

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



El Camino: PLOs (IND) - Architecture

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>PLO #3 Computer Software - Upon completion of the Architecture Program, a student will be able to use various computer software to generate various kinds of drawings to show the process of a project from Design Sketches, Massing Models, Building Perspectives to Construction Documents.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/29/2013</p>	<p>Project - Given instruction and previous criteria, projects are critiqued, assessed and evaluated for skill development.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It is expected that 80% of students will score 80% or above on this PLO.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <p>It is noted that 78% of students demonstrated increased skill levels. (03/29/2019)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Dan Richardson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Peggy Johnson</p>	<p>Action: Use lynda.com and u tube tutorials as additional teaching aids. (03/29/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



El Camino: PLOs (IND) - Auto Collision Repair and Painting

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #3 Damage Repair Estimate - Upon completion of this discipline's course of study, the student will be able to examine a damaged vehicle and create an informal written estimate of the parts, tools, materials and time needed to repair the vehicle.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2018-19 (Fall 2018), 2022-23 (Fall 2022)</p> <p>Input Date: 10/04/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Student will be able to examine a vehicle with non-structural damage to multiple major panels and (1) determine the initial point of impact. Student will then be able to write (2) an estimate or (3) a repair plan to repair the vehicle.</p> <p>Estimate will include vehicle information and an ordered list of damaged panels and parts with notation to repair, replace, refinish, etc. and include part price, labor and refinish hours, materials add-on costs, and total cost for the repair according to Mitchell estimating books/software or CCCOne software.</p> <p>Repair plans will include description or digital photo of the damage, designation of major point of impact (direct damage) and location of indirect damage. Plans will also include list of tools, parts and materials needed for repair as well as an estimate of time in hours or days needed to complete the</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Upon completion of lectures, lesson reviews and practice assignments, students were able to write a non-structural estimate of damage and calculate the total cost of repairs within the desired target of 80%.</p> <p>In ACRP 3A - The estimates were hand written and students had to capture the vehicle identification number (VIN), Year, Make, Model, Color, Mileage, License Plate, Date of Manufacture, Paint and Trim Codes. Estimates were written for specific non-structural points of impact and or refinish only.</p> <p>Using provided P-Page logic, estimating guide pages, and established labor and material rates students were able to calculate an estimated cost of repair that included; Parts, Labor, Paint supplies, Sublet services.</p> <p>Total students in class: 15 Number of students who created an acceptable estimate:13 Number of less than acceptable estimates: 2 Number of students who did not participate: 0 Student challenges: Students were challenged with grasping varying industry terminology/terms and some with the math. Not all students were from the automotive sector, so nomenclature and a basic overview of vehicle constructions had to be established. Even the advanced automotive students benefited from the review.</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement for next assessment: ACRP 3A</p>	<p>Action: Identification and access to a computer lab that's available for each class session or have designated computers for collision estimating and the ability to print. Marketing and advertising support from the college and or department. (04/30/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>repairs.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: 80% of students completing the day program (1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2A, 2B, 2C) or the night program (4A, 4B, 5A, 5B) including 20, 22, 24, and 26 should be able to complete a written estimate with a total cost within 20% of a professionally written estimate.</p> <p>Students with a mix of day and night courses uncomfortable with writing an estimate may write a repair plan and perform the repair. Success is defined as 80% of students completing the repair according to their plan and within 20% of the time allotted in the plan.</p>	<p>is an 8 week class that was offered for the first time in the fall of 2018. The availability of modern vehicles (2010 and newer) with specific damages to estimate and use as samples would aid in learning. Understanding hand written estimates is a basis for collision estimating. It's no longer relevant in mainstream collision centers. However, it provides the students with an understanding of what a computer generated estimate is calculating for them and the importance of the data being entered.</p> <p>In ACRP 3B - The estimates were written using CCC One collision estimating software. Students had to capture the vehicle identification number (VIN), Year, Make, Model, Color, Mileage, License Plate, Date of Manufacture, Paint and Trim Codes. Estimates were written for specific non-structural points of impact and or refinish only. We touched on structural estimating as well. Students were shown how to navigate within CCC One to know where to find P-Page (Motors) logic, find and enter parts in need of replacing or repair, enter the desired labor time, enter notes to aid in explaining a repair choice or procedure within the estimate. Once the necessary date was entered the students were able to preview their work and print their completed estimate.</p> <p>Total students in class: 19 Number of students who created an acceptable estimate: 15 Number of less than acceptable estimates: 4 Number of students who did not participate: 1 Student challenges: A few students were challenged with computer literacy and navigation.</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement for next assessment: ACRP 3B is an 8 week class that was offered for the first time in the fall of 2018 and followed 3A. Identification and access to a computer lab that's available for each class session or have designated computers for collision estimating and the ability to print is a must. The availability of modern vehicles</p>	

