Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Elementary Algebra

Outcome: Given two points, find the slope of the line containing these two points.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use of the slope formula, or 2. Graph both points to determine the rise and run. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>1. The formula is incorrect or no work shown, or 2. the points are incorrect and/or the rise and run are incorrect.</td>
<td>1. The formula is correct, or 2. The points are graphed and rise and run are determined correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>98 (21.7%)</td>
<td>353 (78.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computation of the slope. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>The slope is not computed correctly.</td>
<td>The slope is computed correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>102 (22.6%)</td>
<td>349 (77.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. This data was obtained via a mandatory, yet extra credit quiz given in conjunction with an exam.

Inferences: For both standards, about 80% of students assessed are proficient in finding the slope of the line containing two given points. For
the first objective, students failed to remember the slope formula. For the second objective, students had made errors on signs and additions.

**Action Plan:** We are happy with the result. We will use this method to assess this SLO next semester.

**Local Resource Needs:** Students can use the tutoring services at the MSC and LRC. Also more tutors, computers and softwares are needed to help student improve their learning.

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** We are happy with the result. We may use points with fractions as coordinates.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Survey of Humanities

Outcome: Name 4 artists central to the period of the Renaissance and identify their art works that characterized their contribution.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name 4 artists central to the periods of the Renaissance and identify the art works that characterized their contributions. (Benchmark: 90%)</td>
<td>Students were only able to identify 3, 2, 1 or 0 artists and their works</td>
<td>Students were able to identify 4 or more artists, and name their masterpieces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>45 (17%)</td>
<td>220 (83%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Provide students with visual handouts via faculty website to practice identifying artists and their works.

Action Plan: Design website for Humanities course that will incorporate slide identification practice

Local Resource Needs:
Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: Persons who analyzed this data were: Martha Carreon, Domingo Rodriguez and Hector Gonzalez
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Introductory Psychology

Outcome: Given research findings and theories in psychology, describe and/or evaluate the role that both genetics and environment play in different behaviors.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009, Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1: Student understands the concepts of genetics and environment (Benchmark: 66%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>Using 3 questions, student is unable to correctly identify the definition for genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 478 (38.4%)</td>
<td>Using 3 questions, student correctly identifies the definition for genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 768 (61.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2: Students understands and recognizes an example of the concepts of genetics and environment (Benchmark: 66%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>Using 3 questions with an example, student is unable to correctly identify the concepts of genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 592 (47.5%)</td>
<td>Using 3 questions with an example, student correctly identifies the concepts of genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 654 (52.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations
1. Same data for sections 8097 and 8147 as they are a combined online course.
2. Same data for sections 8097 and 8147 as they are a combined online course.
3. Same data for sections 30131 and 30129 as they are a combined online course.
4. Here are Debra's data as reported to me (VP): Excellent Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Concept 8 12 8 Application 8 5 15
5. Same data for sections 30131 and 30129 as they are a combined online course.
6. Students appear to grasp the concept of genetics (nature) and environment (nurture) most clearly when the material is presented in its simplest form. The initial presentation of examples with which students can easily identify, followed by periodic opportunities for students to create their own examples of each form of influence appear to result in satisfactory retention of the concepts throughout the semester, and presumably beyond. Spaced practice through the form of periodic review of the simplified forms of these concepts (nature vs. nurture) in each chapter has resulted in a greater proficiency than may have otherwise occurred.
7. Here are Debra's full data for this section: Excellent Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Concept 9 16 4 Application 3 12 14
8. This topic of study tends to be one of the most conceptually challenging for many of our students. Even the ones who grasp the basic concepts of nature and nurture have trouble recognizing the application of those concepts and the varieties of interactions between genetics and environment...when given different examples of human behavior.

**Inferences:** About 60% of the students correctly identify the concepts of genetics (nature) and environment (nurture). This is 10% below our benchmark. Only 50% of our students were able to identify these concepts within an example. This suggests that students are having difficulty with the skill of applying these concepts within context.

**Action Plan:** It may be beneficial to students to create problems and/or group activities in the classroom that provide contextual situations wherein these concepts must be identified.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** Kevin Smith, Vern Padgett, Chris Sutow, Karen Beck, Theresa Madamba
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Diversity Issues During Early Childhood, School Age and Adolescence

Outcome: The student will evaluate diversity components in children's programs and educational settings.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses are relevant to the assigned topic.</td>
<td>Responses are unrelated or assignment is incomplete.</td>
<td>Majority of responses are relevant and accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>20 (16.8%)</td>
<td>99 (83.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses adhere to the guidelines/criteria required.</td>
<td>Does not follow the guidelines/criteria or is incomplete.</td>
<td>Guidelines/criteria followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>20 (16.8%)</td>
<td>99 (83.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to the questions posed.</td>
<td>Critical components do not logically relate to current issues.</td>
<td>Most critical components listed logically related to current issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>20 (16.8%)</td>
<td>99 (83.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations
No additional information was submitted

**Inferences:** Students need assistance in reviewing work to assure completion.

**Action Plan:** Review student assignments in class before they are submitted and allow the students to add missing response in order to complete the assignment.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** Sondra Moe Kelly Lynch Carol Sigala Patricia Kepner Susan Sueng Tracy Rodriguez
Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course:** Spanish for the Spanish Speaking

**Outcome:** Using critical thinking skills, students will be able to read and analyze essays for their theses and content, as well as write well-constructed essays using planned language (thesis, supporting essay structure). Students will be able to answer questions orally using essay structure as well. Furthermore, students will be able to show improvement in their Spanish language structure and usage, including problematic areas such as common spelling errors, standard vs. non-standard Spanish language, use of accent marks, and punctuation, among other topics.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Spring, 2010

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communication: Students produce sentences and/or strings of sentences (Benchmark: 80%) **Benchmark Achieved** | Student is able to produce a minimal amount of sentences and related words in order to accomplish basic tasks in the target language.  
___  
0 (0%) | Students is able to produce varied lists of related words and sentences strung together in order to accomplish basic tasks in the target language.  
___  
13 (100%) |
| Course Content: Vocabulary usage (Benchmark: 80%) **Benchmark Not Achieved** | Student demonstrates a minimal knowledge of basic vocabulary in the target language.  
___  
3 (23.1%) | Student demonstrates a sufficient knowledge of basic vocabulary in the target language.  
___  
10 (76.9%) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Content: Proficiency in the use of learned structures and vocabulary (Benchmark: 80%)</th>
<th>Benchmark Achieved</th>
<th>Student is able to partially use learned grammatical structures.</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>1 (7.7%)</th>
<th>Student is able to sufficiently use learned grammatical structures.</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>12 (92.3%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture: Knowledge of cultural practices and products ( Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Student has limited and/or inappropriate knowledge of cultural practices and products.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>Student has sufficient knowledge of cultural practices and products.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

*No additional information was submitted*

**Inferences:** Most students scored satisfactory results in most areas. The only area that needs improvement is the area of vocabulary usage. The numbers are close enough to the benchmark as to infer a general satisfactory outcome but with room for improvement.

**Action Plan:** Instructor will add more classroom based activities which center around vocabulary that is new to heritage speakers, in this way increasing exposure and usage of vocabulary introduced in the textbook and homework.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Principles of Macroeconomics

Outcome: Given a situation of an economic choice, explain the opportunity cost in terms of the alternative use of resources.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009, Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctly describe the opportunity costs of an economic choice. (Benchmark: 75%)</td>
<td>Fail to identify lost use of resources. 5 (55.6%)</td>
<td>Describe the tradeoff in resource use. 4 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: 1. 67% is a higher number than Ph.D. economist succeeded in displaying proficiency in this concept. However, we feel this number can be improved. During the summer session additional excercises relating to this concept, were integrated into this course with positive results.

Action Plan: Integrate the opportunity cost concept into more topics in the course including examples, excercises, and games.
Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Computers for our classes so we can conduct economics experiment on them. Basicaly we are asking for a computer lab as a classroom.</td>
<td>$40000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments: We asked for a computer lab in our program plan. This could be very helpful in doing additional in simulated economic problems and game situations.
## Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course**: Physics for Scientist and Engineers-II

**Outcome**: Given a potential energy function and a wavefunction, students will determine if the wavefunction is a solution to Schrödinger's equation and under what conditions it is a solution.

**Terms Included in this Report**: Fall, 2009

### Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctly substitutes wavefunction and potential energy function into Schrödinger’s equation. (Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>180 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly differentiates wavefunction. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>45 (23.7%)</td>
<td>145 (76.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctly rearranges Schrodinger's equation in order to compare like terms. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>86 (43%)</td>
<td>114 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds the relationships among the physical constants to show the conditions under which the wavefunction is a solution. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>111 (55.5%)</td>
<td>89 (44.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

*No additional information was submitted*

**Inferences:** Review of algebra is needed.

**Action Plan:** Homework will be emphasized with an emphasis in checking for correct algebra.

**Local Resource Needs:** n/a

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** n/a
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Principles of Microeconomics

Outcome: Given a situation of an economic choice, explain the opportunity cost in terms of the alternative use of resources.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009, Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct, clear, logical and appropriate use of this major principles (Benchmark: 70%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>51 (24.1%)</td>
<td>161 (75.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: The level of proficiency is good, but could probably be improved. There has been some improvement on this concept. That may be because in some classes, students were required to do an application on this concept and/or to use the concept in looking at costs of gov't regulation.

Action Plan: continued integration of the concept in the course. Integrate the concept in class exercises, including problems, games and policy analysis. We have been using Aplia (online interactive problem sets) which has been useful to our students, but it has become
increasingly expensive for our students.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: Online interactive problems Game and interactive
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Principles of Microeconomics

Outcome: Given a situation of an economic choice, explain the opportunity cost in terms of the alternative use of resources.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009, Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct, clear, logical and appropriate use of this major principles</td>
<td>51 (24.1%)</td>
<td>161 (75.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: 1. proficiency level is good, but could be improved. Increased proficiency over Econ 101. 2. Level has improved from last year in comparable courses (semester comparisons done in course with same times) This appears to be due to extended, integrated applications of the concept in course activities.

Action Plan: Integrate concept into activities throughout the course: e.g. costs of policy implementation, market adjustments, market failure, etc.
Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: Integration could be greatly enhanced by interactive and collaborative work that could be done with increased computer based activities.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Postcolonial Literature

Outcome: Students should be able to demonstrate a thesis.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should be able to demonstrate a thesis.</td>
<td>No thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Clear, analytical thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 85%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Students need additional help developing and refining thesis statements.

