

# Assessment: Course Four Column

Spring/Summer 2019



## El Camino: Course SLOs (HUM) - ESL

### ECC: ESL 53A:Elementary Writing and Grammar

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #1</b> - Students will write a summary of a low-intermediate text in their own words, including the title and source of the text and key points.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment -</b></p> <p>Students will write a summary and response to a reading previously read and discussed in class.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b></p> <p>70% success</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>This data was collected from Rebecca Loya's ESL 53A class that consisted of 19 students and Evelyn Uyemura's ESL 53A class that consisted of 23 students. The standard for SLO1 was met with a Passing Success Rate of 86%.</p> <p>The vast majority of students were successful.</p> <p>Students in Prof. Loya's class wrote a satisfactory summary of the fictional folktale they read in class ("The Wooden Chest"). This was the third time the class was writing a summary, so they had a good understanding of what was required. A few students forgot to use the literary present verb tense in the summary, and some students began with the present and then switched to the past towards the end. Almost all students understood that the title and source need to be in the first sentence.</p> <p>Professor Uyemura had a unique situation this semester as she explains below:</p> <p>Here's my explanation for these results:</p> <p>I started the semester with 33 students, but only had 26 on</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> ESL 53A instructors should continue to apply the current methodologies, including having students write at least one practice summary-response before the assignment. Since ESL 53A is a course that accepts all levels of entry ESL students, as well as other types of students such as those who are assisted by the SRC, it can sometimes be difficult to predict which students need more practice, explanation, and/or direction. Nevertheless, the success rate shows that with practice and help from their instructors, they can master this skill. (09/06/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>the roster at the end of the semester, which is kind of unusual. 7 students dropped the class for various reasons, some possibly academic, some not.</p> <p>In addition, of the students remaining on the roster past the drop date, 4 of them got grades of F because they actually had stopped attending, or stopped handing in work. (So probably should have been W's, but they missed the deadline.)</p> <p>Then there were 4 students who stayed in the class and completed the final assessment, but were unsuccessful in the class. This number of W's, sort of W's, and actual failures is much higher than usual for me.</p> <p>One issue, I think, was that there were 3 deaf students in the class, including 1 whose writing was far below 53A level at the start. All three deaf students were also not from the US, and so they learned both ASL and English as adults, and it was quite overwhelming. Their presence also entailed two interpreters and a note-taker in the classroom, so it was somewhat of a distraction for the other students.</p> <p>There was also a lot of coming and going--people having to be out of the country for several weeks mid-semester, students simply flaking out, etc.</p> <p>So I felt like the class was a struggle overall.</p> <p>The students who attended regularly, got their work in on time, and did their homework were all successful, with 4 students getting C's mainly based on their results on grammar tests rather than their essays, and many A's and B's.</p> <p>Based on my experience with this class, if I have deaf students enroll who need more support than can be offered in this class, I will be even more pro-active than I was this time. I did reach out to the Student Services and Daef Education people, but they were not helpful, and the</p>	

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>student remained in the class, and not only did not profit from it, but was a distraction to other students as well with off topic questions and outbursts.</p> <p>I do not think that any changes are needed in the materials used. The students who were able to access the material were quite successful.</p>	
		<p>(09/06/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 86</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p>	
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>There were 3 sections of 53A this semester, with a total of 58 students being assessed. The overall success rate for all three sections was 79%, which is an acceptable rate. However, while two sections had success rates of 85% and 86%, a small section had a success rate of only 37%. There may have been some misunderstanding on the part of that instructor about what the expectations were and how to prepare her students to meet them. It is important that part-time instructors have the opportunity to meet with full-time instructors at the beginning of the semester to align goals and methodology. (09/12/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 79</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya, Vicki Blaho</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> It is important that part-time instructors have the opportunity to meet with full-time instructors at the beginning of the semester to align goals and methodology. There should not be such a big divergence between sections of the same class. (09/12/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>This data was collected from Rebecca Loya's ESL 53A class section 6658 which consisted of 27 students and Evelyn Uyemura's ESL 53A class section 6656 which consisted of 31</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> In order for students to continue doing well on SLO1, instructors should continue to give students summary writing practices, at least three, before the actual SLO assessment. Giving</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>students. The standard for SLO1 was met: Total Acceptable = 50, Total Unacceptable = 8, Total Evaluated = 58, Average Passing Success Rate = 86.21%.</p> <p>The vast majority of students were successful in SLO1, except for a few who despite careful and multiple explanations of the assignment, simply didn't include the summary. In Professor Uyemura's class, there were a total of 6 summaries prior to this assignment, with many examples shown in class. 93% of Professor Loya's class wrote a satisfactory summary of the fictional folktale they read in class ("The Wooden Chest"). This was the third time the class was writing a summary, so they had a good understanding of what was required. A few students forgot to use the literary present verb tense in the summary, and some students began with the present and then switched to the past towards the end. Almost all students understood that the title and source need to be in the first sentence; however, what they considered to be the main idea still needed improvement. Many of them referred to the characters as the main idea although there were others who wrote a very good main-idea sentence.</p> <p>(09/11/2017)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p>	<p>students short, 1 - 2 paragraph reading assignments, both fiction and non-fiction, and having them practice writing summaries about them seems to be effective. Since ESL students tend to copy from original text if it is in front of them, having them put away the reading they are summarizing is essential to them writing genuine summaries. Some instructors allow students to use their cell phones while writing because students have access to dictionaries and translators online; however, in this kind of assessment, cell phones should never be allowed. If students have access to the Internet, they may also have access to websites that may contain summaries of the readings. In addition, it is important that the class reads the text together and discusses it thoroughly. Students will understand the reading and they will feel comfortable enough to write a summary using their own words. (06/22/2018)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies  <b>Follow-Up:</b> As suggested in previous Follow-Up statements, instructors assigned additional summary-response assignments prior to the SLO assessment. As the data indicates, it is essential to provide students with plenty of practice before having them take the real SLO assessment.</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			(06/22/2018)
