



Your Right to Know

Graduate Outcomes Report 2016-2017

Fort Lewis College Graduate Outcomes Report: 2016-17 Academic Year

Overview

This report summarizes (1) perceived learning outcomes for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 FLC graduates, as well as (2) employment outcomes for 2014-15, 2010-11, and 2005-06 FLC graduates. Each year's graduating class includes students who completed degrees between July 1 and June 30, a period consistent with degree completion reporting requirements established by NCES and IPEDS.

1. Perceived Learning Outcomes

As recommended by Dumford and Miller (2015, *Research & Practice in Assessment*), FLC is gathering perceived learning outcomes data using a college-wide Senior Exit Survey and a college-wide Graduate Follow-Up survey. While current students may be better at recalling information about affective components of their educational experience, temporally distant graduates (e.g., two years removed from graduation) may provide a more accurate evaluation of the specific skills and abilities required in the workplace. In Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, the Office of Academic Effectiveness and Evaluation administered the college-wide Senior Exit Survey. The first Graduate Follow-Up Survey is scheduled to be administered to 2016-17 graduates in Spring 2019.

Participating students were asked two questions concerning each of the 10 general education learning outcomes listed below: (Q1) "How *important* do you think each of the following skills and abilities are to your future career?" and (Q2) "How much did FLC help you acquire or *develop* each of the following skills and abilities?" Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales from 1 = *Slightly important* to 4 = *Extremely important* and 1 = *Not at all* to 4 = *Very much*, respectively.

- Critical thinking
- Creative thinking and problem solving
- Oral communication
- Written communication
- Knowledge of diversity of human cultures
- Knowledge of the physical and natural world
- Interpersonal relations and working collaboratively
- Networking and relationship building
- Research skills
- Quantitative reasoning

Results

All students approved to graduate in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 were invited to complete the Senior Exit Survey. The overall participation rate was approximately 40%. Table 1 summarizes the number of survey participants by major department.

Table 1. *Number of Senior Exit Survey Participants by Major Department (n = 281)*

Major Department	<i>n</i>	%
Accounting	7	2.4
Anthropology	13	4.5
Art and Design	13	4.5
Biology	15	5.2
Business Administration	31	10.7
Chemistry	6	2.1
Economics	11	3.8
Education	10	3.4
Engineering	18	6.2
English	15	5.2
Environmental Studies	12	4.1
Exercise Science	32	11.0
Gender & Women’s Studies	1	0.3
Geosciences	11	3.8
History	8	2.8
Marketing	8	2.8
Mathematics	3	1.0
Modern Languages	4	1.4
Music	3	1.0
Native American & Indigenous Studies	4	1.4
Philosophy	2	0.7
Physics	3	1.0
Political Science	2	0.7
Psychology	24	8.3
Public Health	15	5.2
Sociology	14	4.8
Theatre	5	1.7

Note. The number of students sums to greater than 281 because double-majors are represented across categories.

The following analysis was guided by three questions: (i) How *important* do seniors think each skill and ability associated with FLC’s general education learning outcome is to their future career? (ii) Do graduating seniors think that FLC contributed to their *development* in these skills and abilities? and (iii) Do the data indicate potential programmatic improvements that could better prepare future FLC graduates? College- and department-level results that address these questions are summarized below.

College-level results. Among survey participants, 25% reported being the first in their family to attend college. When asked about plans after graduation, 55% indicated that they will continue or begin working, 29% will continue their education, 12% will travel, and 4% had other unspecified plans. Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics for student ratings of each skill and ability aligned with FLC’s general education learning outcomes. Columns 1 and 2 of data summarize the survey question results and address questions (i) and (ii), respectively, concerning the **importance** of and the extent to which FLC contributed to their **development** in each skill and ability. The third column of data summarizes the difference between **importance** and **development** ratings, with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. This latter row helps to address question (iii) regarding potential programmatic improvements that might contribute to greater success among FLC graduates. Learning outcome domains with potential skill deficits of at least 0.50 standard deviations are bolded.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (College-Level, n = 281)