Action Plan: Instructor needs to offer more specific directives/activities regarding thesis development. Instructor can include more in-class workshops, which will work to help students develop their thesis-writing ability. In addition, can offer individual conferences to help students on a more specific basis.
Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Music History and Literature Before 1750

Outcome: Given music from the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Baroque Period, students will identify major musical forms.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to define major musical forms in the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Baroque Period. (Benchmark: 70%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: benchmark was not met ... students need more assistance to help them reach the desired outcome

Action Plan: give students more worksheets to help clarify material

Local Resource Needs:
Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course:** Intermediate Reading Skills

**Outcome:** Given a reading selection, students will be able to utilize various comprehension strategies to construct meaning from the pre-collegiate level.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Spring, 2010

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine stated and implied main ideas. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>Over-generalizes and/or over-simplifies the author’s intended main idea.</td>
<td>Identifies stated main ideas. Identifies an author’s implied main idea when given multiple choice options. Copies sentence from text that expresses author’s intended main idea.</td>
<td>Paraphrases author’s main idea whether stated or implied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>— 14 (11.6%)</td>
<td>— 62 (51.2%)</td>
<td>— 45 (37.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguish between major &amp; minor supporting details. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>Incorrectly identifies major &amp; minor details causing misunderstanding of text.</td>
<td>Correctly identifies most of the major &amp; minor details.</td>
<td>Correctly identifies all of the major and minor details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>— 28 (23.1%)</td>
<td>— 51 (42.1%)</td>
<td>— 42 (34.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determine meaning of unfamiliar words using context clues and/or word parts.
(Benchmark: 70%)

**Benchmark Achieved**

- Meaning constructed causes misunderstanding OR is unable to construct any meaning.
  - 20 (16.5%)
- Constructs meaning sufficient for understanding author's message.
  - 65 (53.7%)
- Constructs meaning synonymous with author's message.
  - 36 (29.8%)

**Benchmark Not Achieved**

- Distinguish between facts & opinions.
  (Benchmark: 70%)
- Incorrectly identifies facts and/or opinions.
  - 37 (30.6%)
- Sometimes identifies facts and/or opinions.
  - 57 (47.1%)
- Consistently identifies and qualifies facts and/or opinions.
  - 27 (22.3%)

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

*No additional information was submitted*

**Inferences:** Students have difficulty distinguishing between fact and opinion.

**Action Plan:** Develop additional curriculum and continue faculty discussions and investigations into instructional methods that will enhance student performance for distinguishing fact and opinion.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
**Course Outcome Assessment Report**

**Course:** Introductory Psychology

**Outcome:** Given research findings and theories in psychology, describe and/or evaluate the role that both genetics and environment play in different behaviors.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Fall, 2009

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1: Student understands the concepts of genetics and environment (Benchmark: 66%) <strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td>Using 3 questions, student is unable to correctly identify the definition for genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 478 (38.4%)</td>
<td>Using 3 questions, student correctly identifies the definition for genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 768 (61.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2: Students understands and recognizes an example of the concepts of genetics and environment (Benchmark: 66%) <strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td>Using 3 questions with an example, student is unable to correctly identify the concepts of genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 592 (47.5%)</td>
<td>Using 3 questions with an example, student correctly identifies the concepts of genetics and environment within a particular behavioral context. — 654 (52.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**
1. Same data for sections 8097 and 8147 as they are a combined online course.
2. Same data for sections 8097 and 8147 as they are a combined online course.
3. Same data for sections 30131 and 30129 as they are a combined online course.
4. Here are Debra’s data as reported to me (VP): Excellent Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Concept 8 12 8 Application 8 5 15
5. Same data for sections 30131 and 30129 as they are a combined online course.
6. Students appear to grasp the concept of genetics (nature) and environment (nurture) most clearly when the material is presented in its simplest form. The initial presentation of examples with which students can easily identify, followed by periodic opportunities for students to create their own examples of each form of influence appear to result in satisfactory retention of the concepts throughout the semester, and presumably beyond. Spaced practice through the form of periodic review of the simplified forms of these concepts (nature vs. nurture) in each chapter has resulted in a greater proficiency than may have otherwise occurred.
7. Here are Debra’s full data for this section: Excellent Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Concept 9 16 4 Application 3 12 14
8. This topic of study tends to be one of the most conceptually challenging for many of our students. Even the ones who grasp the basic concepts of nature and nurture have trouble recognizing the application of those concepts and the varieties of interactions between genetics and environment...when given different examples of human behavior.

Inferences: Students have more difficulty with the recognition of concepts rather than just understanding the concepts of genetics and environment. This may suggest a difficulty in the critical thinking skill of application of concepts within a specific context. As far as understanding the concepts of genetics and environment, students are doing quite well in this regard since the data indicate only 3.1% below the benchmark of 66%.

Action Plan: Lectures may include more specific examples of the concepts of nature and nurture. We can increase the use of small group activities working on specific examples. And, quizzes can be used to familiarize students with the application of these concepts. As performance improves, there should be a corresponding increase in the performance on our SLO assessments. The determination of whether these changes have assisted students in future assessments would be the assessments themselves.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None
Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Nursing Care of the Patients with Renal, Urinary, and Gastrointestinal Problems

Outcome: The vocational nursing student will be able to: 1. Analyze abnormal head to toe assessment criteria in patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders in a given case study. 2. Determine the major nursing interventions for patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders. 3. Assess patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders. 4. Initiate the appropriate nursing interventions for patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The vocational nursing student will be able to: The student will be able to: 1. Analyze abnormal head to toe assessment criteria in patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders in a given case study. 2. Determine the major nursing interventions for patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders. 3. Assess patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders. 4. Initiate the appropriate nursing interventions for patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders.</td>
<td>The student will be able to attain 75% or lower in the cumulative scores of exams, quizzes and written assignments.</td>
<td>The student will be able to attain 75% to 89% in the cumulative scores of exams, quizzes and written assignments.</td>
<td>The student will be able to attain 90% or higher in the cumulative scores of exams, quizzes and written assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>28 (96.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders. 4. Initiate the appropriate nursing interventions for patients with a variety of renal, urinary, and gastrointestinal disorders.

(Benchmark: 90%)

Benchmark Achieved

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Evaluation scores were based on four exams, one final exam and GI/GU observation experience paperwork. The number of unsatisfactory students has improved and yet no students achieved Excellent. Benchmark set too high - was not met

Inferences: The benchmark was unrealistic and set too high, will be adjusted to 90% for the next term. Students continue to struggle with the critical thinking style of questions on exams and the final. The exam schedule made it difficult to retain both GI/GU information for testing

Action Plan: Actio Plan/Changes: increase continuity between team teachers, increase practice with critical thinking style questions in case scenarios, clickers and practicve quizzes, remove the GI/GU paper from the lecture assignments due to lack of access to clinical opportunities for observation, will utilize other audiovisual aids to expose student to the procedure within the context of a case scenario in the lecture course and test each system individually.

Local Resource Needs: Clickers, audiovisual aids in skills lab

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: Some students struggle with ESL issues and were referred to the ESL campus program, increased amount of students who leave early from class for employment and miss essential material for exams and final exam.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Approaches to Literature

Outcome: Students will document outside sources using designated citation format.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will document outside sources using designated citation format. (Benchmark: 20%)</td>
<td>Inaccurate or no documentation of source materials.</td>
<td>Correctly documents some source materials.</td>
<td>Correctly documents all source materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>— 5 (11.9%)</td>
<td>— 22 (52.4%)</td>
<td>— 15 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Since students may not have completed ENGL 101, they may not be familiar with documenting sources accurately.

Action Plan: Encourage use of the MLA Handbook and RHC Library resources which include MLA workshops

Local Resource Needs: RHC Library and research librarians
Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Introduction to Geographic Information Systems

Outcome: Using GIS and obtained GIS data, a student completing GIS 120 will be able to perform spatial queries for demographic analysis that allow student to visualize large amounts of complex, spatial data by creating and combining layers of customized maps. Student will have a spatial understanding of GIS in their field of interest (fire, crime analysis, etc)

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2011

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student completes course lessons &amp; (with no or little support) can display addresses from a table as geographic location. You will successfully create &amp; submits lesson layouts and can perform basic analysis to visualize &amp; interpret normally complex spatial relationships in many disciplines. (Benchmark: 100%)</td>
<td>20 (17.2%)</td>
<td>student performs proper file and data management. Student can perform spatial analysis lessons and completed field data collection methods, and completed remote sensing lesson. — 96 (82.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student completes lessons. In addition, the student (with some support) will display addresses from a table in GIS isolated by</td>
<td>20 (19.2%)</td>
<td>Student can perform proper file and data management. Student can perform classification of data, joining tables,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type and geographic location and create deliverable layout. Regular attendance (Benchmark: 85%)</td>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>geocoding addresses, displaying XY data, digitizing shapefiles, collecting GPS data and creating layouts to submit. — 84 (80.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student completes all lessons. In addition, the student (with some support) will display addresses from a table in GIS isolated by type and geographic location and create deliverable layout. Irregular attendance (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>22 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or few lessons submitted. Little attendance in class. (Benchmark: 50%)</td>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>student performs bad file management, unable to perform review lessons. Unable to work with spatial analysis functions, did not attend field data collection methods. Unable to explain GPS and its function in GIS. Unable to explain function and importance of remote sensing. — 27 (35.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. good class of students, 3 students did not attend or irregularly attended and did not submit assignments
2. 4 online students irregularly visited the online BlackBoard page and submitted few if any assigments.
3. The on campus students in the GIS120 motivate me (the instructor) as most are there to learn with an exception of a few students (provided F). Those students will B and C had lower attendance because of various difficulties and partial missing assignments but
demonstrated acceptable skills and knowledge of the applications of GIS / GPS. A concern was the cost of the text and it is increasing again in the spring therefore I changed the required text to a lower cost acceptable text as a reference and will supplement the material in the original text with an ESRI online course to be provided to each student and complete each of the 8 modules as lessons require material to be read.

4. The attrition and attendance for online class is historically the same, low or poor attendance and participation. Because of this, students fall behind and drop or forget to drop. Poor quality hardware and lack of support for installing software and low computer skills also contribute to lower success for online class. As submitted in Perkins 2010-2011 and as mentioned in past SLO, we are about to start a possible solution in the Spring 2011. Students should be able to log onto the computers on campus remotely eliminating requirement for installing software and immediately downloading data. Furthermore, students with Mac computers will not have difficulty nor will students with low performing (or no) computers. Students can log into the lab and use the software required from most all stations even at a local community service center or library. Furthermore, starting the Spring I will assign weekly required assignments using an ESRI online course and the data will be installed ahead of the classes to eliminate any basic problems unrelated to GIS. My attempt is to remove most all obstacles students frequently have to instead focus on the tool and its application. Accessing computers remotely as in this case is the future of teaching and we are excited to be the first to push the technology into existence on the campus with the support of the CAD GIS lab administrative staff and with the support of Perkins funding.