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>Of the the 49 students assessed, 43 (88%) met this standard. This result represents a substantial improvement compared to the previous assessment's result of 53%.</p> <p>In the previous SLO 1 assessment report, it was noted that students had difficulties writing the summary (e.g. omitting the title and/or author of the article being summarized, leaving out key points of the article, and not connecting the essay's thesis statement to its response portion). The recommended Actions were devoting more time to "giving students more explicit instruction on how to write a summary" and assigning more summaries before the SLO assessment to allow for more practice with the SLO assessment essay. Subsequently, before the end of the Spring 2016 semester, 53A instructors assigned additional graded summary-response essays. Per the previous SLO 1 assessment report, these graded essays provided students with the additional feedback it recommended as a means of assisting students with their summary-writing skills.</p> <p>At the same time, more time should be spent on paraphrasing skills that may be linked to students' difficulties with reading comprehension. Although the article chosen for this assessment was at the 52A level, and time was spent on basic reading strategies, students still had difficulties understanding and working with it. These difficulties led to a few instances of students' copying phrases and sentences directly from the article instead of using in their own words. (09/19/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debra Mochidome</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Debra Mochidome and Nitza Llado</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Instructors will continue to assign additional summary-response essays before the SLO assessment essay. Moreover, summary work will begin with shorter (e.g. 1-2-paragraph-length) readings. More time will be spent on analyzing the readings (to pick out key points, etc.) and on paraphrasing skills (key words, use of basic synonyms, etc.) (06/16/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Per the previous SLO 1 assessment's Action plan, instructors assigned additional summary-response essays prior to this SLO assessment to positive effect (09/19/2016)</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Instructors will continue to assign additional summary-response essays before the SLO assessment essay. Moreover, summary work will begin with shorter (e.g. 1-2-paragraph-length) readings. More time will be spent on analyzing the readings (to pick out key points, etc.) and on paraphrasing skills (key words, use of basic synonyms, etc.) (09/20/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Per the previous SLO 1 assessment's Action plan, instructors assigned additional summary-response essays prior</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			to this SLO assessment to positive effect (06/16/2017)
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Not Met</p> <p>The analytical rubric for scoring the assessment contains three categories that relate to this particular SLO. The first one checks to see if students included the title of the article being summarized as well as the name of the author of the article. Out of the 51 essays scored, only 27 received a passing score in this category. Hence, 35.3% of the students met the goal.</p> <p>The second category is whether students write a reasonable summary of the text. Again, the results were not very positive. 53% of the students ( 27 students) met this goal.</p> <p>The third category assessed if students wrote a thesis statement that connected the summary with the response. 28 of the students or 55% of them reached this goal.</p> <p>Therefore, the students did not reach the goal of 70% success on any categories that relate to this particular SLO. It is obvious that students need more explicit instruction on summary writing. (09/09/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Nitza Llado</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> ESL 53A teachers need to spend more time giving students explicit instruction on how to write a summary. This will include giving students more examples of effective summaries including worked examples in class. Teachers will also assign more summaries for grades throughout the semester, and the grades for these summaries will provide students with a greater amount of feedback. (05/13/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Not Met</p> <p>Out of 13 essays, 9 (69%) students met the SLO while 4 (31%) did not. (08/13/2014)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya</p>	
<b>SLO #2</b> - Students will write an effective response to a low-intermediate text, consisting of a personal narrative, opinion, or	<b>Essay/Written Assignment -</b> Students will write a summary and response to a reading previously read and discussed in class.	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>The combined total percentage rate for the two ESL 53A</p>	<b>Action:</b> The success rate for SLO2 and SLO1 were equal, so the recommended actions are the same: continue with the present

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>analysis.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70% success</p>	<p>classes is the same as SLO1. It's 86%. Both Loya's and Uyemura's students did well writing a response to follow the summary they completed for SLO 1.</p> <p>As discussed in SLO1, reading and discussing the story and having the students do a practice before the real assignment helps very much. Many students at this level are attending a college course in the United States for the first time. As one can imagine, writing in a second or third language, especially one in which is unfamiliar, can be extremely challenging and confusing. Not only do students have to express their ideas clearly and correctly, but they are also challenged to analyze a story and assert themselves using vocabulary and sentence structures that are new. The response paragraph that follows the summary gives students an opportunity to integrate experiences from their own lives with themes taken from a reading.</p> <p>Those who did not pass this SLO stopped short. They wrote an adequate summary, but when it came to the response, they either wrote just a comment, briefly, without explanation, or they write a short summary but didn't elaborate with an illustration. (09/06/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 86</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>A total of 58 students in three sections were assessed. The overall success rate was 77%, very close to the success rate in SLO #1. Students not only were able to summarize a reading, but also write a meaningful response to it. However, again, the results varied from 85% to 78% to 50%. The assignment does seem to be manageable to most students at this level, given adequate preparation and instruction. However, faculty need to have consistency in their expectations and how they prepare students to meet</p>	<p>teaching methods. In order to help students strengthen the response-writing skill, instructors could give more lessons on how to expand ideas and transition into pertinent examples that relate to the story. (09/06/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Closer coordination among full and part time instructors, with attention at the very beginning of the semester to building students skills so that they can meet the SLO. (09/12/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>the expectations. (09/12/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 77</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya, Vicki Blaho</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>This data was collected from Rebecca Loya's ESL 53A class section 6658 which consisted of 27 students and Evelyn Uyemura's ESL 53A class section 6656 which consisted of 31 students. The standard for SLO2 was met: Total Acceptable = 51, Total Unacceptable = 7, Total Evaluated = 58, Average Passing Success Rate = 87.93%.</p> <p>In Professor Uyemura's class, most students were successful in SLO 2 because the topics were high-interest and relevant, and they easily understood how to connect their own experiences to the articles.</p> <p>In Professor Loya's class, 85% of the students wrote a response to the story satisfactorily. Almost all of the students wrote some kind of response, but some of their responses were not long enough. Unlike the summary, which was practiced a couple of times before the assessment, the response was only practiced once before. Therefore, students did write their opinion, but few extended their ideas into an example story. (06/16/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 49 students assessed, 41 (84%) met this standard. This result represents a substantial improvement compared to the previous assessment's (74%).</p> <p>As with the comments for SLO 1's Data Analysis above, the</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> An important action that was implemented was to have students practice the summary and response assignment multiple times before the assessment. By doing this, students have the chance to get feedback and learn to improve what they may not have understood the first time. This also gives instructors the opportunity to bring in samples of summary-response assignments that previous students have done. Samples of both good and bad writing can be analyzed and discussed. (06/22/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Two points of discussion for future assessments might be whether the reading for the summary-response should be fiction, non-fiction, or either, and, whether students should be able to see the reading while writing. (06/22/2018)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Instructors will continue to assign additional summary-response essays before the SLO assessment essay. Per the previous SLO 2 assessment's Action plan, additional emphasis was placed on the elements of writing effective responses to</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>additional summary-response essays assigned before this SLO assessment were likely responsible for this increase. Prior discussions of the readings for these assignments and the feedback accompanying these assignments provided students with parameters for the breadth and depth of analysis necessary for writing effective responses to the article. (09/20/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debra Mochidome  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Debra Mochidome and Nitza Llado</p>	<p>readings, and on methods used to connect the essay's thesis statement and summary portion more closely to its response portion. In addition, students will be given examples of acceptable and unacceptable responses to readings to revise and critique, in order to better revise and analyze their own responses to readings. (09/20/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Per the previous SLO 2 assessment's Action plan, more review of previously written summary-response essays is still needed. (06/16/2017)</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met  One category on the analytical rubric relates specifically to this SLO. It reads "Response is pertinent and coherent." The results for this category were positive. Out of the 51 essays, 38 (74%) of them earned a passing score.