach SLS 1515 to be implemented in fall 2013 for spring 2014 selection.
- Early Alert services became consistent college-wide during the spring 2013 semester to help support SLS 1515 success and retention.

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

Measurement 1: Engaged Learning items from the SENSE:

19a, 19b, 19e, 19g, 19h, 19i, 19j, 19k, 19l, 19m, 19n, 19o, 19q, 20d2, 20f2, and 20h2

Outcome:

Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Engaged Learning benchmark over the previous year's results.

Results: As demonstrated in Table 18 below, the College showed improvement in the Engaged Learning Benchmark, but fell 1% short of the stated goal.

Table 18
Edison State College SENSE Survey Results

Benchmark	2011		2012		Edison Year-to-Year Change	
	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Weighted Scores Difference	% Change
Engaged Learning	49.2	50.0	51.4	50.0	2.2	4%

Selected use of results:

- The assessment committee discussed revising the SENSE goals for next year. An increase of 5% over the previous year's goals each year may be unrealistic, especially when ESC is scoring above the comparative weighted scores. The assessment committee 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.

Measurement 3: Student/Faculty Interaction items from the CCSSE: 4k, 4l, 4m, 4n, 4o, and 4q

Outcome: Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark over the previous year's results.

Results: As demonstrated in Table 19 below, the College showed improvement in the Student-Faculty Interaction Benchmark, but fell 4% short of the stated goal.

Table 19
Edison State College CCSSE Survey Results

Benchmark	2010		2013		Edison Year-to-Year Change	
	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Weighted Scores Difference	% Change
Student-Faculty Interaction	48.8	50.0	50.0	50.0	1.7	1%

Measurement 2: Faculty/Student Interaction items from SIR II: 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 Subset of Active and Collaborative Learning items from CCSSE: 4f, 4g, 4h, and 4r

Outcome: Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.

Results: As demonstrated in Table 20 below, the College showed improvement in the Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark, but fell 4% short of the stated goal.

Table 20
Edison State College CCSSE Survey Results

Benchmark	2010		2013		Edison Year-to-Year Change	
	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Weighted Scores Difference	% Change
Active and Collaborative Learning	48.6	50.0	49.3	50.0	0.7	1%

Results: Table 21 below provided the means for SLS 1515 and comparative four-year institutions. For the fall 2012, spring 2013, and summer 2013 SIR II administrations, the overall mean score for the “Faculty/Student Interaction” items exceeded the comparative mean for four-year institutions.

Table 21
SIR II Means: SLS 1515 and Comparative Four-Year Institutions

SIR II Items	Overall Means by Semester					
	Fall 2012		Spring 2013		Summer 2013	
	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution
<i>Faculty/Student Interaction</i>						
Items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.4

Note. Values are means on a 5-point scale.

Selected use of results:

- The College will continue to provide faculty training through the TLC and through the Community of Practice Meetings.
- The QEP Implementation Committee and QEP Advisory committee began a draft of a SLS 1515 staffing plan to include a review of supervisor recommendations.

- On June 27 and 28, the College held a summer Cornerstone Training Institute with sessions led by external experts. Harlan Cohen led a workshop entitled “Supporting First-Year Students: People, Places, and Patience” which focused on ways faculty and staff could support first-year students.

Measurement 3: Qualitative data from focus group responses

Results: Focus group responses were analyzed and discussion of student satisfaction and engagement will be coded. The codes will be grouped into concepts and categories that lead faculty and staff to understand the elements of the course and extracurricular activities that increased students’ satisfaction and engagement. Table 22 provides the resulting categories and concepts for each semester.

Table 22

Major Categories from Focus Group Responses by Concept and Term

Categories	Fall 2012	Spring 2013
Learning and Acquisition	Learning about College Resources	Learning about College Resources
	Gaining and Valuing “Self-Awareness”	Gaining and Valuing “Self-Awareness”
	Learning “Time Management” and Course Success Strategies	Learning “Time Management” and Course Success Strategies
Academic and Affective Support	Learning and Valuing Critical Thinking Skills	Learning and Valuing Critical Thinking Skills
	Valuing Faculty and Reporting Positive Interactions	Valuing Faculty and Reporting Positive Interactions
	Valuing and Critiquing Passport Assignment	Valuing and Critiquing GPS Assignment
	Valuing Peer Architects	Valuing Peer Architects
Campus/ College Engagement	Receiving Support for College Transition	Receiving Support for College Transition
	Critiquing Group Project	Acquiring Presentation Skills and Gaining Confidence
	Participating in College Activities but Needing More Choices	Participating in College Activities but Needing More Choices
	Recommending Multi-Modal Dissemination of Campus Event Information	Recommending Multi-Modal Dissemination of Campus Event Information
	Expanding Social Network and Experiencing Diversity	Expanding Social Network and Experiencing Diversity

Selected use of results:

- Based on these data, the group discussed ways to infuse more time management strategies into the course such as reviewing the Calendar in Canvas, having students use course schedules to enter assignments into planners, creating a weekly schedule and evaluating time usage, etc.
- As part of a restructuring plan, FYE programming will have college-wide oversight to allow for more FYE programming across campus, making participation more accessible to all students.

Goal 5: 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: 4p, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, 6a, 6c, 7, 9a (Fall 2012)

Outcome: Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Academic Challenge benchmark over the previous year's results.

Results: As demonstrated in Table 23 below, the College showed no improvement in the Engaged Learning Benchmark. However, both the 2010 and 2013 weighted scores were above the mean of the entire sample of colleges.