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.6 (0.6)	0.3 (0.6)	0.54
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.6)	0.4 (0.6)	0.61
Oral communication	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.7)	0.5 (0.7)	0.66
Written communication	3.8 (0.5)	3.4 (0.7)	0.3 (0.8)	0.44
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.5 (0.8)	3.4 (0.8)	0.1 (0.9)	0.13
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.5 (0.7)	3.4 (0.8)	0.1 (0.8)	0.15
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.4)	3.4 (0.8)	0.4 (0.7)	0.60
Networking and relationship building	3.8 (0.4)	3.2 (0.8)	0.6 (0.8)	0.75
Research skills	3.6 (0.7)	3.5 (0.7)	0.1 (0.8)	0.14
Quantitative reasoning	3.6 (0.6)	3.4 (0.7)	0.2 (0.8)	0.33

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Interpretation. Students believed that each learning outcome domain was *moderately* to *extremely* important to their future careers (mean ratings ranged from 3.5 to 3.9) and that FLC *somewhat* to *very much* helped their development in these areas (mean ratings ranged from 3.2 to 3.6). The learning outcome domains with potential skill deficit scores of at least 0.50 standard deviation units were networking and relationship building (*d_z* = 0.75), oral communication (*d_z* = 0.66), creative thinking and problem solving (*d_z* = 0.61), interpersonal relations and working collaboratively (*d_z* = 0.60), and critical thinking (*d_z* = 0.54). These skills may be emphasized in programmatic improvements to increase success among FLC graduates.

Department-level results. Tables 3 to 21 summarize the same information as above, disaggregated for major departments with at least five graduates who completed the Senior Exit Survey. Major departments with fewer than five graduates are not disaggregated due to reliability issues and to protect student confidentiality. Students who graduated with more than one major are represented across departments. Learning outcome domains with potential skill deficits of at least 0.50 standard deviations are bolded.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Accounting, n = 7)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	4.0 (0.0)	3.1 (0.7)	0.9 (0.7)	1.24
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.4)	3.0 (0.8)	0.9 (0.9)	0.95
Oral communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.4 (0.5)	0.6 (0.5)	1.07
Written communication	3.7 (0.5)	3.0 (0.6)	0.7 (0.5)	1.46
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.4 (0.8)	3.4 (0.8)	0.0 (1.2)	0.00
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.1 (0.7)	3.0 (0.8)	0.1 (1.1)	0.13
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.7 (0.5)	3.1 (0.7)	0.3 (0.5)	0.65
Networking and relationship building	3.9 (0.4)	3.1 (0.7)	0.7 (0.8)	0.94
Research skills	3.9 (0.4)	2.7 (0.8)	1.1 (0.9)	1.27
Quantitative reasoning	4.0 (0.0)	3.0 (0.6)	1.0 (0.6)	1.73

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 4. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Anthropology, n = 13)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.8)	0.5 (0.8)	0.69
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.3 (0.9)	0.6 (1.0)	0.64
Oral communication	3.8 (0.4)	3.5 (0.8)	0.4 (1.0)	0.40
Written communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.6 (0.8)	0.4 (0.8)	0.50
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.9 (0.3)	3.9 (0.3)	0.0 (0.4)	0.00
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.8 (0.4)	3.5 (0.9)	0.3 (0.9)	0.32
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.6 (0.8)	2.9 (1.0)	0.7 (0.9)	0.73
Networking and relationship building	3.8 (0.4)	2.7 (1.0)	1.1 (1.1)	0.97
Research skills	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.8)	0.5 (0.8)	0.69
Quantitative reasoning	3.5 (0.9)	3.4 (1.0)	0.2 (0.8)	0.19

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Art and Design, n = 13)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.7)	0.4 (0.8)	0.50
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.0)	3.6 (0.7)	0.4 (0.7)	0.59
Oral communication	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.8)	0.5 (0.8)	0.69
Written communication	3.7 (0.5)	3.5 (0.7)	0.2 (0.8)	0.28
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.9 (0.3)	3.6 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.64
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.6 (0.7)	3.3 (0.9)	0.3 (0.7)	0.51
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	0.76
Networking and relationship building	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.89
Research skills	3.8 (0.6)	3.3 (0.8)	0.5 (0.9)	0.53
Quantitative reasoning	3.8 (0.4)	3.1 (0.6)	0.7 (0.8)	0.92