5. Online students will greatly benefit with remote desktop access to perform lessons without installing software. Furthermore I will be able to prepare desktop shortcuts and install patches. This is extremely important for folks with limited access to computers (they can login from any online computer) and also for Mac Users (GIS is a PC technology)

6. many of the students are working or attending other schools for which reason several students did not complete class, one started working. Lab can be better improved (server issues currently being examined by lab admin) to provide less frustration by students to perform lessons. Overall, great class .. students performed and participated very good.

Inferences: On campus students completed lessons successfully and presented their final lesson as expected. I'd like to explore emphasizing applications of GIS in the students respective field. There are students needing additional support and I find it difficult providing them support without meeting with each student.

Action Plan: In the fall I plan to start each new lesson in the room S309 in smaller room without distraction of monitors and to engage the students more in discussion. I'll have each student submit papers including one, about GIS in general, and two, regarding research using GIS
in their respective field. Clearly, the GIS classroom needs a support person for GIS. I plan to explore what CTE programs can provide some partial funding for a GIS lab support for couple of days each week.

**Local Resource Needs:** For online students, essentially important is the ability to provide student remote access to the lab through the 'cloud computing.' While I was hoping summer 2011 would be targeted staring period, I forsee this will not be available until fall (hopefully). This will make a HUGE difference in noth attrition and participation by avoiding any requirement to install software and downloading data and using the required text by enabling me to preset defaults on our lab stations and having it turn key for starting lessons, following tech from ANY computer regardless if Mac or a compuer in a library, grand parents, etc.

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
# Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course:** Principles of Animation  

**Outcome:** The student will create a convincing idle animation that clearly demonstrates the personality of a given character.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Spring 2011

---

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student will create a convincing idle animation that clearly demonstrates the personality of a given character. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>The student’s animation will not match the 2D key poses done in pre-visualization. The animation will not demonstrate a cursory understanding of the principals of animation, and a basic understanding of weight and timing. Student’s animation will not demonstrate the character’s personality.</td>
<td>The student’s animation will resemble but not match the 2D key poses done in pre-visualization. The animation will demonstrate a cursory understanding of the principals of animation, and a basic understanding of weight and timing. Student’s animation will vaguely communicate the character’s personality.</td>
<td>The student’s animation will accurately match the 2D key poses done in pre-visualization. The animation will demonstrate a thorough understanding of the principals of animation and a superior understanding of weight and timing. Student’s animation will clearly express the character’s personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>13 (31%)</td>
<td>18 (42.9%)</td>
<td>11 (26.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**
1. One more bouncing ball tutorial is needed covering timing and then two more tutorials using the bouncing ball character are needed, two idle animations should be created one angry and one happy. Students should have the option of be continually guided or left alone to create their own animations.

**Inferences:** The difficulty level was about right but more practice is needed at a cursory level before transitioning to more difficult animations.

**Action Plan:** Students easily understood key poses but proper use of timing when creating their animations was a bit more difficult to grasp. Create more simple animation assignments that concentrate on timing and a few different types of items to retain student’s interest.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Virtual Media: 3D Modeling and Texturing

Outcome: Given a set of orthographic template drawings of an object, students will construct a virtual 3D model by correctly visualizing its shape, accurately dimensioning its proportions and using efficient construction techniques.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2011

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student will demonstrate a thorough understanding of the polygon tools used when box modeling virtual 3D models. (Benchmark: 70%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>As a result of not choosing the suitable polygon tool and setting up the tools attributes improperly an unsuitable number of vertexes, edges and faces are present on the virtual model. — 51 (24.6%)</td>
<td>By choosing the suitable polygon tool but not setting up the tools attributes properly an inefficient number of vertexes, edges and faces are present on the virtual model. — 82 (39.6%)</td>
<td>By choosing the suitable polygon tool and setting up the tools attributes properly an efficient number of vertexes, edges and faces are used to define the virtual model. — 74 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student will demonstrate an understanding of non-manifold geometry and an efficient approach to representing detail in a polygon mesh.</td>
<td>Polygon mesh contains 2 or more of the following non-manifold geometry, edges that share more than two faces, faces that are defined by more</td>
<td>Polygon mesh contains only 1 or more of the following non-manifold geometry, edges that share more than two faces, faces that are defined by more</td>
<td>Polygon mesh contains none of the following non-manifold geometry, edges that share more than two faces, faces that are defined by more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Benchmark Achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark: 70%</th>
<th>than 4 edges, faces that lay on top of one another or the vertexes defining a face do not lay on a common plane. The polygon mesh contains an inefficient number of polygons.</th>
<th>than 4 edges, faces that lay on top of one another or the vertexes defining a face do not lay on a common plane. The polygon mesh contains an inefficient number of polygons.</th>
<th>edges, faces that lay on top of one another or the vertexes defining a face do not lay on a common plane. The polygon mesh contains an efficient number of polygons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>41 (24.3%)</td>
<td>54 (32%)</td>
<td>74 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student will demonstrate an understanding of the appropriate use of curves and surface tools when generating a virtual 3D mesh.</th>
<th>Curves were not correctly applied and Surface tools were not accurately set up when constructing the polygon mesh.</th>
<th>Curves were correctly applied but Surface tools were not accurately set up when constructing the polygon mesh.</th>
<th>Curves were correctly applied and Surface tools were accurately set up when constructing the polygon mesh.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark: 70%</td>
<td>43 (25.4%)</td>
<td>52 (30.8%)</td>
<td>74 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. A few more simplified modeling tutorials are necessary for students to succeed early in the semester and remain engaged.
2. Students begins to use 3DS MAX as their primary modeling package. It's a powerful tool ;therefore, it requires a longer learning curve. Students wish this class is repeatable.
3. Most of my students were doing work-study. Commitments to the class and assignments were uncertain due their work schedule and personal matters.

**Inferences:** Students need to succeed early in the semester in order to retain their interest, as the assignments are difficult. Need more quick Poly tool demos.

**Action Plan:** Students need to complete more simplified assignments to have a sense of accomplishment before starting on advanced
modeling techniques. Create quick modeling assignments that take beginning students minimal time and allow advanced students to work on more difficult projects.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
## Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course:** English Skills

**Outcome:** Writes short essays demonstrating basic sentence-level competency, effectively uses a thesis statement, and displays organization and control over the essay topic

**Terms Included in this Report:** Fall 2012

### Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students identify patterns of grammatical errors from a written list of 50 sentences.  
(Benchmark: 75%)  
**Benchmark Achieved**          | Less than 70% accuracy — 20 (20.2%) | 70-89% accuracy — 64 (64.6%) | 90-100% accuracy — 15 (15.2%) |
| Students utilize pre-writing techniques to generate ideas.  
(Benchmark: 80%)  
**Benchmark Achieved**          | Demonstrates no strategy — 4 (4%) | Demonstrates 1-2 strategies — 37 (37.4%) | Demonstrates 3 strategies — 58 (58.6%) |
| Students write sentences that support a topic sentence with specific examples and details.  
(Benchmark: 75%)          | Writes less than 4 sentences — 7 (7.1%) | Writes 4-6 sentences — 50 (50.5%) | Writes 7 or more sentences — 42 (42.4%) |
Benchmark Achieved

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Data from the identifying patterns of grammatical errors was taken from the class’ final exam. Data from students writing sentences that support a topic sentence was taken from the Rio Hondo College Common Final.
2. The scores from the RHC Common Final were used for the third rubric

Inferences: Students are generally doing well on writing essays, especially according to RHC college standards; problems appear to be related to identifying and correcting grammatical errors.

Action Plan: More emphasis will be placed on exercises/assignments related to mechanics, punctuation, grammar. Perhaps a pre-test/post-test may be useful in determining progress in this area.

Local Resource Needs: There has been an influx of students with autism, aspergers, and other cognitive impairments within the Edev courses. Faculty with expertise in this area would be helpful to maximize success, not only within DSPS, but within the general College. Unfortunately, this expertise is NOT currently available in our area as these individuals have retired and/or left the College and have not been replaced.

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
**Course Outcome Assessment Report**

**Course:** English Skills

**Outcome:** Writes short essays demonstrating basic sentence-level competency, effectively uses a thesis statement, and displays organization and control over the essay topic

**Terms Included in this Report:** Fall 2012

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students identify patterns of grammatical errors from a written list of 50 sentences. (Benchmark: 75%) <strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>Less than 70% accuracy — 20 (20.2%)</td>
<td>70-89% accuracy — 64 (64.6%)</td>
<td>90-100% accuracy — 15 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students utilize pre-writing techniques to generate ideas. (Benchmark: 80%) <strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates no strategy — 4 (4%)</td>
<td>Demonstrates 1-2 strategies — 37 (37.4%)</td>
<td>Demonstrates 3 strategies — 58 (58.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students write sentences that support a topic sentence with specific examples and details. (Benchmark: 75%)</td>
<td>Writes less than 4 sentences — 7 (7.1%)</td>
<td>Writes 4-6 sentences — 50 (50.5%)</td>
<td>Writes 7 or more sentences — 42 (42.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Data from the identifying patterns of grammatical errors was taken from the class’ final exam. Data from students writing sentences that support a topic sentence was taken from the Rio Hondo College Common Final.
2. The scores from the RHC Common Final were used for the third rubric.

**Inferences:** Students are generally doing well on writing essays, especially according to RHC standards; problems appear to be related to identifying and correcting grammatical errors.

**Action Plan:** More emphasis will be placed on exercises/assignments related to mechanics, punctuation, and grammar. Perhaps a pre-test/post-test may be useful in measuring progress in this area.

**Local Resource Needs:** There has been an influx of students with Autism, Aspergers, and other cognitive impairments within Edev courses. Faculty with expertise in this area would be helpful to maximize students' success, not only within DSPS, but within the general College. Unfortunately, this expertise is NOT currently available in our area as these specialists have retired and/or left the College and have not been replaced.

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: College Algebra

Outcome: Given the description of real-world problem, students construct correct equations and/or inequalities to represent the problem and determine the correct solution or set of solutions.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall 2012

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to develop an equation, a set of equations, or an inequality which correctly represents the problem posed in the text of the problem. The problem posed is appropriate to the level of the course. (Benchmark: 85%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of this rubric. — 26 (40.6%)</td>
<td>Given a representative and diverse series of questions, the student provides correct equations or inequalities for at least 80% of the problems. Do not count incidental errors (i.e. transposing numbers incorrectly from the textbook) against the student. — 38 (59.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to determine the correct solution or set of solutions through an appropriate, documenting all work where appropriate. (Benchmark: 90%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of this rubric. — 26 (40.6%)</td>
<td>The student provides correct solutions for at least 85% of the problems from the standard above. All work should be clearly shown except for the most basic problems. For more advanced courses, do not penalize the student where the work is correct but the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Benchmark was not achieved in either category. First reason is because most students, specially, non-math major students, have hard time with real word problems. Second reason is that the benchmark of 85% and 90% are unreasonably too high.