</p> <p>The results are not surprising given that students were given an entire semester's worth of instruction on how to write effective responses. They were given plenty of model responses to emulate as well as chances to hone this skill on several take-home and in-class essay responses. (09/09/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Matt Kline  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Nitza Llado</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Although students slightly surpassed the goal of 70% success, there are two ways to improve upon this score. First, faculty will give students worked examples of effective responses. Second, faculty will also provide students bad examples of responses and have students critique them. Working on bad examples will engage learners more than simply showing them good models because they will have to analyze and evaluate. (05/13/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met  Out of 13 essays, 12 (92%) were acceptable and 1 (8%) were</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> As these results were satisfactory, we will continue with the current teaching strategies for the personal narrative, opinion, or</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		not acceptable. (08/13/2014) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Darsey Whitmore	analysis. (12/12/2014) <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies
<p><b>SLO #3</b> - Students will correctly use basic transition words, basic verb tenses, basic sentence structure, and paragraph format.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment -</b> Students will write a summary and response to a reading previously read and discussed in class.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70%</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>The percentage rate for this SLO is 83%, just 1% lower than the previous two SLOs. The results for SLO3 are, more or less, unpredictable for 53A because they really depend on the students' previous knowledge and education. Students who have studied and practiced English verb tenses, sentence structures, punctuation, and paragraph formatting do better; this is not to say that students who've studied and learned these principles while in the class and apply them successfully are not capable of passing. Student who use transition words well but do not punctuation correctly, or students who express their ideas clearly, write extensively but do not use correct verb tenses, can easily fall short of passing this SLO. (09/06/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 83</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continual instruction of paragraph formatting, sentence structures and punctuation, verb tenses, and using transition words and phrases is recommended. (09/06/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Not Met</p> <p>Again, the results are based on 58 students. The success rate on this aspect fell below the standard. One class had a 77% success rate, one 60% and one 50%. This SLO covers both mechanics such as paragraph format and the use of transition words, which are quite teachable, and also grammar (verb tenses and sentence structure) which are a focus of the course but also not easily internalized by students, especially when writing under time pressure. (09/12/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 67</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya, Vicki</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Students should be taught not only the details of grammar, but also the importance of proofreading before handing in an essay. Explicit instruction on proofreading for verb tenses and RO/CS sentences may lead to better results in the future. (09/12/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>Blaho</p> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>This data was collected from Rebecca Loya's ESL 53A class section 6658 which consisted of 27 students and Evelyn Uyemura's ESL 53A class section 6656 which consisted of 31 students. The standard for SLO3 was met: Total Acceptable = 48, Total Unacceptable = 10, Total Evaluated = 58, Average Passing Success Rate = 82.76%. (09/13/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Rebecca Loya and Evelyn Uyemura</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Most students were successful because sentence structure, basic grammar, punctuation, and basic paragraph formatting were emphasized throughout the semester. Among students who didn't do well on SLO3, verbs were the main problem with run-on sentences coming in second. Generally speaking, verb tenses in English always pose a challenge for ESL students, and with practice and time, this skill should improve. Also, punctuation should improve as students progress to higher-level writing classes. This assessment was given as a timed, in-class writing assignment, so there is a possibility that students hurried to turn in their compositions without checking their verbs and punctuation carefully. Following the writing process over the course of the semester provided students with guidelines on how to go about writing an in-class essay; these steps include jotting down a quick brainstorming chart, writing a simple outline, writing the composition, and reading it again, carefully, to check for mistakes. (06/22/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The instructors did not discuss the point of whether or not students should be allowed</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			to have the reading in front of them while they are writing or not. For the next semester, instructors should determine which way would be most effective. (06/22/2018)
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 49 students assessed, 42 (86%) met this standard. While the 70% target for success was significantly surpassed, this assessment's result represents a slight decrease, compared with the previous assessment's result (95 %).</p> <p>As in the previous SLO 3 assessment's Data Analysis, much class time was devoted to intensive grammar instruction and writing practice. However, as it has been stated in previous 53A SLO reports, there is no "floor" for students entering the class; the range of students' proficiency ranged from very limited familiarity with formal English reading and writing skills to mid-semester-53A-level skills. It is possible that the essays produced by the less-proficient students may have affected the results of the assessment overall. Nevertheless, the ESL department will continue to monitor SLO 3's assessment results. (09/20/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debra Mochidome</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Debra Mochidome and Nitza Llado</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Instructors will continue to use the same teaching strategies outlined in the previous SLO assessment (e.g. intensive grammar instruction, writing practice, etc.). In addition, more attention will be given to the areas that less-proficient students experience (e.g. spelling, sentence- and paragraph-level formatting, word order, etc.). More opportunities for students to submit revised and rewritten essay drafts may be helpful as well. (06/16/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Per the previous SLO 3 assessment's Data Analysis, it was noted that students' spelling was likely positively affected by their access to the source article for the SLO assessment essay. However, as stated in the comments for SLO 1's Data Analysis above, this access also provided students with the temptation to copy portions of the article instead of paraphrasing them. Subsequently, instructors informally discussed the issue of allowing access to the article</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			during the assessment vs, denying access to the article itself but allowing students to bring in their notes on it. Their opinions were split; therefore, before the next 53A SLO assessment, more department-wide discussion is needed as to whether to keep allowing access to the source article during the SLO assessment and/or whether to enforce article use/non-use across all sections participating in the assessment. (09/20/2016)
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>There are four categories on the rubric that relate to this SLO, and the scores were very positive for each category. 48 or 94% of the students used at least 2 transition words in their essays. 43 or 84% of the students exhibited "reasonable competence" in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and sentence boundaries. 45 or 88% of the students showed "reasonable competence" in their ability to use past tense and present tense verbs appropriately and in their ability to have subjects agree with verbs. Finally, 49 or 95% of the students wrote at least 200 words and at least two paragraphs "indicated by indenting." Consequently, the goal of 70% was greatly surpassed in each of these categories.</p> <p>The positive results are the result of explicit instruction in grammar and in the extensive writing practice students received throughout the semester. During those times of practice, students received feedback from teachers on all of these categories. Further, students read numerous examples of proper verb usage, subject-verb agreement, punctuation, capitalization, indenting, and spelling. Spelling was probably less of a problem for students in this</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Because the results for this SLO were so stellar, faculty will continue to use the teaching strategies and activities that they used during the spring 2015 semester. (05/13/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>essay because they also had access to the article they summarized as they wrote the summaries/responses. (09/09/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Matt Kline  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Nitza Llado</p>	