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 6. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Biology, n = 15)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.5)	0.4 (0.6)	0.63
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.1 (0.7)	0.8 (0.9)	0.93
Oral communication	3.9 (0.4)	3.2 (0.9)	0.7 (1.0)	0.68
Written communication	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.7)	0.5 (0.6)	0.83
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	2.9 (1.0)	2.8 (0.9)	0.1 (1.1)	0.13
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.8 (0.4)	3.9 (0.4)	-0.1 (0.5)	-0.15
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	4.0 (0.0)	3.2 (1.0)	0.8 (1.0)	0.79
Networking and relationship building	3.9 (0.3)	3.1 (0.9)	0.8 (0.9)	0.85
Research skills	3.7 (0.8)	3.7 (0.5)	-0.1 (1.0)	-0.07
Quantitative reasoning	3.5 (0.9)	3.5 (0.5)	-0.1 (0.7)	-0.10

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 7. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Business Administration, n = 31)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.8 (0.5)	3.5 (0.6)	0.3 (0.5)	0.60
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.68
Oral communication	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.7)	0.5 (0.8)	0.56
Written communication	3.5 (0.8)	3.3 (0.7)	0.3 (1.1)	0.23
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.3 (1.0)	3.4 (0.6)	-0.1 (1.0)	-0.06
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.2 (0.9)	3.2 (0.8)	0.0 (0.9)	0.00
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.7)	0.3 (0.8)	0.41
Networking and relationship building	3.8 (0.4)	3.3 (0.7)	0.5 (0.8)	0.56
Research skills	3.3 (0.9)	3.1 (0.9)	0.1 (0.7)	0.19
Quantitative reasoning	3.5 (0.6)	3.2 (0.7)	0.4 (0.6)	0.63

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 8. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Chemistry, n = 6)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	4.0 (0.0)	3.7 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.65
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.91
Oral communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.91
Written communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.91
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.0 (1.1)	3.3 (0.8)	-0.3 (0.5)	-0.65
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.8 (0.4)	3.8 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.00
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.8 (0.4)	3.5 (0.8)	0.4 (1.1)	0.35
Networking and relationship building	3.8 (0.4)	3.3 (0.8)	0.5 (1.0)	0.48
Research skills	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.4)	0.2 (0.4)	0.41
Quantitative reasoning	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.4)	0.2 (0.4)	0.41

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

 Table 9. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Economics, n = 11)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.9)	0.4 (0.9)	0.39
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.9)	0.5 (0.9)	0.49
Oral communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.2 (0.9)	0.8 (0.9)	0.94
Written communication	3.7 (0.5)	3.2 (1.0)	0.5 (1.0)	0.53
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.1 (1.0)	3.1 (1.0)	0.0 (1.7)	0.00
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.1 (0.9)	3.1 (1.0)	-0.1 (1.4)	-0.07
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.9)	0.5 (0.9)	0.58
Networking and relationship building	3.9 (0.3)	2.6 (1.2)	1.3 (1.3)	0.94
Research skills	3.5 (0.5)	3.5 (0.9)	0.1 (1.0)	0.09
Quantitative reasoning	3.7 (0.6)	3.4 (1.0)	0.4 (0.9)	0.39

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 10. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Education, n = 10)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	4.0 (0.0)	3.6 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	0.77
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.0)	3.7 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.62
Oral communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.4)	0.2 (0.4)	0.47
Written communication	3.9 (0.3)	3.8 (0.4)	0.1 (0.6)	0.18
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.9 (0.3)	3.8 (0.4)	0.1 (0.3)	0.32
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.9 (0.3)	3.6 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.62
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	4.0 (0.0)	3.7 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.62
Networking and relationship building	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.7)	0.5 (0.7)	0.71
Research skills	3.6 (0.5)	3.2 (0.9)	0.4 (1.1)	0.37
Quantitative reasoning	3.7 (0.5)	3.3 (0.8)	0.4 (0.8)	0.47

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 11. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Engineering, n = 18)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.2)	3.8 (0.4)	0.1 (0.3)	0.35
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.2)	3.7 (0.5)	0.2 (0.4)	0.54
Oral communication	3.9 (0.2)	3.0 (0.9)	0.9 (0.9)	1.05
Written communication	3.8 (0.5)	3.4 (0.8)	0.4 (1.1)	0.39
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	2.9 (1.1)	2.6 (1.2)	0.3 (1.2)	0.25
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.8 (0.6)	3.7 (0.6)	0.1 (0.6)	0.11
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.8 (0.4)	3.2 (0.9)	0.6 (0.9)	0.68
Networking and relationship building	3.6 (0.6)	3.1 (1.0)	0.5 (1.1)	0.50
Research skills	3.7 (0.6)	3.5 (0.9)	0.2 (0.7)	0.35
Quantitative reasoning	3.9 (0.2)	3.8 (0.4)	0.1 (0.5)	0.24