Action Plan: We need to reduce the benchmark a little (to 70%). To improve the student success in this area, we need to spend more time doing application problem and assigning more application problem. Future result shows if these steps improve SLOs.

Local Resource Needs: No extra resources is needed.

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: This course is taught as a Web-Enhanced class by most instructor. Many students on Financial aid are not receiving their financial aid early enough in the semester to get access code. As a result stay behind. Providing financial aid sooner in the semester may help this students and improve overall success rate.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Advanced Composition and Critical Thinking

Outcome: The student will be able to organize ideas logically.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall 2012

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student will be able to organize ideas logically (Benchmark: 85%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>No organization</td>
<td>Clear organization</td>
<td>Effective organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 175 (11.4%)</td>
<td>— 593 (38.8%)</td>
<td>— 761 (49.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. 2 students did not hand in final papers and are included in the unsatisfactory category.
2. The final exam was used as to assess this outcome. This was a timed persuasive essay in which students incorporated 2 outside sources and analyzed a documentary film for the effectiveness of its argument. The one student in the Unsatisfactory category did not take the final, as he had had surgery on his dominant elbow a week before the final.
3. Requiring my students to write from an outline for their final paper tremendously helped their organization. The first paper (in which no outline was required) had approx. 4-5 students who had very little organization. The final paper required an outline and only 1 student still had trouble logically organizing her paper.
4. The third persuasive research paper was the instrument to assess this student learning outcome. The one student in the Unsatisfactory category did not turn in this assignment, did not continue attending, did not drop the class, and subsequently failed the course.
However, if I had assessed this outcome using the first persuasive research paper of the semester, he would have been assessed in the Satisfactory category based on the results of Paper #1.

5. The third persuasive research paper of the semester was used to assess this SLO. The two students who were assessed in the Unsatisfactory range did not turn in the this assignment. All of the other 26 had mastered the basic concepts of argument organization by that time, at least to a Satisfactory level. This particular section was taught in a conventional classroom. Although just as high a percentage were assessed in the Excellent range as in CRN 31514, the number of students whose final grade was B equaled the number whose final grade was A. The particular group had more students in above average range than the 31514 section comprised of students who selected the computer classroom. It may be that the computer confident students are stronger academically. This might make a case for more computer classrooms for English instruction.

6. This is based on their final grades. I gave one student a D, 20 either a B or C, and three A's.

7. One student in the unsatisfactory count did not participate enough in the semester to be effectively evaluated.

8. The third persuasive research paper of the semester was used to assess this SLO. Students had mastered the basic concepts of argument organization by that time, at least to a Satisfactory level. This particular section was taught in the computer classroom LRC 129, and I believe the classroom promoted the built-in time for one-to-one instruction while the student is drafting. This is one of the most effective ways to ensure learning in composition, particularly in matters of logic and structure as in 201, but I believe this to be true for all levels of Composition, even developmental.

9. Generally students have a logical flow to their ideas, but effective theses and topic sentences are hard to come by.

10. A persuasive research paper from week 13 in the semester served as the assessment tool for this data.

11. A persuasive research paper from week 13 provided the assessment data for the outcomes recorded above.

12. I am basing this evaluation on our most important paper of the semester, the research paper that the students worked on for a month and a half. For this paper they needed to submit an outline two weeks before the paper was due for me to evaluate the likely organization of the yet unwritten paper; those outlines that suggested potential problems I returned with advice about how to repair the outline which was again to be submitted with the final paper. Turning in the outline well before the final paper itself helps assure greater overall class success, especially with organization.

Inferences: Given that the Benchmark was achieved with 89.1% students scoring satisfactory and above, we can conclude that instructors are effectively teaching students to organize their ideas in an essay logically.
Action Plan: We will attempt to identify those 10.9% students in need of additional help in the area of organizing ideas logically. Additional instruction and practice will be employed in the area of Outlining ideas in order to improve the students’ ability to organize their ideas logically. In addition to classroom lecture and classwork, the student will be directed to modules, in the writing lab computer program "Comp Class", that focus on strengthening Outlining skills. We will continue to assess students using the same methods utilized for this assessment report, in addition to the assessment of specific in-class and homework assignments.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Advanced Composition and Critical Thinking

Outcome: The student will be able to write persuasively.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall 2012

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student will be able to write</td>
<td>Not persuasive</td>
<td>Somewhat persuasive</td>
<td>Very persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persuasively (Benchmark: 85%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>177 (11.8%)</td>
<td>615 (40.9%)</td>
<td>713 (47.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. 2 students did not hand in papers and are included in the unsatisfactory category
2. The final exam was used as to assess this outcome. This was a timed persuasive essay in which students incorporated 2 outside sources and analyzed a documentary film for the effectiveness of its argument. The one student in the Unsatisfactory category did not take the final, as he had had surgery on his dominant elbow a week before the final.
3. Going over different strategies for arguing along with different argumentative patterns really helped my students understand their main purpose. Viewing sample student essays also played a large role in showing them how to persuade their audience (evaluating why some students were persuasive and why others weren't).
4. The third persuasive research paper was the instrument used to assess this student learning outcome. The one student in the Unsatisfactory category did not turn in this assignment, did not continue attending, did not drop the class, and subsequently failed the course.
5. The third persuasive research paper of the semester was used to assess this SLO. The two students who were assessed in the Unsatisfactory range did not turn in the this assignment. All of the other 26 had mastered the basic concepts of argument organization by that time, at least to a Satisfactory level. This particular section was taught in a conventional classroom. Although just as high a percentage were assessed in the Excellent range as in CRN 31514, the number of students whose final grade was B equaled the number whose final grade was A. The particular group had more students in above average range than the 31514 section comprised of students who selected the computer classroom. It may be that the computer confident students are stronger academically. This might make a case for more computer classrooms for English instruction.

6. One student in the unsatisfactory count did not participate enough in the semester to be effectively evaluated.

7. Syntheses are improving, generally, among my students.

8. A persuasive research paper from week 13 of the semester provided the assessment tool for this data.

9. A persuasive research paper from week 13 provided the assessment tool for the outcomes recorded above. The one student who assessed in the Unsatisfactory category did not turn in the assessed paper. I explain further in the "Comments" section of the Degree SLO below.

10. In English 201 we study persuasive writing all semester so the research paper is not the first argumentative paper the students have written. Many of the essays are written in class and two or three of the essays they write have theses that go against the grain of ordinary opinion, defenses of perhaps dubious points of view, exercises to challenge comfortable assumptions and to deal with challenges to what they believe. This background helps prepare them for their main class assignment in which they have a longer time to develop their final argumentative paper.

**Inferences:** Given that the Benchmark was achieved with 88.7% students scoring satisfactory and above, we can conclude that instructors are effectively teaching students to organize their ideas in an essay logically.

**Action Plan:** In order to assist the 11.3% of students who scored unsatisfactory, we will attempt to identify students in need of additional instruction regarding persuasive writing and employ techniques that the student can utilize in order to strengthen their persuasive writing techniques. First, the students will be presented with an analysis of a persuasive text that they can model in order to identify the techniques of persuasive writing and to subsequently strengthen their own persuasive writing techniques. Secondly, in-class assignments will be conducted that focus on practicing and eventually strengthening their abilities to write persuasively. In addition, the student will be directed to modules in
“Comp Class” that focus on persuasive writing techniques in order to offer the student further practice. We will continue to assess students using the same methods utilized for this assessment report, in addition to the assessment of specific in-class and homework assignments.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Advanced Composition and Critical Thinking

Outcome: Upon successful completion of this degree, the student will be able to document sources using a designated citation format.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall 2012

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student will correctly document sources. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>Student will incorrectly document or document too few or no outside sources.</td>
<td>Student will correctly document all or some outside sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>47 (14.4%)</td>
<td>280 (85.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. A persuasive research paper from week 13 of the semester provided the assessment tool for this data.
2. A persuasive research paper from week 13 provided the assessment outcomes recorded above. The one student whose assessment was not proficient did not complete the assignment past the outline stage. He did produce a workable outline with well organized ideas to prove an arguable thesis; however, he did not complete the paper and was scored in the bottom level for the 2nd and 3rd SLO in this set of 3. The qualitative data relevant to this student's performance is that he is a vet, troubled and, by his account, resistant to current outreach by the RHC Veteran's Services. In my opinion he had the capability to succeed in ENGL 201, but poor attendance and follow through with assignments lowered his grade and sapped his confidence. He plans to repeat the course in Spring 2013.
3. Although students should have mastered such documentation in English 101, I do see problems even from otherwise good students. In the class we read two or three research papers together, almost in their entirety, and a main point that I stressed at that time was to
have a perfect symmetry between what they cited in the paper (and perhaps what they should also have cited) and what appears in the Works Cited, altogether a matter of the paper's integrity.

**Inferences:** Given that the Benchmark was achieved with 85.7% students scoring satisfactory and above, we can conclude that instructors are effectively teaching students to organize their ideas in an essay logically.

**Action Plan:** In order to assist students, such as those who scored 14.4% not proficient, we will be providing students with work cited papers that they can model in order to strengthen their documentation skills. Also, we will stress the importance of symmetry between the work cited page and what has been cited in the essay itself. In-class assignments will focus on identifying and citing sources correctly from the essay to the work cited page. For additional practice the students will be directed to modules in "Comp Class" that will help them strengthen their documentation skills. We will continue to assess students using the same methods utilized for this assessment report, in addition to the assessment of specific in-class and homework assignments.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Elementary Algebra

Outcome: Given the description of real-world problem, students construct correct equations and/or inequalities to represent the problem and determine the correct solution or set of solutions.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to develop an equation which correctly represents the problem posed in the text of the problem. The problem posed is appropriate to the level of the course. (Benchmark: 75%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of this rubric. — 362 (48.9%)</td>
<td>Given a representative and diverse series of questions, the student provides correct equations or inequalities for at least 80% of the problems. Do not count incidental errors (i.e. transposing numbers incorrectly from the textbook) against the student. — 379 (51.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to determine the correct solution through an appropriate, documenting all work where appropriate. (Benchmark: 75%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of this rubric. — 423 (57.1%)</td>
<td>The student provides correct solutions for at least 75% of the problems from the standard above. All work should be clearly shown except for the most basic problems. — 318 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Most students could not properly set up the equation. It was given on the final exam as a consecutive integer problem. As can be seen by the rubric, it does not match the form of the single question that was administered here. Once the student is not able to set up the equation, it is clear that this same student cannot compute the remainder of the problem proficiently.

