Arts and Sciences (A&S) Division
2014-15 Assessment of Student Learning (ASL) Report
Prepared by Luis A. Nazario

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND GOALS

In August 2014, the Assessment of Student Learning faculty lead for the Arts and Sciences Division provided department chairs with electronic copies of the 2014-2015 Assessment of Student Learning form, prefaced with the following guidelines established by the Assessment of Student Learning Committee:

1. Each department should determine, select, and assess two SLOs per course prefix. (One SLO would be adequate if the SLO requires complex or time-intensive collection or analysis of data.
2. The SLOs must be clear, specific, and measurable.
3. The method/instrument selected to assess each SLO should be relevant and reliable.
4. SLOs for high enrollment courses and/or gatekeeper courses should be assessed across multiple sections of the same course and across more than one course within a department if applicable.
5. During this assessment cycle, chairs may elect not to assess student learning in courses that have low enrollment, courses that are offered infrequently, and/or courses for which there is some other compelling reason to bypass in this assessment cycle. (Chairs who do not plan to assess courses in a particular prefix should provide the division's ASL faculty lead with a brief explanation, which will be included in our division's final report.
6. This academic year, the Arts and Sciences Division will be assessing students' performance based on "PCC's General Education Objectives" (our core competencies). Faculty may choose to assess students' critical thinking ability or students' interpersonal skills. (Of course, departments may include other general education student outcomes, e.g. communication, use of technology, or global and cultural perspectives.)
7. The department chair should not be solely responsible for departmental assessment. All full-time faculty members should be involved in assessment of student learning. Faculty and part-time instructors' involvement should be noted in the section of the assessment plan provided for this purpose.
8. Part-time instructors at branch campuses should be included in the assessment process: the planning and the analysis of results.
9. Courses taught at branch campuses should be included in the assessment process.
10. Dual credit courses taught at the high schools should be included in the assessment process. A comparison between/among campuses should be part of the department's analyses at the end of the assessment cycle.

At the end of the 2013-2014 academic cycle, the Assessment of Student Learning Committee identified reporting challenges that faculty needs to resolve in the 2014-15 assessment cycle. Therefore, chairs should implement and supervise the following practices:

1. **Full Participation of Faculty:** Participation in the assessment of student learning is each faculty's responsibility and also a component of faculty's Annual Performance Planning and Evaluation. To ensure active participation of each faculty member in a department,

department chairs should assign specific prefixes/courses to each faculty member. The faculty member's responsibility will be to identify the SLOs to assess in their assigned prefixes/courses, complete the plan of assessment, gather and analyze data, and recommend changes. Under the supervision of the department chair, these activities should be finalized in collaboration with other faculty members. The department chair will collect all information to create the final planning and results analysis reports.

2. **Alignment of all elements:** Assessment of student learning is crucial to PCC's accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission, helps faculty and instructors to assess their teaching effectiveness, provides the justification and evidence to improve our courses, and offers evidence of PCC's effectiveness to our stakeholders. To achieve valid and reliable data, faculty must carefully align all elements that assess the specific SLOs: The tool, measure, scoring method, sampling method, level of performance, time frame, analysis of data, and recommendations for changes must be unified and function as a whole.

Departments and program in the Arts and Sciences Division continue to perform a combination of department-specific and college-wide learning outcomes assessments. Departments select course-specific outcomes from the course syllabi. Most, if not all, of these outcomes are part of CCCS college-wide curricula and identifies the abilities the students should master by the end of each courses. In addition, departments are required to select and assess PCC's General Education Learning Objectives, which we refer to as Common Core Competencies. The following are PCC's five common core competencies:

1. Read, write, and speak effectively
2. Interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information
3. Use technology to achieve educational objectives
4. Use interpersonal skills essential to their chosen fields
5. Apply global and cultural perspectives

Purpose and Goal

This report reviews the Arts and Sciences Division's 2014-2015 assessment of student learning plans from the planning stage to the use of results to determine how the division may improve its ASL process, its quality of planning and data collection, and its culture of assessment. This information is essential in identifying the division's next step toward raising its level of assessment as defined by The Higher Learning Council.

THE PLANNING PROCESS: FALL 2014 SEMESTER

In 2013-14, the Arts and Sciences Division increased the number of SLOs assessed by 50% (62) from the previous academic year. However, this academic year, the division assessed fewer SLOs (54), a 13% decrease. One reason for this decrease is that many departments used multiple measures to assess the same SLOs to evidence more than one ability, e.g. critical thinking and communication skills.

At the same time, the division saw an increase of 417% in part-time instructors' participation in the assessment of student learning process, from 6 to 31 instructors. However, although most departments list part-time involvement, our division has not defined what constitutes realistic part-

time instructors' "participation" in the assessment process. Thus, it's difficult to assess the number of part-time instructors actively involved in the ASL process. The level of participation needs to be clarified within the actual assessment plans. Branch campuses involvement in the assessment process still remains a challenge. Table 1 presents the above information by departments:

Table 1: Elements of Assessment Planning

	NUMBER OF SLOS ASSESSED	PART-TIME INSTRUCTORS PARTICIPATION	NUMBER AND TYPES OF ASSESSMENT METHODS	TYPES OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS
BIO & PHYSICAL SCIENCE	10	2	**1 TYPE:** Selected Response	Quiz
ECE, ED, LT	2	0	**2 TYPES:** Extended Written Response; Performance Assessment	Rubric
ENG-COM	20	4	**2 TYPES:** Extended Written Response; Performance Assessment	Rubric; writing assignments, research papers, checklist, test
FINE ARTS & HUM	7	10	**3 TYPES:** Selected Response; Extended Written Response; Performance Assessment	Rubric, Test
MAT	6	12	**3 TYPES:** Selected Response; Extended Written Response; Performance Assessment	Test, Rubric
SOC. SCI., C.J.	9	3	**1 TYPE:** Extended Written Response	Rubric
Totals:	***54***	***31***		

No funds are available to compensate part-time participation, and none is expected as the college is guided by and must adhere to the specific number of hours part-time instructors are permitted to work. Thus, participation must be voluntary.

