

Appendix A

Example, Instructional Program, English

ENGLISH									
COURSE LISTING (2021-22 CATALOG)	Last Assessed	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
ENGL 120	2019	SLO 2			SLO 1			SLO 2	
ENGL 120 A	2019	SLO 2							
ENGL 120 B	2020		SLO 1						
ENGL 121	2020	SLO 3		SLO 1 & 2			SLO 3		
ENGL 123	2020	SLO 3			SLO 1		SLO 2&3		
ENGL 125	2020			SLO 3	SLO 1			SLO 2	
ENGL 200	2018					SLO 1&2	SLO 3		
ENGL 201	2020			SLO 1-3					SLO 1-3
ENGL 202	2020			SLO 1-3					SLO 1-3
ENGL 203	2017				SLO 1-3				
ENGL 213	2020			SLO 1&2				SLO 1&2	
ENGL 214	2021				SLO 1&2				SLO 1&2
ENGL 215	2019	SLO 1&2				SLO 1&2			
ENGL 216	2018						SLO 1&2		
ENGL 220	2019	SLO 1&2					SLO 1&2		
ENGL 224	2020			SLO 1&2				SLO 1&2	
ENGL 226	2015				SLO 1 & 2				SLO 1&2
ENGL 228	2021					SLO 1 & 2			
ENGL 85	2018					SLO 1&2			
ENGL 90	2020			SLO 1			SLO 2		

ENGL 95	2019	SLO 1				SLO 1			
ENGL 97	2020		SLO 1						
ENGLN 810	2020				SLO 1*				
AA-T Degree									
PLO 1	2018					PLO 1		PLO 2	
PLO 2	2019								
PLO 3	2020		PLO 3						
Noncredit									
LARN 651	2018								SLO 1

Example, Instructional Program, Digital Design Graphics Tech

DIGITAL DESIGN GRAPHICS TECHNOLOGY							
COURSE LISTING (2021-2022 CATALOG)	Last Assessed	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
DDGT 110	2021	x			x	x	x
DDGT 120	2020	x		x		x	
DDGT 121	2021				x		x
DDGT 130	2018				x		x
DDGT 230	2018			x			
DDGT 240	2020	x		x		x	
DDGT 241	2021				x		x
AS Degree							
PLO 1	2021				x		x
PLO 2	2021				x		x
PLO 3	2021				x		x
PLO 4	2021				x		x

Appendix B

Example, Academic Support and Student Affairs Support

Academic Support - Student Affairs Support						
		Last Year Assessed	2019	2020	2021	2022
Library and Learning Resource Center	PLO 1-2	2020	PLO 2	PLO 1		
MESA	PLOS 1-3	2020	PLO 3	PLO1-3		
Puente	PLO 1-4	2020		PLO 2-4		
Umoja	PLO 1-3	2020	PLO 1-3	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3
Writing Success Center	PLO 1 -2	2020	PLO 1	PLO 1&2		
Math Success Center	PLO 1	2020		PLO 1		
Testing and Tutoring Center (SI)	PLO 1	2021			PLO 1	
Testing and Tutoring Center (SA)	PLO 2-3	2017			PLO 2-3	
Career Center	PLO 1	2020		PLO 1		
Transfer Center	PLO 1-2	2021			PLO 1 & 2	

Appendix C

Example, Course Assessment Template

Department Course Assessment Template

Course name: ENGL 95

Semester: Fall 2021

SLO 1: Think, read, and write critically.

Method of assessment: Final Reflection Questionnaire

Criteria: 70% of students will complete the assignment. (Note: Students who submitted the assignment and answered all 5 questions earned full credit.)

Results:

Quantitative (*Was the criteria met? What was the average success rate?*):

15 of 21 students submitted the assignment, equaling 71%

Qualitative

(*What strengths did students demonstrate?*):

Students were able to answer the questions with varying degrees of specificity and self-knowledge. Most were able to recognize the relationship between writing and the rest of their college career and some even beyond. Many of them recognized that what they learned wasn't only about writing but also about being a college student (time management, starting earlier, self-motivation/valuing the assignments/writing, etc.) especially in contrast to high school. Some were impressively able to identify specific strengths and weaknesses and to describe their writing and revising process in detail.

(Where did students seem most challenged?)

Describing their writing process and weaknesses seemed the most challenging with a number of students falling back on easy/vague generalities (noting grammar/spelling, vocabulary as weaknesses, for example).

Planned Action *(What will you do next time to address weaknesses? What resources would help?)*

I already have assigned 2 other earlier reflections before/after essays but will add similar reflections around the other essays (and possibly other assignments, research for example) as well. I also plan to teach the vocabulary of the writing process and elements a bit more emphatically. I concur with students' struggles with grammar. The exercises I offered this semester were a good start, but I plan to encourage/assign students to follow up with visits to the WSC. They are already required to have 6 WSC visits, but I think specific help/focus on grammar will help them (in some cases more than on essay structure).

Blank Course Assessment Template

Department Assessment Template

Course name:

Semester:

SLO:

Method of assessment:

If the above does not work, write in your own (consistent with the COR):

Criteria: 70% of students will earn a C or higher on the assignment

Results

Quantitative *(Was the criteria met? What was the average success rate?):*

Qualitative *(What strengths did students demonstrate?):*

(Where did students seem most challenged?)