Table 23
Edison State College CCSSE Survey Results

	2010		2013		Edison Year-to-Year Change	
	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Weighted Scores Difference	% Change
Benchmark						
Academic Challenge	50.3	50.0	50.3	50.0	0	0%

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: In fall 2012, twenty-four of the forty-three faculty completers responded to the Cornerstone Instructor Module survey. Table 23 demonstrates that results fell 1% short of the stated goal in each area. Following spring and summer 2013, 100% of the completers reported applying strategies, exceeding the stated goal by 20%.

Table 24
Percentage of Faculty Respondents Applying Strategies by Term

Training Content	Fall 2012	Spring / Summer 2013
Critical Thinking	79.0%	100%
Success Strategies	79.0%	100%

Selected use of results:

- Based on results from spring and summer 2012 surveys, the trainings were revised to include
 - more course-specific content
 - more hands-on activities and specific examples
 - face-to-face requirements for some of the modules
 - lengthier sessions for some of the modules
 - more attention to Critical Thinking training for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept
- Faculty attending the 33rd Annual Conference on Critical Thinking became facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in fall 2012. Three additional faculty attended the conference in summer 2013 and became facilitators beginning in fall 2013.
- A Summer Training Institute was scheduled for June 2013. Harlan Cohen led a workshop on supporting first-year students and Dr. Saundra Maguire led a workshop on helping first-year students develop critical thinking skills.

Measurement 3: SIR II Communication items: 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10

Outcome: Beginning AY 2012-13, faculty results for these items will meet or exceed the comparative mean for four-year institutions.

Results: Table 25 below provides the means for SLS 1515 and comparative four-year institutions. For the fall 2012, spring 2013, and summer 2013 SIR II administrations, the overall mean score for the "Communication" items exceeded the comparative mean for four-year institutions.

Table 25
SIR II Means: SLS 1515 and Comparative Four-Year Institutions

SIR II Items	Overall Means by Semester					
	Fall 2012		Spring 2013		Summer 2013	
	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution	SLS 1515	Comparative Four-Year Institution
<i>Communication</i>						
Items 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.4

Note. Values are means on a 5-point scale.

Selected Use of Results:

- The QEP Implementation Committee and QEP Advisory committee began a draft of a SLS 1515 staffing plan to include a review of recommendations and dispositions.

Goal 6: 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

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: In fall 2012, thirteen of the seventeen staff and administrators who completed the required modules completed the survey. Table 25 below demonstrates results that are 11% below the stated goal in each area. Following spring and summer 2013, the results were 13% below the stated goal.

Table 26

Percentage of Staff and Administrator Respondents Applying Strategies by Term

Training Content	Fall 2012	Spring / Summer 2013
Critical Thinking	69.0%	67%
Success Strategies	69.0%	67%

Selected Use of Results:

- Based on results from spring and summer 2012 surveys, the trainings were revised to include
 - more course-specific content
 - more hands-on activities and specific examples
 - face-to-face requirements for some of the modules
 - lengthier sessions for some of the modules
 - more attention to Critical Thinking training for faculty and staff to have a shared understanding of the concept
- Faculty attending the 33rd Annual Conference on Critical Thinking became facilitators for a Critical Thinking Community of Practice beginning in fall 2012. Three additional faculty attended the conference in summer 2013 and became facilitators beginning in fall 2013.
- A Summer Training Institute was scheduled for June 2013. Harlan Cohen led a workshop on supporting first-year students and Dr. Sandra Maguire led a workshop on helping first-year students develop critical thinking skills.

Measurement 2: SENSE items from Clear Academic Plan and Pathway category:

18d, 18g, 18e, 18f, and 18h

Outcome: Beginning AY 2012-13, there will be a 5% increase in the Clear Academic Plan and Pathway benchmark over the previous year's results.

Results: As demonstrated in Table 26 below, the College's scores did not change in the Clear Academic Plan and Pathway Benchmark, falling 5% short of the stated goal.

Table 27
Edison State College SENSE Survey Results

Benchmark	2011		2012		Edison Year-to-Year Change	
	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Edison Weighted Score	Cohort Weighted Score	Weighted Scores Difference	% Change
Clear Academic Plan and Pathway	48.9	50.0	48.9	50.0	0	0%

- The assessment committee discussed revising the SENSE goals for next year. An increase of 5% over the previous year's goals each year may be unrealistic, especially when ESC is scoring above the comparative weighted scores. The assessment committee 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.

REFLECTION

The preliminary academic achievement data from Implementation Year One demonstrate that SLS 1515 has had a positive effect on students' 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:

- Clarity in writing assignments and use of Standard English
- Use of Academic Technology
- Information literacy and thinking critically about the validity and veracity of texts and lectures

In response the College has made positive changes and continued promising practices to include:

- Developmental and Writing Centers becoming more fluid so that students can receive services in either lab
- Training instructional assistants on the specific criteria for writing assignments
- Designing and implementing academic technology workshops for students across all campuses
- Holding in-house critical thinking training and sending faculty to the International Conference on Critical Thinking

The preliminary data suggest 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 areas 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:

- Implementing a college-wide Early Alert committee to ensure consistent communication among stakeholders to increase student retention
- Increasing evening and weekend programming and service learning opportunities college-wide
- Designing and implementing academic technology workshops for students across all campuses
- Holding in-house training on supporting first-year students and sending faculty and staff to the Annual Conference on The First-Year Experience®