2. Most students could not properly set up the equation. It was given on the final exam as a consecutive integer problem. As can be seen by the rubric, it does not match the form of the single question that was administered here. Once the student is not able to set up the equation, it is clear that this same student cannot compute the remainder of the problem proficiently.

3. Most of the students memorized the formula, however not a lot of them understood the concept of the formula and the real world applications.

4. based on final exam - system of eq and work probs. Many "skipped" or barely attempted the problems. some had weird equations. couple had a good start. Ones that got the equations, most got it correct - just minor errors in solving for the ones that didn't.

5. based on final exam - system of eq and work probs. Many "skipped" or barely attempted the problems. some had weird equations. couple had a good start. Ones that got the equations, most got it correct - just minor errors in solving for the ones that didn't.

Inferences: From our data, 50% of the students are proficient in developing a correct equation. This is 25% below our benchmark. 41.6% of the students are able to the correct solution through an appropriate work. This is 33.4% below our benchmark.

Action Plan: We must provide more practice in application problems. More time should be allocated for these topics.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course: Approaches to Literature

Outcome: Students will demonstrate an ability to incorporate outside sources through the use of quotes and paraphrases.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an ability to incorporate outside sources through the use of quotes and paraphrases. (Benchmark: 20%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Little to no use of outside sources. — 19 (16.8%)</td>
<td>Some use of outside sources. — 47 (41.6%)</td>
<td>Extensive use of outside sources. — 47 (41.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Review of MLA through small group work and/or office hours with struggling students may have helped the 20% of students who were unsatisfactory.

Action Plan: Reviewing MLA through small group work and/or office hours with struggling students will help students who perform at an
unsatisfactory level. Additionally, working with an instructor in the Writing Center will prove beneficial.

**Local Resource Needs:** Additional instructors for literature-based classes are needed in the Writing Center.

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
**Course Outcome Assessment Report**

**Course:** Two Dimensional Design

**Outcome:** Students will create a color wheel showing an understanding of hue, value, temperature and saturation.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Spring 2013

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neatly organized, using media correctly and demonstrating a clear understanding of all four properties of color. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>74 (31.9%)</td>
<td>158 (68.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark Not Achieved**

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

1. The vast majority of the students were highly successful and we are meeting our benchmark.
2. This is the first semester that I have had students that were willing to take an F rather than complete the assignment. I'm not sure what that indicates. Is it a media problem or a general degradation of incoming students prior knowledge of the material.
3. This is the first semester that I have had students that were willing to take an F rather than complete the assignment. I'm not sure what that indicates. Is it a media problem or a general degradation of incoming students prior knowledge of the material.
4. This is a complex subject and over 2/3 of the students gain, or have an understanding of it. I will try to do this in another way and see if I can reach all of them. Perhaps something less tedious and more engaging will help.
Inferences: the students are not finding this process as effective as I would like. I’m going to try something that might include an easy construction in order to show the spherical nature of color theory.

Action Plan: develop a process to do that, perhaps plaster or foam core.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: History of Minorities: Mexican Americans, Asian Americans and American Women

Outcome: Given a specific historical topic students will support generalizations with concrete historical evidence and draw relevant conclusions in a written or oral assignment.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student makes meaningful generalizations supported by accurate and concrete historical evidence. (Benchmark: 75%)</td>
<td>The student does not make meaningful generalizations supported by accurate and concrete historical evidence.</td>
<td>The student makes meaningful generalizations supported by accurate and concrete historical evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>6 (16.2%)</td>
<td>31 (83.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: While students still had to develop generalizations and choose evidence in support of those generalizations, because the assignment was not completed within controlled conditions of the classroom the results may not be a good reflection of what students learned. A better assessment would be possible with an in-class assignment.
**Action Plan:** The nature of the assignment needs to be changed, to begin with. Only with a better reflection of student learning can changes in instruction be addressed in any meaningful way. The assessment of student learning objectives in this course is clearly evolving through a trial and error process.

**Local Resource Needs:** One resource that may prove very effective in presenting material in the course and which would ultimately impact on student learning would be the availability of an Elmo Document Projector.

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** While the History Department collectively determined the learning objectives for the course, the design of the assignment and its assessment has been done by me alone.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Parenting

Outcome: Students will compare and contrast four parenting styles.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses are relevant to the assigned topic.</td>
<td>Responses are unrelated or assignment is incomplete.</td>
<td>Majority of responses are relevant and accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>— 6 (14.3%)</td>
<td>— 36 (85.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses adhere to the guidelines/criteria required.</td>
<td>Does not follow the guidelines/criteria or is incomplete.</td>
<td>Guidelines/criteria followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>— 3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>— 39 (92.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to the questions posed.</td>
<td>Critical components do not logically relate to current issues.</td>
<td>Most critical components listed logically related to current issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>— 3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>— 39 (92.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations
1. 3 students did not complete the assignment.

**Inferences:** Students need to be assisted in completing the assignments.

**Action Plan:** Work on portions of the assignment in class.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** Sondra Moe Patricia Kepner Carol Sigala Kelly Lynch Susan Sueng Tracy Rodriquez
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Postcolonial Literature

Outcome: Students should be able to demonstrate a thesis.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student should be able to demonstrate a thesis. (Benchmark: 85%)</td>
<td>No thesis — 1 (25%)</td>
<td>Thesis — 1 (25%)</td>
<td>Clear, analytical thesis — 2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Students need additional help developing and refining thesis statements.

Action Plan: Instructor needs to offer more specific directives/activities regarding thesis development. Instructor can include more in-class workshops, which will work to help students develop their thesis-writing ability. In addition, can offer individual conferences to help students on a more specific basis.
Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Postcolonial Literature

Outcome: Students should be able to analyze texts and explain the various themes and characteristics of postcolonial literature.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to analyze texts and explain the various themes and</td>
<td>Little to no analysis of texts</td>
<td>Some analysis of texts</td>
<td>Extensive analysis of texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics of postcolonial literature. (Benchmark: 85%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Students need additional help in developing their analytical skills.

Action Plan: Instructor needs to offer more direction regarding analysis. Instructor can include more in-class workshops, which will work to
help students develop their analytical skills. Instructor can create in-class group activities which focus on close-reading and thematic analysis.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Approaches to Literature

Outcome: Students will provide critical analysis of literature.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate critical analysis of literature. (Benchmark: 20%)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate minimal or no analysis of the literature. — 1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate some critical analysis of the literature. — 1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>Students demonstrate specific critical analysis of the literature. — 7 (77.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark Achieved

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Struggling students may be able to do better with additional individualized assistance.

Action Plan: More small group, goal-oriented projects be completed in class.

Local Resource Needs: Struggling students should meet with the instructor during office hours.
Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Print Reading for Construction

Outcome: Given a set of architectural drawings students will be able to read and interpret the drawings such that they would be able to explain the drawings to a customer or client that has no architectural knowledge.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given a set of architectural drawings students will be able to read and interpret the</td>
<td>The students is not able to read, interpret or explain the architectural</td>
<td>The students is able to read and interpret and explain the architectural</td>
<td>The students is able to read and interpret the architectural drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawings such that they would be able to explain the drawings to a customer or client that</td>
<td>drawings — 3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>drawings — 2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>drawings and explain them clearly leaving no questions or uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has no architectural knowledge. (Benchmark: 100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— 19 (79.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted
Inferences: Emphasize to students that they need to come to class on a regular basis.

Action Plan: Incorporate attendance into total grade points.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Architectural Design Studio

Outcome: Given an architectural design problem with a specific plot plan as a basis, student will provide a preliminary design solution according to architectural principles and criteria set forth in the problem. Any person with the same training could create the solution from the same architectural problem.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2011

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given an architectural design problem with a specific plot plan as a basis, student should provide a preliminary design solution according to architectural principles and criteria set forth in the problem. Any person with the same training could create the solution from the same architectural problem. (Benchmark: 100%)</td>
<td>Views are presented. Drawings demonstrate a need to improve aspects such as appropriate selection and placement of views, neatness, cleanliness, proper line weights, symbols and dimensioning methods. The drawing do not meet industrial standards — 7 (10.3%)</td>
<td>Correctly visualize and represent the shape (plan) of the structure with visible and hidden lines shown, produce elevations and pictorial drawings Identify room and space sizes when appropriate. The drawing has qualities of neatness and cleanliness. Lines are drawn with proper line weights and all necessary dimensions are shown and correctly placed with appropriate scale lettering. The drawing meets industrial standards.</td>
<td>Correctly visualize the shape (plan) of the structure with all visible and hidden lines shown, produce elevations and pictorial drawings with correct technique and line weights Accurately identify room and space sizes The drawing is clean and neat. All lines are drawn with proper line weights and all necessary dimensions are shown and correctly placed with appropriate scale lettering. Efficiently use tools and techniques. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Students need to understand the importance of planning and scheduling in order to complete projects not only in the classroom environment but also how this will transfer on into the workplace.

Inferences: Students need to understand the importance of completing projects on time as well as workmanship.


Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Civil Engineering Drafting and Design

Outcome: Given drafting tools and schematic drawings, student will describe the purpose and types of map scale and symbols used on civil documentation, illustrate the relationship between the building structure and the site, draw a topographic map from engineering data, draw a grade plan and create a three dimensional model with the proper use of contour lines and slopes.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and describe the purpose and types of map scale and symbols used on civil documentation (Benchmark: 100%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>Unable to describe the purpose and types of map scale and symbols used on civil documentation — 2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>Illustrate the types of map scale and symbols used on civil documentation — 4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>Understand and describe the purpose and types of map scale and symbols used on civil documentation — 5 (45.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrate the relationship between the building structure and the site, draw a topographic map from engineering data (Benchmark: 100%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>Unable to illustrate the relationship between the building structure and the site, draw a topographic map from engineering data — 2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>Draw a site plan showing building location — 4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>Draw a site plan showing building location and topography of site — 5 (45.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw a grade plan and create a three dimensional model with the proper use of contour lines and slopes (Benchmark: 100%)</td>
<td>Unable to draw a grade plan and create a three dimensional model with the proper use of contour lines and slopes</td>
<td>Create a grade plan and construct a three dimensional model with contour lines</td>
<td>Create a grade plan and construct a three dimensional model with proper contour lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (45.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

1. Students need to focus on the task at hand and ask questions if lesson or projects are not clear or what is expected of him in order to complete the course work and receive a satisfactory grade.

**Inferences:** Students need to understand the importance of completing projects on time as well as workmanship and attendance.

**Action Plan:** Emphasize the importance of completing projects on time as well as workmanship and attendance.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Fundamentals of Oral Communication

Outcome: Students will conclude the course with an understanding of conflict management strategies in an interpersonal relationship context.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I (the instructor) felt that the student gained a(n) understanding of conflict management in an interpersonal setting. (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>9 (10.8%)</td>
<td>38 (45.8%)</td>
<td>36 (43.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. missing data from three students

Inferences: This is a very high success rate and it showed a great increase from Fall 2009.

