Assessment: Course Four Column

FALL 2016

El Camino: Course SLOs (HUM) - Academic Strategies

ECC: AS 1 :Individualized Academic Strategies

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 - Students will demonstrate an increased proficiency level in English, reading or math through various skill building computer programs. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Multiple Assessments -** Students have taken a pretest defining their current level of skills in the subject area. After that, they were given lessons on that level. As they completed them, they were given another pretest and lessons on the higher level adjusted to their individual skills set. Students were progressing up to the 13the grade level. The results of the mastery tests were showing their progress and the difference between the beginning point and the final level of the lessons and a final test. **Standard and Target for Success:** achieving a progress of at least 2 grade levels up or more **Additional Information:** 17/18 students = 94.4% have demonstrated an increased proficiency level in English, reading or math	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 17/18 students (94.4%) have showed an increased proficiency level in English, reading, or math through passing the tests and completing the lessons with at least 80%. They have gone at least 2 grade levels up in their skills or more. (06/11/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Sylwia Kulczak **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Sharon Van Enoo	
SLO #2 - Students will complete a minimum of 100 lessons in 54 hours	**Multiple Assessments -** Students had to study and complete a 100	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014)	

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
or more. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	lessons in 54 hours or more. Every lesson started with a tutorial, practice and finished with a test. Sometimes the lessons were preceded with a pretest. **Standard and Target for Success:** 80% success rate on the lessons and the tests **Additional Information:** Fall 2014 - 17 out of 18 students = 94.4% of the participating students succeeded and completed a 100 lessons or more in 54 hours or more.	**Standard Met? :** Standard Met 17/18 students (94.4%) have fulfilled this SLO successfully. They completed a 100 lessons or more in 54 hours or more (06/11/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Sylwia Kulczak **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Sharon Van Enoo	

ECC: AS 23 :Spelling Techniques

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 - Students will proofread college-level texts and identify most spelling errors. **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:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** Given a college-level text, students proofread to identify and correct spelling errors. **Standard and Target for Success:** 75% of students will succeed on this SLO **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of 25 students tested, 22 passed this part of the final exam (88%) and 3 students did not (12%). Thus, most of my students did quite well with "proofread[ing]." The reason for this success was probably due to both high student motivation and extensive classroom practice. (03/07/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Briita Halonen **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** As this was my first semester teaching AS 23, in the future, I would like to better align my final exam with the SLOs to make the SLO assessment data even more useful. (03/07/2017) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Action:** The class time spent on clearly distinguishing some of the most common rules of spelling (e.g., i before e, y to i, and dropping the silent e when adding a suffix) helped them know what to look for, so instructors of this class should continue providing lots of opportunities for students to practice proofreading these types of errors in class. **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of 30 students tested, 29 Students passed this part of the final exam (97%), and one student (3%) did not pass. The target for success was exceeded. The reason for this success was probably due to the extensive classroom practice with this skill. (02/05/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Mimi Ansite **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** N/A	**Action:** Continue classroom practice of proofreading to identify and correct spelling errors in texts. (02/05/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of 14 students, 12 students (86%)) had acceptable	**Action:** Continue with current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		results, and 2 students (14%) did not. Target for success exceeded. (12/11/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Martha Ansite **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	
SLO #2 - Students will correct common spelling errors identified within a text. **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:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** Given a quiz sheet of sentences, students will correct spelling errors using the spelling rules previously discussed in class. **Standard and Target for Success:** 75% of students will succeed on this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of 25 students taking the test, 21 (84%) passed and 4 (16%) did not. The reason for the high pass rate is probably because of the thorough teaching of the most common spelling rules and the extensive classroom practice. Though the success target was exceeded, I do think there is room for improvement as this was the class's lowest success rate. I think this skill was a bit more challenging for my students because they began to second-guess themselves. This was particularly apparent when we were correcting for apostrophes; some grew quite confused with the plural possessive, i.e., when to put a possessive apostrophe before hte "s" and when to put it after the "s." (03/07/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Briita Halonen **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** As this was my first semester teaching AS 23, in the future, I would like to better align my final exam with the SLOs to make the SLO assessment data even more useful. (03/07/2017) (03/07/2017) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Action:** Continue using the worksheets and handouts as classroom practice for the spelling rules. However, it would be beneficial to spend a bit more time on the nuances of apostrophe usage (especially plural possessives). (03/07/2017) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of 30 students taking the test, 29 (97%) passed this portion of the test, and 1 student (3%) did not pass. The reason for the high pass rate probably is because of extensive classroom practice of the of the most common spelling rules by using various worksheets. (02/05/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Mimi Ansite **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** N/A	**Action:** Continue using the worksheets and handouts as classroom practice for the spelling rules. Spelling games and Spelling Bees are also effective teaching strategies. (02/05/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met	**Action:** Continue current teaching strategies with an emphasis on reinforcing the addition suffixes to