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 12. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (English, n = 15)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.9 (0.4)	0.1 (0.5)	0.15
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.0)	3.9 (0.3)	0.1 (0.3)	0.26
Oral communication	3.9 (0.4)	3.5 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.68
Written communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.9 (0.4)	0.1 (0.4)	0.38
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.9 (0.4)	3.7 (0.6)	0.2 (0.4)	0.48
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.5 (0.6)	3.3 (0.7)	0.1 (0.6)	0.21
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.90
Networking and relationship building	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.5)	0.5 (0.5)	0.90
Research skills	3.7 (0.5)	3.6 (0.5)	0.1 (0.6)	0.21
Quantitative reasoning	3.4 (0.7)	3.3 (0.7)	0.1 (0.7)	0.18

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 13. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Environmental Studies, n = 12)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.7)	0.5 (0.7)	0.74
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.0)	3.4 (0.7)	0.6 (0.7)	0.87
Oral communication	3.8 (0.4)	3.3 (0.7)	0.5 (0.8)	0.63
Written communication	3.8 (0.6)	3.5 (0.7)	0.3 (0.9)	0.29
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.7 (0.7)	3.5 (0.5)	0.2 (0.8)	0.20
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.9 (0.3)	3.7 (0.9)	0.3 (1.0)	0.26
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.8 (0.4)	3.3 (0.9)	0.5 (0.9)	0.55
Networking and relationship building	3.8 (0.5)	3.0 (1.0)	0.8 (1.0)	0.78
Research skills	3.5 (0.9)	3.7 (0.5)	-0.2 (0.9)	-0.18
Quantitative reasoning	3.6 (0.5)	3.2 (0.7)	0.4 (0.8)	0.53

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 14. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Exercise Science, n = 32)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.5)	0.5 (0.6)	0.83
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.2)	3.5 (0.6)	0.5 (0.6)	0.88
Oral communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.5 (0.6)	0.5 (0.6)	0.94
Written communication	3.8 (0.4)	3.4 (0.6)	0.4 (0.5)	0.76
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.4 (0.7)	3.2 (0.8)	0.3 (0.8)	0.30
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.4 (0.8)	3.3 (0.7)	0.1 (0.8)	0.17
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.2)	3.4 (0.8)	0.6 (0.7)	0.79
Networking and relationship building	3.9 (0.2)	3.1 (0.8)	0.8 (0.8)	1.00
Research skills	3.6 (0.8)	3.7 (0.5)	-0.1 (0.9)	-0.11
Quantitative reasoning	3.7 (0.6)	3.4 (0.6)	0.3 (0.7)	0.35

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 15. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Geosciences, n = 11)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.7 (0.5)	3.7 (0.5)	0.0 (0.7)	0.00
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.7 (0.5)	3.5 (0.5)	0.2 (0.6)	0.32
Oral communication	3.7 (0.5)	3.5 (0.5)	0.2 (0.4)	0.47
Written communication	3.8 (0.4)	3.5 (0.7)	0.3 (0.7)	0.44
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.0 (1.1)	3.5 (0.7)	-0.5 (0.7)	-0.71
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.9 (0.3)	4.0 (0.0)	-0.1 (0.3)	-0.32
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.5 (0.5)	3.2 (0.8)	0.3 (0.7)	0.44
Networking and relationship building	3.5 (0.7)	3.1 (0.9)	0.4 (0.5)	0.77
Research skills	3.6 (0.8)	3.6 (0.5)	0.0 (0.7)	0.00
Quantitative reasoning	3.6 (0.5)	3.5 (0.5)	0.1 (0.7)	0.14

