

# Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



## El Camino: PLOs (HUM) - English

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>PLO #3 Transfer Level Composition -</b> Students will create a thesis-driven, coherent, unified, and well-developed essay in MLA format that demonstrates reading and writing competence at the transfer level.</p> <p><b>PLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>PLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 07/01/2013</p>	<p><b>Multiple Assessments -</b> Review SLO assessment data for aligned courses.</p> <p><b>Standard and Rubric:</b> A minimum of 70% of students will meet the course SLOs, though rates in the 80-90% range are preferable.</p>	<p><b>Semester of Current Assessment:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met:</b> Standard Met</p> <p>All transfer level composition courses demonstrated success rates of 84% or higher, with the only exception of English 1C's spring 2016 assessment of SLO 3, which had a success rate of 79%. Even with this one exception, all scores are well above the division goal of 70% success rate. Overall, instructors attribute these high rates of success to early introduction of concepts in the semester, multiple opportunities to write thesis-driven essays throughout the semester, and extensive practice with in-class and out-of-class work, writing workshops, and conferences.</p> <p>However, as the previous PLO assessment observed, English 1C's spring 2016 SLO 3 score of 79% is noteworthy. This is an 8% decrease in grammar proficiency from English 1A (Fall 2015), which means that students who are passing SLO 3 in English 1A are not passing SLO 3 in English 1C. English 1C instructors recommend a survey for all current English 1C instructors to determine which grammar errors are most common, and then advise English 1A instructors to emphasize the correction of those errors.</p> <p>Overall, instructors noted these high success rates are due to brown bags throughout the semester where instructors share best practices with each other. However, the writers of this report anticipate that the data for student success will look very different in upcoming semesters because of the implementation of AB-705. To help instructors</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> As stated above, the Faculty Learning Teams will help instructors collaborate to create and share best practices. The Teachers' Lounge will hopefully be a well-utilized space for full-time and part-time instructors to help them navigate the AB-705 classroom. (03/15/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>anticipate the AB-705 classroom, the division's new SITE coordinators created The Teachers' Lounge, a collaborative space for instructors to share lessons. Additionally, the creation of Faculty Learning Communities (which have replaced Learning Teams) foster instructor-based inquiry into issues affecting their teaching. Each FLC will present their findings in the form of brown bag presentations so all faculty can continue to learn from each other. We hope that these actions will support instructors throughout the transition from AB-705 so that transfer-level composition courses will continue to have high success rates.</p> <p>(03/15/2019)  <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Stephanie Merz  <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Stephanie Merz, Elayne Kelley, and Rachel Williams  <b>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment:</b> English 1A, 1AH, 1B, 1BH, 1C, 1CH</p> <hr/> <p><b>Semester of Current Assessment:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)  <b>Standard Met:</b> Standard Met          PLO 3 requires an examination of how well the program prepares its students to write "thesis-driven, coherent, unified, and well developed essays in MLA format that demonstrates reading and writing competence at the transfer level."          With the exception of the English 1C's Fall 2014 assessment of SLO 3 which found only 70% of the students acceptable, all other assessments involving PLO 3 revealed a success rate higher than 83%. while the numbers certainly affirm that the time spent on teaching the numerous elements of college composition yield positive outcomes, a closer look at some data indicates a need for continued improvement in particular areas. That is, the assessment in the literature courses English 28, 35, 36, 42 and 44 evaluated a maximum of 15 students in each course; English 1B assessed 86 students whereas English 1C assessed 224 students; hence, the low success rate of the larger number of students is concerning.          English 1C's SLO 3 assesses students' ability to "organize an essay in proper MLA format and will also be technically</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> We should consider changes to English 1C and 1B's COR to include some review instruction on the aforementioned problem areas. We should consider creating a new capstone assessment tool in English 1A. Perhaps we should assess students' writing in response to an in-class prompt to assure that our assessments are truly based on students' abilities and not the helps they received during the revision process. We can also take steps to improve students abilities in this area through the workshops aligned with the Consistency Project. (04/06/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Curriculum Changes</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>correct in paragraph composition, sentence structure, grammar, grammar, spelling and usage." The acquirement of these skills is essential. The success rate of 70% when juxtaposed with an 87% success rate for students in the prerequisite course, English 1A's SLO 3, indicates a noteworthy decline. To clarify, English 1A's SLO 3 essentially assesses the same skills measured in 1C's SLO 3. Certainly, expected outcomes in English 1C are higher, but not appreciably in the areas of paragraph and sentence structure, MLA formatting and grammar. In fact, because these aforementioned skills are taught in English 1A, little time is devoted to the teaching of these skills in English 1C. (04/06/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debra Breckheimer</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> All faculty in the department who teach the applicable courses contributed to the SLO data.</p> <p><b>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment:</b> English 1A, 1B, 1C, 28, 35, 36, 42, 44, and Humanities 1</p>	

# Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



## El Camino: PLOs (HUM) - ESL

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>PLO #1 Mastery of Listening and Speaking Skills</b> - Upon completion of the CREDIT ESL program, students will have the listening and speaking skills to successfully complete English 1A.</p> <p><b>PLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>PLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 03/17/2015</p>	<p><b>Multiple Assessments</b> - Review of the SLO data for ESL 51A, 51B, 51C</p> <p><b>Standard and Rubric:</b> 70% of students in each course will succeed on each of the course SLOs.</p>	<p><b>Semester of Current Assessment:</b> 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p><b>Standard Met:</b> Standard Met</p> <p>For ESL 51A from 2015-2018, SLO 1 had a 92% success rate, SLO 2 had a 93% success rate, and SLO 4 had a 94% success rate. This far exceeds the goal of 70% that was listed as the standard. During the same time period, ESL 51B SLO 1 had an 82% success rate, SLO 2 had 95% success rate, SLO 3 had an 89% success rate, and SLO 4 had an 83% success rate. Again this is well above the 70% goal; we attribute this slight decline compared to the 51A course to the fact that 51B has more stringent expectations and the concepts are more challenging. ESL 51C SLO 1 and 2 had a 99% success rate, SLO 3 had a 93% success rate, and SLO 4 had a 97% success rate. This class tends to be smaller and is a single class being evaluated; it also tends to be filled by students who have been here for several semesters and have been able to build fluency in their English.</p> <p>The numbers consistently show success and the patterns are very similar across the levels, regardless of year taught or instructor teaching. For ESL 51B, in 2017 SLO 4 did show a slight dip in success with 67% achieving proficiency where a listening cloze exercise was used to assess. It was determined that more practice with this type of exercise was needed. The overall success can be attributed to the usage of the same textbook and consistency with the delivery of material.</p> <p>(03/11/2019)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> We will continue to share materials and ideas within our department to foster student success. We can also start to build an online repository of materials through a shared folder system like Dropbox or Google Docs. We can also implement more Listening Log activities at all levels and include discussions in class about things the students have listened to. We can also continue to build interest in the 51C level, which can result in students receiving a certificate and also being better prepared for lecture courses with native speakers.</p> <p>(03/11/2019)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Evelyn Uyemura and Allison Carr</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Debra Mochidome, Grace Shibata, Jennifer Holt-Molina, Nitza LLado, Greta Hendricks, and Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment:</b> ESL 51A, B, and C</p>	
		<p><b>Semester of Current Assessment:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met:</b> Standard Met</p> <p>Overall, the SLO assessments for the ESL 51 course series had success rates surpassing the minimum 70% success rate standard. ESL 51B and 51C students' success rates were in the 88-100% range In in the areas of pronunciation, listening comprehension, and appropriate responses to aural input.</p> <p>At the same time, while ESL 51A students' success rate for speeches was very good, at 88%, their success rates were lower, at 76%, for each of these 3 areas: pronunciation, listening comprehension, and appropriate responses to aural input. It must be noted that 51A does not have a "floor"; thus, the 51A student population includes students who come in with a wide range of proficiency levels from those who have the most basic English-language skills to those who are proficient yet feel the need to "start at the beginning." This diversity of students' proficiency levels may have contributed to the lower success rates.</p> <p>In addition, at 78%, the 51C students' speech success rate was lower than those of the 51A and 51B students. In the most recent 51C SLO report, it was noted that an 8-10-minute speech given by 30 or more students may take up too much class time and that more time should be allotted beforehand for students to gather information and prepare for their speeches. Students in this class also expressed a desire for shorter, more frequent assignments completed either individually or in groups. (09/10/2015)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Debra Mochidome</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Evelyn Uyemura</p> <p><b>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment:</b> ESL 51A, ESL</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> The ESL department should consider the possibility of offering additional midday sections of 51A, 51B, and 51C to better serve the needs of students coming from the local community. (12/11/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Removing 51B SLO #4-- recognizing and correct meanings of common American idioms-- should be considered. Idioms in context are covered within the units in Pronunciation Celebration (Uyemura, Llado, and Mochidome 2011), the text used by the majority of 51B instructors, and therefore, do not need to be treated as separate components of the course content. A preliminary step in this process would involve examining its alignment with 51B's Course Objectives. (12/11/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The ESL faculty has discussed the possibility of making 51 series courses required courses for students pursuing the proposed "ESL Certificate." The</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		51B, ESL 51C	<p>ESL Certificate is currently in the approval process. (12/11/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p><b>Action:</b> In 51B and 51C, we will continue to do whatever works well pedagogically. For 51C, the number, scope, and duration of speech assignments should be re-examined and modified to better suit students'--and their instructor's--needs To better serve the needs of our 51A student, looking into additional activities, strategies, and methods of assessment would improve students' overall proficiency. For example, more listening comprehension activities could be added to those already in place, and more role-playing activities could enhance students' ability to respond appropriately to aural input. (09/14/2015)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

# Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



## El Camino: PLOs (HUM) - Journalism

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>PLO #1 Journalistic Content</b> - Use news judgment to select, produce and publish journalistic content. <b>PLO Status:</b> Active <b>PLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) <b>Input Date:</b> 10/31/2013</p>	<p><b>Multiple Assessments</b> - We reviewed SLO data from aligned courses to establish the number of acceptable and unacceptable results. We identified and described trends in the analysis of successful SLOs and actions plans in unacceptable. <b>Standard and Rubric:</b> Multifactorial data assessment was used. We aim is to achieve 70 percent success on all SLOs assessed.</p>	<p><b>Semester of Current Assessment:</b> 2014-15 (Spring 2015) <b>Standard Met:</b> Standard Not Met Assessment of the data revealed that eleven courses has met their stated standard, while seven had not. This is a 61 percent success rate. The most consistent trends in the courses that did not meet their standard were a need for updated computers and a desperate need for program support in the form of an office staff/advertising manager/lab assistant. The seven courses that did meet their standard, four mentioned the need for increased staff support and three mentioned a need for computers. Program support, as defined earlier, and new computers are chief issues of concern. Teaching strategies are the chief reason for our success in the courses that did meet the standard. (03/11/2015) <b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Kate McLaughlin <b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Department-wide assessment <b>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment:</b> Journalism 1, 9,11 and 14</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> We will continue to plead with the institution to replace, please, our computers. We have included requests in our program review, our plan builder, our program plan, our CTEA filings, our department meetings, to the Academic Senate, to members of the technology committee, to the IT department and to others who may be able to help. We have also included new computers in our annual CTEA filing, but were denied the ability to pursue the computers through that channel.</p> <p>The same process has been attempted with regard to getting office help/lab tech. So far we have been unsuccessful in achieving that help. (12/10/2015) <b>Action Category:</b> Program/College Support</p>