Course Assessment- Part B: Your Results & Analysis   COMPLETE   #689

Please select your course and name from the drop-down menu. If your course or name are incorrect or missing, contact Sara Wade, the Instructional Services Administrative Assistant, 541-506-6037 or swade@cgcc.edu.

FYE 100- First Year Experience- Stephen Shwiff- Part B- Winter 2025

* Part B: Your Results DIRECTIONS 1. Report the outcome achievement data gathered via the assignments, tests, etc. you identified for each outcome (question 3) of your Part A. (Only include data for students who completed the course. Do not include students who withdrew or earned an incomplete) Data for all 3 outcomes should be reported below.

All students who completed this class earned at least a C. Outcome 2 (create career and academic plans) was the outcome with the most variance, because I had a couple students complete one plan or the other, but not both.

* Outcome #1

Evaluate CGCC Pathways and degree options to determine their potential for employment or further study.

* % of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above)

80

* Outcome #2

Create education/career and financial plans that help meet academic, workforce, and personal goals.

* % of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above)

60

* Outcome #3

Explore social and environmental responsibility as part of one's chosen Pathway.

* % of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above)

100

* ANALYSIS 3. What contributed to student success and/or lack of success?

This course used the same contract grading model and core structure developed by Tori Stanek and Kristen Booth in Fall 2024. Students who succeeded stayed engaged in weekly reflection activities, collaborated in forums, and made steady progress on their academic and financial plans. Several students who did not succeed stopped submitting work early on, and the contract grading model made it difficult to recover. Those who completed the Community Learning Project, however, demonstrated excellent synthesis of ideas. Instructor feedback and advisor meetings were key to the success of most students

* 4. Helping students to realistically self-assess and reflect on their understanding and progress encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning. Please compare your students' perception of their end-of-term understanding/mastery of the three outcomes (found in student evaluations) to your assessment (above) of student achievement of the three outcomes.

Student survey responses indicate confidence growth across all three outcomes. Many students self-rated as "Proficient" by the end of term. However, instructor data shows a disconnect between perception and actual completion of key assignments—especially for Outcome #2. This mirrors feedback from other instructors using the contract model and suggests a need for clearer progress indicators.

* 5. Did student achievement of outcomes meet your expectations for successfully teaching to each outcome (question 4 from Part A)

Not fully. Like Tori, I found that Outcome #2 (plans) had the most variance. While the majority of students who completed the course met the expectations, those who missed one or more major components were unable to meet the outcome. I plan to revisit the

* 6. Based on your analysis in the questions above, what course adjustments are warranted (curricular, pedagogical, student instruction, etc.)?

Clarify assignment completion requirements within the grading contract

Add visual indicators in Moodle to support students' tracking of progress

Include short instructional videos for complex assignments

Require students to complete both academic and financial plans to meet Outcome #2

Build in additional early outreach and check-ins in Weeks 2–3 for at-risk students

7. What resources would be required to implement your recommended course adjustments (materials, training, equipment, etc.)? What Budget implications result?

No additional materials or budget needed. However, I would support participation in the First Year Experience Conference or NCORE as suggested by Tori, which could deepen instructional practice in community-building and culturally responsive design.

* 8. Describe the results of any adjustments you made from the last assessment of this course (if applicable) and their effectiveness in student achievement of outcomes.

This was the first formal assessment of the redesigned FYE 100 using the shared model. Lessons learned this term will lead to refinements in grading, pacing, and student support.

9. Describe how you explain information about course outcomes and their relevance to your students.

I include a Week 1 lesson on course, program, and institutional outcomes (CLOs, PLOs, ILOs). Students are introduced to these as learning goals and personal milestones. We refer back to them as we complete career exploration, planning, and community project work. I use the outcomes to frame students' reflections on why each component matters.

10. Please describe any changes/additions to instruction, curriculum or assessment that you made to support students in better achieving the CGCC Institutional Learning Outcomes: ILO #1: Communication. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Content Development"and/or Control of Syntax and Mechanics" and ILO #2: Critical Thinking/Problem Solving. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Evidence" (Critical Thinking) and/or "Identify Strategies" (Problem Solving). ILO #4: Cultural Awareness. The area that faculty is focusing on is: "Openness" (Encouraging our students to "Initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others") ILO #5: Community and Environmental Responsibility. ILO#3 - Quantitative Literacy - "Application/Analysis" and/or "Assumptions"

ILO #1: Communication (Content Development): Students practiced communication through reflections, a pathway pitch, and the Community Learning Project presentation.

ILO #2: Critical Thinking/Problem Solving (Identify Strategies): Students analyzed pathway options and completed step-by-step plans aligned with workforce or transfer goals.

ILO #4: Cultural Awareness (Openness): Reflections and the Community Learning Project prompted students to consider their role in a diverse professional environment.

ILO #5: Community and Environmental Responsibility: Central to the Community Learning Project, where students connected personal, academic, and civic goals.

ILO #3: Quantitative Literacy (Application/Analysis): Budget activities and planning tools encouraged real-world application of financial literacy and academic planning.