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Not Met  Out of 13 essays, 8 (62%) were acceptable and 5 (38%) were not acceptable. (08/13/2014)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Darsey Whitmore</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> ESL instructors will reach out to counseling and the assessment center to inform students scoring below the 6th grade level of alternative learning opportunities (e.g. Adult School Language courses, the Language Academy, and lower level ESL courses at Compton College) for students scoring below the 6th grade level. (12/12/2014)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b>  Program/College Support</p>

# ECC: ESL 53B:Intermediate Writing and Grammar

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #1</b> - Students will demonstrate basic organizing elements such as a thesis, topic sentences, and transitions.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 05/15/2015</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - Write an essay with thesis, topic sentence, and transitions.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70%</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>83 of 102 students (four sections) met the SLO (81.37%); this is slightly lower than the last assessment (82.35%), but it is clear that this an area of strength for both instructors and students. (09/11/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 81.37</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Elise Geraghty</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Sharifi, Takamine, Savina</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Because the success rate is fairly high for this SLO, instructors should continue with the successful practices that they have been using to instruct students in essay organization. (09/12/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Students met the target at 82.35%. The SLO concepts were strengthened throughout the semester even though this semester's target did not match the last semester's stellar percentage of 99%. Students had an opportunity to complete 5 formal essays that required a thesis, topic sentences and transitions. Students did fairly well presenting a thesis statement in their essay. They also understood topic sentences and used transition words to connect ideas. (09/19/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 82.35</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jelena Savina, Vicki Blaho</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Writing a thesis statement, topic sentences, and using transitions are skills that are essential at this level; therefore, instructors should be sure that by the end of the semester, their students understand and are demonstrating these skills. (09/19/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Out of the 119 students assessed for this SLO, we had a 99% success rate. In other words, only one student was unable to meet the SLO. Many of the instructor comments point out that the rate of success was due to the teaching and practice of these specific slo elements repeatedly throughout the semester. Most instructors required 6-8 essays. Repetition of the skills is crucial to student success.</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> We will continue to exchange successful teaching strategies. (09/13/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>Instructors also indicate that they taught each of these essay components individually, where students could focus writing homework and in-class work on one specific element. (09/13/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Carr/Llado</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Atoofi, Carr, Davis, Llado, Nozaki</p>	
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>Out of 159 students assessed, 142 (92%) demonstrated basic organizing elements in their essays. This percentage of success is the exact same percent as the previous assessment cycle indicating that the program continues to do an excellent job of teaching students how to include elements such as thesis statements, topic sentences, and transitions in their writing. There are several reasons for this success. First, the curriculum requires faculty to spend approximately 20 hours of instruction on the organizing elements of an essay. Second, faculty employ a variety of effective teaching techniques when teaching these elements such as modeling and guided practice. Third, these elements are not as difficult for learners to learn and employ compared to things like proper grammar. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Matt Kline, Nitza Llado, Rebecca Loya, Susan Nozaki, and Jenny Simon</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> A success rate of 92% is outstanding. Faculty need to continue teaching basic organizational elements using the same techniques as they did in the Spring 2016 semester. Further, future revisions of the course outline of record should not include a decrease in the amount of time spent on these elements. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>92% Success. Of 78 students in 4 sections of ESL 53B, 72 were acceptable and 6 were unacceptable. The assignments of all 4 faculty members were comparable, indicating a high degree of consistency. This SLO showed the highest degree of success, indicating that emphasis on thesis sentences and topic sentences has been incorporated into all sections and that students achieve competency in using these skills. (05/15/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> No action necessary. With a 92% success rate, no change is needed. (05/15/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> N. Currey, R. Loya, S. Nozaki</p> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 35 students evaluated, 30 (86%) achieved the standard. (09/12/2014)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debbie Mochidome</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> While the success rate exceeds the target for success, it is recommended that instructors double-check writing prompts for possible vague or ambiguous wording that could confuse students. (06/11/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
<p><b>SLO #2</b> - Students will use textual evidence from a high-intermediate level text.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - Write an essay using a personal narrative, opinion, or analysis.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70%</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>83 of 102 students met the SLO (81.37%), which is a dramatic increase from the last assessment results (68.63%). While more than one instructor commented on the difficulty that some students had with the reading material, the majority of the students were able to use textual evidence from a high-intermediate level text. We should watch this SLO over a few more semesters to see if this is a positive trend. (09/11/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 81.37</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Elise Geraghty</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Sharifi, Takamine, Savina</p> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Not Met</p> <p>Students enrolled in 52B (reading class) had a better understanding of sources, citations and such. Those who had had experience with quotations before this class knew how to use an integrated quotation well. However, those who had never tried it before, or those who had only done it once or twice in this class did not get the hang of it. More practice would have improved this SLO result. One instructor stated that there was "no research done in the class," which shows that the instructor didn't</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> There was an increase in the success rate of this SLO, so the faculty should watch this SLO to see if this is a positive trend. We should continue to encourage ESL students to enroll in reading classes concurrently with writing classes, and all ESL students should be encouraged to enroll in the currently optional ESL 52C. (09/12/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The next time this assessment is conducted, the lead teacher should make sure that all instructors understand the SLO. In addition, instructors should integrate more activities to show students the appropriate ways of integrating textual evidence from a text. (09/19/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>understand the SLO. (09/19/2018)  <b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 68.63  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jelena Savina, Vicki Blaho</p>	