Action Plan: One instructor expressed a change in structure of this hybrid course, placing the section on interpersonal communication in the
middle. We can make this suggestion to others teaching the course.

**Local Resource Needs:** The same software that was requested for the Speech 100 course could be used for this section of this course also.

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course:** Fundamentals of Oral Communication

**Outcome:** Students will conclude the course with the ability to deliver a coherent speech inclusive of a distinctive introduction, body, and conclusion; including 2-3 substantive main points within the body and appropriate transitions.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Spring, 2010

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speech included a distinctive introduction, body, and conclusion.</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>43 (58.1%)</td>
<td>28 (37.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Benchmark: 85%)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The body of the speech included 2-3 substantive main points.</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>51 (68.9%)</td>
<td>20 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Benchmark: 85%)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate transitions (previews, transitions, and summaries) were integrated in</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>51 (68.9%)</td>
<td>20 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Benchmark: 85%)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. This semester I also switched the order of the component of the course to cover Public speaking first and it seemed to have worked in retaining more students to stay and worked on the more "nerve wrecking" portion first. More of them stayed after the first portion and worked through the rest of the communication concepts--self concept, interpersonal, small group and organizational.

Inferences: Very impressive results from a hybrid course that does not dedicate the entire semester to public speaking.

Action Plan: One instructor indicated that she taught the public speaking portion of this course first instead of last. This may have produced this significant improvement from Fall 2009. We will tell other instructors to experiment with this shift.

Local Resource Needs: The tutors and/or labs discussed under the 101 SLOs should be available for students taking Speech 102 also.

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Approaches to Literature

Outcome: Students will document outside sources using designated citation format.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will document outside sources using designated citation format. (Benchmark: 20%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Inaccurate or no documentation of source materials.</td>
<td>Correctly documents some source materials.</td>
<td>Correctly documents all source materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (11.3%)</td>
<td>33 (46.5%)</td>
<td>30 (42.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Since students may not have completed ENGL 101, they may not be familiar with documenting sources accurately.

Action Plan: Encourage use of the MLA Handbook and RHC Library resources which include MLA workshops

Local Resource Needs: RHC Library and research librarians
Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Approaches to Literature

Outcome: Students will demonstrate an ability to incorporate outside sources through the use of quotes and paraphrases.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an ability to incorporate outside sources through the use of quotes and paraphrases. (Benchmark: 20%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Little to no use of outside sources.</td>
<td>Some use of outside sources.</td>
<td>Extensive use of outside sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— 8 (12.5%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 (50%)</td>
<td>24 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Students may benefit from additional journal assignments that emphasize quoting and paraphrasing from literature.

Action Plan: Dedicate some journal assignments, at the beginning of the semester, before students submit essays to be graded.
Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Fundamentals of Oral Communication

Outcome: Students will conclude the course with the ability to deliver a coherent speech inclusive of a distinctive introduction, body, and conclusion; including 2-3 substantive main points within the body and appropriate transitions.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speech included a distinctive introduction, body, and conclusion. <em>(Benchmark: 85%)</em></td>
<td>5 (4.8%)</td>
<td>69 (65.7%)</td>
<td>31 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The body of the speech included 2-3 substantive main points. <em>(Benchmark: 85%)</em></td>
<td>7 (6.7%)</td>
<td>75 (71.4%)</td>
<td>23 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate transitions (previews, transitions, and summaries) were integrated in</td>
<td>13 (12.4%)</td>
<td>70 (66.7%)</td>
<td>22 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. This semester I also switched the order of the component of the course to cover Public speaking first and it seemed to have worked in retaining more students to stay and worked on the more "nerve wrecking" portion first. More of them stayed after the first portion and worked through the rest of the communication concepts--self concept, interpersonal, small group and organizational.

**Inferences:** Student success in this area improved from previous semesters as instructors began teaching this course with the public speaking section in order to avoid rushing that information at the end. It appears that the public speaking focus was not on transitional material.

**Action Plan:** We will ask instructors to be sure to spend a little more time on transitions.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Fundamentals of Oral Communication

Outcome: Students should be able to control/manage their verbal and nonverbal communication to enhance the audience’s understanding and appreciation of the speech message appropriate to the specific audience.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speaker controlled/managed his or her vocal qualities (volume, rate, pitch,</td>
<td>13 (11.1%)</td>
<td>91 (77.8%)</td>
<td>13 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocal variety, emphasis, pauses) in the speech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker controlled/managed other forms of nonverbal communication (facial</td>
<td>21 (17.6%)</td>
<td>86 (72.3%)</td>
<td>12 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression, body movement, eye contact, gestures, posture) in the speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Effective delivery was still difficult to achieve given the limited amount of time students had; ineffectiveness was largely due to the lack of practice and the lack of class time to work on delivery.

Inferences: There is a significant difference in results between vocal delivery and other forms of nonverbal communication. One reason could be that students who experience intense speaking anxiety often aim to avoid Speech 101 and instead take Speech 102. The anxiety these students have could be preventing them from delivering effectively and in this course where the instructor has limited time to spend on public speaking, the student in not able to get proper time delivering to improve delivery.

Action Plan: We will ask instructors to try to fit in more public speaking opportunities throughout the semester as try to discuss speaking anxiety more.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: English as a Second Language (ESL)-Composition

Outcome: Students will begin writing well developed paragraphs and transition into four paragraph essays. Their essays will include effective introductory and concluding remarks, a clear thesis, and strong support for the thesis.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2011

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 percent proficiency (Benchmark: 1%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>14 (25%)</td>
<td>33 (58.9%)</td>
<td>9 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 percent proficiency (Benchmark: 1%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>7 (18.4%)</td>
<td>25 (65.8%)</td>
<td>6 (15.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. The majority (21 out of 22) did very well on the common final. Having a mock common final really helped demystify the “Common Final.” Brainstorming in class for both the mock and real Common Final also proved beneficial. Similar preparation may continue to yield positive results.
**Inferences:** Keys for future success of students in ESL 197 should include collaborative prewriting for the Common Final and providing students with one or more mock common finals. These components should help prepare students for writing under pressure.

**Action Plan:** Since collaborative prewriting and mock final exams appear to improve students' performance, perhaps additional prewriting and in-class essays would decrease students' anxiety over the Common Final, resulting in better scores.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** Further discussion is needed as to the importance/relevance of a Common Final for ESL 30 and 197 students.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course:** Readings in the Short Story

**Outcome:** Students should be able to provide logical and original interpretation of text(s) in their written work.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Spring 2012

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to provide logical and original interpretation of text(s) in their written work. (Benchmark: 85%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>Interpretation either unsupported or illogical. — 5 (26.3%)</td>
<td>Occasional lapses in logic in written work, but ideas generally well-supported — 8 (42.1%)</td>
<td>Logical and original analysis of text(s) in written work. — 6 (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

*No additional information was submitted*

**Inferences:** The wide range of competencies among LIT 145 students suggest that instructors need to devote more time to helping students distinguish between flabby, problematic "readings" of texts and the kind of sharp, logical analyses that are worthy of college-level work.

**Action Plan:** Instructors should offer more examples of model essays to students and should devote more class time to breaking down these
essays. Also, instructors should offer individual conferences, perhaps in the middle of the semester, to students struggling to compose sound readings of the texts.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

**Course:** Basic Vocabulary

**Outcome:** Students will accurately recognize, recall and use target vocabulary words presented in a class exam to distinguish between multiple meanings and parts of speech according to context. Students will use correct spelling, acknowledge word components and produce functionally intelligible pronunciation.

**Terms Included in this Report:** Fall 2012

**Data Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will accurately recognize, recall and use target vocabulary words presented in a class exam to distinguish between multiple meanings and parts of speech according to context. Students will use correct spelling, acknowledge word components and produce functionally intelligible pronunciation. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>Students consistently misuse target vocabulary in a sentence. They also misidentify the definition as well as the part of speech of the target vocabulary. — 0 (%)</td>
<td>On an exam, students will correctly identify the part of speech, relevant definitions of target vocabulary and use of target vocabulary in a sentence with 70 percent regularity. — 0 (%)</td>
<td>On an exam, students will correctly identify the part of speech, relevant definitions of target vocabulary and use of target vocabulary in a sentence with 90 percent regularity. — 0 (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Twelve of fifteen students successfully assimilated 70% of the new vocabulary. Unlike the three students that did not reach this benchmark, the students that did had excellent attendance and participation habits.

Inferences: 80 percent of students reached or exceeded the benchmark for the course. Better attendance and participation habits seem to be the reason for the disparity between the 80 percent that succeeded in the course from the 20 percent that did not.

Action Plan: An attempt to earlier identify struggling students may improve the chances for the students not reaching the satisfactory benchmark. The instructor/department may then offer the struggling students assistance with their deficit skills.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Elementary Algebra

Outcome: Given the description of real-world problem, students construct correct equations and/or inequalities to represent the problem and determine the correct solution or set of solutions.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to develop an equation which correctly represents the problem posed in the text of the problem. The problem posed is appropriate to the level of the course. (Benchmark: 75%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of this rubric. --- 362 (48.9%)</td>
<td>Given a representative and diverse series of questions, the student provides correct equations or inequalities for at least 80% of the problems. Do not count incidental errors (i.e. transposing numbers incorrectly from the textbook) against the student. --- 379 (51.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to determine the correct solution through an appropriate, documenting all work where appropriate. (Benchmark: 75%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of this rubric. --- 423 (57.1%)</td>
<td>The student provides correct solutions for at least 75% of the problems from the standard above. All work should be clearly shown except for the most basic problems. --- 318 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Most students could not properly set up the equation. It was given on the final exam as a consecutive integer problem. As can be seen by the rubric, it does not match the form of the single question that was administered here. Once the student is not able to set up the equation, it is clear that this same student cannot compute the remainder of the problem proficiently.

2. Most students could not properly set up the equation. It was given on the final exam as a consecutive integer problem. As can be seen by the rubric, it does not match the form of the single question that was administered here. Once the student is not able to set up the equation, it is clear that this same student cannot compute the remainder of the problem proficiently.

3. Most of the students memorized the formula, however not a lot of them understood the concept of the formula and the real world applications.

4. Based on final exam - system of eq and work probs. Many "skipped" or barely attempted the problems. Some had weird equations. Couple had a good start. Ones that got the equations, most got it correct - just minor errors in solving for the ones that didn't.

5. Based on final exam - system of eq and work probs. Many "skipped" or barely attempted the problems. Some had weird equations. Couple had a good start. Ones that got the equations, most got it correct - just minor errors in solving for the ones that didn't.

Inferences: From our data, 50% of the students are proficient in developing a correct equation. This is 25% below our benchmark. 41.6% of the students are able to the correct solution through an appropriate work. This is 33.4% below our benchmark.