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		Out of 14 students, 12 students (86%) were successful on the SLO, and 2 students (14%) were not. Target for success was exceeded. (12/11/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Martha Ansite **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	unfamiliar words. (02/05/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Action:** Continue current teaching strategies. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
SLO #3 - Students will understand and correctly apply common spelling and usage rules to previously unfamiliar words. **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:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** List of unfamiliar words with missing suffixes will be given to students to complete according to spelling rules previously discussed in class. **Standard and Target for Success:** 75% of students will succeed on this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of the 25 students who took the exam, 23 (92%) passed and 2 (8%) did not. This is, happily, a fantastic rate of success. The small group of students who did not pass this section would often create new errors (unrelated to the spelling rule) simply by miscopying parts of the original word. This might stem from a lack of careful proofreading or perhaps learning disabilities like dyslexia. (03/07/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Briita Halonen **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** As this was my first semester teaching AS 23, I found that my final exam/assessment did not fully capture all of the SLOs as well as I would have liked. I plan to revise the final exam to more closely align with these SLOs. (03/07/2017) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Action:** The next time that I teach this class, I plan to incorporate more handwritten answers (as opposed to multiple choice) earlier in the semester so that I can identify and address this issue earlier. (03/07/2017) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of the 30 students taking the exam, 24 students (80%) passed this part of the exam, and 6 students (20%) did not pass. This was the most difficult part of the exam, but the high rate of success is probably due to classroom exercises and individual student memorization of the spelling usage rules. (02/05/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Mimi Ansite **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** N/A	

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Out of 14 students, 11 (79%) were successful on this SLO, and 3 students (21%) were not. Target for success was met. (12/11/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Martha Ansite **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Continue current teaching strategies of practice with worksheets and with practice adding suffixes to unfamiliar words. (02/05/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Action:** Continue current teaching practices. (01/27/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies

ECC: AS 25 :Thinking Skills for College Courses

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 - Demonstrate the use of a series of techniques necessary to analyze, compare, contrast, organize and execute verbal reasoning problems. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Multiple Assessments -** Corrected worksheets using techniques taught solving verbal reasoning problems were used as well as the scores on the pre and post (final) tests. **Standard and Target for Success:** Students will achieve 70% success rate on worksheets. In addition, they will score on the Final the same or a higher score than they achieved on the pretest. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 29 students finished one section of AS 25 Thinking Skills for College Courses. They were asked to work with a partner (whose pretest scores were close to their own) on 4 to 6 worksheets of verbal reasoning problems. The students needed to use the methods for solving the problems taught by the instructor and they needed to do them out loud so their partners and the instructor could hear how they solved the problem. Mistakes on the worksheets were identified by the instructor then corrected by the students. 24 (83%) of the participating students succeeded and showed competence on four to six worksheets using the methods taught in class. 5 (17%) of the students found problem solving very difficult and showed little success. (02/24/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Sharon Van Enoo **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** The students' skill level in problem solving vary so greatly, from IQ below 95 to an IQ that exceeds 125 (according to Whimbey), that precise care must be taken in: 1. Creating partnerships and work groups. 2. Because of the amount of time spent with each student the class size should stay at 30 or less. Final scores suffer when the class is too big. 3. There must be enough challenging assignments for high achievers that are not required of lower achievers. 4. There should be more math word problems created. Instructors should: 1. Be conscious of teaching to the final outcome: answer the question asked with the greatest of speed and accuracy. This is required of all professional tests. 2. Teach methods with fixed steps, require neatness and make sure all instructions are followed for accuracy and a positive outcome. 3. Find more time to spend on math reading problems. The stress should be on the concrete so students understand what they are looking for before formulas are taught. (02/24/2015) **Action Category:** Curriculum

