

# Assessment: Course Four Column

Fall 2018



## El Camino: Course SLOs (HSA) - Educational Development

### ECC: EDEV 11:Writing and Reading for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																		
<p><b>SLO #1 WH Questions</b> - Student will locate answers to WH-Questions (who/what, do-what, where, when, why, &amp; how).</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 11/08/2013</p>	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - There were two tests given. One was a pre-test and the other was a post-test. Both tests were in the multiple choice format.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> Students will pass the test at least at the 70% accuracy level.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Fall 2013)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Not Met</p> <p>Two short stories were given. They were to answer WH-questions at the end of each story. The pre-test consisted 8 multiple-choice questions while the post-test consisted 10 (MC) questions.</p> <p>First test (pre-test) – 6 students present, one absent.</p> <table><tr><th>Question #</th><th># of wrong answers in each Q</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>2</td></tr></table> <p>Out of 6 students, 3 passed with 70% accuracy. For those 3 students that did not pass with 70%, it was anticipated that two would not to pass due to their minimal language skills (which falls most likely at the 1st or 2nd grade reading level) while the other student was quite a surprise because this student had excellent communication skills and he should</p>	Question #	# of wrong answers in each Q	1	2	2	3	3	2	4	3	5	1	6	1	7	3	8	2	<p><b>Action:</b> Looking at the results of the assessments, it has been determined that the answer choices following the reading material may not have been clear enough for this group of students. So, next time this type of assessment will occur, a different reading material and answer questions will be provided. (05/01/2014)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The assessment questions have been changed and a different story has been used since this previous test and it was noticeable that the students were able to understand the questions better. (12/13/2018)</p>
Question #	# of wrong answers in each Q																				
1	2																				
2	3																				
3	2																				
4	3																				
5	1																				
6	1																				
7	3																				
8	2																				

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																						
		<p>have been able to, at least, comprehend this short reading passage. He was inquired as to why he didn't do well on the pre-test and he admitted that he really did not want to be at school but would rather be working full-time instead. The instructor encouraged him to put in a little bit more effort in the class because the possibility with this student to move on to upper English classes after completing this class was evident.</p> <p>Second test (post-test) –6 students present, the one that was absent at the first test was dropped from class.</p> <table><tr><th>Question #</th><th># of wrong answers in each Q</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>2</td></tr></table> <p>The result is actually the same with the pre-test result (out of 6 students, 3 passed with 70% accuracy.) However, the three that passed, two of them got higher scores than the pre-test while one remained the same with the number of wrong/correct answers with both tests.</p> <p>Comparison between the two tests: The first test was relatively easier to read and easier to locate the answers from the passage. The second test was slightly longer in text and a bit more challenging to find the answers, requiring some inference thinking. However, the instructor's expectation for students passing both tests were 70% and out of the 12 students (3+3 total for both tests), only 6 (3+3 total of getting below 70%) equates to 50%. This did not meet the expectation of the teacher. This was half of the class that did not pass both tests. However, with those that did pass, it was evident that progress was made with these</p>	Question #	# of wrong answers in each Q	1	2	2	5	3	3	4	1	5	4	6	2	7	3	8	1	9	4	10	2	
Question #	# of wrong answers in each Q																								
1	2																								
2	5																								
3	3																								
4	1																								
5	4																								
6	2																								
7	3																								
8	1																								
9	4																								
10	2																								