As noted in Table 1, the majority of departments use rubrics as their principle tools of assessment, followed by tests. Although most rubrics are created by the departments, this AY year three departments—Fine Arts and Humanities, Early Childhood Education, and English and Communication—chose to implement one or more of the following three AACU (Association of American Colleges and Universities) VALUE rubrics: Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric; Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, and Teamwork VALUE Rubric. According to the Association of American Colleges and Universities, VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) rubrics, created by teams of faculty from AACU member institution and tested for reliability and validity, are "aligned with the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) competencies for achievement across the associate and baccalaureate levels."

The Arts and Sciences Division's ASL faculty lead will continue to encourage the use of VALUE rubrics as a way to increase consistency among departments in assessing general education outcomes. Thus, across discipline comparisons of students' level of mastery of core competencies may lead to more meaningful changes. However, consistency in applying VALUE rubrics among the disciplines will require professional development, which CTEAL may provide.

This academic year, we were unable to include in our assessment process dual credit courses taught at the high schools. Because this HLC mandate is relatively new, we still need to understand the logistics involved and prepare the process for including high school instructors and courses in our

division's ASL process. PCC's CAO has demonstrated her support of this mandate by appointing an English and Communication Department faculty member to work with the high schools to make dual credit faculty an integral part of PCC's culture, including assessment of students learning.

During this 2014-15 academic year, faculty increased its focus on assessing general education objectives. Table 2 lists the results:

Table 2: 2014-15 General Education Objectives Assessed by Departments

	BIO & PHYSICAL SCIENCE	ECE, ED, LT	ENG-COM	FINE ARTS & HUM	MAT	SOC. SCI., C.J.	*Total GenEd SLOs assessed*	*%*
Read, write, speak effectively	0	2	8	3	2	9	***24***	***31%***
Interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information	10	2	7	4	5	9	***37***	***48%***
Information/Communication technology	0	0	1	0	0	9	***10***	***13%***
Interpersonal skills	0	2	2	0	0	0	***4***	***5%***
Cultural/global awareness	0	0	1	1	0	0	***2***	***3%***
Total GenEd SLOs Assessed	***10***	***6***	***19***	***8***	***7***	***27***	***77***	
Range of GenEd objectives selected	***1***	***3***	***5***	***3***	***2***	***3***		

The faculty from each discipline did an outstanding job in focusing assessment on general education objectives. Departments chose to assess from 1 to 5 GenEd objectives, the majority chose two objectives to assess. Critical thinking (48%) and communication (31%) competencies were the main focus of assessment. In the next assessment cycle, the ASL faculty lead, with the approval of the Assessment of Student Learning Committee, increase the array of general education objectives selections by assigning a specific number of GenEd objective that each department must assess and/or by approaching specific departments and request that they include specific SLOs that are the least assed by the division. This assessment cycle establishes the baseline for next year's assessment of general education objectives.

It has been nearly a decade since PCC has revised its present general education objectives. As a result, a lack of fit exists between the general education objectives and how these objectives are presently defined in the plans. The most obvious discrepancy is in the third general education objectives, "use technology to achieve educational objectives." However, the assessment plan lists this objective as ***Information and Communication Technology Literacy*** and defines this competency as students' ability to "identify, locate, interpret, evaluate, synthesize, present, and communicate accurate and reliable information." At some point in the many revisions of the plans, a disconnect between the plan and the original core competency occurred. This discrepancy will need to be addressed by the Assessment of Student Learning Committee before next year's planning stage.

Another example of the need to update our general education plan is in our limited definition of *critical thinking* as the ability to "interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information." This definition of critical thinking was a great start when the college first developed the general educational objectives,

but since then, we have come to understand more about nature of critical thinking and its interdependence on these and other abilities such as analysis, inference, application, creativity, and others. Our general education objective should reflect a more realistic and relevant meaning of critical thinking. This revision becomes more crucial as our college continue to focus more on the importance of assessing critical thinking and its application in all areas of learning.

Another problematic area is in the omission of general education objectives for math and science. When our present general education objectives were created, the committee determined the present definition of critical thinking would serve these areas. Again, this decision did serve its purpose at that time; however, with the college's growing emphasis on STEM, the Assessment of Student Learning Committee should add a competency for this area, e.g. *quantitative and scientific reasoning*.

See pages 8-9 for recommendations based on these findings and page 10 for summaries of departmental plans.

MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS AND COLLECTING DATA

On February 12, 2015, PCC held its spring semester faculty professional development, led by CTEAL. The Assessment of Student Learning Committee chair and the faculty lead for Arts and Sciences Division facilitated two sessions on critical thinking, "Critical Thinking: The Endgame." Attendees discussed the importance of and problems in assessing critical thinking as well as considered strategies—methods and instruments—to assess critical thinking. The goal was to agree on elements of critical thinking that would later act as a starting point in developing a college-wide definition of critical thinking that would provide wider cross-division consistency in the assessment of PCC's critical thinking general education outcome. Although attendees left with a broader sense of what constitutes critical thinking and the importance of assessing this outcome, the short time allotted each session did not permit the facilitators to fully realize the goal of the session. The college is presently considering dedicating a future Faculty Professional Development Day solely to critical thinking. (See recommendations 2 and 3, page 5.)

In addition, on March 19, 2015, the monthly Arts and Sciences Division meeting was cancelled, and, instead, faculty met by departments to review the data collected in the fall so they could start working on the final stage of the assessment process, analysis of results and use of results. Although the departmental meetings helped start discussions on assessment and build our culture of assessment, departments who benefitted most were those who collected data at the end of the fall semester. Many departments plan their data collection at the end of the academic year, some to help increase the sampling.

A strong planning stage is crucial to meaningful data collection. However, strong planning is insufficient when the final stage of the process deters data collection, analysis, and reporting. Using the academic year as our assessment cycle has limited the time that departments are able to finalize their assessment plans and make decisions on changes resulting from their analyses so they can then complete and submit their reports. For example, PCC's academic year ended May 15, 2015, and departments' final assessment of student learning reports were due on May 18, 2015 to the ASL faculty lead. To complete their ASL reports, many departments relied on data from their final exams or final projects that were due at the end of the semester. During the final week, faculty and instructors are busy grading papers, posting final grades, and closing their courses; thus, meeting to

discuss assessment and prepare reports becomes an added challenge, which may affect the quality of data analysis.