Action Plan: We must provide more practice in application problems. More time should be allocated for these topics.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Calculus II

Outcome: Given an improper integral, the student will correctly set up the problem and determine whether the integral is convergent or divergent. When it is convergent, the student can evaluate the integral.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student will correctly set up the problem.</td>
<td>30 (11.2%)</td>
<td>53 (19.8%)</td>
<td>185 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student will correctly determine if the integral converges or diverges.</td>
<td>90 (33.8%)</td>
<td>76 (28.6%)</td>
<td>100 (37.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. no qualitative data is obtained here.
2. The problem was given on the final exam. Most students seem to know how to set up the problem. Also determining whether the
improper integral converges or diverges seems to be fine with most students. Only using the L'Hospital’s rule, some students did not follow through it carefully. Overall, they performed very good for this SLO.

3. The majority of students could set up the integral using the proper notation involving limits. The integral involved a u-substitution. Students who did not earn a satisfactory score evaluating this integral did not recognize the u-sub. Students who earned a satisfactory score correctly determined that the integral diverged, but had notational errors with the limits of integration for the u-sub. NOTE: My other section of Calc II had a different improper integral for their SLO on their Final Exam for test security reasons.

4. This integral involved integration by parts. Most of the students had the integral set up correctly using the limit notation required for improper integrals. The students who earned unsatisfactory scores for the second part did not correctly integrate by parts, and therefore did not determine that the integral converged. NOTE: I gave different problems to my two separate sections since this was a problem on the final exam.

5. Convergent improper integral which required a u-substitution. This problem was overall easier that the problem I assigned to Sec 72332. Since the classes were on different days, I gave different problems. Perhaps I should leave the SLO problem exactly the same. Satisfactory on the 2nd part was given to students who determined the integral converged, but with a minor computational or notational error.

6. Convergent improper integral which required two rounds of integration by parts. This problem was much harder than the problem I assigned to Sec 71334. Since the classes were on different days, I gave different problems. Perhaps I should leave the SLO problem exactly the same. Satisfactory on the 2nd part was given to students who determined the integral converged, but with a minor computational or notational error. The students who were unsatisfactory in setting up the problem either didn't use proper limit notation OR didn't recognize that the integral was by parts.

7. The students who scored unsatisfactory on the set up confused the improper integral with a series and tried to use a convergence test (other than the integral test!). Most students who scored unsatisfactory on the evaluation part integrated properly but evaluated the limit incorrectly.

Inferences: 83% can set up the integrals using proper notation. Only 55% are completing the problem correctly. Some were stuck in the integration step, others in evaluating the limit.

Action Plan: We are going to change the SLO rubric to distinguish between results for integration and limit evaluation. Review for limits needs to be included with this section or earlier in the semester.
Local Resource Needs: Make use of MESA/SSS Academic Excellence Workshops to do more review of evaluation of limits.

Resource Requests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>In order to help students visualize and understand calculus concepts, we need computers and projectors in all calculus classrooms.</td>
<td>$5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments: Written by Krysia Mayer and Lydia Gonzalez.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: The History and Development of the Theatre

Outcome: The student will be able to identify the 4 steps needed for theatre to separate from religion.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can identify all 4 steps needed for the theatre to exist separately from religion. (Benchmark: 75%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>19 (61.3%)</td>
<td>12 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. This topic needs to be explained in a clearer way with more examples.

Inferences: These stats are sadly accurate and so are the teachers comments. This is a hard concept for the student to understand and usually it is covered at the beginning of the semester, long before the mid-term.

Action Plan: A review nearer the test would help with this SLO. The benchmark is probably right, the students need to get closer to it so the teacher needs to emphasize it more or perhaps double test the students.
Local Resource Needs:

**Resource Requests:** None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Theatre Arts Appreciation

Outcome: The student will identify Aristotle's six components of a play.


Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student can identify 5 of 6 components and cite examples from plays. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>The student cannot successfully identify these components and examples.</td>
<td>The student can identify these components and examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>304 (26.2%)</td>
<td>858 (73.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Students were evaluated via a short answer quiz. A score of 80% was considered "proficient."
2. Students were evaluated via a short answer quiz. A score of 80% was considered "proficient."
3. It seems to me the wrong boxes are labeled NOT Proficient and Proficient, it is confusing.
4. It seems to me that the boxes are mislabeled: Not proficient then describes proficiency, and proficient describes not proficient, it is confusing.
5. The criteria for proficiency appear to be reversed. "The student can successfully identify...." should be evidence of proficiency. "The student cannot identify..." should be evidence of insufficiency. Please interpret my numbers as per the following: 24 out of 26 students achieved proficiency; 2 out of 26 students did not. Thanks. Susanna Levitt
**Inferences:** These stats seem accurate and very positive. Over 80% of the students are at the proficient level which is above the benchmark. Online is even higher, perhaps because of the testing method or lack of no-shows

**Action Plan:** Things should continue as is. Perhaps the benchmark should be raised to 75%.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: The Art of Mexico

Outcome: Given a slide image related to course lecture and reading material (Precolumbian through Modern Mexican art and architecture), students will be able to identify the work of art and attribute it to the correct artist.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam score of 70% or higher.</td>
<td>166 (19.9%)</td>
<td>670 (80.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. students have trouble with artists' names-- multiple choice method of assessment is preferable
2. This is a course taught from 7 to 10 pm. Many of my students are working full time or engaged all day with young children. The rigors curriculum requires a great degree of self motivation since we only meet weekly.
3. This program is for early college on the campus of Mt. View high school. These students are not chosen to participate due to their grades and therefore anyone can apply. I have high expectations for them and they meet or exceed those expectations
4. The high grades in this class are due in part to the fact that it is a night class. Many of the students are mature adults who have very busy lives and they work very hard to do well. I am continually puzzled by students who stay in the course so long in the semester, do a lot of work, take many tests and still drop at the very last moment!
5. Assessment through quizzes, midterm and final examinations.
6. This course is part of the Early College Academy at Mt. View high school.
7. This course was part of the Early College Academy at Pioneer High School.

**Inferences:** Current instruction provides students with adequate resources for achieving this student learning outcome.

**Action Plan:** Implementation of early non-participation-drop policy refines class to students more committed to success in online classes. More careful monitoring of course progress throughout the semester will improve student success in traditional class.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Principles of Microeconomics

Outcome: Given a situation of an economic choice, explain the opportunity cost in terms of the alternative use of resources.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009, Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct, clear, logical and appropriate use of this major principles (Benchmark: 70%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>51 (24.1%)</td>
<td>161 (75.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: The level of proficiency is good, but could probably be improved. There has been some improvement on this concept. That may be because in some classes, students were required to do an application on this concept and/or to use the concept in looking at costs of gov't regulation.

Action Plan: continued integration of the concept in the course. Integrate the concept in class exercises, including problems, games and policy analysis. We have been using Aplia (online interactive problem sets) which has been useful to our students, but it has become
increasingly expensive for our students.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: Online interactive problems Game and interactive
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Principles of Microeconomics

Outcome: Given a situation of an economic choice, explain the opportunity cost in terms of the alternative use of resources.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall, 2009, Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct, clear, logical and appropriate use of this major principles (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td>51 (24.1%)</td>
<td>161 (75.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: 1. proficiency level is good, but could be improved. Increased proficiency over Econ 101. 2. Level has improved from last year in comparable courses (semester comparisons done in course with same times) This appears to be due to extended, integrated applications of the concept in course activities.

Action Plan: Integrate concept into activities throughout the course: e.g. costs of policy implementation, market adjustments, market failure, etc.
Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: Integration could be greatly enhanced by interactive and collaborative work that could be done with increased computer based activities.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Human Physiology

Outcome: Given an example of qualitative data, displayed graphically, representing the effect of varying pH and temperature on enzyme function, students will be able to evaluate the relationship between enzyme function and varying conditions.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes the relationship between enzyme function and temperature (Benchmark: 85%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Fails to recognize that temperature affects enzyme function and does not demonstrate knowledge of exact mechanism — 16 (11.9%)</td>
<td>Correctly identifies that temperature change affects enzyme function by stopping or slowing enzyme function due to denaturation (at high heat) — 118 (88.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes the relationship between enzyme function and pH (Benchmark: 85%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Fails to recognize that pH affects enzyme function and does not demonstrate knowledge of exact mechanism — 18 (13.5%)</td>
<td>Correctly identifies that pH change affects enzyme function by stopping enzyme function due to denaturation of the enzyme — 115 (86.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations
1. The data indicate that the majority of students are very aware of the effects of temperature and pH on enzyme function. For the few students deemed not proficient, there needs to be more emphasis on denaturing of proteins.
2. Data indicate that more emphasis throughout the course on the effects of temperature and pH on enzyme function may be helpful to our students.
3. Data indicate that the topic of temperature and pH effecting protein function is being appropriately addressed in this course. For those that are not proficient, more emphasis on the denaturing of proteins would help.
4. The data indicate that bench mark has not been met. This indicates that more emphasis should be placed on this topic during lecture and laboratory sections.
5. All students indicated the understood the effects temperature on enzyme function. Only one student was found not proficient on the effects of pH on enzyme function and this is because they did not discuss denaturing of proteins.
6. Most students demonstrate that they understand the effects of pH and temperature on enzyme function. For those who were not proficient, more emphasis on protein denaturing is required.

Inferences: Changes made since the fall semester have increased proficiency.

Action Plan: Continued and increased emphasis on enzyme function and the effects of temperature and pH will increase proficiency.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Cinema as Literature

Outcome: The student should be able to clearly demonstrate knowledge of the basic elements of film structure in relation to specific themes.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme(s)</strong> (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Little to no analysis of film(s) —</td>
<td>Some analysis of film(s) —</td>
<td>Extensive analysis of film(s) —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (17.4%)</td>
<td>7 (30.4%)</td>
<td>12 (52.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Concerns</strong> (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Little to no analysis of film(s) —</td>
<td>Some analysis of film(s) —</td>
<td>Extensive analysis of film(s) —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (17.4%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>16 (69.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directorial Approaches</strong> (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Little to no analysis of film(s) —</td>
<td>Some analysis of film(s) —</td>
<td>Extensive analysis of film(s) —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (17.4%)</td>
<td>8 (34.8%)</td>
<td>11 (47.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted
**Inferences:** Students achieved the goal of a 5% increase in satisfactory outcome; therefore, early intervention for students who were not completing prewriting assignments and follow up was successful.

