

FYEP Table of Themes/Evidence

<b>Program Design: 101</b>		
<p>Openness of design Pro/Con Same outcomes, different approaches cause some variance</p> <p>Allows for cross-curricular approach</p>	<p>Provide more opportunities for faculty conversation around expectations</p> <p>Transparent syllabi collections and options</p> <p>Consider “interdisciplinary” vs strictly disciplinary approaches to explain to students</p> <p>Promote TILT methodology in FYEP faculty development</p>	<p><a href="#">2019-20</a></p>
<p>Reflection role</p> <p>Matching focus of expectations to what we actually do</p>	<p>“Outcomes are focused on skills most aligned with academic writing in analytical or expository modes but the common assignment is analytical and reflective”</p>	<p><a href="#">2017-18</a></p>
<p>Revision of offerings: 101 primarily in the Fall, 190 primarily in J-term and Spring</p>	<p>Goal to provide a more scaffolded experience for students, to provide a common experience for all students at the beginning of the academic year</p>	<p>Discussions in Reports</p> <p>Transition year: Fall 2015 Assessment</p>
<p>Revision of who will take 101 to a broader audience to acknowledge Running Start students with some writing background</p>	<p>Again, providing students with a robust foundational experience that is common</p> <p>See High Impact Practices literature</p>	<p>EPC proposal Fall 2020</p>
<b>Program Design: 190</b>		
<p>Struggle with ownership Struggle with focus</p>	<p>Revision of learning outcomes</p>	<p>See below</p>

	<p>Communication to faculty</p> <p>Cornerstones model and success</p> <p>Development of FYEP 102</p>	<p>See reports</p> <p><a href="#">FYEP data</a></p> <p>Spring 2021 report</p>
<b>Learning Outcomes</b>		
Revision of learning outcomes	101	<a href="#">2010</a>
	190 Revision from 5 outcomes to 3 outcomes to 2 outcomes	<a href="#">2016</a> <a href="#">2013</a> <a href="#">2010</a>
	Program	<a href="#">2018</a> 2010
<b>Assessment Process/ Practice</b>		
Reflection in assessment expectations	<p>Include both the essay and reflection piece for review in assessment process</p> <p>Include tips for reflection teaching in the common assignment overview sent to faculty at the beginning of each semester</p>	<a href="#">2019-20</a>  <a href="#">Common Assignment</a>
Additional contextual information for triangulation of data	In both 2018-19 and 2019-20, the assessment committee recommended gathering survey data: specific question “to what extent does the common assignment favor students with prior knowledge/experience”	<a href="#">2019-20</a> <a href="#">Draft of student survey</a>  <a href="#">2018-19</a>
Faculty emphasis on the common assignment as an important task	Continue to clarify the role of this instrument to faculty . . .	<a href="#">2019-20</a>  <a href="#">2017-18</a>

<p>Assessment process as discussion of pedagogy and curriculum</p>	<p>Reports highlight the use of these annual meetings as a way to discuss both curricular and pedagogical work</p>	<p>Examples of teaching workshops can be found in annual report discussions</p>
<p><b>General</b></p>		
<p>We need a better organizational structure and place to store data</p>	<p>-the report template combines the annual report with two appendices that are sometimes combined and sometimes not, making it difficult to pull out the assessment data</p> <p>Form revision: google form template for assessment data</p>	<p>Google form LINK</p> <p>Proposed organizational structure LINK</p>