

Assessment: Course Four Column

FALL 2015



El Camino: Course SLOs (HUM) - English

ECC: ENGL 12:Introduction to Fiction

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
SLO #1: Short Story Analysis - Examine short stories and novels analytically and interpretively, to identify and analyze literary elements like plot, character, setting, tone, point of view, theme, style, symbol, metaphor, and image. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017) Input Date: 11/12/2013			
SLO #2: Comparison & Synthesis - Compare and contrast authors' treatments of theme, character, and subject matter, as well as synthesize diverse critical studies of a given author or particular short stories or novels. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017) Input Date: 11/12/2013			

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

SLO #3: Historical Research - Trace the historical development of the short story and the novel by examining selected representational works.

Course SLO Status: Active

Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017)

Input Date: 11/12/2013

ECC: ENGL 15A:Survey of British Literature

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1: Literature Identification - Upon completion of the course, students will identify representative works of major British authors from the Medieval, Early Modern, Restoration, and 18th Century periods, and examine their literary genres, devices, conventions, and poetic elements.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/13/2013</p>	<p>Term/Research Paper - Thesis-driven term paper written out of class that performs literary analysis on one or more primary text assigned for the class and incorporates at least one scholarly secondary source.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>96% of students (47 out of 49 in two sections) succeeded on this SLO.</p> <p>Students were successful on this requirement. As with the previous reviewers, we attribute the high rate of success to the fact that by the end of the semester, students had adequate opportunity to become familiar with the literary periods and poetic devices. This familiarity allowed the students to write more effectively on these issues in the term paper. (02/04/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Lyman Hong</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sean Donnell</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>98% of students (44 students of 45 in two sections) succeeded on this SLO.</p> <p>Students were incredibly successful on this requirement. This is likely because by the end of the semester, students had sufficient time to become familiar with the time periods covered by the course. After almost a full semester of identifying and assessing literary and poetic devices, students were able to write effectively about these elements of representative texts. (12/11/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Chelsea Henson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Janet Madden</p>	<p>Action: Continue current practices. (02/04/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Continue current practices. (12/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2: Literary Analysis - Upon completion of the course, students will perform literary analysis on representative works from the periods covered by the course, interpreting linguistic or formal features, and displaying awareness of relevant cultural and historical backgrounds.</p>	<p>Term/Research Paper - Thesis-driven term paper written out of class that performs literary analysis on one or more primary texts assigned for the class with at least one scholarly secondary source.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on this</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>92% of students (45 students out of 49 in two sections) were successful on this SLO. Because much of the discussion and in-class exercises focused on the type of literary analysis required for the term paper, the students were well prepared to meet this particular standard.</p>	<p>Action: Continue current practices. (02/04/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) Input Date: 12/13/2013	SLO.	(02/04/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Lyman Hong Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sean Donnell <hr/> Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Spring 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 91% of students (41 students out of 45 in two sections) were successful on this SLO. Instruction has clearly conveyed strong understanding and examples of analysis so students are able to effectively perform similar analyses in their writing. The course focus on historical and cultural backgrounds, particularly the objective of analyzing literature with respect to its historicity and time period contexts have allowed students to successfully meet this criterion. (12/11/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Chelsea Henson Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Janet Madden	<hr/> Action: Continue current practices. (02/04/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies <hr/> Action: Continue current practices. (12/10/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies
SLO #3: Literary Research Writing - Upon completion of the course, students will research, evaluate, and synthesize secondary material, and incorporate that material into a term paper that interprets a work of British literature from the Anglo-Saxon period through the 18th century. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) Input Date: 12/13/2013	Term/Research Paper - Thesis-driven term paper written out of class that performs literary analysis on one or more primary texts assigned for the class with at least one scholarly secondary source. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on this SLO.	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 84% of students (41 out of 49 students) were successful on this SLO. This number is still quite high, though the marginally lower success rate here may be a result of insufficient use of secondary source material. Students were asked to research, evaluate, and "synthesize" secondary material. We suspect that because less class time was spent on modeling evaluation and synthesis of secondary materials, the students struggled more with this standard. We would also note, however, that the 84% success rate is more than acceptable (02/04/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Lyman Hong Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sean Donnell	Action: Having taught this course for several semesters, the faculty assessment leader, Lyman Hong, would like to suggest that the following curriculum change be considered at the next course review: Please consider having SLO #3 evaluated as a stand-alone assignment because it is cumbersome for instructors and students who are novices to engage in the sophisticated analysis of secondary sources. UCLA's survey series, for example (the "10" series), does not require the use of secondary sources required in English 15A at ECC. It is perfectly sensible to introduce students the intelligent use of secondary sources, but I think it is debatable whether a second-year

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			English student who has limited exposure to the use of secondary sources can effectively integrate such material in a single semester. (04/13/2016) Action Category: Curriculum Changes
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>84% of students (38 out of 45 in two sections) were successful on this SLO. This number is still quite high, though the marginally lower success rate here may be a result of insufficient use of secondary source material. Students were asked to research, evaluate, and "synthesize" secondary material. Some, though they did incorporate secondary material, did not sufficiently evaluate or synthesize, and some students neglected to include secondary material at all. (12/11/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Chelsea Henson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Janet Madden</p>	<p>Action: Emphasize necessity of using secondary source substantially to support argument. (12/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ENGL 1A:Reading and Composition