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met  Out the 116 students assessed for this SLO, 104 were successful. This is an 89.6 % success rate. Instructors attributed this success to more time teaching how to incorporate outside evidence. This high success rate may be due to an increased emphasis in the course on including more challenging source material as a basis for the essays we write. Also, more instructors are introducing the idea of MLA formatted quotes and paraphrases earlier in the semester. (09/13/2017)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Carr/ Llado  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Atoofi, Carr, Davis, Llado, Nozaki</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue to share ideas and materials for use as outside sources. (09/13/2017)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met  81% or 124 out of 159 students successfully used textual evidence in their essays, so the standard was met. 81% reflects a 6% drop in success compared to the previous year, yet 81% might more accurately reflect student performance on this SLO because the number of students assessed was double that of the students assessed in Spring 2015.</p> <p>It is interesting to note neither the course objectives nor the outline of subject matter on the ESL 53B course outline of record mention teaching students how to use textual evidence in their writing. If it were included, the percentage of success might be higher on future assessments. (09/14/2016)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Matt Kline  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Matt Kline, Susan</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> As of Fall 2016, the course outline of record's course objectives and outline of subject matter do not require instructors to teach the use of textual evidence in student writings. If more time is spent in class on this area, students might perform even better on future assessments. Hence, the department faculty should consider adding this topic to the outline of subject matter.</p> <p>The department should also consider the changes to the SLO suggested in the Spring 2015 assessment report at the next department meeting. (09/14/2016)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		Nozaki, Nitza Llado, Rebecca Loya, and Jenny Simon	<b>Action Category:</b> Curriculum Changes
		<b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015) <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met 87% success rate. Of 78 students in 4 sections, 68 were acceptable and 10 were unacceptable. The SLO merely requires that students "use" textual evidence; we consider that we might want to adjust the SLO to include some emphasis on selecting and using evidence effectively. Also, we think that this SLO should include the use of lead-ins for quotes ("no dropped quotes.") (05/15/2015) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> N. Currey, R. Loya, S. Nozaki	<b>Action:</b> Re-visit the SLO description and consider including some assessment of quality beyond merely "use" textual evidence. (05/15/2016) <b>Action Category:</b> SLO/PLO Assessment Process <b>Follow-Up:</b> The faculty who wrote the report for Spring 2015 recommended amending the SLO. Unfortunately, this suggestion was not communicated to the entire ESL faculty, so the SLO was not changed. The faculty need to discuss changing it at the next department meeting. (09/14/2016)
		<b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014) <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met Of the 35 students evaluated, 33 (94%) achieved the standard. (09/12/2014) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debbie Mochidome	<b>Action:</b> While the success rate exceeds the target for success, it is recommended that the ESL 53B SLO Datasheet for SLO #2 be corrected to reflect response to a "high-level intermediate" text, rather than a "low-intermediate text." (06/11/2015) <b>Action Category:</b> SLO/PLO Assessment Process
<b>SLO #3</b> - Students will use proper formatting and basic documentation of sources.  <b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active <b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-	<b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - Write an essay using proper MLA documentation. <b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70%	<b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019) <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met 78 of 102 (76%) students met SLO #3; this SLO has the lowest success rate of the 4 SLOs, and it is lower than the last assessment's success rate of 82%. One instructor noted that he does not teach documentation until later in the semester. More than one instructor noted that several	<b>Action:</b> As was mentioned in the last assessment cycle, faculty should consider revising the COR's Outline of Subject Matter to include more coverage of documenting and use of sources. Also, faculty should consider introducing these concepts early

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020) <b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013		<p>students, rather than document correctly, plagiarized, which affected success rates. (09/12/2019)  <b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 76  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Elise Geraghty  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Sharifi, Takamine, Savina</p>	<p>in the semester so that students have more practice applying them. (09/12/2019)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)  <b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met  Instructors said that it was helpful to instruct students on how to document sources when they were in a computer lab. In this way, the instructor could model a Works Cited page and students could follow. Other instructors said it was beneficial when students worked on documentation exercises in groups. Most students understand the basic formatting requirements. In one class, the teacher stated that some students totally forgot to add a Work Cited page. This could have been because they were nervous during the in-class test, which was when the students of this section were instructed to demonstrate this SLO. (09/19/2018)  <b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 85.29  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jelena Savina, Vicki Blaho</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> 53B instructors should continue the strategy of teaching the Works Cited page and other forms of basic documentation by demonstration. After students understand the basic principles, they should be given additional exercises that allow them to practice the skills on their own. (09/19/2018)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)  <b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met  94 out of 114 students assessed on this SLO were successful. While this is a slight drop (82%) compared to SLOS 1 and 2, this is an improvement from the previous spring where only 67% of students met this SLO successfully. Jenny Simon and Rebecca Loya gave a Brown Bag on formatting and source documentation. This information likely led to the improvement of individual teaching strategies, which in turn led to more student success. (09/13/2017)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Carr/Llado  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Atoofi, Carr, Davis, Llado, Nozaki</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Send e-mail asking colleagues to look through SP 17 assessments and see if there is a pattern in errors in citation. Then, share any information gleaned from this at our next ESL prep day. (12/20/2017)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Not Met</p> <p>69% of the students assessed did not successfully use proper formatting and did not correctly document sources. Just like SLO #2, these areas are not addressed in the course outline of record's outline of subject matter. Therefore, it is possible that faculty do not spend a sufficient amount of time teaching students these two points.</p> <p>Another possibility is that several of the faculty members do not employ effective teaching methods for these points. Three instructors had success rates of 64%, 46%, and 57%, whereas two instructors had success rates of 80% and 91%. It could be that the instructors (Rebecca Loya and Jenny Simon) utilized very good teaching techniques and student activities and the other three need to learn these techniques. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Matt Kline, Susan Nozaki, Nitza Llado, Rebecca Loya, and Jenny Simon</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> 1. Faculty should consider including formatting and documenting sources in the outline of subject matter on the course outline of record.</p> <p>2. ESL 53B faculty need to have a brown bag workshop addressing teaching techniques and student activities that help students learn proper formatting and help students learn how to document sources. At the workshop, Rebecca Loya and Jenny Simon should share with the faculty the teaching methods they used during the Spring 2016 semester. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>80% success. 63 out of 78 students were successful. Documentation of sources was the weakest of the 4 SLOs, but that is understandable as this is a technically challenging aspect of academic writing and is a new skill. However, although it was the lowest of the 4 aspects, it is still impressively high. (05/15/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> N. Currey, R. Loya, S. Nozaki</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Instructors should provide additional examples and opportunity for students to begin grasping the importance of proper Works Cited entries. (05/15/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 35 students evaluated, 31 (89%) achieved the standard. (09/12/2014)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debbie Mochidome</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> While the success rate exceeds the target for success, it is recommended that there be further discussion and clarification regarding "basic" documentation of sources. (06/11/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			Strategies