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>(2010 and newer) with specific damages to estimate and use as samples would aid in learning. as well. (02/28/2019)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: pati fairchild</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: chuck owens</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: ACRP 1A, 3A, 3B</p> <hr/> <p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <p>ACRP 1A was chosen to provide data for this assessment. 1A is an intensive beginning class that covers all areas of collision repair including tool and vehicle parts nomenclature, vehicle construction, welding, non-structural dent repair, priming, painting, and, at the end, estimating and jobs within collision repair. Although these students have just begun their ACRP studies, they provide a 'base data' group to compare future data to. Estimating is not covered in all classes and has not yet been tracked.</p> <p>Estimating used to be its own class (ACRP 3A), but it was inactivated years ago. ACRP instructors at ECC and Compton, as well as advisory members, strongly agree the class needs to be updated and reinstated if students are expected to have a well-rounded collision repair education.</p> <p>In 1A after lecturing on the topic for a week and writing individual estimates with instructor guidance, the students were asked to form 3 groups and consider the quote, "Speed, quality, price. Pick any two." Students discussed as a class how a shop that picks two might perform their work, treat a customer, and focus their talents. A shop that values speed and high quality cannot stay in business if they also have a great low price, for example. Each group was assigned two of the three, then all students were given access to an 8-year-old minimally damaged minivan. The students then had to work together to write one estimate as their shop using the Mitchell printed estimating guides for help with labor times and replacement parts costs.</p> <p>Target #1 - Determination of point of impact. 100% of students were able to do this. The hood had a small dent near the fender and the bumper had scratches on the</p>	<p>Action: Work with ACRP instructors at ECC and Compton as well as advisory committee to rewrite/update and reinstate ACRP 3A estimating class as two 8-week 3-unit classes similar to 20, 22, 24 and 26 that would lead to a 6-unit mini certificate in one semester. Class curriculum should include writing non-structural and structural damage estimates on paper using printed estimating guides and on a computer using estimating software. Curriculum should also include vehicle parts nomenclature, ASE and I-CAR repair standards, and legal rights, responsibilities and liabilities for vehicle owner, repair facility and insurance company. (09/30/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>same side of the vehicle.</p> <p>Target #2 - Writing the estimate Vehicle info: 100% of groups were able to find necessary vehicle information such as year of manufacture, make, model, body style, trim package, VIN number and license plate number.</p> <p>Ordered list of damaged parts: 100% of groups were able to correctly list damaged items from front of vehicle to rear. Groups focused on quality included color matching the fender and removing the bumper cover and painting it separately. Both of these are standard practice within the industry but may not be performed by a shop focused on low price. Students were quick to notice that the whole van looked tired and dull and were unsure where to end their estimate. We discussed 'pre-existing condition' as the goal of any collision repair shop as opposed to 'restoration'.</p> <p>Repair/replace: 100% of students were able to justify their choices to repair or replace parts and included the correct refinish times. They had difficulty with adding labor time for clearcoat and blending adjacent panels. These are topics too advanced for one week of lecture, but were discussed for student awareness.</p> <p>Parts and labor costs: Students who chose to replace panels also correctly identified the parts cost in the estimating guide. Locating and recording labor times was more difficult, especially since the times are written in tenths of an hour and kept separate for body labor and paint labor. Although 100% of groups came up with the right answer, I suspect not everyone in the group understood it enough to do it himself. Hidden parts and small parts such as bumper reinforcement bars and plastic clips were not included in most estimates. Future lectures need to emphasize the importance of these 'little' items to the financial survival of the shop. Hidden items are a more advanced level of estimating that are better suited to students with more experience taking vehicles apart and putting them back</p>	