In May 2015, the Assessment of Student Learning Committee addressed this problem and recommended that divisions consider using the calendar year, instead of the academic year, as the assessment cycle. Therefore, during AY 2015-16, the Arts and Sciences Department will transition to a calendar year reporting cycle. This change will alleviate many of the reporting problems the division is presently encountering, as well as ensure the quality of the final analyses. During the transition period, faculty will be planning and reporting on one semester, fall 2015, for its 2016 assessment report. As a result, fewer students may be sampled. In January 2016, the division will begin planning for the 2017 assessment cycle, collecting data in spring, summer, and fall 2016 to report in 2017.

This academic year, many departments made strong efforts to improve their plans by rethinking their tools for assessment and/or by redesigning their rubrics to include sections that address critical thinking. This effort targeted last academic year's assessment challenge in which some departments indicated that they would assess critical thinking but provided no evidence that this outcome was assessed. However, in some cases, even with rubrics that included descriptors for critical thinking, the final results were expressed as an overall single value, with no indication as to the proficiency levels of critical thinking or other embedded outcomes. One solution would be to tie a specific departmental assessment tools, e.g. division or college-wide rubric, for each general education outcome that departments will be assessing; thus, the instructor must analyze the data focusing on the criteria/standards established in each tool and not group two or more outcomes into an overall score that does not serve to identify students' levels of mastery per outcome. (See additional recommendations, 2e, page 8, and 4 page 9.)

During this 2014-15 assessment cycle, faculty closed the loop in 15% of SLOs assessed. As illustrated in Table 3, only 50% of departments closed loops. The faculty lead will need to examine the number of SLOs that are annually re-assessed and document the reasons that those SLOs are continuously reassessed.

Table 3: Closing the Loop

	NUMBER OF SLOS ASSESSED	LOOP CLOSED
BIO & PHYSICAL SCIENCE	10	0
ECE, ED, LT	2	2
ENG-COM	20	5
FINE ARTS & HUM	7	0
MAT	6	0
SOC. SCI., C.J.	9	1
Totals:	***54***	***8=15%***

Status of Challenges Identified in AY 2013-14

	CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED AY 2013-14	STATUS OF CHALLENGES BY SPRING 2015
1.	Faculty resistance to assessment of student learning continues. Some still don't see the value of assessment to continuous improvement leading to departmental and institutional changes. Instead, they view assessment as a distraction, busy work, or a process tied solely to accreditation.	*This challenge persists although in a few departments' interest in assessment has increased.*
2.	In a few cases, the interpretation of assessment results is not consistent with the type of assessment instrument indicated in the Planning Stage. It is not clear whether appraisers changed the instrument without noting the change in the assessment plan or whether the instrument chosen was unreliable to assess the SLO or the expected outcome.	*This issue has improved. Some departments have adopted national rubrics, e.g. AACU VALUE rubrics. Also, many departments create their own rubrics. PCC will need to provide professional development to help faculty create reliable and valid assessment tools as well as trained faculty in the use of VALUE rubrics.*
3.	In some cases, final departmental reports appear to be the result of a last minute task—resulting in weak analysis of data to no analysis, almost like a pass-fail situation.	*This problem continues. The main reason is that the majority of the data are collected at the end of the academic year, and, in most cases the final exams become the data. As a result, not much time is available for data gathering and results, especially when faulty and instructors are preparing to submit course grades and faculty contracts end that week. To address this problem, the Arts and Sciences Division will transition to a calendar year assessment cycle rather than the academic year. This change will result in smaller sampling for the next assessment cycle since it will be based on fall 2015 students only. In spring 2016, planning for three semesters (Spring, summer, and fall) will begin, and at the same time, we'll be closing the previous year, 2015.*
4.	A few faculty and instructors do not demonstrate an understanding of the interconnection of the various components of the assessment of student learning process: determining what to assess, establishing appropriate and significant SLOs, selecting reliable and valid instruments of measurements, collecting data, establishing reliable sampling, and analyzing the relationship of the results to possible weaknesses in planning and data collection.	*This problem persists and becomes problematic when faculty creates SLOs that require multiple measures to address the abilities stated in SLOs. Faculty use one rubric and assign a single rating for the entire SLO without analyzing and quantifying the various abilities the SLO claims to assess. During the next assessment cycle, the ASL faculty lead will need to meet with each chair the minute the problem surfaces in the planning stage and then again, the minute the analyses of results do not follow the order of the plans.*
5.	Department chairs are instrumental in changing mindset to help develop a climate and culture of assessment. However, in some cases, chairs need to assert their leadership in assessment and help develop PCC's culture of assessment as a vital element toward continuous improvement. Unfortunately, chairs' biases, negativity, and resistance toward assessment and the manner in which assessment is implemented in the divisions or college is easily transmitted to their faculty and instructors rather than to propose changes to the Assessment of Student Learning Committee.	*This problem has improved, but not significantly. A few chairs continue to control assessment. The ASL dean (CAO) and the division dean will have to mandate that chairs make each faculty member responsible for creating, planning, and data gathering for specific SLOs. All members of the department should meet to collaborate on the final analyses and the results to report. The chair should collect these reports to incorporate into and present as one report. Because assessment of student learning is part of faculty's professional responsibilities and also part of faculty's performance evaluation, chairs must address the degree of each faculty member's participation in the ASL process.*
6.	Although at the end of each stage, the ASL faculty lead received 100% of the assessment plans, punctuality is still a problem.	*Punctuality continues to be a problem in both the planning and reporting stages.*
7.	Although the ASL faculty lead is new to the position, he needs to do a better job in assisting faculty in aligning the various components of the assessment plan, helping faculty develop realistic and reliable assessment strategies, and supporting faculty in the development of surveys, rubric, and any other assessment needs.	*Although there has been some improvement, the ASL faculty lead failed to use the Arts and Sciences Division ASL Committee members to help address the identified challenges. The next assessment cycle will find more involved ASL committee members.*

2014-15 CHALLENGES

With the support of the Assessment of Student Learning Committee, the ASL faculty lead will continue to address the following challenges during the next assessment cycle:

1. Continue to work on challenges listed on page 7

2. Improve the assessment of critical thinking and work with CTEAL to provide faculty training in assessing critical thinking, creating appropriate rubrics, and developing a shared definition

3. Help faculty choose appropriate methods and tools to assess SLOs

4. Increase the number of part-time instructors on all campuses who actively participate in assessment and define what constitutes active participation.

5. Ensure that each general education outcomes is assessed, especially those that are often ignored, e.g. interpersonal skills and global awareness.