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1: Thesis-Driven Research Essay - Complete a research-based essay that has been written out of class and undergone revision. It should demonstrate the student's ability to thoughtfully support a single thesis using analysis and synthesis.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Compose an argumentative research essay with a thesis that is specific, manageable, provable, and contestable. You should analyze and prove your thesis using paraphrases and quotations from at least five sources. The sources should come from ECC library databases, books, and/or credible websites. You must sustain your argument, use transitions effectively, and use correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation. This essay will be approximately 5-7 pages in length, and you must use MLA format, including in-text citations and a Works Cited page.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 89% of the students met this SLO while 12% did not. A total of 1,864 students were evaluated in this assessment. This far exceeds our 70% target for success. This is excellent and can be attributed to the amount of time dedicated to teaching the research paper. However, because a number of our students who transfer to our second semester composition courses, English 1B ad 1C, still tend to have difficulty with logically supporting a thesis, a review of the standard for "thoughtfully support[ing] a single thesis using analysis' is recommended. (01/29/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Debra Breckheimer Reviewer's Comments: Discuss the idea of reviewing what is considered acceptable analysis and thoughtful support in student work is a recommendation I will discuss at a department meeting.</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 87% (563/643) of students scored acceptable on this SLO while 13% (80/643) scored unacceptable. The especially high rate of success can be attributed to the course's focus on this as a core element of the curriculum, with most classes spending multiple weeks building up to the research essay with hosting workshops on research methods as well as having students write shorter essays, prewriting and informal writing. However, due to survey sampling, we are unsure that the high rate of success is entirely accurate. (02/09/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin Degnan, Chelsea Henson Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Department-wide assessment</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2012-13 (Spring 2013) Standard Met? : Standard Met</p>	<p>Action: As noted in the analysis, a review of the standard for acceptability is recommended which ultimately would fall under the category of teaching strategy since evaluation is an integral element of teaching. I further recommend we review the revision process to assure that students are not getting so much help that it skews our evaluation of the students' skill set for this particular SLO. This would require a review of our teaching strategies for revision. (08/29/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Anecdotally, we know that a number of students remain enrolled in 1A, but do not complete the research essay and that there may be a substantial number of students who remain enrolled, do complete the research essay, but do not pass. We'd like to capture a larger sample of 1A research essays (at least 50%, up from 25%) and record how many students did not attempt the essay and tally those results. (12/09/2015) Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Make English A harder or increase the requirements for English 1A. (01/12/2015)</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		Of the 1307 English 1A students assessed, 83% received a grade of C or better, while the other 17% received a score of D or F. (08/26/2014)	<p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Action: Consider norming workshops for consistency. (01/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Action: Consider adjusting the cut-score for placement into English 1A. (01/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Action: Have stricter requirements for English A students entering 1A. (01/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Action: Weigh the research paper more heavily. (01/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Action: Require a research paper to pass the class. (01/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Action: Prepare students more for research. (01/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Action: Focus more on MLA/Works Cited/Sources (01/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
SLO #2: Use of Research - Integrate multiple sources, including a book-length work and a variety of academic databases, peer-reviewed journals, and scholarly websites. Citations must be in MLA format and include a	Essay/Written Assignment - Compose an argumentative research essay with a thesis that is specific, manageable, provable, and contestable. You should analyze and	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>86% of the students met this SLO while 16% did not. The total number of students evaluated were 1,864. This far</p>	<p>Action: The spread sheet for instructors needs to be revised. (08/29/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Works Cited page.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>prove your thesis using paraphrases and quotations from at least five sources. The sources should come from ECC library databases, books, and/or credible websites. You must sustain your argument, use transitions effectively, and use correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation. This essay will be approximately 5-7 pages in length, and you must use MLA format, including in-text citations and a Works Cited page.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this SLO.</p>	<p>exceeds our target of 70% and can certainly be attributed to the the number of classroom hours dedicated to MLA and the use of multiple sources. However, it is important to note that the data may not be entirely accurate due to an error on the spread sheet faculty were given to record their data. Furthermore, a significant number of students continue to struggle with MLA documentation in the second semester compositions courses. Hence, I will suggest that faculty make certain that this skill is practiced multiple times in order to bolster this skill. (01/29/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Debra Breckheimer</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments: The changes made to the COR which go into effect fall 2016 should help address this concern.</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>82% (528/641) scored acceptable on this assessment while 18% (113/641) scored unacceptable. This success rate is explained by 1A's relentless focus on the use of readings in one's arguments and the incorporation of multiple book length works in each section as required by the course outline. Additionally, most 1A instructors make use of the library's resources in offering research training workshops. Works Cited pages are very often included, but there is no current mention of the quality of those Works Cited pages in the SLO as it exists. Further, due to survey sampling, we are unsure that the high rate of success is entirely accurate. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin Degnan, Chelsea Henson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Department-wide assessment</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2012-13 (Spring 2013)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>As of spring 2013, SLO #2 was not assessed independently of SLO #1. (08/26/2014)</p>	<p>Action: The new COR which will be effective fall 2016 now requires more assignments to integrate sources which will provide students more time to practice the requisite skills of MLA. (08/29/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Action: Anecdotally, we know that a number of students remain enrolled in 1A, but do not complete the research essay and that there may be a substantial number of students who remain enrolled, do complete the research essay, but do not pass. We'd like to capture a larger sample of 1A research essays (at least 50%, up from 25%) and record how many students did not attempt the essay and tally those results. We would also like to discuss revising the wording of the SLO statement to include a mention of the level of quality of the Works Cited page. (12/09/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #3: Organization & Grammar - Demonstrate logical paragraph composition and sentence structure. The essay should have correct grammar, spelling, and word use.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Compose an argumentative research essay with a thesis that is specific, manageable, provable, and contestable. You should analyze and prove your thesis using paraphrases and quotations from at least five sources. The sources should come from ECC library databases, books, and/or credible websites. You must sustain your argument, use transitions effectively, and use correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation. This essay will be approximately 5-7 pages in length, and you must use MLA format, including in-text citations and a Works Cited page.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students write essays that meet the minimum standards of this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>87% of the students were successful while 14% were not. There were a total of 1,864 students evaluated. These numbers are excellent; however, again because of an error in the spreadsheet faculty used to record their SLOs, the data may be skewed. Furthermore, a significant number of students who progress to the second semester compositions courses, continue to have difficulty with paragraph focus and organization. They also continue to have grammar errors particularly with sentence fragments, run on and comma splice sentences. (01/29/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Debra Breckheimer</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>84% (540/641) of students scored acceptable on this SLO, while 16% (101/641) students scored unacceptable. This result was higher than expected because, anecdotally, many instructors believe the grammar skills of their students may be sub par. We are then unsure if instructor impressions of student abilities is correct, though survey sampling could be an issue. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin Degnan, Chelsea Henson</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Department-wide assessment</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2012-13 (Spring 2013)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met</p> <p>As of spring 2013, SLO #3 was not assessed independently of SLO #1. (08/26/2014)</p>	<p>Action: The faculty spreadsheet for recording SLO data must be revised. I will also recommend making a change to SLO #3 requesting that we separate paragraph structure from the skill of sentence level and grammar issues. For example, paragraph structure should have an SLO of its own, and grammar should have an SLO of its own. (08/29/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Anecdotally, we know that a number of students remain enrolled in 1A, but do not complete the research essay and that there may be a substantial number of students who remain enrolled, do complete the research essay, but do not pass. We'd like to capture a larger sample of 1A research essays (at least 50%, up from 25%) and record how many students did not attempt the essay and tally those results. (12/09/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

ECC: ENGL 1AH:Honors Reading and Composition

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 - Complete a research-based essay that has been written out of class and undergone revision. It should demonstrate the student's ability to thoughtfully support a single thesis using sophisticated analysis and synthesis.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/03/2015</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will write an out-of class, research-based essay of 6-8 pages that incorporates at least 6 academically-appropriate sources.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 80% of students will achieve "acceptable" rating on this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>5 sections of English 1AH were offered in this semester, and all students in all sections were assessed. For this SLO, 112 out of the 113 total students who were assessed earned an "acceptable," with only 1 student earning an "unacceptable" rating. This means that 99% of the students were acceptable, and only 1% was unacceptable, which far exceeds our target of at least 80% acceptable. This makes sense in an honors course because of how highly motivated honors students tend to be. This also suggests that the honors instructors are doing a great job of teaching students to formulate a focused thesis and support it. This high success rate may also have to do with the fact that this is a new course that is being labeled for the first time as honors in the course title and course outline, which led to high fill rates of honors students in the honors sections of English 1AH. (02/08/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Rachel Williams</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Barbara Jaffe, Rachel Ketai,Briita Halonen, Lyman Hong, and Sue Bachmann.</p>	<p>Action: Honors instructors should continue to teach the writing process and thesis development and support as they have been, as their techniques are clearly successful. (02/08/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2 - Integrate multiple sources, including a book-length work and a variety of 2. academic databases, peer-reviewed journals, and scholarly websites. Citations must be in MLA format and include a Works Cited page.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/03/2015</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will write an out-of class, research-based essay of 6-8 pages that incorporates at least 6 academically-appropriate sources.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 80% of students will reach "acceptable" status for this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>For this SLO, 105 out of the 113 total students who were assessed were deemed "acceptable." 8 students were deemed "unacceptable." This means that 93% of students were "acceptable," and only 7% were "unacceptable." This far exceeds our target, and suggests that honors instructors are effectively teaching honors students how to use scholarly and academic sources. One possible problem with this data, however, is that the SLO is listed in two different ways on our assessment form. The actual SLO mentions MLA format and a Works Cited page, but the abbreviated SLO that appears in the column where instructors are to give their ratings only mentions "integrate sources, " and</p>	<p>Action: To ensure that the data we gather for this SLO is reliable, two steps should be taken. First, SLO 2 should be split into two different SLOs, since integrating source and MLA format, citations, and Works Cited page are two different things. Then, each SLO should be abbreviated more accurately on the assessment sheets that instructors use to gather data. (10/01/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>has MLA formatting listed as part of SLO 3. Depending on how instructors used this sheet, they data may not be entirely reliable here. (02/08/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Rachel Williams</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Barbara Jaffe, Rachel Ketai, Briita Halonen, Lyman Hong, and Sue Bachmann.</p>	
<p>SLO #3 - Demonstrate logical paragraph composition and sentence structure. The essay should have correct grammar, spelling, and word use.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/03/2015</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will write an out-of class, research-based essay of 6-8 pages that incorporates at least 6 academically-appropriate sources.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 80% of student will achieve "acceptable" status for this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>106 students earned an "acceptable" rating for this SLO, with only 7 students earning an "unacceptable" rating. This means that 94% of students achieved this SLO acceptably, and 6% did not. Again, this far exceeds our target, and suggests that honors instructors are doing a good job teaching paragraph composition and sentence structure. It is also the case that most honors students come into the course with strong grammar, spelling, and word use abilities--those who don't have these abilities often don't qualify for the program because of GPA requirements or because of the quality of the essay that is required as part of the application. Thus, honors instructors have much less to teach than non-honors instructors in terms of grammar, etc. There is also an issue on the SLO form that needs to be looked at here; the column that lists SLO 3 talks about "MLA/mechanics," but this SLO isn't about MLA at all. Again, this may have skewed the data. Also, since paragraph composition and sentence structure are different from grammar, spelling, and word use, we may want to consider splitting this into two SLOs in the future. (02/08/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Rachel Williams</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Barbara Jaffe, Rachel Ketai, Briita Halonen, Lyman Hong, and Sue Bachmann.</p>	<p>Action: Again, I recommend two changes here to make sure that we are getting the best data possible. First, we should split the current SLO 3 in two two separate statements, one about logical paragraph composition and sentence structure, and one about grammar, spelling, and word use. Then, the SLO assessment form should be changed so that the abbreviated version of each SLO is more accurate to the whole statement. (10/01/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>
<p>SLO #4 - Demonstrate sophisticated critical thinking by showing awareness of audience in anticipating readers' questions, biases, and potential lack of knowledge.</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will write an out-of class, research-based essay of 6-8 pages that incorporates at least 6 academically-appropriate sources.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>For this SLO, there were 104 students deemed "acceptable" and 9 deemed "unacceptable." This means that we had a</p>	<p>Action: On the assessment form on which instructors collect data, I recommend a clearer abbreviation for SLO 4, one that mentions audience awareness, since that is</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 12/03/2015</p>	<p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that at least 80% of students will receive "acceptable" status for this SLO.</p>	<p>92% acceptable rate, and an 8% unacceptable rate. This was the lowest percentage on any of the SLOs, even though it is still quite high and well above our target. This is also our most challenging SLO, and was designed specifically to assess the higher-level critical thinking skills expected of honors students. Overall, it seems that our honors instructors are doing well working with students to consider this issue of audience. I would also note that, as one of our five instructors commented "the [honors] students, in general, utilized my office hours more than my other English 1A classes (non-honors) and spent more time in development of their papers." This is true across the board in sections of Engl 1A-H, and probably helps explain the high student success rates. (02/09/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Rachel Williams</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Barbara Jaffe, Susan Bachmann, Rachel Ketai, Briita Halonen, Lyman Hong</p>	<p>really the heart of this SLO. That way, we can feel even more confident that our data is accurate. (02/09/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