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 16. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (History, n = 8)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Developmnt	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.5 (1.1)	3.3 (1.0)	0.3 (0.5)	0.54
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.4 (1.1)	3.1 (1.1)	0.3 (0.5)	0.54
Oral communication	3.5 (1.1)	3.0 (1.1)	0.5 (0.8)	0.66
Written communication	3.5 (1.1)	3.3 (1.0)	0.3 (0.5)	0.54
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.4 (1.1)	3.5 (1.1)	-0.1 (0.6)	-0.20
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.3 (1.0)	3.1 (1.0)	0.1 (0.6)	0.20
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.4 (1.1)	3.0 (1.1)	0.4 (0.7)	0.50
Networking and relationship building	3.4 (1.1)	2.9 (1.0)	0.5 (0.8)	0.66
Research skills	3.4 (1.1)	3.1 (1.1)	0.3 (0.7)	0.35
Quantitative reasoning	3.3 (1.0)	2.9 (1.0)	0.4 (0.5)	0.72

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 17. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Marketing, n = 8)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	4.0 (0.0)	3.6 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	0.72
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.54
Oral communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.54
Written communication	3.6 (0.5)	3.3 (0.9)	0.4 (1.1)	0.35
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.1 (0.8)	2.6 (1.1)	0.5 (1.2)	0.42
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	2.8 (1.2)	2.6 (1.1)	0.1 (1.1)	0.11
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.54
Networking and relationship building	4.0 (0.0)	3.6 (0.5)	0.4 (0.5)	0.72
Research skills	3.8 (0.5)	3.6 (0.5)	0.1 (0.6)	0.20
Quantitative reasoning	3.9 (0.4)	3.5 (0.8)	0.4 (0.5)	0.72

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 18. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Psychology, n = 24)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.6 (0.6)	0.3 (0.7)	0.37
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.7 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.47
Oral communication	3.9 (0.3)	3.6 (0.6)	0.3 (0.6)	0.41
Written communication	3.8 (0.4)	3.6 (0.6)	0.2 (0.6)	0.30
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.6 (0.7)	3.7 (0.6)	-0.1 (0.8)	-0.16
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.3 (0.6)	3.1 (0.6)	0.1 (0.6)	0.21
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.7)	0.4 (0.7)	0.53
Networking and relationship building	3.9 (0.4)	3.3 (0.8)	0.5 (0.8)	0.65
Research skills	3.6 (0.7)	3.8 (0.4)	-0.2 (0.8)	-0.27
Quantitative reasoning	3.4 (0.7)	3.5 (0.6)	-0.1 (0.8)	-0.16

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 19. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Public Health, n = 15)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.4)	0.2 (0.4)	0.48
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.7 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.58
Oral communication	4.0 (0.0)	3.6 (0.6)	0.4 (0.6)	0.63
Written communication	3.9 (0.3)	3.6 (0.5)	0.3 (0.5)	0.68
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.9 (0.4)	3.6 (0.6)	0.3 (0.5)	0.58
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.5 (0.6)	3.4 (0.5)	0.1 (0.7)	0.09
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.3)	3.5 (0.6)	0.4 (0.5)	0.79
Networking and relationship building	3.9 (0.4)	3.3 (0.6)	0.5 (0.5)	1.03
Research skills	3.9 (0.4)	3.7 (0.6)	0.2 (0.7)	0.30
Quantitative reasoning	3.8 (0.4)	3.5 (0.5)	0.3 (0.6)	0.45

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 20. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Sociology, n = 14)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.6)	0.5 (0.8)	0.66
Creative thinking and problem solving	3.9 (0.3)	3.4 (0.6)	0.5 (0.8)	0.66
Oral communication	3.9 (0.4)	3.2 (0.9)	0.6 (0.9)	0.69
Written communication	3.6 (0.5)	3.4 (0.9)	0.2 (0.8)	0.27
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.7 (0.6)	3.5 (0.8)	0.2 (1.0)	0.22
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.4 (0.8)	3.4 (0.9)	0.1 (1.0)	0.07
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	3.9 (0.4)	3.4 (0.7)	0.5 (0.9)	0.58
Networking and relationship building	3.6 (0.6)	3.1 (0.8)	0.6 (0.8)	0.76
Research skills	3.5 (0.8)	3.7 (0.6)	-0.2 (0.8)	-0.27
Quantitative reasoning	3.4 (1.0)	3.4 (0.8)	-0.1 (1.2)	-0.06

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

Table 21. *Descriptive Statistics for Ratings of Learning Outcome Importance, Development, and Deficits (Theatre, n = 5)*

