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%) Benchmark Achieved</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></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>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>6 (14.3%)</td>
<td>36 (85.7%)</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>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>39 (92.9%)</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>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>39 (92.9%)</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 Rodriguez
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>—</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 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 characteristics of postcolonial literature. (Benchmark: 85%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>Little to no analysis of texts — 1 (25%)</td>
<td>Some analysis of texts — 1 (25%)</td>
<td>Extensive analysis of texts — 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. —</td>
<td>Students demonstrate some critical analysis of the literature. —</td>
<td>Students demonstrate specific critical analysis of the literature. —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>7 (77.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 drawings such that they would be able to explain the drawings to a customer or client that has no architectural knowledge. (Benchmark: 100%) Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>The students is not able to read, interpret or explain the architectural drawings — 3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>The students is able to read and interpret and explain the architectural drawings — 2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>The students is able to read and interpret the architectural drawings and explain them clearly leaving no questions or uncertainty — 19 (79.2%)</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. <em>(Benchmark: 100%)</em> Benchmark Not Achieved</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. Efficiently use tools and techniques. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Un satisfactory</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%)</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>Bench mark Not Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrate the relationship between the building structure and the site, draw a topographic map from engineering data (Benchmark: 100%)</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>
</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)</td>
<td>9 (10.8%)</td>
<td>38 (45.8%)</td>
<td>36 (43.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________ understanding of conflict management in an interpersonal setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. 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. (Benchmark: 85%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>43 (58.1%)</td>
<td>28 (37.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The body of the speech included 2-3 substantive main points. (Benchmark: 85%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>51 (68.9%)</td>
<td>20 (27%)</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>
</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
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. — 8 (11.3%)</td>
<td>Correctly documents some source materials. — 33 (46.5%)</td>
<td>Correctly documents all source materials. — 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>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (12.5%)</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.</td>
<td>5 (4.8%)</td>
<td>69 (65.7%)</td>
<td>31 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 85%)</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>7 (6.7%)</td>
<td>75 (71.4%)</td>
<td>23 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 85%)</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>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>
the speech.
(Benchmark: 80%)

**Benchmark Achieved**

### Qualitative Data/Comments and Observations

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, vocal variety, emphasis, pauses) in the speech. (Benchmark: 80%) Benchmark Achieved</td>
<td>13 (11.1%)</td>
<td>91 (77.8%)</td>
<td>13 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker controlled/managed other forms of nonverbal communication (facial expression, body movement, eye contact, gestures, posture) in the speech (Benchmark: 80%)</td>
<td>21 (17.6%)</td>
<td>86 (72.3%)</td>
<td>12 (10.1%)</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%)</td>
<td>Interpretation either unsupported or illogical. —</td>
<td>Occasional lapses in logic in written work, but ideas generally well-supported —</td>
<td>Logical and original analysis of text(s) in written work. —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Not Achieved</td>
<td>5 (26.3%)</td>
<td>8 (42.1%)</td>
<td>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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></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</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of</td>
<td>Given a representative and diverse series of questions, the student provides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 75%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>not count incidental errors (i.e. transposing numbers incorrectly from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td>379 (51.1%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to determine the correct solution through an appropriate,</td>
<td>The student fails to achieve the goal specified under the Proficient section of</td>
<td>The student provides correct solutions for at least 75% of the problems from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Benchmark: 75%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></td>
<td>318 (42.9%)</td>
<td>—</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><strong>Benchmark Achieved</strong></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><strong>Benchmark Not Achieved</strong></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 Krysa Mayer and Lydia Gonzalez.
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>Unsatisfactory</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.</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: 70%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</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:**