ECC: ENGL 25A:Creative Writing: Introduction to the Craft of Fiction

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1: Short Fiction Identification - Students will identify specific strategies--principles of dramatic structure, indirect and direct methods of characterization, proper format for purposeful dialogue, and setting as thematic element--in short fiction and utilize these strategies in a variety of journal exercises.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Portfolio - The portfolio will be a compilation of the original draft of the short story, the revision of the short story, and a one page description of the changes made to the story through revision. Standard and Target for Success: Seventy percent of students should meet this goal.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 97% of students or 38 of the 39 students who completed English 25A successfully completed SLO 1. Our success in meeting the target for this SLO is made possible by the almost sixteen week preparation for it--the lectures and exercises, the review of story ideas, the workshop of story drafts, and the individual conferences on revised stories. Students who enroll in this class are highly motivated to succeed and have often been writing for many years. They use the course as an opportunity to refine their skills or finish a story they have always wanted to write. (03/01/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Adrienne Sharp Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Adrienne Sharp, Ashley Gallagher</p>	
	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - The portfolio will be a compilation of the original draft of the short story, the revision of the short story, and a one page description of the changes made to the story through revision. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on the SLO</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 52 out of 54 students or 96% of students succeeded on the SLO (01/27/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Adrienne Sharp Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Adrienne Sharp, Jennifer Gallagher</p>	<p>Action: Continue with current practices. (12/18/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2: Short Story Composition - Students will compose one 12-20 page short story demonstrating their competency with elements of fiction mentioned in SLO 1. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p>	<p>Portfolio - The portfolio will be a compilation of the original draft of the short story, the revision of the short story, and a one page description of the changes made to the story through revision. Standard and Target for Success: Seventy percent of students should meet this goal.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall</p>	
	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - A 12</p>		

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>the original draft.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on this SLO</p>	<p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>100% of students or 39 out of 39 students who completed the course successfully met SLO 3. All student members of workshop are required to write critiques of the stories presented. As well, students annotate the stories they read. In this way, each student writer collects at the end of workshop copies of his or her story, annotated and accompanied by a separate written critique. These written comments, along with the comments delivered orally in workshop, give the writer much to think about. The writer's responses to these critiques and his decisions as to which suggestions to employ and which to ignore are the heart of this SLO. Our success in meeting target is due to the free flowing nature of workshop itself, where suggestions and comments are debated, enhanced, or discarded. Students are therefore comfortable with and familiar with how to respond when they turn to their written assessments of changes made to their stories based on workshop feedback. Students who enroll in this class are highly motivated to succeed and have often been writing for many years. They use the course as an opportunity to refine their skills or finish a story they have always wanted to write. AS 3/1/16 (03/01/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Adrienne Sharp Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Adrienne Sharp, Ashley Gallagher</p>	
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>51 out of 54 students or 94% of students met this SLO. (01/27/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Adrienne Sharp Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Adrienne Sharp, Jennifer Gallagher</p>	<p>Action: Continue current practices. (01/27/2015)</p>

ECC: ENGL 30:English Bible As Literature

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SLO #1: Identification & Analysis - Identify and analyze representative works of the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament in terms of literary genres, tone, fundamental themes, historical and cultural ideologies, and biblical scholarship. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 11/12/2013	Essay/Written Assignment - As a measure of success, students will demonstrate their understanding of literary genres, tone, fundamental themes, historical and cultural ideologies of various biblical works by composing a college-level analytical essay based on one or more biblical literary works.	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 82% of students adequately met the standard. 18% of students did not adequately meet the standard. This last number is not surprising given the exceptionally small class size. Two students did not adequately meet the SLO standards. It is not atypical for a few students to enter the class lacking the writing skills necessary to succeed in a literature class. The caveat to this particular SLO is that students must write at the college-level and be analytical in their writing. (12/11/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Bruce Peppard	Action: To achieve a higher success rate for this SLO, students should be encouraged to utilize the writing center as well as faculty office hours. Constructive feedback on essays tend to go a long way. Perhaps students who don't do well on the first essay should be compelled to meet with the instructor prior to subsequent essays being turned in. (02/05/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 82% of students acceptably met this SLO criteria. While even more students were able to demonstrate their understanding of literary genres, tone, etc., the caveat that such knowledge be embedded in a college-level analytical essay is what held some students back from the acceptable category. The essay as part of a limited time final exam could be one potential reason for a lack of college-level achievement for more students. (01/07/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Bruce Peppard	Action: I recommend assessing the essay separately from the final exam. Allowing students more time to formulate an essay will likely result in less rushed work and will likely lead to more students achieving acceptable for this SLO. (12/11/2015) Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process
SLO #2: Biblical Knowledge - Demonstrate knowledge of the principle divisions of the Bible and will recall and identify major names and characters found in the Bible. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 11/12/2013	Exam/Test/Quiz - As a measure of success, students will demonstrate their understanding of principle divisions of the Bible and recall and identify major names found throughout the Bible by successfully passing the final exam. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will receive a passing grade on the final exam.	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 91% of students adequately met the standard for this SLO. That means that 91% of the students received a 70% or higher on those exam questions that demonstrate they understand both the divisions of the text as well as the biblical stories and the principle characters in those stories. This number is quite high. While this number is 4% lower than last year, the decline is quite likely due to the lower	Action: Because there was such a high percentage of students meeting this SLO, the plan of action should be to continue to present the material in the same fashion. Although the standards for this course are high, students are clearly grasping the concepts and are able to prove such on their exams. Continuing to hold students accountable for their readings (the action plan from the

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>number of students taking the course. The remaining 9% of the class accounts for only one student. Consequently, one student didn't adequately meet the minimum requirement for this SLO.</p> <p>I suspect the percentage for successful completion of this SLO is high because the content alluded to in this SLO is greatly emphasized throughout the semester. (12/11/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Bruce Peppard</p>	<p>last assessment) seems to be working. (02/05/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 95% of students were able to demonstrate their understanding of principle divisions of the Bible as well as recall and identify major names found throughout the Bible. Because students were continuously quizzed on their readings throughout the semester, it is no surprise that the results are a high percentage. (01/07/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Bruce Peppard</p>	<p>Action: Continue to stress the major divisions of the Bible as well as how those divisions function individually and with the text as a whole. In addition, continue to hold students accountable for their readings and recalling major characters and elements of their readings. (12/11/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #3: Biblical Symbolism - Recognize and discuss symbolism and figurative language used throughout the Bible as well as describe and explain background information pertaining to the ancient Middle East. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - As a measure of success, students will demonstrate their ability to recognize and discuss symbolism and figurative language used throughout the Bible and describe and explain background information pertaining to the ancient Middle East by successfully passing the short-answer portion of the final exam. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will pass the short-answer portion of the final exam.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 100% of students adequately met the standard of success for this SLO. Ample class time is spent discussing symbolism, figurative language, literary genres, and historical backdrops to the text. Consequently, it comes as no surprise that students are so readily able to successfully complete those portions of the final exam that demonstrate their knowledge. (12/11/2015) Faculty Assessment Leader: Bruce Peppard</p> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 91% of students achieved "acceptable" for this SLO. Throughout the semester, class discussions and small group work are often focused on identifying and understanding</p>	<p>Action: The action going forward should be to continue to have small group discussions that focus on biblical symbolism. In addition, class lecture should continue to emphasize such symbolism as well. (02/05/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <p>Action: The action going forward should be to continue to have small group discussions that focus on biblical symbolism. In addition, class lecture should continue to emphasize such symbolism as well.</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>various nuances in the language of the text. In addition, lectures are often focused on background information of the Middle East and the cultural contexts underlining the time periods during which the text was written.</p> <p>Consequently, given the amount of time spent on these concepts, it's not surprising such a high number of students were able to achieve "acceptable" for this SLO.</p> <p>(01/07/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Bruce Peppard</p>	<p>(02/05/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ENGL 35:World Literature, 3500 BCE to 1650 CE