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>students by the time they took the post-test.</p> <p>Out of the 8 questions for the pre-test, it was noted that the number of wrong answer was widely dispersed and equally. So, this indicated that the students all had similar understanding of the questions. As the instructor, looking at the questions, the fourth question was probably the most difficult to answer because the question itself was not really clear and the answer choices were very vague. Out of the 10 questions for the post-test, it was noted that question #2 had the highest number of errors. The question was rather easy to answer and the answer was evident in the passage, however, it required the students to think about the order the event happened. Perhaps, the students were expected to see more of “chronological order” from beginning to the end. The passage was actually in sequential order, but not in the order of the first, second, and so on. The answer to #2 was actually in the middle of the passage where other events that had happened first was at the end of the semester. This writing style of the author probably threw the students off. (02/07/2014) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jaymie Collette</p> <p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2013-14 (Fall 2013) <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met see report (01/28/2014) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jaymie Collette</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Looking at the results of the assessments, it has been determined that the answer choices following the reading material may not have been clear enough for this group of students. So, next time this type of assessment will occur, a different reading material and answer questions will be provided. (09/30/2014) <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The assessment questions have been changed and a different story has been used since this previous test and it was</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - Two short stories were given to the students of Educational Development Reading class as a pre-test and a post-test to assess their reading comprehension. They were to answer WH-questions at the end of each story. Both tests consisted 10 fill-in-the-blank questions.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> Students will pass both tests with at least 70% accuracy.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>All five students passed the pre-test with 70% accuracy. Three students got 90% while the other two got 80%. For the second test, two students passed at the 70% percentile. One student passed at the 80% and the other two at the 90%. Result is all five students passed with at least 70% accuracy.</p> <p>Comparison between the two tests: the first test was relatively easier to read and easier to locate the answers in the passage. There was a couple inference questions. This posed a bit of a challenge since these students were accustomed to finding concrete answers in the passage. The second test was slightly longer in text and a bit more challenging to locate answers. There were a couple inference questions as well. With this test, the students did better on the inference questions than with the pre-test. (12/08/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Jaymie Collette</p>	<p>noticeable that the students were able to understand the questions better. (12/13/2018)</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Change the test format. Use different stories that is more appropriate with their frame of reference. Maybe eliminate the inference questions and teach more on that specific skill. (10/17/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The assessment questions have been changed and a different story has been used since this previous test and it was noticeable that the students were able to understand the questions better. No inference questions were included in this assessment. (12/13/2018)</p>
	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - A reading comprehension - short story was given as part of the final exam. Answers were in the multiple choice format.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> At least 70% of the class, students will pass at the 70% accuracy level.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>A short essay on Harriet Tubman was given and following the story had 10 multiple choice questions. All questions covered each of the WH Q, including 'how'.</p> <p>Out of the 9 students who were present to take the assessment, 7 students passed with 70% accuracy. The remaining two students who did not fell at the 60%.</p> <p>2 - 60% 2 - 70% 2 - 80% 2 - 90% 1 - 100% (12/13/2018)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Maybe give out the assessment earlier in the semester and then increase the reading level should the students do well early on. (12/13/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

**Faculty Assessment Leader:** Jaymie Collette

**SLO #3 Drafting** - Students will demonstrate the prewriting and drafting steps of the writing process.  
**Course SLO Status:** Active  
**Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2018-19 (Fall 2018), 2020-21 (Fall 2020)  
**Input Date:** 01/21/2014

**Exam/Test/Quiz** - A blank graphic organizer worksheet was provided to the students where they would write down in their knowledge of the pre-writing process of writing the 5-paragraph essay. The picture on the worksheet was of a hamburger where the top bun represented the topic sentence and the three ingredients inside the buns represented three details supporting the main idea and finally the bottom part, which was the bottom bun, which represented the conclusion.

The students were not to be responsible for edited and revised stage at this point but they were to indicate knowledge and understanding of the different portions of the hamburger and accurately put in information in its designated places.

**Standard and Target for Success:** At least 70% of the class, students will successfully answer at least four of the five-part essay sections of the test.

**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2018-19 (Fall 2018)  
**Standard Met?** : Standard Met  
 Every one of the 9 students who took the assessment were able to accurately answer all five parts of the 5-paragraph essay pre-writing test. Though many of them did not write a complete topic sentence. All of them wrote at least 2-3 sentences in the detail boxes. All wrote something in the conclusion. All had the right idea of how to jot down their ideas in the appropriate places on the worksheet. However, should this assessment be more formalized, such as being at a revision or final edition stage, they all need a lot of work/improvement. But, being at the drafting/pre-writing stage, they all understood the concept and were able to put down a lot of great ideas on their worksheets. (12/13/2018)  
**Faculty Assessment Leader:** Jaymie Collette