<p><b>SLO #4</b> - Students will demonstrate correct grammar and sentence structure at the high-intermediate level.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - Write an essay using proper grammar and sentence structure.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70%</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>83 of 102 (81.37%) students met SLO #4; this is an increase from the last assessment (78.43%). This slight increase might have come at the expense of SLO #3 (source documentation), which was the weakest of the 4 SLOs this assessment cycle. Instructors might have been spending more time on grammar and not as much time on source documentation. (09/12/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 81</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Elise Geraghty</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Sharifi, Takamine, Savina</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> The success rates were good for this SLO, so instructors should continue with successful grammar instruction; however, instructors must be mindful about the holistic results for ESL 53B, and be sure to balance instruction time to include adequate instruction in all areas (specifically source documentation). Perhaps faculty can develop lesson plans that simultaneously target the instruction of source documentation and grammar so that class time is used efficiently. (09/12/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>This SLO is always a challenge for students to master. They have trouble with sentence structures and punctuation, which is to be expected at this level. Most had previous grammar instruction and/or had taken 53A. (09/19/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 78.43</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Rebecca Loya</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jelena Savina, Vicki Blaho</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Instructors should continue to provide students with instruction, supportive documents (i.e. grammar and sentence structure handouts), and supplemental exercise practices. (09/19/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>98 students out of the 119 assessed for this SLO were considered to have met the SLO. Our target for success is 70%, and our percentage of meeting the SLO is 82%. While this is our lowest success rate out of the four SLOs, it is still a strong success rate. Instructors believe specific directed</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Look through essays from Spring 2017 that did not meet SLO #4 and determine the most common errors. (12/15/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>teaching towards various aspects of grammar contributed to this success. (09/14/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Carr/ Llado</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Atoofi, Carr, Davis, Llado, Nozaki</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>80% of the students met this SLO, so the standard was exceeded. As with SLO #2, there was a drop in the success rate from the previous assessment cycle. The drop was 8% points. Yet, as discussed in the analysis of SLO #2, the sample size for this assessment was much bigger (more than double in size). Hence, 80% might be a more statistically accurate figure of the success rate of ESL 53B students for this SLO.</p> <p>Success on this SLO is probably due to the emphasis that grammar and sentence structure receive in the course. Approximately 33 out of 90 hours of instruction are dedicated to these learning points. Also, teachers gave their students a significant amount of grammar and structure feedback on student writings throughout the semester. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Matt Kline, Susan Nozaki, Nitza Llado, Rebecca Loya, and Jenny Simon</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>88% success rate. 69 of 78 essays were judged to be acceptable. Although students continue to have minor errors, the vast majority are producing comprehensible English sentences. Virtually none of the essays we assessed were difficult to comprehend. (05/15/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> N. Currey, R. Loya, S. Nozaki</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> 1. Faculty should continue to emphasize grammar and sentence structure in their classes.</p> <p>2. Faculty should consider changing the SLO to be more specific or to provide an example paragraph illustrating what the level of grammar meets this SLO. The word "proper" is too generic, so faculty may have varying interpretations of what constitutes proper grammar. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> No changes needed. (05/15/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> As the success rate</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		(Spring 2014) <b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met Of the 35 students evaluated, 31 (89%) achieved the standard. (09/12/2014) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debbie Mochidome	exceeds the target for success, continued methods of instruction should be maintained. (06/11/2015) <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies

# ECC: ESL 53C:Advanced Essay Writing and Grammar

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #1</b> - Students will demonstrate organizing elements such as a thesis, topic sentences, and transitions.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - College-Level Academic Essay</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this SLO.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>A total of 94 students were assessed on this cycle. 86 students (91%) successfully met the goal of this SLO by demonstrating organizing elements for an essay such as a thesis, topic sentences, and transitions. The results are not surprising given that students start learning about the organizing elements of essays in ESL 53A, which is two levels below ESL 53C, and these concepts are recycled repeatedly in ESL 53B as well as ESL 53C. Further, in ESL 53C students write quite a few essays before the final writing assignment, so they have plenty of practice including organizing elements in their writing. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 86</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon and Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Valerie Lernihan and Greta Hendricks</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Students should continue practicing writing essays with organizing elements throughout the course. Therefore, faculty should keep assigning the same number of essays for this course as they normally do. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Out of 143 students, 127 (89%) succeeded in this SLO. The instructors cited a particular focus on essay organization throughout the course as a reason for the success of students. (09/14/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 89</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jenny Simon; Allison Carr; Grace Shibata; Valerie Lernihan</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching practices. (09/14/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Out of the 122 students assessed, 115 rated as acceptable on SLO 1 for a 95% pass rate. 7 students rated as unacceptable on this SLO. Two sections reported that all students passed this SLO. The instructors mentioned that their teaching, feedback, and rubrics all focussed on skills</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Given the very high success rate for this SLO, the department should continue to ensure consistency by meeting with both adjuncts and full-timers every semester. (09/11/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>associated with this SLO. (09/11/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Allison Carr, Greta Hendricks, Grace Shibata, Eric Takamine</p>	
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>Out of the 118 students assessed, 110 rated as acceptable on SLO 1. 8 students rated as unacceptable on this SLO. Three sections reported that all students passed this SLO. Because this SLO deals with the basic structure of an essay, it is not surprising that many students rated as acceptable on this outcome, as writing a college-level essay is the overall goal of the course. The findings reveal that students passing 53C understand theses, topic sentences, and transitions because they are also part of the curriculum in 53A and 53B, so students have had more than one semester to master these skills. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Allison Carr</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Nancy Currey, Jelena Savina, Jenny Simon, Grace Shibata,</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching practices. (09/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> We are continuing with current teaching practices; the Spring 2017 assessment had similar high results. (09/11/2017)</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>88% (44-50) of students were successful with organizing elements.</p> <p>Although down from spring 14 by 3%, clearly, there is no problem with organizing elements per our SLO for 53C students. Theses, topic sentences, and transitions are very teachable elements of the essay; they've been taught and refined since 53A, so students are well-versed. (05/15/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Nancy Currey</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> J. Simon, R. Loya, D. Mochidome, S. Nozaki, B. Pereyra, G. Shibata</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Essay 6--Simon Final In-Class Essay.docx</a></p> <p><a href="#">53C Happiness Cause Effect Research.docx</a></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching practices. (01/28/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The department continues to teach successfully to this SLO (see 2016 results). (09/14/2016)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>41 out of 45 were found acceptable for a 91.1% success rate. As 5 were plagiarized--thus rendered invalid--and 10 were not submitted, our numbers were changed from 60 essays to 45. From one section, 3 essays were plagiarized and the other 7 were unacceptable in at least one category. It is of note that the assignment for this section apparently did not address the minimum criteria for SLO#1; it was not thesis driven and did not lend itself to topic sentences. (05/16/2014)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> J. Simon, N. Currey</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> No teaching, program, curriculum or SLO action is necessary (06/01/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The department continues to teach this SLO successfully (see 2015 results). (09/14/2016)</p>