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1: Understanding Literary Elements - Demonstrate an understanding of literary elements such as plot, point of view, character, theme, symbolism, irony, and style in representative works of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, and Middle Eastern cultures written before 1650 CE.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Final in-class essay of three hours comparing and/or contrasting different works from different cultures and genres.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>82% of students (9 out of 11) succeeded on this SLO.</p> <p>Weekly lectures and discussions which focused on analyzing literary elements of assigned works coupled with students writing weekly essays which gave them practice at articulating their understanding of literary elements contributed to the high success rate of this SLO.</p> <p>(02/04/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Brent Isaacs</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Brent Isaacs</p>	<p>Action: Continue with current teaching practices. (02/04/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>90% of students (9 out of 10) succeeded on this SLO.</p> <p>Weekly lectures and discussions which focused on analyzing literary elements of assigned works coupled with students writing weekly essays which gave them practice at articulating their understanding of literary elements contributed to the high success rate of this SLO.</p> <p>(12/10/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Brent Isaacs</p>	<p>Action: Continue with current teaching practices. (12/10/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2: Literary Elements - Analyze representative texts of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, and Middle Eastern cultures written before 1650 CE in terms of literary elements, cultural contexts, genre, and/or authors.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Final in-class essay of three hours comparing and/or contrasting different works from different cultures and genres.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>91% of students (10 of 11 students) achieved this SLO.</p> <p>Weekly lectures and discussions which focused on analyzing cultural contexts of assigned works coupled with students writing weekly essays which gave them practice at articulating their understanding of cultural contexts contributed to the high success rate of this SLO.</p> <p>(02/04/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Brent Isaacs</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Brent Isaacs</p>	<p>Action: Continue current teaching practices. (02/04/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
		<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p>	<p>Action: Continue current teaching</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 90% of students (9 students) achieved this SLO. Weekly lectures and discussions which focused on analyzing cultural contexts of assigned works coupled with students writing weekly essays which gave them practice at articulating their understanding of cultural contexts contributed to the high success rate of this SLO. (12/10/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Brent Isaacs	practices. (12/10/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies
SLO #3: Thesis-Driven Analysis - Develop a thesis regarding representative texts of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, or Middle Eastern cultures written since 1650 CE by employing organized, unified, coherent points that are supported by appropriate quotations from and references to the texts, using vocabulary appropriate to the subject, exhibiting correct sentence structure, and following MLA format for citations. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 11/12/2013	Essay/Written Assignment - Final in-class essay of three hours comparing and/or contrasting different works from different cultures and genres. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will succeed on this SLO.	Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 91% of students (10 of 11 students) succeeded on this SLO. Weekly essays on assigned works in which students had to develop and support their own theses on the assigned works contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (02/04/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Brent Isaacs Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Brent Isaacs Reviewer's Comments: The seemingly large percentage increase in this SLO's from the previous year's assessment is most likely attributable to the effort and competency of this year's students in contrast to a couple of particularly ill-prepared and apathetic individual students in the Fall 2014 class. Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 70% of students (7 students) succeeded on this SLO. Weekly essays on assigned works in which students had to develop and support their own theses on the assigned works contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (12/10/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Brent Isaacs	Action: Continue current teaching approach of weekly essays in which students must develop and support their own theses without a guided prompt in preparation for the in-class final essay exam. (02/04/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Action: Continue current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) Action Category: Teaching Strategies

ECC: ENGL 39:Literature and Film

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 - Analyze selected novels, plays, and short stories and compare them with corresponding film adaptations.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - In a 5-7 page researched essay, discuss the literary elements of 2-4 paired works of written literature and the written work's film adaptation. The essay must be thesis-driven and must in some way compare and/or contrast the two works and their artistic success.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70%</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Ultimately, of the 20 final papers handed in, my students had a 100% success rate. However, one student needed to rewrite his paper to earn a passing grade, which he did in January. Another student earned an Incomplete, but he never turned in this paper, so his final grade became a D. Two other students stopped attending class and doing work after the drop date so they both earned F grades. The high success rate of the 20 papers may be partially explained because this was a particularly engaged class and because most of the students were English majors, with competent writing skills. (01/27/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Dr. Susan Bachmann</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Dr. Susan Bachmann</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>90% (17/19) of students scored acceptable on this SLO, while 10% (2/19) scored unacceptable. The high rate of success can be explained in that for this SLO, so long as the student was writing within the most basic parameters of the assignment and the mission of the course, the student would score acceptably. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin Degnan</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin Degnan</p>	<p>Action: The SLO, as worded, seems clear and represents the focus of this course. Unfortunately, the 3 students who didn't submit a paper had seemed capable of success until the drop date had passed and they stopped attending, so I don't know of any action that I could have taken to change this. (01/28/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: For this SLO, as worded, the target success rate might be increased to 90-100% (12/09/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>
<p>SLO #2 - Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of adapted works in comparison with the original printed versions.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - In a 5-7 page researched essay, discuss the literary elements of 2-4 paired works of written literature and the written work's film adaptation. The essay must be thesis-driven and must in some way compare and/or contrast the two works and their artistic success.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 20 papers completed, my students had 100% success rate evaluating the film adaptations and comparing them with the original print versions of A Streetcar Named Desire. These results may reflect the fact that most of my students were English majors and that the changes in the film are both dramatic and intriguing to students, especially because</p>	<p>Action: The comparison and contrast of film adaptations with the original printed versions should be maintained. Having students examine scholarly criticism is especially effective if the film is a literary classic, with significant research available. (01/30/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>of the censorship codes. Students also were encouraged to incorporate scholarly criticism to support and deepen their analysis. (01/30/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Dr. Susan Bachmann Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Dr. Susan Bachmann</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met 84% (16/19) students scored acceptable while 16% (3/19) scored unacceptable. The high rate of success can be explained in that for this SLO, so long as the student was writing within the most basic parameters of the assignment and the mission of the course, the student would score acceptably. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin Degnan Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin Degnan</p>	<p>Changes</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Maintain current teaching emphasis on literary elements of fiction, drama, graphic novels and their film counterparts. It might also be good to add literary theory/analysis to the course outline to make achieving this SLO more rigorous. (12/16/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <p>Follow-Up: Language was added to the course outline to encourage instructors to also include discussion of literary theory (feminism, psychoanalysis, postcolonial, etc.) in analyzing texts and encourage or require students to engage literary theory in their formal writing. (02/11/2015)</p>
<p>SLO #3 - Demonstrate an ability to analyze basic techniques employed by screenwriters, filmmakers, and writers of fiction and/or drama.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - In a 5-7 page researched essay, discuss the literary elements of 2-4 paired works of written literature and the written work's film adaptation. The essay must be thesis-driven and must in some way compare and/or contrast the two works and their artistic success.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 20 papers completed, my students had 100% success rate analyzing techniques employed by screenwriters, filmmakers, and writers. The high success rate probably reflects the number of English majors in the class and the repeated examination of these techniques in the films and texts studied all semester. (01/30/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Dr. Susan Bachmann Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Dr. Susan Bachmann</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p>	<p>Action: The analysis of basic techniques employed by screenwriters, filmmakers, and writers should continue to be central to this course, supplemented by critical theory and scholarship for each work studied. (01/30/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p> <hr/> <p>Action: For this SLO, as worded, the target success rate might be</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>84% (16/19) students scored acceptable while 16% (3/19) scored unacceptable. The high rate of success can be explained in that for this SLO, so long as the student was writing within the most basic parameters of the assignment and the mission of the course, the student would score acceptably. (02/09/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Kevin Degnan</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Kevin Degnan</p>	<p>increased to 90-100%</p> <p>The SLO might also be reworded to account for the upcoming curriculum change to include analysis using critical theory. (12/09/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>