**Action:** Maybe try a different graphic organizer or have the students show their ability to brainstorm and write down their drafting ideas on a blank sheet of paper, without guidance as seen on the previous assessment. (12/13/2018)  
**Action Category:** Teaching Strategies

# ECC: EDEV 140:Assisted Computer Literacy

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #1 Word Document</b> - Students will create a properly formatted word document</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 01/21/2014</p>	<p><b>Multiple Assessments</b> - Lab assignments, exams, and final project</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> It is expected that 80% of the students will be 75% successful as per their lab assignments, exams, and final project</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2016-17 (Fall 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Not Met</p> <p>Eleven students were enrolled but 2 students did not complete the final project and were not able to be evaluated. Of the remaining students, 56% of evaluated students met criteria with scores of 75% or higher. (01/11/2017)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Tiffanie Lau</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Instructor may want to consider introducing topics/skills through earlier assignments in order to give students additional practice time. With greater frequency throughout the semester, students should be able to master skills for the final project. (01/11/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Beginning Spring 2017, Instructor has introduced topics/ skills earlier and has provided more opportunities to practice formatting word documents. Also, instead of having students create a final project, instructor has been evaluating student skills throughout the semester with multiple assessments (lab assignments and exams.) (04/02/2018)</p>
	<p><b>Multiple Assessments</b> - Two assessments were given several weeks apart. One assessment was an assignment at the end of the MS Word section. Students were to answer several questions and format the document according to the specifications. The second assessment was part of the lab final exam where students had to reformat a document.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> It was expected that 70% of students</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Not Met</p> <p>In the MS Word Review assignment, 3 of 5 students completed the assignment. All 3 (100%) were able to complete the assignment with a score of 80% or higher.</p> <p>In the Lab Final, 4 out of 5 students completed the MS Word portion. Only 1 student (25%) was able to complete the exam with a score of 70% or higher. (12/18/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 57</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Tiffanie Lau</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Tiffanie Lau</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> The analysis shows that students were able to meet the SLO on the review assignment because they had just completed the section. Student retained the information long enough and had sufficient and continued practice throughout the section. The last few weeks of the semester, we move away from MS Word and discuss alternate educational technologies. We do not review or discuss MS Word until the final</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

were able to properly format an MS Word document 70% of the time.

review. In future semesters, I can have the students continue to practice and review formatting techniques while discussing the different alternate educational technologies. (02/11/2019)  
**Action Category:** Teaching Strategies

## ECC: EDEV 33:Specific Learning Strategies

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #3 Memory Strategies</b> - Students will identify mnemonic devices for improving memory of academic content.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 11/08/2013</p>	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - Students will answer questions on a quiz about mnemonic devices and identify/recognize different types of mnemonic devices.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> It is expected that 70% of students will score 75% or higher on these questions.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Twenty-three students participated in a quiz which included 3 questions about mnemonic devices. 88% of the students answered all three of the questions correctly. The questions required the students to identify the purpose of mnemonic devices, as well as identifying two common types of mnemonic devices. (11/28/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 88</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Kathryn Holmes</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Throughout the semester, I will encourage students to create mnemonic devices to assist in recalling content. Students can do this individually, or in small groups as a class activity. (11/28/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>
	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - Students will answer questions on a quiz about the meaning of the term, mnemonic devices, and various types of mnemonic devices. Questions will be posed in True/False, multiple choice, or fill in the blank formats.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> 70%</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>This SLO has been met. Out of 28 students, 26 students were able to answer questions on a quiz about the meaning of the term, mnemonic devices, and provided examples of various types of mnemonic devices. Questions were posed in True/False, multiple choice, and fill in the blank formats. 2 students did not pass the class due to missing work and attendance issues. This was evidenced via homework, classwork, and 4 tests that were given in class, as well as the final research project and presentation. As the instructor, I modeled how to complete the task, and I offered 1:1 computer lab assistance, which really helped with meeting this SLO. Students were also given instruction in proper MLA format, which they can carry on to other classes and disciplines. (12/15/2017)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 80</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Dr. Patricia Gray</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> As the instructor, I modeled how to complete the task, and I offered 1:1 computer lab assistance, which really helped with meeting this SLO. Students were also given instruction in proper MLA format, which they can carry on to other classes and disciplines. I recommend this be continued. (03/02/2018)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> 03/04/19 (03/04/2019)</p>
		<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Spring 2016)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>The quiz included 5 questions about mnemonic devices and overall, 71% of the questions were answered correctly. The students scored higher on the questions presented in either True/False or multiple choice formats. (03/29/2016)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Based on the weaker responses in the fill in the blank questions, I will incorporate more verbal discussion in the classroom review of this topic. Students appear to recognize the meaning of mnemonic devices, but have</p>