6. Continue to review and monitor plans so that all elements are aligned.

7. Continue to update ASL plans so that they meet the needs of the departments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. PCC should continue to provide opportunities for faculty to get together by department or program to work collaboratively on assessment of student learning—both during the planning stage and in the data collection and analysis stages. We will need to collect data to assess the effectiveness of these meetings.

2. The Arts and Sciences Division should focus assessment on general education objectives to document that PCC graduates exit with those abilities.
    a. Require departments to assess at least three general education objectives; one should be critical thinking
    b. Ask certain departments to assess specific general education outcomes that are frequently ignored, but more specific to their departments
    c. Develop a shared definition of *critical thinking*, develop a rubric (preferable adapt AAC&U LEAP Critical Thinking VALUE rubric) to assess critical thinking campus-wide. Adapting national rubrics to our shared definition will help not only assess but describe students' level of critical thinking and other abilities.
    d. Require departments who use indirect assessment, such as surveys, to also include a secondary direct assessment to validate the results
    e. Request that CTEAL provide rubric norming sessions or outside experts to help foster consistency in how we assess general education objectives. Bringing in outside experts will require funding.

3. As the Arts and Sciences Division, as well as other divisions, continue to increase their focus on assessing critical thinking, PCC must consider using cla+ to provide additional internal, as well as external, measure that will strengthen the reliability and validity of all

results. Dr Schmitt (CAO) presented cla+ to the Assessment of Student Learning Committee in 2014. At that time, the committee found asl+ too expensive to implement. However, in view of HLC requirements for external measures and the difficulty PCC's AQIP Portfolio team faced in identifying external measures that supports student learning, we must reconsider asl+. Implementing asl+ will require substantial funding.

4. Departments should consider engaging in collaborative, cross-discipline assessment of general education objectives. For example, if assessing communication competency, courses such as psychology, social sciences, or biology may partner with the English and Communication Department who will act as outside evaluators to assess the writing quality of the papers or projects. In this case, the benefits are two-edge: the disciplines validate their own assessment of students' communication skills, and the English department will have a broader and more realistic data to justify changes or need for further contextualization. In addition, such interdisciplinary assessment may provide the motivation for general education reform, leading to changes on a broader scale.

5. We need to review and update PCC's general education objectives in view of 21th century learning. See page 5 for concerns with our present general education objectives.

6. ASL leads and department chairs should develop a plan to include HS dual credit faculty in our assessment process as well as in related professional development activities.

7. The Assessment of Student Learning Committee needs to assess its own effectiveness as a committee and the state of assessment at PCC as perceived by faculty. The lead instructors should get together to determine the survey and work with Cory to implement, and analyze the results. The information gathered will help the committee members determine how to improve PCC's culture of assessment.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENTAL PLANS AND RESULTS

Arts and Sciences Division: Assessment of PCC's Core Competencies

Biological and Physical Sciences

Core Competencies	Depart./ Program	SLO Assessed, Method, and Tool		
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**AST 101**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 94.7% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**AST 102**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 100% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions		
	Performance Target	Selected Response; Quiz	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**BIO 106**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 95.3% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**BIO 111**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 88.4% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.

INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**BIO 201**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 91.1% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**BIO 202**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 83% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**CHE 101**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 95% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**CHE 102**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 100% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**CHE 112**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 83% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.

INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**PHY 112**	Explore and interpret scientific research including the identification of the hypothesis and controls, as well as analyze results and conclusions	**Assessment Finding**	Overall the students were competent in the scientific method. 100% of the students passed the quiz.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Quiz		
	Performance Target	75% of the assessed students will earn a 72% or higher.	**Use of Results**	The next step will be to include tables and graphs, to determine if students can analyze and draw conclusions from these data formats.

Early Childhood Education, Education, and Library Technician Dept.

Core Competencies	Depart./ Program	SLO Assessed, Method, and Tool		
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY & INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION & INTERPERSONAL SKILLS	**ECE 241**	Research a specific topic, plan the event, create the Facilitators Guide and present at their Staff Meeting final.	**Assessment Finding**	Overall that 2 of the 3 teams received full points and the 3rd team still performing at 90% of the expectations. Teamwork: 87% reported Capstone or level 4 and 13% reported Milestones or Level 3.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Performance Assessment; Departmental Rubric & AACU Teamwork Value Rubric		
	Performance Target	• Teamwork: 75% of group will score a 3 or better • Research: 75% of the group will score a 3 or better • Communication: 75% of the group will score Practicing to Mastery • Presentation: 75% of the group will score Practicing to Mastery	**Use of Results**	Changes: Be clearer with the assignment instructions, create a list of topic headings that will be included in the Facilitator's Guide, and include a specific rubric for oral presentations. This will help the students and the instructor so that there is less subjectivity. This SLO will not be reassessed.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY & INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION & INTERPERSONAL SKILLS	**ECE 260**	Research a specific topic, plan the event, create the Facilitators Guide and present at their Staff Meeting final.	**Assessment Finding**	• Teamwork: 90% of group scored a 3 or better • Research: 90% of group scored a 3 or better • Communication: 90% of group scored a above a 5 or better • Presentation: 80% of group scored above a 10 or better
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Rubric		
	Performance Target	• Teamwork: 75% of group will score a 3 or better • Research: 75% of the group will score a 3 or better • Communication: 75% of the group will score Practicing to Mastery • Presentation: 75% of the group will score Practicing to Mastery	**Use of Results**	Changes that will be made to the Family Night so the students will be able to write a facilitator's guide on how to present the family night. Only 75% of my students completed a facilitator's guide. At this time I have not decided to continue with this SLO.