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			Changes
SLO #2 - Demonstrate the use of a series of techniques necessary to analyze, compare, contrast, organize and execute trends and patterns. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Multiple Assessments -** Corrected worksheets using techniques taught solving trends and patterns problems were used as well as the scores on the pre and post tests. **Standard and Target for Success:** Students will achieve 70% success rate on worksheets. In addition, they will score on the Final the same or a higher score than they achieved on the pretest. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 29 students were in one section of AS 25. They were asked to work with their existing partner using the problem solving methods taught by the instructor for trends and patterns. They needed to do them out loud so their partner and the instructor could hear how they solved the trends and patterns problems. Mistakes on the worksheets were identified by the instructor then corrected by the students. 21 (72%) of the participating students succeeded and showed competence on four to five worksheets using the specific methods taught in class. 8 (28%) of the students were not able to complete four worksheets or do them with 70% accuracy. Some students had trouble with simple math such as adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing. (02/24/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Sharon Van Enoo **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** The students' skill level in problem solving vary so greatly, from IQ below 95 to an IQ that exceeds 125 (according to Whimbey), that precise care must be taken in: 1. Creating partnerships and work groups. 2. Because of the amount of time spent with each student the class size should stay at 30 or less. Final scores suffer when the class is too big. 3. There must be enough challenging assignments for high achievers that are not required of lower achievers. 4. There should be more math word problems created. Instructors should: 1. Be conscious of teaching to the final outcome: answer the question asked with the greatest of speed and accuracy. This is required of all professional tests. 2. Teach methods with fixed steps, require neatness and make sure all instructions are followed for accuracy and a positive outcome. 3. Find more time to spend on math reading problems. The stress should be on the concrete so students understand what they are looking for before formulas are taught. (02/24/2015) **Action Category:** Curriculum Changes

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
SLO #3 - Demonstrate the use of a series of techniques necessary to analyze, compare, contrast, organize and execute analogies. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Multiple Assessments -** Corrected worksheets using techniques taught solving analogies were used as well as the scores on the pre and post tests. **Standard and Target for Success:** Students will achieve 70% success rate on worksheets. In addition, they will score on the Final the same or a higher score than they achieved on the pretest. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 29 students were in one section of AS 25. They were asked to work by themselves or with their existing partner using problem solving methods taught by the instructor for analogies. They needed to be able to verbalize the steps necessary to solve analogy problems. They worked on 6 worksheets in class. These were corrected in class with student and teacher participation. 24 (83%) of the participating students succeeded and showed competence on six worksheets using the specific methods taught in class. 5 (17%) had a hard time understanding how to use the specific methods. (02/24/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Sharon Van Enoo **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** 1. It is important that analogies be solved out loud because students tend to guess with their feelings instead of logic. 2. The steps should be constantly reinforced: a. Identify parts of speech b. Look for general relationships c. Look for specific relationships d. Order e. The need to extend one's vocabulary This (02/24/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies

ECC: AS 33 :Memory Techniques

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 - Students will be able to explain two different mnemonic systems for encoding the same cluster of information. **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:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** A comprehensive in-class final that both tests students' ability to recall material memorized previously in the semester and to demonstrate different methods for encoding new information presented on the final. **Standard and Target for Success:** 70% of students will succeed in this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met One hundred percent (29 of 29 assessed students) achieved this SLO. As the only instructor of AS 33 in this assessment cycle, I would like to take credit for the increase over the previous year's success rate (when I too was the only instructor of the course during that assessment cycle). The reality is that four students who were not likely to pass the course final--on which one section is devoted to this SLO--who were still enrolled in the course after the final drop date did not show up to take the final exam, thus they were not included in the assessment. Had they all shown and failed the section of the final requiring the encoding of information (for Fall 2016, the NATO alphabet) into two different mnemonic devices, the success rate would have been only 88%, still above the target but more in-line with previous semesters' assessments. (03/13/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** Since all 29 students who took the final in Fall 2016 achieved success on this SLO, the only logical action to take in regards to this SLO is to continue the current approach to teaching mnemonic encoding strategies, which is one of the foundational skills students take the class to learn. (03/09/2018) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 90% of students (19 of 21) succeeded in this SLO. Repeated assignments both in-class and as homework that asked students to encode and retrieve information in a variety of mnemonic devices contributed to the success of this SLO. (02/04/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** Continue current approach to teaching mnemonic encoding strategies. (02/04/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Follow-Up:** Since the action plan was to continue teaching mnemonic encoding strategies and the result in assessed students' success rates improved from 90% to 100%, I can only immodestly describe the action plan of the last year for SLO #1 as an unqualified success. (03/13/2017)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 75% of students (21 of 28) succeeded in this SLO. Repeated assignments both in-class and as homework that asked students to encode and retrieve information in a variety of mnemonic devices contributed to the success of this SLO. (12/11/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Continue current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
SLO #2 - Students will be able to demonstrate a method of rehearsal of previously retained information. **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:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** A comprehensive in-class final that both tests students' ability to recall material memorized previously in the semester and to demonstrate different methods for encoding new information presented on the final. **Standard and Target for Success:** 70% of students will succeed in this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met One hundred percent (29 of 29 assessed students) achieved this SLO. As the only instructor of AS 33 in this assessment cycle, I would like to take credit for the increase over the previous year's success rate (when I too was the only instructor of the course during that assessment cycle). The reality is that four students who were not likely to pass the course final--on which one section is devoted to this SLO--who were still enrolled in the course after the final drop date did not show up to take the final exam, thus they were not included in the assessment. Had they all shown and failed the section of the final requiring the recall of previously rehearsed information (for Fall 2016, the crafting of acrostics for lists of information from four different academic disciplines), the success rate would have been only 88%, still above the target but more in-line with previous semesters' assessments. (03/13/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** Seeing as all 29 students who were assessed on this SLO on the Fall 2016 final achieved success, the only logical course of action is to continue current teaching methods of assigning information from different academic disciplines throughout the eight week sessions that students must encode and rehearse in order to recall on the appropriate section(s) of future final exams. (03/09/2018) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 86% of students (18 of 21) succeeded in this SLO. Repeated assignments both in-class and as homework that asked students to encode and retrieve information in a variety of	**Action:** Continue with current approach to teaching memory rehearsal. (02/04/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Follow-Up:** Since the action plan