<p><b>SLO #2</b> - Students will use basic research skills and textual evidence from an advanced-level text.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - College-Level Academic Essay</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this SLO.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>82 out of 94 students successfully used basic research skills and textual evidence from an advanced-level test in the assessment. This positive result is due to several factors. First, research skills and the integration of textual evidence in writing are key aspects of ESL 53C. Instructors provide students with numerous models of textual evidence. Second, they use worked examples to explain how to do research and integrate textual-evidence. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 87</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon and Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Valerie Lernihan and Greta Hendricks</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Faculty should continue to provide students with models and worked examples repeatedly throughout the course of the entire semester. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 143 students evaluated, 117 (82%) met the standard. According to instructors, success is due to thorough discussions of the readings; those that did not succeed had trouble reading and understanding text. (09/14/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 82</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching practices. (09/14/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jenny Simon; Allison Carr; Grace Shibata; Valerie Lernihan</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met  Out of the 122 students assessed, 110 rated as acceptable on SLO 1 for a pass rate of 90%. 12 students rated as unacceptable on this SLO. Instructors reported focussing their teaching on using evidence and citing their evidence in multiple essays during the semester. This resulted in strong outcomes for students. (09/11/2017)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Allison Carr, Greta Hendricks, Grace Shibata, Eric Takamine</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met  91% of students assessed were successful in meeting the minimum standards for SLO 2. Faculty agreed upon common criteria of at least three outside sources to be included in the assessment essay. This is an increase in success from previous semesters, where some essays assessed did not meet the SLO standard because there was no use of outside source material. Moving towards a common assessment tool has increased students success. (09/15/2016)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Allison Carr  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Nancy Currey, Jenny Simon, Jelena Savina, Grace Shibata</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met  84% (42/50) were successful with SLO #2. As we had 5 varied assignments, there was different "textual evidence." 2 of 5 of the essays used the novel as the research source. Two required inclusion of student-culled database sources. As an improvement from spring 2014, all essays were thesis-driven and addressed the minimum criteria of the SLO. (05/15/2015)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Given the very high success rate for this SLO, the department should continue to ensure consistency by meeting with both adjuncts and full-timers every semester. (09/11/2017)  <b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Continue current teaching practices. (09/15/2016)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies  <b>Follow-Up:</b> Current teaching practices resulted in equally strong outcomes on this SLO for Spring 2017. (09/11/2017)</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Next spring, we will incorporate a common criteria for textual evidence into our capstone essay research assignments. EX: Students will provide textual evidence from at least one outside source from the ECC database. (03/19/2016)  <b>Action Category:</b> SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> N. Currey <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> J. Simon, R. Loya, D. Mochidome, S. Nozaki, B. Pereyra, G. Shibata	<b>Follow-Up:</b> In spring 2015, criteria for capstone essays of each section being taught will be collected and cross referenced to ensure minimum common criteria for textual evidence is met. (05/19/2015)
		<b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014) <b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met 38 out of 45 for 84.4% success rate. As 5 were plagiarized--thus rendered invalid--and 10 were not submitted, our numbers were changed from 60 essays to 45. From one section, 3 essays were plagiarized and the other 7 were unacceptable in at least one category. It is of note that the assignment for this section apparently did not address the minimum criteria for SLO#2. (05/16/2014) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> J. Simon, N. Currey	<b>Action:</b> The results are good overall; however, there is a consistency problem that needs to be addressed. Not all assignments adhered to the SLO requirements. Five of the originally culled 50 essays were omitted from the norming session due to plagiarism. One of the essay prompts required a summary and response to one source only. Evelyn and Nancy will hold a Saturday workshop to address consistency issues with full time and part time faculty. This workshop will include TurnItIn.com training. (12/12/2014) <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies <b>Follow-Up:</b> As part of the ESL 53C consistency project for 2014-2015, there were workshops where instructors shared assignments and discussed whether assignments were consistent with SLOs or not. (05/15/2015)
	<b>Essay/Written Assignment - College-Level Academic Essay</b> <b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this		

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p>SLO.</p> <p><b>Additional Information:</b> Throughout the course, instructors used several assignments that incorporate outside sources, some from novels and some from research done through the ECC database.</p>		
<p><b>SLO #3</b> - Students will use proper formatting and MLA documentation.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - In an in-class timed writing, students will write a research essay. Students will use at least one outside source in their writing, which may have been chosen from several provided by the instructor, or may be the result of their own outside research. They will include at least one direct quote and one paraphrase or summary, properly MLA documented, plus a minimum of one work cited entry. 10 randomly chosen essays from each fulltime faculty section and two of three adjunct sections ( a total of 50 essays) will be assessed on an "acceptable/unacceptable" . If there were categories judged "unacceptable," they were read a second or third time.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70% of the 60 essays (10 from each of the 6 sections) will be determined acceptable. See attached rubric.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>79 out of 94 students used proper MLA formatting and documentation on this assessment. Although this is a lower number of students than those who successfully met the goals of SLO 1 and SLO 2, it is still well above the minimum goal for this particular SLO. Although students receive plenty of instruction including models and worked examples of MLA formatting and documentation, it is still rather difficult to master given the multitude of possible sources. This may explain why the success rate is somewhat lower for this SLO. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 84</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon and Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Valerie Lernihan and Greta Hendricks</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 143 students evaluated, 121 (85%) met the SLO. Instructors cited the fact that they focussed on MLA format and rules from early in the semester. (09/14/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 85</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jenny Simon; Allison Carr; Grace Shibata; Valerie Lernihan</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>84% (42/50) were determined acceptable, an 8.5% increase from last year. All 53C students have been trained in how</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue to give students models and worked examples of MLA formatting and documentation as well as practice following these rules. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Continue current teaching practices. (09/14/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching practices. (01/28/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>to document sources both in-text and using works cited. Further, there was a pronounced improvement in plagiarism this semester with only one in 50 essays being identified as partially plagiarized (20-30%). Turnitin was not used in the case of this essay. (05/15/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> N. Currey  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> R. Loya, D. Mochidome, S. Nozaki, B. Pereyra, G. Shibata, J. Simon</p>	<p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The department continues to teach this SLO successfully (see 2016 results). (09/14/2016)</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met            34 out of 45 were found acceptable for a 75.5% success rate. As 5 were plagiarized--thus rendered invalid--and 10 were not submitted, our numbers were changed from 60 essays to 45. (05/16/2014)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> J. Simon, N. Currey</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> This while acceptable based on our criteria, was our lowest success rate. This is understandable as MLA documentation is a new skill at 53C. However, we will make the recommendation to the department that MLA be introduced in 53B and more emphasis be placed on it in 53C as a means of better preparing 53C students for success in this category. (06/01/2015)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies  <b>Follow-Up:</b> For our PLO assessment, an action was proposed to revise the COR for 53B to include introduction of MLA. (10/14/2015)</p>