English and Communication Department

Core Competencies	Depart./ Program	SLO Assessed, Method, and Tool		
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS	**AAA 098**	**SLO 2-** Collaborate with peers to construct and deliver an effective, appropriate class presentation.	**Assessment Finding**	The data show a minimal difference between how students rate each other and how instructors rate students. 100% of average student ratings and instructor ratings met the performance target of Level 3 (16-17) or better
	Method & Tool	Performance Assessment; Rubric used by students and instructors to rate presentations for comparison.		
	Performance Target	80% of students will attain Level 3 (Milestone 3 "Good") or better.	**Use of Results**	Communication regarding the assessment plan, process, and reporting expectations will be implemented across all campuses. The new rubric that was planned for this cycle will be implemented next cycle. This SLO may be assessed again, but the assessment tools and process will change.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**COM 115**	**SLO 1:** Construct and deliver an effective, appropriate, and meaningful conclusion to their speeches	**Assessment Finding**	85% of the students reached the goal.
	Method & Tool	Performance Assessment; Rubric		
	Performance Target	80% of students will be able to attain a score of 1 or higher.	**Use of Results**	Assessment tool needs to be revised. This SLO will be reassessed.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**COM 125**	**SLO 1:** Demonstrate the ability to identify breakdowns in communication due to violations of appropriate nonverbal behavior.	**Assessment Finding**	56% rate of success in identifying proxemics. Expanding the question to ask for identifications of overall nonverbal communication breakdowns would raise the success rate to 87.5%. This would represent a more accurate and fair measure of students' abilities to identify nonverbal breakdowns.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Journal assignment, using Youtube video clip.		
	Performance Target	75% of students will be able to list accurately the nonverbal component of proxemics	**Use of Results**	This SLO will be reassessed next AY.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**COM 220**	**SLO 1:** Identify an example of a symbol and write a research paper explaining how members of a culture construct meaning for that symbol.	**Assessment Finding**	44% of students scored 16 or higher.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric for Analysis research paper; rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of students will score 15 or higher on the assigned rubric.	**Use of Results**	The course is undergoing a redesign for Fall 2015. The measurement tool for evaluating the significance of signs to a culture will be changed. This SLO will be reassessed next AY.

CULTURAL/ GLOBAL AWARENESS	**COM 220**	**SLO 2:** Demonstrate new perspectives about their own cultural rules and biases.	**Assessment Finding**	59% of students demonstrated a "Conversant" level of cultural awareness.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric for Analysis research paper; rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of students will demonstrate global knowledge and cultural self-awareness by reaching a milestone score of 3 on the AACU Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric	**Use of Results**	The course is undergoing a redesign for Fall 2015. The measurement tool for evaluating the significance of signs to a culture will be changed. This SLO will be reassessed next AY.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**CCR 091 & CCR 092**	**SLO 1:** Demonstrate the ability to understand required reading selections and incorporate relevant information into their essays	**Assessment Finding**	• 88% scored a 70% or better on the final "Reading Comprehension Quiz." (73% of those students scored an 80% or better, indicating an even greater likelihood of college reading readiness.)
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Reading selections and final writing assignment; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	• 75% of will score • 70% or better on the final "Reading Comprehension Quiz." • 75% or more students will score 10 or better on written portion of the final	**Use of Results**	Change in methodology and materials, increase reading selections to both apply reading process and incorporate relevant source material. This SLO will be reassessed next AY.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**CCR 094**	**SLO 1:** Demonstrate an understanding of the structure of the essay by writing a well-organized essay in which they apply the principles of thesis, unity, coherence, support, and style	**Assessment Finding**	• 67% of CCR 094 students scored 3 or better on the rubric, performing 8% below the targeted 75%. • The traditional groups scored 68%, an insignificant 1%, and also below the 75% performance targeted.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	• 75% of ENG 121 students will demonstrate a rubric score of 3 or better in their ability to write essays that are well structured, coherent, and unified. • 75% of students in ENG 121-iGRAD will demonstrate skills level similar to or better than ENG 121 non-developmental education students.	**Use of Results**	We will increase sampling next semester and consider another instrument to assess this SLO. This SLO will be reassessed next semester.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**CCR 094**	**SLO 2:** Demonstrate ability to paraphrase source information	**Assessment Finding**	71% scored 6 or higher, placing us below our goal.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response;		

		Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	80% of students will be able to attain a score of 6 or higher.	**Use of Results**	Close this SLO and continue to search for ways to increase learning in this area. Percentage were slightly below target, considering new attendance policy, we feel comfortable closing the loop.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**ENG 121**	**SLO 1:** Demonstrate an understanding of the structure of the essay by writing a well-organized essay in which they apply the principles of thesis, unity, coherence, support, and style	**Assessment Finding**	68% of students in the mainstreamed CCR 094 + traditional and 68% of students in the traditional ENG 121 scored 3 or better. There's no significant difference between both groups.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	• 75% of ENG 121 students will demonstrate a rubric score of 3 or better in their ability to write essays that are well structured, coherent, and unified. • 75% of students in ENG 121-iGRAD will demonstrate skills level similar to or better than ENG 121 non-developmental education students.	**Use of Results**	We will increase sampling next semester and consider another instrument to assess this SLO. This SLO will be reassessed next semester.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**ENG 121**	**SLO 2:** Revise their essays to demonstrate a rigorous revision process	**Assessment Finding**	Fall: 67% of students scored a 2 or higher. Spring: 78% achieved a score of 2 or higher.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of the students sampled will achieve a revision of score of at least a 2, for "moderately revised.	**Use of Results**	To gauge of the results of the "radical revision" piece of the proposed ENG 121 redesign, this SLO will be reassessed next AY.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**ENG 121**	**SLO 3:** Demonstrate ability to paraphrase source information	**Assessment Finding**	75% scored a 6 or higher, slightly below our goal.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	80% of students will be able to attain a score of 6 or higher	**Use of Results**	While our percentage is slightly below target, considering the extenuating circumstances with attendance, we feel comfortable closing the loop. We will not assess this SLO next AY.

INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**ENG 122**	**SLO 1:** Integrate source material into their research papers using signal phrases and other integrating devices correctly	**Assessment Finding**	**TOTAL:** 63% of students scored (64/102) 3 or better. Although this result is a significant increase from last year (44%), we still need to developed strategies for improving this number. We need to rethink our rubric as well as ensure that the established standards are consistently applied to all students' work.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of ENG 122 student papers will use signal phrases and other integrating devices as demonstrated by a rubric score of 3 or higher.	**Use of Results**	We will plan a norming session to permit PT and FT instructors to come to agreement on performance standards (rubric) and how these standards are consistently assessed in students' work. This SLO will be reassessed next AY.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**ENG 122**	**SLO 2:** Incorporate in-text citations in their research papers correctly	**Assessment Finding**	Spring 2015: 70% of students scored 3 or 4. This important outcome was short of the 75% targeted. We will need to assess the strategies employed in teaching this SLO. We will also need to determine the impact the increase of absenteeism die to the change in attendance policy has had on student learning.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	75 % of ENG 122 sampled papers will employ effective and correct use of in-text citations as demonstrated by a rubric score of 3 or higher.	**Use of Results**	This SLO will be reassessed next assessment cycle.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**ENG 122**	**SLO 3:** Construct MLA Works Cited lists that correctly document and format the types of primary and secondary sources required in the problem-solution research paper	**Assessment Finding**	48 % of students scored 3 or 4. The English Department leads for this SLO will need to do a better job in articulating to all instructors on all branch campuses the expectations. In addition, the rubric assessing this SLO is weak and need to be revised.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of sampled papers in ENG 122 will include correct works cited pages as demonstrated by a rubric score of 3 or higher.	**Use of Results**	This SLO will be closed out as of AY 2014-2015. We will revise rubric to correctly define the criteria for this SLO. An SLO that more accurately reflects the nature of the skills being assessed will be written for AY 2015-2016.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**ENG 122**	**SLO 4:** Employ correct MLA manuscript style, including headings, pagination, levels of heads, in their research papers	**Assessment Finding**	• Paper uses the required levels of headings and subheadings: 46/66 70% • Paged numbering are in correct MLA format: 43/66 65% • Paper is free of dropped quotations: 41/66 62%
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Checklist		
	Performance Target	75% of ENG 122 sampled papers will employ MLA manuscript style effectively as demonstrated by a checklist.	**Use of Results**	This SLO will be reassessed next year.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**ENG 122**	**SLO 5:** Demonstrate critical thinking by researching and finding a specific problem and communicating researched-based solutions to that problem	**Assessment Finding**	61% of students scored 3 or 4. As this is the first year we are assessing this SLO, we need to establish a baseline. We will also need to increase the sampling as well as get more faculty and part-time instructors involved in the assessment of this SLO.

	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; AACU Critical Thinking Value Rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of ENG 122 sampled papers will employ demonstrate proficiency in critical thinking by a score of three or higher as assessed by a rubric.	**Use of Results**	This SLO will be assessed again next year.
INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATIO N TECHNOLOGY	**ENG 131**	**SLO 1:** Demonstrate an understanding of basic components of visual design by integrating graphics into their description reports	**Assessment Finding**	TOTAL: 87.5 % of students scored 3 or better
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of ENG students will earn a rubric score of 3 or higher.	**Use of Results**	We will not assess this SLO next AY.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**LIT 115**	**SLO 1:** Identify basic elements of poetry	**Assessment Finding**	Only 57% of students (21 out of 37) earned the Performance Target score of 75% or above on the assessment test.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Test		
	Performance Target	80% of students will achieve a score of at least 75% correct answers.	**Use of Results**	This assessment loop is closed based on the instructor's discussion with the department chair and departmental colleagues which determined this to be an inappropriate SLO. It isolates too narrow an area of the field of literary studies for an introductory level course.
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS	**LIT 115**	**SLO 2:** Collaborate effectively to create and present a dramatic monologue to a broader audience	**Assessment Finding**	82% of students assessed scored 3 or above, successfully completing all assigned tasks in a way that was thorough, comprehensive, and advanced their group.
	Method & Tool	Performance Assessment; Rubric		
	Performance Target	Students will score 3 of 5 on AACU Value Rubric.	**Use of Results**	These results will serve as a baseline for a reassessment of this SLO next year.

Fine Arts and Humanities Department

Core Competencies	Depart./ Program	SLO Assessed, Method, and Tool		
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**ART 110**	**SLO 1:** Write using an academic voice.	**Assessment Finding**	33% of students received 5 or more points, which is much lower than our target of 80%. Students had particular trouble documenting their research
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	80% of students will achieve 5 points or more on the academic writing component of the rubric	**Use of Results**	Create a guideline for documenting sources that will be shared with Art Appreciation students when they are introduced to writing reaction papers. We will also seek advice from other

		(Part III)		departments on improving academic writing. This SLO will be reassessed next academic year.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**ART 110**	**SLO 2:** Utilize visual literacy (Design Elements and Principles) to analyze works of art.	**Assessment Finding**	54% of students scored 8 or more points, which is below our target of 75%. Students were able to describe the artwork and provide an evidence-based judgment, but they had difficulty analyzing particular elements and principles of design.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	75% of students will achieve 8 points or more	**Use of Results**	Do more practice critiques to prepare for the final reaction paper; when we design the curriculum for next semester, we add more weight to the grade for the existing assignment, or make it a more substantial research paper. We will reassess this SLO next academic year.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**HUM 121**	**SLO 1:** Write using an academic voice.	**Assessment Finding**	38% of students who scored 3 or better on the department rubric for academic writing, which is significantly lower than our goal of 80%. Students had particular trouble documenting their research and avoiding first-person pronouns.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	80% of students will achieve 3 or better on the departmental academic writing rubric	**Use of Results**	We will create a handout that outlines how to document research sources to go along with the discussions on academic writing. Students demonstrated particular difficulty with in-text citations, so that will be emphasized in the handout. We will also have students turn in a draft of the research paper so that they can receive early feedback. This SLO will be reassessed next academic year..
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION **&** **CULTURAL/GLOBAL AWARENESS**	**HUM 121**	**SLO 2:** Analyze similarities and differences of a topic from the ancient world compared to an equivalent topic from the modern era.	**Assessment Finding**	• 34% of students who scored 3 or better on the AACU rubric for critical thinking, which is significantly lower than our goal of 75%. • Using the AACU rubric for intercultural knowledge and competence, we found that 41% of students scored 3 or better, which is far short of our goal of 75%.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; • Rubric-AACU Critical Thinking Value Rubric • Rubric -AACU Global Perspectives Value Rubric		
	Performance Target	• 75% of students will achieve 3 or better on the critical thinking Value Rubric. • 75% of students will achieve 3 or better on the global perspective Value Rubric.	**Use of Results**	To improve critical thinking and their intercultural knowledge, work with students early in the semester to develop more complex theses, clarify the points that they want to make and consider the topic from many angles. We will share the rubrics with them when we introduce the paper so they know the expectations. Having students submit a draft should also help achieve better quality results. We will reassess SLO next academic year.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**PHI 112**	**SLO 1:** Evaluate the major ethical theories.	**Assessment Finding**	Student performance was much lower than expected. 12% scored 70% or higher on the survey. 41% of the students who were not able to match any of the seven philosophers with their theories.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Comprehensive Exam		
	Performance Target	50% of students will achieve 70% or better;	**Use of Results**	We will review the textbook, review assessment tool to consider whether it is the best measure of