Learning Outcome Domain	Q1:	Q2:	Deficit:	
	Importance	Development	(Importance – Development)	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>d_z</i>
Critical thinking	3.6 (0.5)	3.2 (0.8)	0.4 (1.1)	0.35
Creative thinking and problem solving	4.0 (0.0)	3.2 (0.8)	0.8 (0.8)	0.96
Oral communication	3.8 (0.4)	3.0 (0.7)	0.8 (0.8)	0.96
Written communication	4.0 (0.0)	2.8 (0.8)	1.2 (0.8)	1.43
Knowledge of diversity of human cultures	3.8 (0.5)	3.4 (0.5)	0.3 (1.0)	0.26
Knowledge of the physical and natural world	3.4 (0.9)	2.6 (0.9)	0.8 (1.1)	0.73
Interpersonal relations, working collaboratively	4.0 (0.0)	3.4 (0.9)	0.6 (0.9)	0.67
Networking and relationship building	4.0 (0.0)	3.0 (0.7)	1.0 (0.7)	1.41
Research skills	3.5 (0.6)	2.6 (0.5)	1.0 (0.8)	1.22
Quantitative reasoning	3.4 (0.5)	2.2 (0.4)	1.2 (0.4)	2.68

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. Responses to Q1 and Q2 were coded on 4-point Likert-type scales with end points of 1 ‘Slightly important’ to 4 ‘Extremely important’ and 1 ‘Not at all’ to 4 ‘Very much’, respectively. The deficit column summarizes the difference between importance and development ratings with greater values indicating greater potential skill deficits. *d_z* = standardized difference score (Cohen, 1988, p. 48).

2. Employment Outcomes

In Fall 2016, the Office of Academic Affairs purchased an employment outcomes report from Educate to Career (ETC) to further support academic program review and accreditation efforts. ETC gathered and summarized occupation data for most FLC majors, separately, from databases maintained by NCES, US Treasury, US Federal Reserve, US Department of Education, and other resources. Regrettably, ETC was unable to gather data for Gender and Women's Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies, Marketing, Native American and Indigenous Studies, and Physics. All other departments are represented.

ETC's report was comprised of Tables 10-12 below that summarize employment outcomes for 2014-15, 2010-11, and 2005-06 FLC graduates, respectively. Summary data include the number of graduates working in each occupational category, the number of graduates working part-time, and the number of graduates currently attending graduate school. The data coverage rates were very high with between 80% and 100% of graduates from each major represented in the report.

Conclusion

Results of the 2016-17 Senior Exit Surveys suggest that each learning outcome domain was perceived as *moderately* to *extremely* important to graduates' future careers and that FLC *somewhat* to *very much* helped graduates' develop in these areas. A number of learning outcome domains demonstrated potential skill deficits whereby importance was rated higher than development with moderate to large effect sizes (see d_z 's greater than 0.50 in Tables 2-21). When considering curricular and programmatic improvements, learning outcomes with larger skill deficits might be the most sensible areas on which to focus. For example, students in several non-STEM departments reported substantial skill deficits in quantitative reasoning. These skills may be emphasized in programmatic improvements to increase success among FLC graduates.

Limitations

Several limitations should be noted. First, given the modest survey response rate, the sample may not be representative of all 2016-17 graduates and caution is encouraged when generalizing results. Second, this study relied on self-reported data rather than direct student assessment. Most studies looking at self-reports in higher education suggest that self-reports and direct assessments are positively related (Anaya, 1999; Pike, 1995). Finally, the quantitative nature of the data may not fully reflect student perceptions of the importance and level of their skill development across learning outcome domains.

In addition to the limitations noted above, Educate to Career's graduate outcomes report does not provide detailed employment information such as employer, duration of employment, satisfaction with career, or satisfaction with compensation. The Graduate Follow-Up Survey scheduled to be delivered to 2016-17 graduates in 2019 will help address these limitations.