	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment - College-Level Academic Essay</b>  <b>Standard and Target for Success:</b>            70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this SLO.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met            Out of the 122 students assessed, 110 rated as acceptable on SLO 3 for a 90% success rate. 12 students rated as unacceptable on this SLO. Along with including textual evidence, instructors also focussed on MLA citation format at the same time. The results reflect a 5% increase since the last assessment and a 15% increase since the assessment taking place two years ago (Spring 2015).</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Given the very high success rate for this SLO, the department should continue to ensure consistency by meeting with both adjuncts and full-timers every semester. (09/11/2017)  <b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>(09/11/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Allison Carr, Greta Hendricks, Grace Shibata, Eric Takamine</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>91% of students assessed met the minimum requirement for SLO 3. This is an increase from last year. All 53C students have been trained in how to document sources both in-text and using a works cited page. Also, instructors are introducing MLA format to students in 53A and 53B. (09/15/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Allison Carr</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Nancy Currey, Jenny Simon, Jelena Savina, Grace Shibata</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching practices. (09/15/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Faculty continue to teach the skills associated with this SLO with strong results (90% in Spring 2017). (09/11/2017)</p>
<p><b>SLO #4</b> - Students will demonstrate correct grammar and sentence structure.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017), 2017-18 (Spring 2018), 2018-19 (Spring 2019), 2019-20 (Spring 2020)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 12/10/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - College-Level Academic Essay</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b></p> <p>70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this SLO.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Spring 2019)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>77 out of 94 students met the goal of this SLO. This is above the minimum goal set for the SLO, but it is the lowest score out of the four SLOs assessed in this cycle. There were four sections of students assessed on this cycle, and in three out of the four sections, the students did well on this SLO. However, in one section 9 out of 26 students did not exhibit correct grammar and sentence structure on the assessment. It could be that the students in this section began the semester with weaker grammatical proficiency. Or, it could be that the instructor did not give enough help to students with their grammar. Or, it could be that sense each instructor evaluated her or his students' grammar on the assessment, that the instructor for this course was stricter in his judgment of what constituted correct grammar and sentence structure. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 82</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon and Matt Kline</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Valerie Lernihan and Greta Hendricks</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Only one section of students performed somewhat poorly on this SLO. However, it is not clear why. It could be the students' proficiency levels prior to entering the course; it could be the grammar instruction during the semester; or, it could be the fact that the instructor assessed only his students and may have been a stricter grader than his peers when it came to grammar.</p> <p>Therefore, in the future there should be one rubric used by all the instructors to evaluate how well students meet the SLO. (08/30/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> Continue current teaching</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>(Spring 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>Out of 143 students evaluated, 124 (87%) were successful in this SLO. Instructors mentioned various strategies such as practice grammar exercises online and in the textbook, reviewing classmates' errors, error logs, and having students focus on problem areas. (09/14/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 87</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jenny Simon; Allison Carr; Grace Shibata; Valerie Lernihan</p>	<p>practices. (09/14/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>85% of students assessed met the minimum standard for SLO 4 (104 out of 122 students). Grammar and sentence structure are ongoing challenges for ESL students. These results have been consistent for the past three assessment cycles. Use of the Writing Center grammar workshops for students with repeat errors, in-class use of error logs throughout the semester, and repeated instruction in how to fix the errors all contributed to the success rate. (09/11/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jenny Simon</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Allison Carr, Greta Hendricks, Grace Shibata, Eric Takamine</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Given the very high success rate for this SLO, the department should continue to ensure consistency by meeting with both adjuncts and full-timers every semester. (09/11/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>85% of students assessed met the minimum standard for SLO 4. Grammar and sentence structure are ongoing challenges for ESL students. These results have been consistent for the past two assessment cycles. Use of the Writing Center grammar workshops for students with repeat errors, in-class use of error logs throughout the semester, and repeated instruction in how to fix the errors all contributed to the success rate. (09/15/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Allison Carr</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Nancy Currey, Jenny Simon, Jelena Savina, Grace Shibata</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching, curriculum, and assessment practices. (09/15/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Faculty continue to teach these grammar skills with consistently high results (Spring 2017, 85%). (09/11/2017)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>86% (43/50) students demonstrated correct grammar and sentence structure. This is in keeping with results from spring 14, at 86.6%. Sentence structure errors, such as fragment, comma splice, and run-on were at a minimum. Teachers generally attribute success in this area to three things: required Writing Center workshop for students with repeat errors, semester-long error log/analysis activity, and explicit repeated instruction of how to fix the errors.</p> <p>Grammar errors are more difficult to analyze as they vary widely. Among the global errors are shifts in tense and point of view as well as wrong use of verb forms. (09/24/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> N. Currey</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> R. Loya, D. Mochidome, S. Nozaki, B. Pereyra, G. Shibata, J. Simon</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with current teaching, curriculum, and assessment practices. (09/28/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The department continues to teach this SLO successfully (see 2016 results). (09/14/2016)</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Spring 2014)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>39 out of 45 were found acceptable for 86.6% success rate. As 5 were plagiarized--thus rendered invalid--and 10 were not submitted, our numbers were changed from 60 essays to 45. (05/16/2014)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> E. Uyemura</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> J. Simon, N. Currey</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> No action in teaching, curriculum, program or SLO is necessary. (06/01/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The department continues to teach the SLO successfully (see 2015 results). (09/14/2016)</p>