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		mnemonic devices contributed to the success of this SLO (02/04/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	was to continue teaching mnemonic rehearsal methods strategies and the result in assessed students' success rates improved from 86% to 100%, I can only immodestly describe the action plan of the last year for SLO #2 as an unqualified success. (03/13/2017)
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 75% of students (21 of 28) succeeded in this SLO. Repeated assignments both in-class and as homework that asked students to encode and retrieve information in a variety of mnemonic devices contributed to the success of this SLO. (12/11/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Continue current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
SLO #3 - Students will be able to recall information pegged to a specific mnemonic system. **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:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** A comprehensive in-class final that both tests students' ability to recall material memorized previously in the semester and to demonstrate different methods for encoding new information presented on the final. **Standard and Target for Success:** 70% of students will succeed in this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met One hundred percent (29 of 29 assessed students) achieved this SLO. As the only instructor of AS 33 in this assessment cycle, I would like to take credit for the increase over the previous year's success rate (when I too was the only instructor of the course during that assessment cycle). The reality is that four students who were not likely to pass the course final--on which one section is devoted to this SLO--who were still enrolled in the course after the final drop date did not show up to take the final exam, thus they were not included in the assessment. Had they all shown and failed the section of the final requiring, a recall of information pegged to a specific mnemonic system (for Fall 2016, vocabulary words encoded by use of the loci method), the success rate would have been only 88%, still above the target but more in-line with previous semesters'	**Action:** Once again, in light of the effectiveness of assigning students information that must be encoded in a specific mnemonic pegging system, I must repeat my standard action plan of continuing the current instructional approach to this SLO. (03/09/2018) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		assessments. (03/13/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 86% of students (18 of 21) succeeded in this SLO. Repeated assignments both in-class and as homework that asked students to encode and retrieve information in a variety of mnemonic pegging methods contributed to the success of this SLO. (02/04/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** Continue current approach to teaching of encoding and retrieval of mnemonic pegging strategies. (02/04/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Follow-Up:** Since the action plan was to continue teaching a specific mnemonic pegging system (e.g., the loci method) and the result in assessed students' success rates improved from 86% to 100%, I can only immodestly describe the action plan of the last year for SLO #3 as an unqualified success. (03/13/2017)
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 75% of students (21 of 28) succeeded in this SLO. Repeated assignments both in-class and as homework that asked students to encode and retrieve information in a variety of mnemonic pegging methods contributed to the success of this SLO. (12/11/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Continue current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies

ECC: AS 35 :Listening and Notetaking Strategies

Course SLOs	*Assessment Method Description*	*Results*	*Actions*
SLO #1 - Students will be able to demonstrate the use of common abbreviations and speedwriting techniques. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** An in-class final in which students must take notes on the same article in two different note-taking styles. **Standard and Target for Success:** 70% of students will succeed in this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met Only 20 of 25 students (80%) achieved success in this SLO this year. While this is still above the course standard and target, it is significantly lower than the success rate of the other two SLOs. One reason for this has to do with the outdated wording of the SLO itself (the half focused on "speedwriting" techniques). Another reason for this has to do with the intellectual inability of of one slightly developmentally disabled student to grasp the concept of both speedwriting and standard abbreviations. A final reason for the lower success rate of this SLO is that since it was a course mandated (but soon to be changed) SLO, only one day was devoted to each of the two concepts and the other four students who failed had missed one of those two days' lecture and corresponding practice assignment. (03/13/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** The rewriting of this SLO as a result of the Fall 2015 Action Plan and which will henceforth go into effect will necessitate a initial close monitoring of the attendant curriculum changes and a careful analysis of the first few semesters' SLO assessing. (as stated in the follow up to the Action Plan for Fall 2015, SLO #1 should now read: "Students will demonstrate a critical adjudication of the most important ideas and major details in readings and lectures.") (03/09/2018) **Action Category:** SLO/PLO Assessment Process
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 96% of students (26 of 27) succeeded in this SLO. In-class and homework assignments in which students practiced using common abbreviations properly contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (02/04/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** The SLO should be revised/rewritten as the term "speedwriting" is not standard in the Learning Techniques/Academic Strategies discipline and isn't used in any of the textbooks by major publishers. Future instructors of this course might be confused about what this term entails, (02/04/2016) **Action Category:** Curriculum Changes **Follow-Up:** SLO #1 should now read: "Students will demonstrate a critical adjudication of the most important ideas and major details