Table 22. *Employment Outcomes for 2014-15 Fort Lewis College Graduates*

Educate To Career, Inc. 501(c)(3) m.havis@educatetocareer.org																										
FORT LEWIS COLLEGE Undergraduates Outcomes Report for 2014-15 Graduates																										
FLC Major																										
	Accounting	Adventure	Anthropol	Art & Desi	Biology	Business A	Chemistry	Economics	Education	Engineerin	English	Environme	Exercise Sc	Geology	History	Liberal Stu	Mathemati	Music	Philosophy	Political Sc	Psychology	Public Hea	Sociology	Spanish	Totals	
Major code	6201	4101	5502	6007	3600	6200	5003	5501	2304	2400	3301	1301	4101	5004	6402	3401	3700	6002	4801	5506	5200	6110	5507	2602		
Number of students identified by ETC	22	14	25	33	53	86	17	10	11	11	31	35	45	26	11	20	0	0	12	14	49	15	36	0	576	
<i>Occupational Category (n)</i>																										
ACC Accounting	9					7		1																	17	
BUS Business Professional Support						6		1		1	1								1	1	2	1			14	
CLN Cleaning																										0
CMM Computer Occs						2	1	1		1							0									5
CMS Community Service																					3	1	3			7
CON Construction																										0
EAT Hospitality																						1				1
EDU Education		3	3		3	3	5		7		4		5	6		2	0	0			3		3	0		47
ENG Engineering										5																5
ENT Entertainment and Publishing				8						1	2							0								11
EXT Extraction (mining)																										0
FFF Agriculture																										0
FIN Finance																										0
HLS Health Support					3								3													6
LGL Legal																				1						1
MED Health Professionals					3								3								1					7
MGR Management	2		2		2	9	1	1		1	2	6	3			2			2	1	2	1	2	0		39
MIL Military																										0
NUR Nursing					2																	1				3
OFF Office Support	3	3	6	6	5	16	1	1			4	7	5			6	0	0	3	3	5	3	7	0		84
PRD Production					1																					1
PRS Personal Service													6													11
PRT Protective Service																										0
RPR Repair																										0
SAL Retail and Other Sales	2	3			2	14		1			2		6					0		2	2		4			38
SCI Science					5		5					9		15							0					34
TRN Transportation																										0
WHL Wholesale Sales																										0
Working Part Time	2	3	9	14	16	23	1	2	3	1	13	11	6	2		7	0	0	3	3	18	7	10	0		154
Attending Grad School	2	1	3	3	10	5	1	1	1	1	3	2	4	2		2	0	0	2	2	7	1	4	0		57
<i>Data Coverage</i>																										
Total students represented, n	20	13	23	31	52	83	15	9	11	11	31	35	41	25	0	19	NA	NA	11	13	47	15	33	NA		538
Total students represented, %	91%	93%	92%	94%	98%	97%	88%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	96%	0%	95%	NA	NA	92%	93%	96%	100%	92%	NA		93%

Table 23. *Employment Outcomes for 2010-11 Fort Lewis College Graduates*

Educate To Career, Inc. 501(c)(3) m.havis@educatetocareer.org																									
FORT LEWIS COLLEGE Undergraduates Outcomes Report for 2010-11 Graduates																									
		FLC Major																							
		Accounting	Adventure	Anthropol	Art & Desi	Biology	Business A	Chemistry	Economics	Engineerin	English	Environme	Exercise Sc	Geology	History	Liberal Stu	Mathemati	Music	Philosophy	Political Sc	Psychology	Public Hea	Sociology/ Spanish	Totals	
Major code		6201	4101	5502	6007	3600	6200	5003	5501	2400	3301	1301	4101	5004	6402	3401	3700	6002	4801	5506	5200	6110	5507	2602	
Number of students identified by ETC		22	11	13	31	47	126	15	5	0	42	16	33	20	16	36	2	9	4	19	63	0	27	5	562
<i>Occupational Category (n)</i>																									
ACC	Accounting	11					10		1																22
BUS	Business Professional Support						11		0		2								3	4	0	2			22
CLN	Cleaning																								0
CMM	Computer Occs						6		0	0							0								6
CMS	Community Service																				7	0	4		11
CON	Construction																								0
EAT	Hospitality																								0
EDU	Education		2	2	4	5		4			6	4	3		3	5	1	2			6			1	48
ENG	Engineering									0															0
ENT	Entertainment and Publishing				11						5		2					4							22
EXT	Extraction (mining)																								0
FFF	Agriculture																								0
FIN	Finance																								0
HLS	Health Support																								0
LGL	Legal																								0
MED	Health Professionals					7		2					2								3				14
MGR	Management	2	3	2		5	22	1	1	0	4	3	5	2	3	4	1	0	1	4	6	0	4	1	74
MIL	Military																								0
NUR	Nursing																								0
OFF	Office Support	3	2	3	5	6	23		1		7	3	5	5	3	8		1	1	5	11	0	6	2	100
PRD	Production																								0
PRS	Personal Service												8												8
PRT	Protective Service																								0
RPR	Repair																								0
SAL	Retail and Other Sales	2	2	3		5	31		1		4		4		3	5			1	3	6		4		74
SCI	Science					7		6				4		9											26
TRN	Transportation																								0
WHL	Wholesale Sales																								0
	Working Part Time	3	2	1	6	5	19	1	0	0	11	0	2	2	2	10	0	1	1	2	12	0	4	1	85
	Attending Grad School	0	0	1	1	5	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	26
<i>Data Coverage</i>																									
	Total students represented, n	21	11	12	27	45	126	14	4	NA	41	15	32	19	15	34	2	8	4	18	60	NA	25	5	538
	Total students represented, %	95%	100%	92%	87%	96%	100%	93%	80%	NA	98%	94%	97%	95%	94%	94%	100%	89%	100%	95%	95%	NA	93%	100%	96%