ECC: ENGL 40A:American Literature

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 - Students will be able to identify representative works of American literature from its beginnings through the Civil War.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - As part of an exam, students must identify the author, text, and sense of quotations from works they have read during the semester.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: I expect a vast majority of students (70%) to score better than a C average (70%) on this assessment.</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments: The objective of this SLO is ensure that students read the texts carefully.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>For this SLO 23 out of 29 students scored a C or better. That is, 79 percent of the responses were rated acceptable while 6 percent were rated unacceptable. (12/08/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Tom Cody</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments: This SLO requires students to read, remember, and distinguish passages from texts assigned in class. Many of the students who take this course are English majors who enjoy the literature assigned and so do well on the assessment.</p>	
<p>SLO #2 - Students will be able to analyze representative works of American literature from its beginnings through the Civil War.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 11/12/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - As a measure of success, students will compose an essay that analyzes or evaluates one or more representative works of American literature, demonstrating a reasonable understanding of authors, literary elements, or cultural contexts. (Active)</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: More than 70% of students should compose a passing essay analyzing one or more representative works of American literature.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 29 students who completed the class, all 29 scored a C or better on the formal essay that analyzes a representative work of American literature. (100%) (12/08/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Tom Cody</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments: The few students who did not submit an essay or whose essays failed to earn a C or better dropped the course.</p>	
<p>SLO #3 - Students will be able to recognize social, historical, and ethnic influences in representative works of American literature from its beginnings through the Civil War.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - As a measure of success, students will compose an essay that analyzes or evaluates one or more representative works of American literature, demonstrating a reasonable understanding of social, historical, and ethnic influences. (Active)</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Of the 29 students who completed the course only all but one student achieved SLO three. Ninety-seven percent achieved the SLO while three percent did not. (01/26/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Tom Cody</p>	

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

2018)

Input Date: 11/12/2013

Standard and Target for Success:

More than 70 percent of students should be able to compose an essay recognizing social, historical, and ethnic influences on a representative work of American literature.

ECC: ENGL 41B:Survey of Film: 1950 to the Present

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
SLO#1 - Identify values and aesthetics such as film genres, people and pivotal events of post-1950s narrative films on an objective test. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 08/29/2014			
SLO#2 - Compose an essay evaluating values, aesthetics, technical aspects such as plot, character, tone, point of view and imagery, and the cultural significance of films and in the post-1950s. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 08/29/2014			
SLO#3 - Compose an essay evaluating films from the 1950s era to present incorporating secondary sources such as film criticism and/or theory. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 08/29/2014			

ECC: ENGL 44:The Literature of American Ethnic Groups

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1: Literary Analysis - Students will be able to analyze literary text(s) representative of an American community of color.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017) Input Date: 07/01/2013</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will compose an extended academic analysis of one or more texts covered during the semester. The text(s) will be representative of an American community of color. The analysis will be thesis-driven, and it will employ literary, theoretical, and/or historical concepts related to race and ethnicity. Moreover, the analysis will utilize close reading methods. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will compose an essay satisfying the requirements stated in the description.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 15/15 students who completed the assessment instrument assignment successfully completed this outcome.</p> <p>This level of success is partly due to the fact that this was a low-enrolled course with a large number of highly-motivated students, a number of them intrinsically interested in the subject matter (including English majors). Of the few students who were least prepared for the course, most dropped out before this assignment was collected.</p> <p>In addition, the class was built around multiple low-stakes writing assignments that helped students develop and practice their skills of literary analysis (students submitted writing 18 times during the semester). Therefore, students matured as literary scholars in an encouraging and non-threatening way before completing the high-stakes final assessment.</p> <p>Moreover, students discussed this final assignment one-on-one with the instructor (a task made easier because of the small class size), which encouraged a higher degree of success. (02/01/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Scott Kushigemachi</p>	<p>Action: Instructors should consider offering students multiple opportunities to submit low-stakes writing. This allows for an assignment sequence that prepares students for the final assessment. It also allows instructors to regularly provide feedback on students' writing and ideas. In my class, students wrote about their initial impression of each text, completed one in-class reading response, and composed a short thesis-driven analysis (for six different texts). Instructors should also consider providing opportunities for one-on-one feedback on the final assessment before it is due. (02/01/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2: Conceptual Analysis - Students will employ literary, theoretical, and/or historical concepts related to race and ethnicity in the analysis of literary text(s). Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017)</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will compose an extended academic analysis of one or more texts covered during the semester. The text(s) will be representative of an American community of color. The analysis will be thesis-driven, and it will employ literary, theoretical, and/or historical concepts related to race and</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 15/15 students who completed the assessment instrument assignment successfully completed this outcome.</p> <p>This level of success is partly due to the fact that this was a low-enrolled course with a large number of highly-motivated students, a number of them intrinsically interested in the subject matter (including English majors).</p>	<p>Action: Instructors should consider offering students multiple opportunities to work with similar academic concepts. This allows students to develop greater fluency with challenging terms and ideas, and to see their application in multiple contexts. For example, discussing W.E.B. DuBois's concept of</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>Input Date: 07/01/2013</p>	<p>ethnicity. Moreover, the analysis will utilize close reading methods. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will compose an essay satisfying the requirements stated in the description.</p>	<p>Of the few students who were least prepared for the course, most dropped out before this assignment was collected.</p> <p>Regarding "literary, theoretical, and/or historical concepts related to race and ethnicity," these were presented to students through lectures, presentations, and classroom activities. Students then continued to reflect on these concepts through our ongoing discussion of multiple literary texts. Then students practiced using these concepts in their writing in low-stakes writing assignments. The course then culminated with them employing these concepts in the final high-stakes assignment. In other words, students had multiple opportunities to practice applying academic concepts to literary texts before the final assignment, and these opportunities included various methodologies and appealed to a variety of learning styles. This meant that by the time they reached the final assignment, they were confident and well practiced.</p> <p>Moreover, students discussed this final assignment one-on-one with the instructor (a task made easier because of the small class size), which encouraged a higher degree of success. (02/01/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Scott Kushigemachi</p>	<p>"double consciousness," an instructor might introduce the concept in a presentation format, allow for various forms of group activities/discussions concerning the topic, encourage students to use the term in informal writing, introduce the concept across multiple texts, and then allow students to use the concept in the final assessment.</p> <p>Instructors should also consider providing opportunities for one-on-one feedback on the final assessment before it is due, allowing them to give feedback on students' application of key concepts. (02/01/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #3: Thesis-Driven Essay - Students will compose an academic thesis about literary text(s) representative of an American community of color, and support that thesis through methods of close reading. The resulting essay will be organized and developed in a strategic and rhetorically purposeful way.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2013-14 (Spring 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015),</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will compose an extended academic analysis of one or more texts covered during the semester. The text(s) will be representative of an American community of color. The analysis will be thesis-driven, and it will employ literary, theoretical, and/or historical concepts related to race and ethnicity. Moreover, the analysis will utilize close reading methods. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will compose an</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 13/15 (87%) students who completed the assessment instrument assignment successfully completed this outcome.</p> <p>This class was built around multiple low-stakes writing assignments that helped students develop and practice their skills of literary analysis (students submitted writing 18 times during the semester). Therefore, students matured in their academic writing skills in an encouraging and non-threatening way before completing the high-stakes final assessment.</p>	<p>Action: We can advise instructors to take an inventory of students' writing abilities early in the semester, and refer students to additional support services from on-campus resources such as the Writing Center. This will allow students who have been away from the English curriculum to catch up after becoming "rusty" in their writing skills. (02/01/2016) Action Category: Program/College Support</p> <p>Action: We can encourage shared standards and expectations</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2016-17 (Spring 2017) Input Date: 07/01/2013	essay satisfying the requirements stated in the description.	<p>Moreover, students discussed this final assignment one-on-one with the instructor (a task made easier because of the small class size), which encouraged a higher degree of success.</p> <p>However, it is also notable that this SLO had the lowest success rate of the three, with 13% of students not successfully meeting this outcome. While the other two SLOs emphasized students' reading skills and their conceptual understanding of the material, this one focuses specifically on their writing abilities. The two students who failed in this area did so primarily because they did not perform well in areas covered in English 1A (paragraph cohesion, sentence-level correctness, MLA documentation, etc.). Interestingly, both of these students had passed English 1A and were reasonably capable writers. Thus, there is an open question of why they failed to adequately demonstrate these skills with the assessment instrument. One acknowledged her lack of confidence going into this class because she had not taken an English class in some time, although she had successfully completed both English 1AH AND English 1C. Perhaps she would have benefited from additional support from on-campus resources such as the Writing Center. This would have allowed her to catch up after becoming "rusty" from several semesters away. On a larger scale, if writing across the curriculum was similarly assessed and valued, then time away from English courses would not have these kind of effects on students' writing confidence. (02/01/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Scott Kushigemachi</p>	<p>concerning students' writing in non-English courses (a project along these lines is currently being funded and initiated with Student Equity funds). (02/01/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Curriculum Changes</p>