<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Kathryn Holmes</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> n/a</p>	<p>difficulty discussing the use of them. (03/29/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Lectures in general have included more emphasis on the application of content learned in each chapter. While teaching mnemonic devices, I have had students create mnemonic devices in small groups and identify which type of device they created. While teaching other topics, I have incorporated the concept of mnemonics as a study tool. Scores on the quiz on mnemonics improved to some degree. Scores on general non True/False questions have improved overall. (12/08/2016)</p>

# ECC: EDEV 35:Reading Skills for Students with Learning Differences

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #2 Main Idea</b> - Students will describe various techniques to determine the author's main idea.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 11/08/2013</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - In a written assignment the students will compare and contrast two techniques for identifying the authors main idea.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> In the written assignment submitted 80% of the students will accurately reflect 80% of the techniques presented in the text and lecture.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>31 students submitted the assignment. 26 (85%) of the students achieved the required 80% of the techniques. Pretty good outcome for a majority of the students considering the learning challenges. (02/04/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Bill Hoanzl</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> A supplemental instruction lab that includes computer practice and targets main ideas will benefit many students. (02/27/2017)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> Students attended the lab once a week to complete practice exercise. This should be continued. (03/07/2017)</p>
	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment</b> - the students had to read a reasonably understandable article that Julie Land condensed/abridged from PracticalMoneySkills.com about how to choose what car to buy. The main idea was that choosing a car to buy is a big decision, requiring that the buyer know his/her needs as a driver and know what s/he can handle financially. The class took turns reading the article aloud, then completed the graphic organizer individually.</p> <p>There were two sets of supporting details. The first, re: knowing one's needs as a driver, included the "where," as in the usual weather and type of road surfaces anticipated for driving, how far the usual driving distance(s) might be, who the usual passengers might be (kids, clients, etc.) and how much storage space might be needed.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Not Met</p> <p>Section 4261 - 15 of 23 students took the assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 students earned a score of 6</li> <li>1 student earned a score of 5</li> <li>5 students earned a score of 4</li> <li>5 students earned a score of 3.5</li> </ul> <p>10 out of 15 (67%) students who took assessment earned a score of 4 or more.</p> <p>Section 4262 - 11 of 12 students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 students earned a score of 6</li> <li>3 students earned a score of 5.5</li> <li>1 student earned a score of 4.5</li> <li>3 students earned a score of 3.5</li> <li>2 students earned a score of 3</li> </ul> <p>6 out of 11 (55%) students who took the assessment earned a score of 4 or more.</p> <p>Analysis points to lack of decoding skills, partly due to disability and partly due to ESL issues. Also, in previous semesters, the class has been using a program hosted on the Santa Monica College website called Reading for Understanding. This semester, RFU was under construction and was not available to us. Mr. Hill and I scrambled during</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Having a lab classroom available to use at the start of the semester is crucial (not 2-3 weeks into the semester). Several of the students mentioned that they do not have access to a computer outside of campus which minimizes their ability to practice with the online programs to build reading fluency.</p> <p>I hope to use one individualized reading program (either RFU (if available), Total Reader, or another program) throughout the semester. (02/11/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p> <p><b>Action:</b> What we can do in future semesters is to introduce the concept of main ideas and supporting details earlier in the semester. I introduced and discussed these concepts the last 4 weeks of the semester. We can</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>The second set included knowing how much cash one has available for a down-payment and how high a car payment one can handle each month, keeping in mind that there will be gas, repair, and insurance costs.</p> <p>The rubric is below; the target was that 70% of the class would reach at least 4.0  6.0 = thorough answer for Main Idea and for both sets of Supporting Details  5.5 = only a partial response on the Main Idea, but thorough answers re: the Supporting Details  5.0 = thorough answer on the Main Idea, but one of the Supporting Detail answers only partially given.  4.5 = thorough answer on the Main Idea, but both of the Support Detail answers only partially given.  4.0 = Partial answer for Main Idea; partial for both sets of Sup</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b>  The target is 70% of the class would earn at least a 4 according to a rubric.</p>	<p>the first few weeks to find another compatible individualized reading program. Neither one of us felt comfortable asking students to pay for a subscription for a reading program because it was not listed as a requirement on our syllabus nor with the bookstore.</p> <p>I used the free version of a website called Newsela, but students were not able to take the assessment and read the articles to their specific reading level. Mr. Hill was able to negotiate a 10 week trial for Reading Plus. Both classes were able to use this program for the last 7 weeks of the semester. It was a great program that assessed individual students skills in reading fluency, reading comprehension, and vocabulary. After the assessment, students were able to work on tailored assignments in the three areas. While the program was a great addition, many students reported no computer access off campus, which minimized their ability to practice skill building outside of class.  (12/18/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 62  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Tiffanie Lau  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Tiffanie Lau, Jerell Hill</p>	<p>give students more opportunity to practice finding main ideas through readings.</p> <p>We can present the concept of main ideas with a different approach by giving the students lists of easily understood general or supporting statements and have them come up with the main idea.</p> <p>Students need more time to write and develop an understanding of the language transfer as it relates to the reading and writing process.  (02/11/2019)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