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>together.</p> <p>Materials add-on costs: These include such non-panel-specific items as color match, nib and polish, cover car for overspray and hazardous waste disposal. 100% of students dutifully added them because they were supposed to, but not every student fully understood why they are needed.</p> <p>Calculation of totals: After no small amount of grumbling about mathematical ability and a bit of practice, students were able to calculate labor and materials costs quite well. They even wanted to calculate the tax on materials. Apparently, putting a dollar sign in front of numbers makes math a lot more interesting. 100% of groups were able to calculate the estimate totals correctly, but again, I suspect not every group member could have done it on his own.</p> <p>Standard: Even though all groups created their estimates with a fair degree of accuracy, their totals did not come within 20% of an professional estimate and could not be used for professional repairs. The little and hidden items missing, the lack of blend or color match time, etc. are errors common to those just learning collision repair for the first time. Overall I am very proud of their efforts and how far they've come learning so many different ACRP topics in such a short time.</p> <p>(12/01/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: patricia fairchild Faculty Contributing to Assessment: patricia fairchild Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: ACRP 1A</p>	

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



El Camino: PLOs (IND) - Automotive Technology

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>PLO #3 Updated Knowledge and Skills - Upon completion of a course of study in ATEC, the student working in the field will develop updated knowledge and skills in the automotive field.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 07/01/2013</p>	<p>Performance - Using a voltage waveform viewer/scope students will demonstrate proficiency in diagnosing late model computer controlled automotive fuel injection and ignition systems.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: Students will be required to access a particular vehicles electrical schematics for it's CAN network, fuel injection control system and ignition system. Using this service information, students will be required to identify power (B+) circuits for each system, access these circuits using a voltage waveform viewer/scope and verify power (B+) on the appropriate circuits. Students will then access the control side of the fuel injector and ignition circuits using a voltage waveform viewer/scope and verify both the timing and duration of these pulse width modulated circuits for proper operation. 90 % of students are expected to score a 75% or above on the first demonstration of proficiency with 100% of students expected to score 75% or above after instructor</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Met</p> <p>Standard for this assessment was met satisfactorily. Students accessed electrical schematics for a vehicle's CAN network, fuel injection control system and ignition system. Using this service information, students identified power (B+) circuits for each system, accessed these circuits using a voltage waveform viewer/scope and verified power (B+) on the appropriate circuits. Students then accessed the control side of the fuel injector and ignition circuits using a voltage waveform viewer/scope and verified both the timing and duration of these pulse width modulated circuits for proper operation. 92 % of students scored a 75% or above on the first demonstration of proficiency and 100% of students scored a 75% or above after instructor correction and a second proficiency demonstration. This assessment demonstrates students are satisfactorily developing updated knowledge and skills in the ever technologically advancing automotive field. (03/10/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Michael Anderson</p>	<p>Action: None (02/24/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>correction and a second proficiency demonstration.</p> <p>Survey/Focus Group - Find out how many of the students have been employed within the automotive industry and have come back for update training on new technologies.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: This would be a yes-no survey given to students currently attending automotive classes.</p> <p>Additional Comments: The SLO would be best represented by higher-level course work for emerging technologies that current technicians. are not well prepared for.</p> <p>Related Documents: Automotive Technology PLO Jun 7, 2012 (1)</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met Not yet met (02/24/2019)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Edward Matykiewicz</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Harry Stockwell Micheal Anderson</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: All</p> <hr/> <p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met There have been no surveys issued to survey the current or past population of students served. (02/23/2019)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Edward Matykiewicz</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: All</p> <p>Related Documents: Automotive Technology PLO Jun 7, 2012 (1)</p>	<p>Action: Conduct a study of all returning students (02/24/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Get all of the faculty to count how many students are in their class that have returned for update training (08/29/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Follow-Up: Have someone start a uniform survey to all incoming students (08/30/2019)</p>