		hoping to improve on last year's results of 22%		student learning, and explore the possibility of hiring a full-time faculty member with an advanced degree in philosophy to help lead the philosophy discipline. This SLO will be reassessed next academic year.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**SPA 111**	**SLO 1: I**nterpret written and oral texts of various types dealing with daily topics to identify the main idea, keywords and specific detail.	**Assessment Finding**	76.5% of the students received a score of 80% or higher. The instructor believes that the scores could be improved if the exercises were tied to a grade.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Direct assessment using questions that accompany the videos		
	Performance Target	80% of students will achieve 80% or better	**Use of Results**	The assignments will be part of the final grade in order to get more earnest efforts and a higher score average. This SLO will be reassessed next academic year.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**SPA 111**	**SLO 2: E**xchange personal information concerning everyday life, by asking and answering questions, expressing likes and dislikes, and making basic comparisons.	**Assessment Finding**	93% of students achieved 80% or better, but only 53% achieved 90% or higher.
	Method & Tool	Performance Assessment/Personal Communication; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	80% of students will achieve 90% or better	**Use of Results**	More efforts will be made to increase the percentage of those receiving 90-100% by applying more conversation activities throughout the semester. This SLO will be reassessed.

Mathematics Department

Core Competencies	Depart./ Program	SLO Assessed, Method, and Tool		
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**MAT 050**	**SLO 1:** Analyze and evaluate data, then synthesize the information to solve a variety of application problems in MAT 050	**Assessment Finding**	For the 8 exam questions, there were 997 correct answers out of 2023 responses, or a success rate of 49.3%. This is a decrease of 3.4%.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Tests		
	Performance Target	Increase 2% above the baseline percentage of 52.7%	**Use of Results**	In class activities will be used to enhance the understanding of application problems. The SLO will be reassessed during the 2015-16 AY.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**MAT 055**	**SLO 1:** Analyze and evaluate data, then synthesize the information to solve a variety of application problems in MAT 055	**Assessment Finding**	For the 21 exam questions, there were 867 correct answers of 1554 answers, or 55.8% correct. This is an increase of 3.1% over the baseline data.

	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Tests		
	Performance Target	Increase 2% above the baseline percentage of 52.7%	**Use of Results**	A continuation of the emphasis of applications will be implemented in all MAT 055 classes. The SLO will be reassessed during the 2015-16 AY.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**MAT 120**	**SLO 1:** Use mathematical language as responsible citizens in MAT 120	**Assessment Finding**	Summary Statistics, rounded: mean of 79% with standard deviation of 13% for n = 14, outlier omitted. max 100, Q3 at 89, median 73, Q1 at 67, min 66. The mean, with outlier removed, was close to 80% but the median and the nearest scores were half a standard deviation away; no resemblance to normalcy exists.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Test		
	Performance Target	Distribution of student scores on final exam will be approximately normal, with a mean above 80% (and so 50% of students will score above the mean).	**Use of Results**	More repetition of important concepts written into daily fact checks; inclusion of a midterm using the same in-class, fill-in-the-blank format as the final; assignments and activities in weeks prior to exams, designed to emphasize discussion of content-centered vocabulary and lead students to synthesize important concepts. Also, we will continue and redefine the gamified area. SLO will be reassessed during the 2015-16 AY.
INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION	**MAT 121**	**SLO 1:** Analyze and evaluate data, then synthesize the information to solve a variety of application problems in MAT 121	**Assessment Finding**	55 randomly selected students from all 8 sections of MAT 121 were assessed by analyzing the final exam. The average correct response was 78.3%, an increase of over 15%.
	Method & Tool	Selected Response; Test		
	Performance Target	Overall increase of 2% above the baseline percentage of 62.4%.	**Use of Results**	Continue to emphasize applications in the course work. Expand the assessment of the SLO to include chapter exams and all students for AY 2015-16
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY	**MAT 135**	**SLO 1:** Design an experiment to gather data, then summarize and analyze the data using descriptive and inferential statistics on a final project in MAT 135	**Assessment Finding**	Fall 2014, nine (9) final group projects (18 students) were assessed using a grading rubric which was given to the students as part of the instructions for the project. The average score was 64.7%. Spring 2015, five (5) final group projects (20 students) were assed using the same grading rubrics as Fall 2014. The average score was 81.8%.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Performance Assessment; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	An average of 80% for the class on the final project grade	**Use of Results**	Continue methodology and activities employed before spring assessment. The SLO will be reassessed next AY
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE**	**MAT 201**	**SLO 1:** Correctly use technology, use proper techniques, arrive at correct answers and analyze results by completing a Capstone Lab in MAT 201	**Assessment Finding**	80% or higher on the Capstone Lab, so the goal was exceeded
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Performance Assessment; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance	75% of students completing	**Use of**	To improve the strategies and results, all 20

INFORMATION	**Target**	the Capstone Lab will achieve 80% or higher.	**Results**	Math labs were rewritten, and further refinement will be forthcoming. Additionally, students are encouraged to work in groups to facilitate discussion and exploration for the solution to the problem, while the lab is written up individually by each student. The SLO will be reassessed next AY (2015-16).

Social Sciences and Criminal Justice Department

Core Competencies	Depart./ Program	SLO Assessed, Method, and Tool		
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**	**GEO 105**	**SLO 1:** Identify appropriate and a required number of academic sources within contemporary forms of technology, select topics that are relevant to the academic subject and time-frame, and communicate those findings effectively in written form.	**Assessment Finding**	**Spring 2015 Results:** 86% (26 students out of 30) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target*
		Method & Tool: Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
		Performance Target: 70% of students will score 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale in three areas: communication, critical thinking, and information and communication technology literacy.	**Use of Results**	To verify that these statistics are consistent and not anomalous, we will use the same SLO for the 2015 – 2016 AY. We will continue to refine the rubric to address more specific issues related to the SLO, which will provide the most accurate assessment possible.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/**	**HIS 111**	**SLO 1:** Identify appropriate and a required number of academic sources within contemporary forms of technology, select topics that are relevant to the academic subject and time-frame, and communicate those findings effectively in written form.	**Assessment Finding**	**Fall 2014 Results:** 79% (71 students out of 90) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.* **Spring 2015 Results:** 65% (46 students out of 71) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *slightly below the performance target.* **2014 – 2015 Totals**: 73% (117 students out of 161) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *slightly above the performance target*.
		Method & Tool: Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		

COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY	**Performance Target**	70% of students will score 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale in three areas: communication, critical thinking, and information and communication technology literacy.	**Use of Results**	To verify that these statistics are consistent and not anomalous, we will use the same SLO for the 2015 – 2016 AY. We will continue to refine the rubric to address more specific issues related to the SLO, which will provide the most accurate assessment possible.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**	**HIS 112**	**SLO 1:** Identify appropriate and a required number of academic sources within contemporary forms of technology, select topics that are relevant to the academic subject and time-frame, and communicate those findings effectively in written form.	**Assessment Finding**	**Fall 2014 Results:** 89% (34 students out of 38) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.* **Spring 2015 Results:** 79% (37 students out of 47) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.* **2014 – 2015 Totals**: 84% (71 students out of 85) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target*.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	70% of students will score 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale in three areas: communication, critical thinking, and information and communication technology literacy.	**Use of Results**	To verify that these statistics are consistent and not anomalous, we will use the same SLO for the 2015 – 2016 AY. We will continue to refine the rubric to address more specific issues related to the SLO, which will provide the most accurate assessment possible.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**	**HIS 121**	**SLO 1:** Identify appropriate and a required number of academic sources within contemporary forms of technology, select topics that are relevant to the academic subject and time-frame, and communicate those findings effectively in written form.	**Assessment Finding**	**Fall 2014 Results:** 96% (24 students out of 25) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.* **Spring 2015 Results:** 82% (49 students out of 60) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.* **2014 – 2015 Totals:** 86% (73 students out of 85) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.*
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	70% of students will score a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale in three areas: communication, critical thinking, and information and communication technology literacy.	**Use of Results**	This SLO was not assessed in HIS 121 sections in the 2013 – 2014 AY, as its use was expanded across most HIS sections this year.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&**	**HIS 122**	**SLO 1-** Identify appropriate and a required number of academic sources within contemporary forms of	**Assessment Finding**	**Fall 2014 Results:** 85% (41 students out of 48) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.* **Spring 2015 Results:** 78% (53 students out of

INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**		technology, select topics that are relevant to the academic subject and time-frame, and communicate those findings effectively in written form.		68) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *above the performance target.* **2014 – 2015 Totals:** 81% (94 students out of 116) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.*
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	70% of students will score 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale in three areas: communication, critical thinking, and information and communication technology literacy.	**Use of Results**	To verify that these statistics are consistent and not anomalous, we will use the same SLO for the 2015 – 2016 AY. We will continue to refine the rubric to address more specific issues related to the SLO, which will provide the most accurate assessment possible.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**	**HIS 247**	**SLO 1:** Identify appropriate and a required number of academic sources within contemporary forms of technology, select topics that are relevant to the academic subject and time-frame, and communicate those findings effectively in written form.	**Assessment Finding**	**Fall 2014 Results:** Not assessed **Spring 2015 Results:** 95% (20 students out of 21) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.* **2014 – 2015 Totals:** 95% (20 students out of 21) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *well above the performance target.*
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	70% of students will score 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale in three areas: communication, critical thinking, and information and communication technology literacy.	**Use of Results**	To verify that these statistics are consistent and not anomalous, we will use the same SLO for the 2015 – 2016 AY. We will continue to refine the rubric to address more specific issues related to the SLO, which will provide the most accurate assessment possible.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**	**POS 111**	**SLO 1:** Identify appropriate and a required number of academic sources within contemporary forms of technology, select topics that are relevant to the academic subject and time-frame, and communicate those findings effectively in written form.	**Assessment Finding**	**Fall 2014 Results:** Unavailable **Spring 2015 Results:** 83% (50 students out of 60) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *above the performance target.* **2014-2015 Results:** 83% (50 students out of 60) scored a 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale, *above the performance target.*
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	70% of students will score 4 out of 5 (80%) or greater per the rubric scale in three areas: communication, critical thinking, and	**Use of Results**	To verify that these statistics are consistent and not anomalous, we will use the same SLO for the 2015 – 2016 AY. We will continue to refine the rubric to address more specific issues related to the SLO, which will provide the most

		information and communication technology literacy.		accurate assessment possible.
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**	**PSY 101**	**SLO 1:** evaluate a popular media article on a psychological topic for adherence to basic rules of research to include: a) identifying false assumptions presented as fact, b) correlation and variables of causation, c) potential for inappropriate actions if the article is taken seriously, and d) reframing the summary of research (title) to more accurately represent the findings	**Assessment Finding**	The average overall score for all Pueblo campus PSY 101 sections in fall of 2014 and spring of 2015 was 80%. I am pleased with these results, as they demonstrate continued success and overall improvement - up significantly from 68.5% in the spring of 2013, which was the first semester all instructors on the Pueblo campus participated. Results for specific questions (and concepts) are listed below: Q. 1. 74% (correlation and variables of causation) Q. 2. 78% (potential for inappropriate actions if the article is taken seriously) Q. 3. 87% (reframing the summary of research (title) to more accurately represent the findings)
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	Class average will equate to a score of 80% or higher.	**Use of Results**	This SLO will not be reassessed
READ, WRITE, SPEAK EFFECTIVELY **&** **INTERPRET, EVALUATE, AND SYNTHESIZE INFORMATION** **&** **INFORMATION/ COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY**	**PSY 235**	**SLO 1:** Evaluate environmental factors affecting prenatal development and then apply possible outcomes using the developmental theories of Erikson and Piaget	**Assessment Finding**	Last year, results for PSY 235 assessment were significantly lower than the performance target (see below) but I am happy to report they are considerably higher this year! **2013-14**: Q.1. 48% (application of Erickson's theory) Q.2. 46% (impact on society) Q.3. 40% (prognosis) Overall: 45% **2014-15**: Q.1. 71% (application of Erickson's theory) Q.2. 65% (impact on society) Q.3. 72% (prognosis) Overall: 70% The data show we have made significant improvement in helping students understand and apply these concepts.
	Method & Tool	Extended Written Response; Departmental Rubric		
	Performance Target	Overall average score of 80% or higher	**Use of Results**	We will continue assessing this concept, but in a different format, format to be determined by faculty and instructors over the summer of 2015.