## ECC: EDEV 37:Increased Learning Performance: English

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p><b>SLO #2 Five-step writing process -</b> Students will utilize the five-step writing process: pre-writing, planning, drafting, revising, proofreading.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 08/24/2015</p>	<p><b>Essay/Written Assignment - :</b> Students will utilize the five-step writing process: pre-writing, planning, drafting, revising, and proofreading</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> Based on Percentages: It is expected that 70% of students will score 70% or above on this SLO.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Met</p> <p>This 10-item True—False Quiz was administered in three sections of EDEV 37, a one-unit support class for students with disabilities enrolled in a wide range of El Camino College English classes, either Reading or Writing, or in both Reading and Writing. The specific levels of Writing classes represented included English B (two levels below the AA and Transfer), English A (one level below the AA and Transfer), English 1A (Freshman Comp, for AA and Transfer) and English 1C (Critical Thinking, for Transfer). The Reading levels served by EDEV 37 included English B (upper elementary school level), English 82 (middle school level), and English 84 (high school level). EDEV 37 is slated for students with disabilities; however, what may co-exist with a student's given disability is the process of English acquisition, i.e., there may be some students who could still be considered second language learners. For the foregoing reasons, the ten True-False items were read aloud. Students were also permitted to refer to their handout b/c the Five Steps of the Writing Process had first been introduced in Week 1; by contrast, the SLO Assessment was conducted in Week 14.</p> <p>NOTE: there can be no meaningful correlation established between the students' current English class levels and their scores on the SLO Assessment because, as mentioned above, some students are taking a Reading class, only; some are taking a Writing class, only, and others are taking both. Each section of EDEV 37 may have a dramatically different make-up of students in terms of their current level English or ESL class(es), their skills, and their past achievements in Reading and/or Writing. There is no way to predict or control the levels of English classes which may be represented in EDEV 37 from one semester to the next. Therefore, the SLO Assessment Results have been combined, i.e., for a total of 33 students in three sections of</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> EDEV 37 MUST have its own dedicated classroom / computer lab so that these classes may no longer need to keep switching locations from on class meeting to the next, which is the situation at this writing. The lab MUST be furnished with assistive technology, such as Inspiration Software, JAWS for students who are blind, etc. Program / College Support.</p> <p>Enter Date here F' 19</p> <p>Item #8: Give students a sample paragraph full of grammar, punctuation and spelling errors. Have them proofread three times, once for each category.</p> <p>Teaching Strategies Enter Date here F' 19</p> <p>Item #9: Give students two versions of a sample writing passage which has spelling errors. The misspelled words in the second version will have been corrected by Spell-Check; however, the wrong words have surfaced, with possibly embarrassing results. Emphasize that the correct spelling of a word relies on context as well as on spelling rules.</p> <p>Teaching Strategies. Enter</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>EDEV 37 who took the assessment. All three sections received the same handout and same lecture, which included the visual of five nested cups to represent the process of “refining” as a writer moves from Step 1 through Step 5 of the Writing Process. To clarify the numbers: sixteen out of eighteen in sec. 4269 (Land, Tu.) completed the assessment, as did eight out of fourteen students in sec. 4270 (Collette, Wed.) and nine out of eighteen in sec. 4271 (Collette, Wed.), administered on the day before Thanksgiving, hence the somewhat low attendance in the two Wednesday sections.