ECC: ENGL 50RWA: Integrated Reading and Writing

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1: Literal & Inferential Comprehension - Demonstrate literal and inferential comprehension of non-fiction works.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 08/29/2014</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will write a multi-paragraph essay that has undergone revision.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of the students will rate "acceptable" on this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 91% of students rated "acceptable" at demonstrating literal and inferential comprehension of non-fiction works. (01/07/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Lauralee Welsh Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Pete Marcoux, Debra Breckheimer</p>	<p>Action: Students did extremely well with this SLO. Extra in-class time in this 5 unit course allows for more opportunities for in class exercises and discussion of material. These practices will be continued in future sections of RWA (08/01/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies Follow-Up: The course will be assessed again in one year, Spring 2017. (01/21/2016)</p>
<p>SLO #2: Analytical Response - Read a college-level text and develop an analytical response that demonstrates college-readiness.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 08/29/2014</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will write a multi-paragraph essay that has undergone revision.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of the students will rate "acceptable" on this SLO</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 87% of the assessed students rates "acceptable" at reading a college-level text and developing an analytical response that demonstrated college-readiness. (01/07/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Lauralee Welsh Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Pete Marcoux, Debra Breckheimer</p>	<p>Action: Students had a strong response with this SLO. Extra in-class time in this 5 unit course allows for more opportunities for in class exercises and discussion of material. These practices will be continued in future sections of RWA (08/01/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #3: Thesis Driven Essay - Write a multi-paragraph thesis-driven expository essay that has undergone revision and demonstrates readiness for college-level writing.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Input Date: 08/29/2014</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Students will write a mutli-paragraph essay that has undergone revision.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: It is expected that 80% of the students will rate "acceptable" on this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met 88% of students assessed rated "acceptable" at writing a multi-paragraph thesis-driven expository essay that has undergone revision and demonstrates readiness for college-level writing. (01/07/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Lauralee Welsh Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Pete Marcoux, Debra Breckheimer</p>	<p>Action: Students were very successful with this SLO. Extra in-class time in this 5 unit course allows for more opportunities for in class exercises and discussion of material. These practices will be continued in future sections of RWA (08/01/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: ENGL 82:Introduction to Reading Skills

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 - Demonstrate the ability to actively engage in the reading process in order to comprehend and analyze multi-paragraph non-fiction texts at the high school level.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - At the end of the semester, all English 82 students take a 40-question multiple-choice test, with each question assigned to one of the three SLOs</p> <p>The students will take the Townsend Test Level 1, Form A: passing score is 28.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of the students should score acceptable on this SLO.</p>		
<p>SLO #2 - Students will demonstrate their ability to employ comprehension strategies necessary to comprehend multi-paragraph non-fiction texts written at the high school level.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 01/13/2015</p>	<p>Multiple Assessments - At the end of the semester, instructors may choose one of three assessment tools. Each of these tools assesses the stated learning outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Townsend Test Level 1, Form A given at end of semester: passing score is 30; 2. Degrees of Reading Power J-4 (grades 7-9) given at end of semester: passing score is 54; or 3. Highlight and annotate a multiparagraph text written at the 7th-9th grade level. <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of all students in each course should pass the SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>77% of all students (214/278) did pass for this SLO. The ability to apply comprehension strategies is affected and directed by several factors, including discipline expectations; reading purpose; type of text; and instructor's assignment. The Course Outline of Record (COR) lists the strategies most common to college reading, but our variety of assessment methods may not provide data for these strategies. For example, the Degrees of Reading Power tests students' facility with context clues used to define vocabulary. The use of context clues is directly associated with textual comprehension, but without additional testing of other comprehension strategies, such as locating main ideas and supporting details, that one assessment method may not provide data on all the comprehension strategies listed in the COR. Another concern is the SLO itself, which at the time of assessment listed a grade range of 7th-9th. This grade range actually indicated the probable mastery level of students entering the course; by the end of English 82, students should have attained a mastery level of 9th-12th grade (or a Lexile range of 1000-2000). The SLO has since</p>	<p>Action: At issue are two concerns: a flawed SLO and a range of assessments that do not allow for meaningful data analyses. The first concern already has been addressed: the flawed SLO has been revised to reflect the appropriate mastery level that students should have attained by the end of English 82 (9th-12th level), along with a Lexile range that indicates appropriate text complexity (a Lexile range of 1000-1200). The second concern, a common and meaningful assessment method, also currently is being addressed. During the Fall, 2014, semester, reading instructors reviewed English 84 assessment methods and designed a common test that will use a text of the appropriate Lexile level. This test will be piloted during the Spring, 2015, English 84 assessment. Results of that pilot will be used to design a</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>been revised, but our Fall, 2014, assessment used the flawed SLO. Given the low grade level listed in the flawed SLO and the mix of assessment types, any data analysis must be deemed invalid. (02/06/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Suzanne Gates</p>	<p>similar common assessment for English 82, which will be piloted during the Fall, 2015, English 82 SLO assessment. We expect that the revised SLO, along with a common assessment method, will provide rich data about students' outcomes in English 82. (12/12/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>
	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - At the end of the semester, all English 82 students take a 40-question, multiple-choice test, with each question assigned to one of three SLOs.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70%</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met Standard: 70% ECC Torrance Campus results: 69% (454/656)</p> <p>Assessment data & analysis:</p> <p>The department agreed that all instructors must use the Townsend Press, Level 1, Form A as the assessment for English 82. In the past, multiple assessments were available, but this inconsistency made it difficult to uniformly evaluate the outcomes. The Reading Advisory Committee reviewed the Townsend Press exam and updated the version to ensure that the passages were current, clear and at the appropriate reading level. Once the new version of the exam was created, the committee divided the various questions into specific categories so all three SLOs were scored separately. All instructors were required to use the exam and the SLOs were measured by looking at results from specific questions that directly assessed each outcome.</p> <p>To assess SLO 2, we identified 21 questions (out of 40) that measure comprehension skills. These questions ask students to do things like identify the main idea, find supporting details, look for patterns of organization and determine between facts and opinions. These questions constitute the majority of the test and support the skills</p>	<p>Action: Action plan:</p> <p>The department intends to continue to improve comprehension instruction through the implementation of the common assessment. Requiring all instructors to administer the Townsend Press exit exam will create consistency. During the spring consistency project, the department will discuss the changes and share “best practices” to ensure directed and purposeful instruction on the comprehension skills outlined in our objectives and outcomes.</p> <p>Furthermore, students will now be encouraged to annotate the text while reading. Annotation and active engagement in the reading process should increase overall comprehension. (02/04/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>outlined in the course objectives. 69% of the students passed this SLO. This does meet the department standard; however, it is very close to our overall goal.</p> <p>Comprehension strategies are the basis of the texts used in English 82 and will continue to be emphasized throughout the course. Instructors are encouraged to use supplemental lab programs and online support exercises to reinforce these skills. We are confident that this SLO can be met and strategies will be discussed at the upcoming consistency project.</p> <p>One change in SLO 2 that will help bolster student passing is the addition of the six vocabulary questions previously separated and assessed under SLO 1. 74% of the students passed SLO 1. Including these questions should increase the passing score. (02/01/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Rose Ann Cerofeci</p>	
<p>SLO #3 - Students will demonstrate their ability to analyze multi-paragraph non-fiction texts written at the high school level. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) Input Date: 01/13/2015</p>	<p>Multiple Assessments - At the end of the semester, instructors may choose one of three assessment tools. Each of these tools assesses the stated learning outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Townsend Test Level 1, Form A given at end of semester: passing score is 30; 2. Degrees of Reading Power J-4 (grades 7-9) given at end of semester: passing score is 54; or 3. Highlight and annotate a multiparagraph text written at the 7th-9th grade level. <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students will pass the SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met 76% of all students (211/278) did pass for this SLO. However, currently three assessment types may be used to assess SLOs, with each type differing in its coverage of textual analysis. In addition, some disagreement exists between instructors on the breadth of analysis coverage in each assessment type. Our current assessment methods do not allow us to distinguish between types of analysis strategies used (for example, we cannot distinguish between inferential strategies and text connection strategies). Another concern is the SLO itself, which at the time of assessment listed a grade range of 7th-9th. This grade range actually indicated the probable mastery level of students entering the course; by the end of English 82, students should have attained a mastery level of 9th-12th grade (or a Lexile range of 1000-2000). The SLO has since been revised, but our Fall, 2014, assessment used the flawed SLO. Given the low grade level listed in the flawed</p>	<p>Action: At issue are two concerns: a flawed SLO and a range of assessments that do not allow for meaningful data analyses. The first concern already has been addressed: the flawed SLO has been revised to reflect the appropriate mastery level that students should have attained by the end of English 82 (9th-12th level), along with a Lexile range that indicates appropriate text complexity (a Lexile range of 1000-1200). The second concern, a common and meaningful assessment method, also currently is being addressed. During the Fall, 2014, semester, reading instructors reviewed English 84 assessment methods and designed a common test that will use a text of the appropriate Lexile level. This test</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		<p>SLO and the mix of assessment types, any data analysis must be deemed invalid. (02/06/2015)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Suzanne Gates</p>	<p>will be piloted during the Spring, 2015, English 84 assessment. Results of that pilot will be used to design a similar common assessment for English 82, which will be piloted during the Fall, 2015, semester. We expect that the revised SLO, along with a common assessment method, will provide rich data about students' outcomes in English 82. (12/19/2015)</p> <p>Action Category: SLO/PLO Assessment Process</p>
	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - At the end of the semester, all English 82 students take a 40-question, multiple-choice test, with each question assigned to one of the three SLOs</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of all students in each section should pass the SLO</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Not Met Standard: 70% ECC Torrance Campus results: 54% (359/656)</p> <p>Assessment data and analysis:</p> <p>The department agreed that all instructors must use the Townsend Press, Level 1, Form A as the assessment for English 82. In the past, multiple assessments were available, but this inconsistency made it difficult to uniformly evaluate the outcomes. The Reading Advisory Committee reviewed the Townsend Press exam and updated the version to ensure that the passages were current, clear and at the appropriate reading level. Once the new version of the exam was created, the committee divided the various questions into specific categories so all three SLOs were scored separately. All instructors were required to use the exam and the SLOs were measured by looking at results from specific questions that directly assessed each outcome.</p> <p>To assess SLO 3, we identified 13 questions that require students to use skills, such as inference, to deduce meaning in the text. 54% of the students passed this SLO. The department standard was not met. The ability to analyze</p>	<p>Action: Action plan:</p> <p>The department will discuss strategies and best practices to help discover more in-depth and effective ways to teach analysis. The consistency project will also work to provide additional training in this area. The addition of SLO 1 will certainly help students improve this skill. Annotation and engagement with the text should help the students obtain a deeper understanding of the content. The Reading Advisory Committee will analyze the results from the pilot program to determine if the passages chosen for annotation resulted in higher pass rate of SLO 3. This information will assist with our next steps. (02/04/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