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



El Camino: PLOs (IND) - Fashion

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																																										
<p>PLO #1 Identifying Basic Sewing Techniques - Upon successful completion of the courses in the fashion department (both AS degrees and certificates) the student will be able to identify basic sewing techniques.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Fall 2013), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 07/01/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - The assessment tool is a 25-item document named “Exit Quiz Assessment”. Each item is a sketch or photograph of a sewing technique or tool.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: The standards for success are as follows:</p> <p>Each correctly identified item on the assessment is worth one point.</p> <p>There are 25 points possible.</p> <p>The breakdown is as follows:</p> <p>22-25= 90%+</p> <p>20-21=80%</p> <p>17-19=70%</p> <p>15-16=60%</p> <p>13-14=50%</p> <p>Below 13=Fail</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <table><thead><tr><th>student No.</th><th>Score</th><th>Percent</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1</td><td>16</td><td>94</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>16</td><td>94</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>15</td><td>88</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>15</td><td>88</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>2</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>15</td><td>88</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>13</td><td>76</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>13</td><td>76</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>Out of 13 students, only 5 earned a score of at least 85% Only 38% earned 85% or more. The maximum points available was 17. (02/28/2019)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Vera Ashley</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Fashion 10, vashion 26</p>	student No.	Score	Percent	1	16	94	2	16	94	3	14	82	4	14	82	5	15	88	6	15	88	7	2	12	8	15	88	9	13	76	10	14	82	11	14	82	12	14	82	13	13	76	<p>Action: This information can be reviewed after its initial teaching, especially for the pattern symbols. Students could make a miniature pattern for a 5 pocket jean. (02/28/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Follow-Up: A one year follow-up is appropriate (02/28/2019)</p>
student No.	Score	Percent																																											
1	16	94																																											
2	16	94																																											
3	14	82																																											
4	14	82																																											
5	15	88																																											
6	15	88																																											
7	2	12																																											
8	15	88																																											
9	13	76																																											
10	14	82																																											
11	14	82																																											
12	14	82																																											
13	13	76																																											
		<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <table><thead><tr><th>student No.</th><th>Score</th><th>Percent</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1</td><td>16</td><td>94</td></tr></tbody></table>	student No.	Score	Percent	1	16	94	<p>Action: have students review material in more than one class. (02/28/2019)</p>																																				
student No.	Score	Percent																																											
1	16	94																																											

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		21694 31482 41482 51588 61588 7212 81588 91376 101482 111482 121482 131376	Action Category: Teaching Strategies
		Out of 13 students, only 5 earned a score of at least 85% Only 38% earned 85% or more. The maximum points available was 17. (02/28/2019) Faculty Assessment Leader: Vera Ashley Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Fash 10 and 26	
		Semester of Current Assessment: 2013-14 (Fall 2013) Standard Met: Standard Not Met Student #1 (Fashion Design and Production) and has taken Fash 10 and Fash 11/score: 9/25=36%	
		Student # 2 (Associate's degree) and has taken only Fash 10/score : 12/25= 48%	
		Student #3 (Associates Degree) and has taken on Fash 10/score =13/25=53%	
		The scores were 36%. 48%, and 53%, No student correctly identified 70% of the tools and techniques that were itemized on the assessment form.	
		The sample size was too small. Possible survey participants were recruited in two ways. A mass email was sent to all fashion students asking them to contact me if they were graduating this year or the next year. I received approx 7 emails, to which I replied to contact me the last week of	

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions																																										
		<p>school so that they could fill out the assessment form. I also put a list in instructors' mailboxes for students to give me their contact information if they were graduating in the fall 2013 or spring 2014 semester. A list was compiled and those students received an invitation to take the assessment quiz. (04/01/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Vera Bruce</p>																																											
	<p>Survey/Focus Group - The assessment tool is a single sheet with sketches of pattern symbols and pattern parts of a 5 pocket jean. Each item is numbered. Students are to write the names of the indicated items in the blank boxes on the form.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It is expected that at least 80% of the survey participants will score 85% or better on this program learning objective.</p> <p>Additional Comments: Surveys from students who plan to graduate or complete their ECC education in the current 2019 year were used for the assessment.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <table> <tr> <th>student No.</th> <th>Score</th> <th>Percent</th> </tr> <tr><td>1</td><td>16</td><td>94</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>16</td><td>94</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>15</td><td>88</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>15</td><td>88</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>2</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>15</td><td>88</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>13</td><td>76</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>14</td><td>82</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>13</td><td>76</td></tr> </table> <p>Out of 13 students, only 5 earned a score of at least 85% Only 38% earned 85% or more. The maximum points available was 17. [more] (02/28/2019)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Vera Ashley</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: None</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: Fash 10 and 26</p>	student No.	Score	Percent	1	16	94	2	16	94	3	14	82	4	14	82	5	15	88	6	15	88	7	2	12	8	15	88	9	13	76	10	14	82	11	14	82	12	14	82	13	13	76	<p>Action: Have students review the material at the end of the term that these items are taught. This may be through a quiz or general review. (02/28/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
student No.	Score	Percent																																											
1	16	94																																											
2	16	94																																											
3	14	82																																											
4	14	82																																											
5	15	88																																											
6	15	88																																											
7	2	12																																											
8	15	88																																											
9	13	76																																											
10	14	82																																											
11	14	82																																											
12	14	82																																											
13	13	76																																											