</p> <p>Although the target was met, i.e., 70% of the students got at least 70% (seven out of ten questions correct), the pattern of errors was uniform; items 8 and 9 were missed most, i.e., if errors were made, the errors were on those two items most of the time. These errors (on items 8 and 9) were related to the issue of proofreading and to the issue of relying too heavily on Spell Check. Students should ideally proofread three times, not just once, i.e., using three different filters, one each time: grammar, spelling, and punctuation, thus, proofreading three times. Students should also be wary of relying on Spell Check, exclusively, to correct their spelling errors, i.e., students must be aware that context drives the spelling of many words. There were also consistent errors made on items 2, 3, and 4, all of which have to do with having realistic expectations when writing a paper. The Action Plan, below, indicates suggested remedies to address these five errors (items 8 &amp; 9, and items 2, 3, &amp; 4). (03/04/2019) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Julie Land <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Jamie Collette</p>	<p>Date here F’ 19</p> <p>Items 2, 3, and 4 (having realistic expectations when writing a paper): There is no one particular activity or separate handout for these three items. Rather, instructors must emphasize in their lecture that the Five Steps of the Writing Process are a framework, not a guarantee (item #2), that in the brainstorming process, ideas should be permitted to flow with no judgement or censure (item 3), and that in a rough draft, there is typically no requirement for complete sentences or perfect spelling (item 4). Teaching Strategies Enter Date here F’ 19</p> <p>(10/01/2019) <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

## ECC: EDEV 38:Increased Learning Performance: Mathematics

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #2 Use the appropriate mathematical formula</b> - Students will use the appropriate mathematical formula or procedure to solve the given math problem.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 08/24/2015</p>	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - Students were given a 10 T/F question assessment.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> It is expected that 70% of the class will get 70% of the assessment (7 out of 10 questions )correct.</p> <p><b>Additional Information:</b> All 3 Ed Dev38 sections were given the same assessment.</p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met? :</b> Standard Not Met</p> <p>Section 4273 - 36% met Section 4274 - 71% met Section 4276 - 81% met</p> <p>For all sections, the items most frequently missed items were 6 and 9, i.e., multiplication of fractions and the undefined fraction. Both items are language-intense. I believe that if the students who missed those two answers had given themselves a sample problem, they would have gotten the correct answer. (12/17/2018)</p> <p><b>% of Success for this SLO:</b> 65</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Tiffanie Lau</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Tiffanie Lau, Julie Land, Jerell Hill</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Another action is to emphasize the importance of having students read the item aloud, at least twice (which we do for mini-lessons on word problems), and ask themselves what the words really mean. If they are not sure, they should make up a sample problem for themselves. Having additional time to practice math applications would help students' understand the need to transfer skills from the classroom to the workforce. (02/11/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> The students would benefit from more lab time to target specific skills like number sense, and mathematical reasoning. (02/11/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p>