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

text is an essential college skill, but one of the most difficult to master. Requiring students to critically think about a text requires a higher level of thinking and understanding.

The low passing score of this SLO is concerning, however, not particularly surprising. It is one of the most difficult skills to teach and often requires significant time and deeper cognitive development for the students. The results of this SLO provide valuable information to faculty. It is clear that we need to find more effective ways to teach these skills and continue to provide ongoing practice to the students.
(02/01/2016)

Faculty Assessment Leader: Rose Ann Cerofeci

ECC: ENGL B:Introduction to College Writing

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 - Apply appropriate strategies in the writing process, including prewriting, composing, revising, and editing techniques to write a paragraph that responds to a text discussed in class.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 05/04/2015</p> <p>Comments:: Per 5.04.2016 e-mail from Elise Geraghty.</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Typed paragraph of 250-300 words based on personal experience and observations that has undergone multiple revisions and responds to a text discussed in class.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students shall meet this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Out of 311 students enrolled in our many sections of English B, 90% of them were found to be successful at applying appropriate writing strategies and at understanding the writing process. Notably, this SLO also includes the qualifier: "to a text discussed in class;" it is a complicated and high cognitive level learning objective, and the 90% success is an impressive number. That being said, since we've been able to maintain this number for two semesters in a row, it would be nice to see if it can increase. (02/05/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Erica Brenes</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: All English B Faculty</p>	<p>Action: From personal experience and from interacting with my colleagues and asking them about their knowledge of the English B classroom, I know how critical the embedded writing tutors are to instruction. They are particularly helpful when it comes to the writing process; therefore, I argue that it will be interesting to see how this success rate may be damaged by the cutting of resources in future semesters. Our department was recently alerted that in the future, sections of English B will downsize from two tutors to one, and I would imagine that the great success we have been seeing may also decrease. Accordingly, my suggestion would be to return the research and recognize the value of our tutors. A 90% success at a remedial course is beyond impressive, and it deserves it be maintained. The only way to continue meeting such success would be to continue doing what instructors have been doing; teaching the writing process requires tireless repetition because one must lead a student to both internalizing the practice and to believing in it.</p> <p>Moreover, there are a number of strategies within each level of the process and without small ratio modeling, it's very difficult to teach it. For example, brainstorming can be</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			<p>shown on the board every day, but without the man power to go from desk to desk to encourage and examine, this critical step can be fumbled. Notably, with 35+ students and 1 instructor, this standard can quickly feel impossible without extra hands on deck. (02/05/2016) Action Category: Program/College Support</p>
<p>SLO #2 - Compose paragraphs, both in and out of class, that include a clear topic sentence that is supported by pertinent supporting details. Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 05/04/2015 Comments:: Per 5.04.2016 e-mail from Elise Geraghty.</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Typed paragraph of 250-300 words based on personal experience and observations that has undergone multiple revisions and responds to a text discussed in class. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students shall meet this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met Although the pass rate of English B falls short of what most of our instructors have in mind, this SLO, which involves quite challenging learning objectives ("clear topic sentences and pertinent support"), was overwhelmingly our most successful area of assessment. With 93% of our students performing at an acceptable level, I wonder why more of them did not pass their course. After all, English B is centered on mastering the paragraph, and this SLO is the cornerstone of such mastery. It is also interesting to note that teachers at the 1A and 1C level continuously complain that their students still have not mastered this skill, so the almost perfect scores in our B seem inconsistent with other factors. All that being said, when students were asked to show this skill in and outside of class, most of them conquered it. (02/05/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Erica Brenes Faculty Contributing to Assessment: All English B Section Teachers</p>	<p>Action: Immediately, after looking over our numbers, I'm overwhelmed with the following questions: Are we creating assignments based on the most meaningful student learning outcomes? If so, since SLO #2 is one of the most complex, why are so many students handling the isolated activity well and yet failing the term? If we are appropriately centering our pedagogy around agreed outcomes (as we are asked to), what's keeping our students from moving on to English A? What standards are we using to keep them out of that level? These are important questions because many of our students are marooned in the land of basic skills with progression nowhere in sight, and we must solve that predicament. The inconsistency between the class's pass rate and the seeming success of this SLO (especially in accordance with the over 90% success rate on SLO 1) is troubling, to say the least, and we must act. In the future, we should aim to develop and clarify this SLO, as well</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			<p>as others, in a way that will allow us to better identify our biggest obstacles in English B. If students are successful in this arena but not ultimately successful in the course, a disconnect is happening, our SLO collection is not helping name that problem.</p> <p>The easiest and most immediate solution I can think of is to host an English B meeting on consistency, grading, and SLO alignment, much as we did as a department in the Fall for English 1A.</p> <p>A meeting, perhaps a consistency board who could be consulted, an assignment alignment workshop, even perhaps an early semester norming session, or a syllabus building brown bag for all B teachers would be a wise choice. These are common at other colleges that are worried about the gate keeper element of their basic skills courses, and since I know we share these concerns, they may be actions we'd be willing to look into.</p> <p>Last but not least, I worry that the matching 93% score from semester to semester without a meaningful increase in pass rate means that professors also may disagree on what "acceptable" means. I would suggest adding a rubric to the SLOs for this course that would help parallel our expectations and perhaps yield more meaningful numbers, even if that means taking a deep look into that</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			<p>vague and ubiquitous term, "success." In defense of this suggestion, it should be noted how large the difference is between each faculty member's collected data. If the overall proportion of our students was 93% successful and our professors were well aligned in their expectations, each professor's section should have neared that number, but, unfortunately, that didn't occur-- some sections had an acceptable rate as low as 63%, another only 83% while some reported 100%. While this range may seem shocking, it isn't surprising considering how subjective the term "acceptable" is. At the end of the day, the result is a misleading number and it prevents us from seeing a deeper trend or issue that may be harming pass rate, and a meeting would be a wise way to solve it.</p> <p>(02/05/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Program/College Support</p>
<p>SLO #3 - Use basic rules of grammar, spelling, usage, and punctuation, and avoid errors that interfere with clarity.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017)</p> <p>Input Date: 05/04/2015</p> <p>Comments: Per 5.04.2016 e-mail from Elise Geraghty.</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Typed paragraph of 250-300 words based on personal experience and observations that has undergone multiple revisions and responds to a text discussed in class.</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students should meet this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>After two extremely successful SLO assessments, our rates take their first dip with SLO #3, which is both somehow unsurprising and surprising. Of course this deep is still quite mellow; our students, on the whole, were still 83% successful. But a change of 10% asks for a deeper look.</p> <p>Ask anyone experienced at this level of composition, and they'll tell you our students struggle the most with mechanics—this is even true in higher level courses.</p>	<p>Action: Since we seem to be stagnating at 83/84% for two consecutive semesters, we should try something new. Perhaps our writing center could host basic skills workshops on grammar the way our reading success center does on reading. I oversaw such a project as BSI Coordinator of English at Golden West College, and although I know Barbara Budrovich would be successful on her own, I would be</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>Without a proper foundation and a lifetime of a repetition and reinforcement, it takes a long time and a ridiculous amount of commitment and effort to master the finer properties of English. That part of the assessment is unsurprising. However, if you look at the deeper and more subtle similarities between SLO 1 and SLO 3, our numbers are shocking. If 90% of our students are successfully using writing process skills that pertain to revising and editing, then we shouldn't be seeing this dip. Editing, at its core, is a step of the process ENTIRELY DEDICATED to eradicating errors in grammar, spelling, usage, and punctuation. Which is all to say, that I don't how understand how a student could be considered successful at using the process but unsuccessful at punctuation. (02/05/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Erica Brenes</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: All English B Faculty</p>	<p>willing to volunteer my experience in this realm. I saw it be massively successfully, and I saw it have a direct link to the SLO success in courses equivalent to English B. And although I fear sounding like a broken record, I reinforce my earlier sentiments: we should NOT remove a tutor from English B. Grammar needs all hands on deck, and best practices dictate that grammar be taught entirely in context, which means handouts won't work—workshopping will, going desk to desk will, engaging in editing with them will. One professor cannot do this in a room of 35+.</p> <p>It should also be said that the study of teaching grammar has changed drastically in the last ten years, and it possible that some of our faculty may not be practicing in line with best standards; pedagogy is an evolving field, particularly in the world of rhetoric and composition. So I suggest we arrange an event where we swap materials or we trade secrets and tips on how to teach this untalked about element of English. I know I improved greatly after talking to Professor Peppard about how to teach syntax in B in a way that was less stressful for me and more integrated for them. I have had similar discussions with professor Chris Page, which were illuminating both in spite and because of our differences in expertise-- Page's being an expert in A and my</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
			strengths lying in B. (02/05/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies
<p>SLO #4 - Follow MLA guidelines to format a document (heading, margins, indentation, spacing, font, pagination, title). Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 05/04/2015 Comments:: Per 5.04.2016 e-mail from Elise Geraghty.</p>	<p>Essay/Written Assignment - Typed paragraph of 250-300 words based on personal experience and observations that has undergone multiple revisions and responds to a text discussed in class. Standard and Target for Success: 70% of students should meet this SLO.</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met Teaching MLA guidelines seems to be our weakest area. We only barely surpassed the standard with a 76% success rate. At least we improved since last year's 72%. (02/05/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Erica Brenes Faculty Contributing to Assessment: All B Faculty</p>	<p>Action: Some could argue that this is the least critical of the SLOs. MLA is important, but it doesn't necessarily demand high level thinking, so the teaching of it may be getting less attention or perhaps time allotment doesn't end in its favor when there are so many greater issues to tackle in the English B classroom.</p> <p>That being said, I wonder if these numbers point to a larger issue in the classroom. Are we providing enough resources? MLA can be as simple as following instructions that have been made appropriately available. Or is there a problem with our students following instructions? How can we best confront this? Should we all take our student to the library so they can hear the standards from the authority of a librarian? These issues could be confronted at the meeting I suggested in SLO 2's actions. If it's an attention problem, should our embedding counselors help? (02/05/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>