Table 24. *Employment Outcomes for 2005-06 Fort Lewis College Graduates*

Educate To Career, Inc. 501(c)(3) m.havis@educatetocareer.org																								
FORT LEWIS COLLEGE Undergraduates Outcomes Report for 2005-06 Graduates																								
FLC Major																								
	Accounting	Adventure	Anthropol	Art & Desi	Biology	Business A	Chemistry	Economics	Engineerin	English	Environme	Exercise Sc	Geology	History	Liberal Stu	Mathemati	Music	Philosophy	Political Sc	Psychology	Public Hea	Sociology/	Spanish	Totals
Major code	6201	4101	5502	6007	3600	6200	5003	5501	2400	3301	1301	4101	5004	6402	3401	3700	6002	4801	5506	5200	6110	5507	2602	
Number of students identified by ETC	23	0	21	45	45	134	10	5	0	67	0	40	10	12	62	7	10	4	14	47	0	48	6	610
<i>Occupational Category (n)</i>																								
ACC Accounting	9					8		1		2														20
BUS Business Professional Support	1		2		1	7	1	0		5					1				2	3		3		26
CLN Cleaning																								0
CMM Computer Occs	1				1	4		0	0	2					1	1		0		1				11
CMS Community Service															1					3		4		8
CON Construction						5			0															5
EAT Hospitality																								0
EDU Education		0			4	4	1			8		6	1	2	2	2	1	1		3		3	1	39
ENG Engineering									0															0
ENT Entertainment and Publishing				8		7				6					41		6			1				69
EXT Extraction (mining)																								0
FFF Agriculture																								0
FIN Finance																								0
HLS Health Support																								0
LGL Legal																								0
MED Health Professionals		0			7	2					4									1				14
MGR Management	2	0	9	5	6	22	1	1	0	9	0	6	2	3	2	2	1	1	4	4		11	1	92
MIL Military																								0
NUR Nursing																				1				1
OFF Office Support	3		4	6	6	19		1	0	8		4	1	3	3		0	1	2	5	0	6	1	73
PRD Production						4	1		0															5
PRS Personal Service												8								6				14
PRT Protective Service																				1		2		3
RPR Repair									0															0
SAL Retail and Other Sales	2	0		9	4	24	1	1	0	7		6	1	2	3		0		4	5		6	1	76
SCI Science					5		3				0		3											11
TRN Transportation																								0
WHL Wholesale Sales																								0
Working Part Time	2	0	1	12	5	20	0	0	0	17	0	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	9	0	8	1	88
Attending Grad School	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
<i>Data Coverage</i>																								
Total students represented, n	20	NA	17	41	40	127	8	4	NA	66	NA	37	9	12	57	7	9	4	13	43	NA	43	5	562
Total students represented, %	87%	NA	81%	91%	89%	95%	80%	80%	NA	99%	NA	93%	90%	100%	92%	100%	90%	100%	93%	91%	NA	90%	83%	92%

References

- Anaya, G. (1999). College impact on student learning: Comparing the use of self-reported gains, standardized test scores, and college grades. *Research in Higher Education, 40*, 499-526.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dumford, A. D., & Miller, A. L. (2015). Are those rose-colored glasses you are wearing? Student and Alumni Survey Responses. *Research and Practice in Assessment, 10*, 5-14.
- Pike, G. R. (1995). The relationship between self-reports of college experiences and achievement test scores. *Research in Higher Education, 36*(1), 1-22.