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			in readings and lectures." (03/13/2017)
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 86% of students (31 of 36) succeeded in this SLO. In-class and homework assignments in which students practiced using common abbreviations properly contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (12/11/2014) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Continue current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
SLO #2 - Students will be able to exhibit proper use of the Cornell note-taking system. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** An in-class final in which students must take notes on the same article in two different note-taking styles. **Standard and Target for Success:** 70% of students will succeed in this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met All 25 assessed students (100%), achieved success in achieving this SLO. The increase in proper use of the Cornell note-taking system from the previous annual assessment (wherein 89% of students achieved success in this SLO) may be due to the increased amount of classroom time devoted to both teaching of and the students' practicing this system with both readings and lectures as a result of class time devoted to the final year of the current SLO #1 was decreased. (03/13/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** Maintaining a 100% success rate in this SLO will likely prove impossible as the time spent on it in the next year will decrease as a result of the increase of class time spent on the new SLO #1. A realistic goal will be an achievement of success higher than the Standard and Target 70% from Fall 2015 and earlier assessments. (03/09/2018) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 89% of students (24 of 27) succeeded in this SLO. In-class and homework assignments in which students practiced using the Cornell note-taking system properly contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (02/04/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** Continue the current teaching focus on Cornell note-taking assignments (four separate Cornell assignments, two each on different lectures and different readings in four distinct disciplines). (02/04/2016) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Follow-Up:** The focus on the Cornell note-taking system from

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
			both readings and lectures was not just maintained but increased as a result of decreasing the time spent on the outgoing SLO #1, as previously noted. (03/13/2017)
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 86% of students (31 of 36) succeeded in this SLO. In-class and homework assignments in which students practiced using the Cornell note-taking system properly contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (01/27/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Continue current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
SLO #3 - Students will be able to demonstrate the use of concept mapping as a note-taking system. **Course SLO Status:** Active **Course SLO Assessment Cycle:** 2014-15 (Fall 2014), 2015-16 (Fall 2015), 2016-17 (Fall 2016), 2018-19 (Fall 2018) **Input Date:** 12/10/2013 **Inactive Date:** **Comments::**	**Exam/Test/Quiz -** An in-class final in which students must take notes on the same article in two different note-taking styles. **Standard and Target for Success:** 70% of students will succeed in this SLO. **Additional Information:**	**Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:** 2016-17 (Fall 2016) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met All 25 assessed students (100%), achieved success in achieving this SLO. The increase in proper use of concept mapping as a method of note-taking from the previous annual assessment (wherein 93% of students achieved success in this SLO) may be due to the increased amount of classroom time devoted to both teaching of and the students' practicing this system with both readings and lectures as a result of class time devoted to the final year of the current SLO #1 was decreased. (03/13/2017) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action:** Maintaining a 100% success rate in this SLO will likely prove impossible as the time spent on it in the next year will decrease as a result of the increase of class time spent on the new SLO #1. A realistic goal will be an achievement of success higher than the Standard and Target 70% from Fall 2015 and earlier assessments. (03/09/2018) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2015-16 (Fall 2015) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 93% of students (25 of 27) succeeded in this SLO. In-class and homework assignments in which students practiced using the concept map system of note-taking properly contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (02/04/2016) **% of Success for this SLO:**	**Action:** Continue the current focus on creating mind/concept maps for two distinct reading assignments in different disciplines and one comparison-chart assignment on a reading from a third discipline. (02/04/2016)

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
		Faculty Assessment Leader: Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Brent Isaacs	**Action Category:** Teaching Strategies **Follow-Up:** The focus on creating mind/concept maps and a comparison chart was not just maintained but increased as a result of decreasing the time spent on the outgoing SLO #1, as previously noted. (03/13/2017)
		Semester and Year Assessment Conducted: 2014-15 (Fall 2014) **Standard Met? :** Standard Met 86% of students (31 of 36) succeeded in this SLO. In-class and homework assignments in which students practiced using the concept map system of note-taking properly contributed to the success rate of this SLO. (01/27/2015) **% of Success for this SLO:** **Faculty Assessment Leader:** Brent Isaacs **Faculty Contributing to Assessment:**	**Action:** Continue current teaching practices. (12/10/2015) **Action Category:** Teaching Strategies