ECC: TUTOR 200: Theory and Practice of Tutoring

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p>SLO #1 - Students/prospective tutors will understand how to assess the tutee's learning needs.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018)</p> <p>Input Date: 04/03/2014</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students/prospective tutors will answer the following questions on a quiz or final exam. They may also demonstrate competency by participating in a mock tutoring session.</p> <p>1) Explain what you would do at the beginning of a tutoring session to assess a student's learning needs?</p> <p>2) Explain what tutoring methods, tutoring strategies and learning theories you would use during a tutoring session?</p> <p>3) Explain what you would do during your tutoring sessions to effectively communicate with a diverse student population?</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70%</p> <p>Related Documents: TUTOR 200 SLO - Sept 19 2013.docx</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Twenty-two (88) out of 25 students answered this question correctly. Favorable outcomes for this course are the norm because students in the class are often working as tutors, or they hope to become a tutor in the near future. (02/05/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Sheryl Kunisaki</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sheryl Kunisaki</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments: The three students who did not answer this prompt correctly did not seem to understand the meaning of "assess." In the future, I will provide a clearer definition and examples.</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Twenty-two out of 24 (91%) of the students provided an acceptable answer to this SLO on their final exam. Favorable outcomes are the norm for this course because students take this course to be a tutor for the Learning Resources Center, or students are tutors at off-campus venues. (10/28/2014)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Sheryl Kunisaki</p> <p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sheryl KUNisaki</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments: The two students who provided answers that are "not acceptable" are both non-native speakers of English. They were able to fully participate in class discussions, but they have difficulty writing academic English. One of the students is an LRC tutor for French and is required to take the course.</p>	<p>Action: The instructor should provide models to demonstrate how to write an acceptable response to the prompt. (10/28/2014)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #2 - Students/prospective tutors will understand how to apply tutoring methods, strategies and learning theories to a tutoring session.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students/prospective tutors will answer the following questions on a quiz or final exam. They may also</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p>Standard Met? : Standard Met</p> <p>Twenty-two (88%) out of 25 students answered this</p>	<p>Action: In the future, I will provide examples of well-written responses to this prompt, (02/05/2016)</p> <p>Action Category: Teaching</p>

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) Input Date: 04/03/2014	<p>demonstrate competency by participating in a mock tutoring session.</p> <p>1) Explain what you would do at the beginning of a tutoring session to assess a student's learning needs?</p> <p>2) Explain what tutoring methods, tutoring strategies and learning theories you would use during a tutoring session?</p> <p>3) Explain what you would do during your tutoring sessions to effectively communicate with a diverse student population?</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70%</p> <p>Related Documents: TUTR 200 June 1, 2013.doc</p>	<p>question correctly. The three students who did not get full credit for this question, wrote responses that are very unclear. (02/05/2016)</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Leader: Sheryl Kunisaki Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sheryl Kunisaki Reviewer's Comments: In the future, I will provide examples of well-written responses for this prompt,</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met Twenty-two out of 24 (91%) provided acceptable responses. Since 21 of the students come to class with experiences as tutors, they have real-life situations where they have applied the concepts for assessment that were covered in class. (10/28/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Sheryl Kunisaki Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sheryl Kunisaki Reviewer's Comments: Learning strategies were not covered in class because there was not enough time; therefore, this part of the prompt was eliminated on the final exam.</p>	<p>Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Learning theory is not covered in the textbook, so materials on this topic will be collected and distributed next time the course is taught. (10/28/2014) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p>
<p>SLO #3 - Students/prospective tutors will understand how to effectively communicate with a diverse student population.</p> <p>Course SLO Status: Active Course SLO Assessment Cycle: 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2017-18 (Fall 2017) Input Date: 04/03/2014</p>	<p>Exam/Test/Quiz - Students/prospective tutors will answer the following questions on a quiz or final exam. They may also demonstrate competency by participating in a mock tutoring session.</p> <p>1) Explain what you would do at the beginning of a tutoring session to assess a student's learning needs?</p> <p>2) Explain what tutoring methods, tutoring strategies and learning theories you would use during a tutoring session?</p>	<p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) Standard Met? : Standard Met Twenty-one (84%) out of 25 students answered this prompt correctly. Three out of four students who answered incorrectly are international students. (02/05/2016) Faculty Assessment Leader: Sheryl Kunisaki Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sheryl Kunisaki Reviewer's Comments: I need to understand how international students perceive a "diverse student population."</p> <hr/> <p>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) Standard Met? : Standard Met Twenty-one out of 24 (87%) provided an acceptable response to this prompt. (10/28/2014) Faculty Assessment Leader: Sheryl Kunisaki</p>	<p>Action: I will try to guide international students so they have a better understanding of what it means to be a member of a diverse student population. (02/05/2016) Action Category: Teaching Strategies</p> <hr/> <p>Action: Diversity is an important topic for this course, so instructors should provide relevant, interesting material on this subject. (10/28/2014) Action Category: Teaching</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
	<p>3) Explain what you would do during your tutoring sessions to effectively communicate with a diverse student population?</p> <p>Standard and Target for Success: 70%</p> <p>Related Documents: TUTR 200 June 1, 2013.doc</p>	<p>Faculty Contributing to Assessment: Sheryl Kunisaki</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments: Two of the students whose responses are “not acceptable” are non-native speakers of English. One student forgot to answer this prompt. Students believe since they live in southern California, it is natural to adapt tutor styles to a diverse student population.</p> <p>Related Documents: SLO Assessment for Final Fall 2014.docx</p>	<p>Strategies</p>