Assessment: Assessment Unit Four Column

Fall 2018



El Camino: PLOs (IND) - Nutrition and Foods

PLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p>PLO #2 Sources of Nutrients - Upon completion of the Nutrition and Foods program, Students know the sources and functions of macronutrients and micronutrients.</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p> <p>PLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/29/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Knowledge of macronutrients (Carbohydrates, Protein, and Lipids) is assessed on a 20 question, multiple choice quiz.</p> <p>Knowledge of micronutrients (Vitamins and Minerals) is assessed on a 20 question, multiple choice quiz.</p> <p>Standard and Rubric: It is expected that 75 of the students will score at least 75% or above on the multiple choice quizzes.</p>	<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <p>Data is taken from three sections, 7723, 7734, and 7720. 118 students took Quiz #2, on macronutrients (carbohydrates, lipids, and protein) and on micronutrients (vitamins and minerals). 32% of students scored A (90-100%), 24% scored B (80-89%), 17% scored C (70-79%), 13% scored D (60-69%), and 14% scored F (0-59%). The standard was that 75% of students will score 75% or above. During this semester, 65% of the students scored 75% or above. (02/27/2019)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Sue Ellen Warren</p> <p>Courses Associated with PLO Assessment: NFOO 11</p>	<p>Action: Possible actions include 1.) instructor creates a practice quiz which students complete as homework, and discuss in class, 2.) students help create (and play) a classroom game re: macro and micro nutrients; 3.) instructor continues to analyze quizzes with students; and 4.) quizzes are discussed in class and students suggest edits where questions are unclear or misleading. (09/16/2019)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p>Semester of Current Assessment: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met: Standard Not Met</p> <p>Data is taken from the Fall, 2014 Wednesday evening section (7734) of Nutrition 11.</p> <p>36 students took Quiz #2, over the macronutrients (carbohydrates, protein, and lipids). The scores were: One 100%, four 95%, five 90% - 10 (28%) students earned As.</p> <p>Two 85% and three 80% - 5 (14%) students earned Bs.</p> <p>Four 75% and three 70% - 7 (19%) students earned Cs.</p> <p>Nine 65% and one 60% - 10 (28%) students earned Ds.</p> <p>Two 55%, one 50%, and one 45% - 4 (11%) students earned</p>	<p>Action: Modify the lecture on macronutrients, adding more detail and examples. Modify the quiz on macronutrients, checking for clarity. (03/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>PLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>an F.</p> <p>37 students took Quiz #, over the micronutrients (vitamins and minerals). The scores were: Five 100%, one 95%, eight 90% - 14 (38%) students earned As. Three 85% and six 80% - 9 (24%) students earned Bs. Three 75% and four 70% - 7 (19%) students earned Cs. Three 65% and three 60% - 6 (16%) students earned Ds. One 45% - 1 (3%) students earned an F.</p> <p>Only 53% of students hit the target of '75% of students will score at least 75%' on macronutrients. This is far below the target</p> <p>70% of students hit the target of '75% of students will score at least 75% on micronutrients. This is slightly below the target.</p> <p>Two strategies come to mind: better direct instruction and revising the quiz. Students have difficulty with these topics (macronutrients and micronutrients) because they are not common knowledge, as are some topics, like energy balance (weight management). The lecture could have more detail and repetition. Some students claim that the quiz questions are 'tricky.' (although when we review the quiz, they immediately see their errors) The instructor should review the quiz for clarity.</p> <p>The higher scores on micronutrients are puzzling to the instructor, because there is much detail on vitamins and minerals. Perhaps because the second quiz covers only two topics, it is 'easier.' (03/10/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Sue Ellen Warren</p>	