**Action Plan:** A large percentage of unsatisfactory work is a result of those students who fail to complete prewriting assignments, so early intervention with follow up is recommended. Unsatisfactory outcomes will be analyzed to determine if the percentage has decreased.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Basic Reading

Outcome: When reading paragraphs of short passages, students will be able to use appropriate reading strategies to ensure comprehension.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selects topic, main idea, and supporting details.</td>
<td>Indicates little or no knowledge of writing structure.</td>
<td>Finds topic, main idea, and details of most (70%) paragraphs and short writings.</td>
<td>Finds topic, main idea, and details, indicating knowledge of structure of the paragraph and short writings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>— 11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>— 21 (45.7%)</td>
<td>— 14 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses vocabulary approaches to determine word meaning.</td>
<td>Uses no vocabulary approaches.</td>
<td>Uses one or two approaches only.</td>
<td>Uses knowledge of dictionary, context clues, and word parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>— 11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>— 21 (45.7%)</td>
<td>— 14 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses transitions to guide reading.</td>
<td>Ignores transitions when reading.</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited knowledge of meaning and types of transitions.</td>
<td>Uses knowledge of the meaning and purpose of different types of transitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>— 11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: Success rate of students increased over last semester. However, number of students actually completing the course decreased significantly.

Action Plan: (1) Continue to evaluate Reading 20 course in conjunction with Reading 21. (2) Begin to assess new placement cut-off scores. (3) Monitor number of students placing into and completing Reading 21 (Does spring indicate a trend?)

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Spanish I

Outcome: Given oral questions, written prompts and/or reading selections, students will demonstrate productive and receptive skills in the target language. Students will demonstrate accuracy and proficiency in the use of learned structures and vocabulary. Students will demonstrate knowledge of cultural practices and products in the target language.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/or strings of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student is able to produce a minimal amount of sentences and related words in order to accomplish basic tasks in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student is able to produce varied lists of related words and sentences strung together in order to accomplish basic tasks in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>307 (85.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Content:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student demonstrates a minimal knowledge of basic vocabulary in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student demonstrates a sufficient knowledge of basic vocabulary in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>311 (86.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Content:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students is able to partially use learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student is able to sufficiently use learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benchmarks Achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>learned structures and vocabulary (Benchmark: 70%)</th>
<th>grammatical structures.</th>
<th>grammatical structures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>314 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 (12.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture: Knowledge of cultural practices and products (Benchmark: 70%)</th>
<th>Student has limited and/or inappropriate knowledge of cultural practices and products.</th>
<th>Student has sufficient knowledge of cultural practices and products.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>314 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 (12.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

### Inferences

Almost all students (about 87%) scored at least satisfactory results. The results are higher than the previous semester's numbers, which indicates our action plan is working.

### Action Plan

We will continue to implement more communicative activities in our effort to improve the learning outcome.

### Local Resource Needs:

### Resource Requests: None

### Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Spanish II

Outcome: Given oral questions, written prompts, and/or reading selections, students will demonstrate productive and receptive skills in the target language through sentences and strings of sentences and in some instances paragraphs. Students will demonstrate accuracy and proficiency in the use of learned structures and vocabulary. In addition, students will comprehend and be intelligible to sympathetic speakers of the target language. Students will demonstrate knowledge of cultural practices and products in the target language.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication: Students discuss, and analyze and produce well-constructed oral and written reports, summaries, and compositions/essays. (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Student is able to produce a minimal amount of tasks in the target language. — 9 (13%)</td>
<td>Student is able to successfully accomplish the various types of tasks in the target language with minimum difficulty. — 60 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content: Vocabulary Usage. (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Student demonstrates a minimal knowledge of basic vocabulary in the target language. — 10 (14.5%)</td>
<td>Student demonstrates a sufficient knowledge of basic vocabulary in the target language. — 59 (85.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Course Content: Proficiency in the use of learned structures, critical thinking and basic literary analysis skills.**  
(Benchmark: 80%)  
**Benchmark Achieved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficiency in the use of learned structures, critical thinking and basic literary analysis skills.</th>
<th>Student is able to partially use and comprehend learned vocabulary, grammatical structures and skills learned in the target language.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (11.6%)</td>
<td>Student is able to sufficiently use vocabulary, grammatical structures and skills learned in the target language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 (88.4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Culture: Increased knowledge and appreciation of the Spanish language usage in Spanish-speaking countries and their cultural practices.**  
(Benchmark: 80%)  
**Benchmark Achieved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increased knowledge and appreciation of the Spanish language usage in Spanish-speaking countries and their cultural practices.</th>
<th>Student has limited and/or inappropriate knowledge of literary/cultural practices and products.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (17.4%)</td>
<td>Student has sufficient knowledge and appreciation of literary/cultural practices and products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 (82.6%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

*No additional information was submitted*

**Inferences:** Almost all students (about 85%) scored at least satisfactory results. This is a higher percentage than the previous semester, which indicates the success of our action plan.

**Action Plan:** We will continue to implement more communicative based activities in our effort to improve the learning outcome.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Fundamentals of Oral Communication

Outcome: Students will conclude the course with an understanding of conflict management strategies in an interpersonal relationship context.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring, 2010

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I (the instructor) felt that the student gained a(n) _________ understanding of conflict management in an interpersonal setting. (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>4 (9.5%)</td>
<td>18 (42.9%)</td>
<td>20 (47.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

No additional information was submitted

Inferences: This is a very high success rate and it showed a great increase from Fall 2009.

Action Plan: One instructor expressed a change in structure of this hybrid course, placing the section on interpersonal communication in the
middle. We can make this suggestion to others teaching the course.

**Local Resource Needs:** The same software that was requested for the Speech 100 course could be used for this section of this course also.

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Basic Mathematics

Outcome: Given a set of numerical problems involving whole numbers, fractions, and decimals with the basic operations of addition/subtraction/multiplication/division/parentheses/exponents, students will use order of operations to simplify the expressions without a calculator.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall 2012

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order of Operations</td>
<td>Two or more operations are out of order — 99 (16.6%)</td>
<td>All but one operation is in correct order — 135 (22.6%)</td>
<td>All operations are in correct order — 363 (60.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td>Two or more calculations are incorrect — 91 (15.3%)</td>
<td>One calculation is incorrect — 117 (19.7%)</td>
<td>All computations are done correctly — 386 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. 19 of 38 students answered correctly, no errors.
**Inferences:** According to the collected data, students meet the math department benchmark of 80% or better. In the fall of 2012, the percent of those successfully completing this objective was over 91% which is a significant improvement over prior years. At this point, we are uncertain as to the cause of this improvement. All performance objectives in this category were significantly higher than the fraction objective (SLO). We postulate that this might be due to the fact that the order of operations skill is emphasized throughout the semester whereas the fraction skills are covered in one chapter.

**Action Plan:** Continue to maintain the benchmark of the order of operations while investigating the cause of the drastic improvement over prior years on this objective.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:** Data for two sections were unreported for fall of 2012.
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Fast-Track Prealgebra

Outcome: Given a real-life situation involving fractions, use an appropriate operation or operations to answer the question posed.

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student chooses the correct operation to answer the first question. (Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td>The student does not choose the correct operation to answer the first question or does not answer it.</td>
<td>The student does chooses the correct operation to answer the first question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 (57.9%)</td>
<td>51 (42.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student computes correctly to answer the first question. (Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td>The student does not compute correctly to answer the first question.</td>
<td>The student computes correctly to answer the first question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 (57.9%)</td>
<td>51 (42.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student chooses the correct operation to answer the second question. (Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td>The student does not choose the correct operation to answer the second question or does not answer it.</td>
<td>The student does chooses the correct operation to answer the second question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117 (96.7%)</td>
<td>4 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The student computes correctly to answer the second question.
(Benchmark: 80%)

**Benchmark Not Achieved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student does not compute correctly to answer the second question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118 (97.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The student computes correctly to answer the second question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations**

1. The problem was tough for them: "The day after a big party, Josh saw that 5/12 of the large cake he had ordered was left. So, he invited a few more friends over for cake. They ate 2/9 of what was left. 1. What fraction of the original cake was eaten at the party? 2. What fraction of the original cake did Josh and his friends eat the day after the party?" Almost all of my students subtracted for the 2nd question instead of multiplied to find what was left. I think they thought that leftovers had to involve subtraction.

2. There was only one question on the final, so I used the first part of the answer as the "first question", using subtraction. The second part of the question, using multiplication, I used as the "second question".

3. The 2nd part of this SLO was a disaster, all of my students subtracted instead multiplying.

**Inferences:** We did not meet the benchmark, but we improved on last semester's work on the first question, and we still have terrible results on the second question. The question involved critical thinking skills, as it deals with a real like situation, so it is NOT just the calculation skills that are a problem. Because the problem involved fractions, which were covered 2 months earlier in the curriculum, we need to select two separate problems that are not connected to each other.

**Action Plan:** We'll change this problem to two separate problems, and see if we get better returns.

**Local Resource Needs:**

**Resource Requests:** None

**Additional Comments:**
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Basic Grammar

Outcome: The student will write sentences which use present, past, present, and present progressive tenses correctly

Terms Included in this Report: Spring 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students produce sentences using present, past, present progressive and past tenses correctly. (Benchmark: 75%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Less than 75% accuracy — 2 (6.1%)</td>
<td>31 (93.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students correctly identify correct verb tenses on multiple choice examination. (Benchmark: 75%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>Less than 75% accuracy — 2 (6.1%)</td>
<td>31 (93.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Similar to SLO #1, students achieved proficiency in producing sentences correctly with various tenses and identifying correct verb tenses on multiple choice exams. For the moment, it appears that the switch from lab to lecture is paying dividends.
Inferences: The reinforcement of course material with practice using lab software seems to be working well.

Action Plan: Emphasis should be placed on updating course materials, lectures, and lab software as the course continues to develop.

Local Resource Needs:

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments:
Course Outcome Assessment Report

Course: Critical Thinking

Outcome: Assess, in written form, the strength of the connection between premises and conclusions, with respect to relevance.

Terms Included in this Report: Fall 2013

Data Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Standards</th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will articulate the context of the argument and the argument itself.</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
<td>30 (93.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency requires schematizing the argument and stating the context of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will explain how the context determines the relevancy of the argument.</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
<td>29 (90.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency requires demonstration of contextual sensitivity to the argument,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is, understanding the argument in the proper context. (Benchmark: 70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

1. Later in the semester students were asked to schematize an argument and its context and using relevance articulations, formally articulate the context. The assignment used was on Baker Lake and questions what the object in the sky was, to which, students must have schematized the possible conclusions and the way the conclusions relate to the premises. Proficiency is high due to having had previous practice and instruction on it.

Inferences: New SLO being used with a new text. The results are impressive and will continue to be monitored. The new material is working well.

Action Plan: I will continue to my current method and assignments for a few semesters to see if a difference in students makes a difference in the results.

Local Resource Needs: none

Resource Requests: None

Additional Comments: Scott Dixon and Ted Preston