Planned Action *(What will you do next time to address weaknesses? What resources would help?)*

Appendix D

Example, Course Assessment Rubric

Semester: Fall Course: THEA 143

SLO 2:	A	B	C	D	F
Show a cultural and artistic appreciation of theater arts.	Displays a strong ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays good ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays adequate ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays some ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays lack of ability/Work not complete.
Method of Assessment (write in your own, consistent with the COR): Discussions					
Criteria:					
1		X			
2		X			
3			X		
4		X			
5		X			
6			X		
7			X		
8		X			
Quantitative Results:	100% average of criteria met				
Qualitative Results:	<i>Students excelled in zoom discussion about issues of culture and gender as well as the place of our performance in history. Their work in production management allows this awareness to be present in the rehearsal and performance process.</i>				

Blank Course Assessment Rubric

Semester: Course:

SLO :		A	B	C	D	F
		Displays a strong ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays good ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays adequate ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays some ability to meet the learning outcome.	Displays lack of ability/Work not complete.
Method of Assessment (write in your own, consistent with the COR):						
Criteria:						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
Quantitative Results:	____ % average of criteria met					
Qualitative Results:	<i>In what ways did students excel? What difficulties did students exhibit?</i>					
Recommended actions:						

Appendix E

Example, Program Assessment Template

PLO Assessment Template

Program: Psychology AA and AA-T

Semester: Spring 2020

PLO 1: Understand the major theoretical perspectives in psychology and analyze the implications of these theories.

Method of assessment: Research Paper

Criteria: Students in the program will achieve an average of 70%

Results

Quantitative (Average of success rate):

82% of students met or exceeded the criterion of 70%.

Qualitative

In what areas were students most successful?

- Students were particularly successful in their ability to:
- Summarizing past research that is relevant to their own research hypotheses.
- Draw upon relevant theories to support their research hypotheses.
- Reference seminal authors who wrote or contributed to major theories in psychology.
- Apply those theories to form their own hypotheses.

What issues and needs were revealed?

- Students appear to have difficulty integrating and synthesizing multiple theories. They are good at drawing on one primary theory, but they do not readily integrate more than one. For example, they have difficulty identifying how theories relate to one another, difficulty comparing and contrasting theories, and difficulty offering alternative hypotheses implied by various theories.
- Students have difficulty crafting adequate transitions between different studies or theoretical perspectives, suggesting they have difficulty outlining a cohesive argument.

- Students also have difficulty situating their work in terms of past research; they do not readily discuss the extent to which their research is consistent or inconsistent with past research and theory.

What was surprising about the findings/results?

- We experienced some surprise about students' failure to implement feedback on the paper – students would make one suggested edit, then fail to implement those same edits elsewhere in the paper.
- We were also somewhat surprised about how narrowly they thought about relevant theories when applying them to their paper – they had difficulty.
- One pleasant surprise was that, given the transition to online teaching this semester due to Covid-19, students took a high degree of independent initiative when working on this research project. There is a lot more dialogue and visits in office hours during a typical semester, but students were less engaged with faculty yet produced pretty high-quality work.

Would a different assessment/tracking method be more appropriate?

- It might make good sense to have a specific assignment that encourages students to think critically about big picture ideas and theories in psychology. This type of assignment might also help remind students of theories that they can then use to inform their research hypotheses.
- Since this PLO focuses on broader theoretical knowledge, perhaps a better assessment would be to include data from other classes that build on General Psychology (e.g., Human Development, Social Psychology, Psych of Adjustment, Theories of Personality).
- Perhaps a different assessment could come in the form of implementing a “theory” paper, in addition to a research project. This type of paper would encourage students to synthesize multiple theories and be better prepared to situate hypotheses and data in terms of those theories.

Planned Action:

What professional development opportunities would help support success?

The department could meet to discuss the ways that the faculty could be more consistent with one another in the nature of the assessments being done. This would help us ensure that we are properly measuring these PLOs, consistently, across faculty and across different classes offered in the department.

Blank Program Assessment Template

PLO Assessment Template

Program:

Semester:

PLO :

Method of assessment: Analysis and discussion of activities across 4 years

Criteria: Students in the program will achieve an average of 70%

Courses included in the discussion: _____

Analysis and Discussion Notes

Below are examples of questions to help guide your discussion. More questions can be found on the Program Student Learning Outcomes web page, "Guided Dialogue for Assessment" document.

**In what areas were students most successful?*

**What issues and needs were revealed?*

What was surprising about the findings/results?

Would a different assessment/tracking method be more appropriate?

Does the program outcome language need to be refined? If so, how?

Planned Action:

What professional development opportunities would help support success?

What additional resources are needed (equipment/supplies/space/budget) to implement improvements?

Appendix F

Adapted from Guiding Dialogue for Course-Level & Program-Level Assessment

Compiled by: Robyn Wornall, Ph.D., Director of Institutional Research and Stephanie Burns, Ph.D., Faculty SLO Coordinator 2011-2012

The “Suggested Questions to Consider” in the following section are intended to guide dialogue and keep the focus on student learning and improvement.

Suggested Questions to Consider When Analyzing/Discussing Assessment Data:

So, you’ve collected data. Now what? The following questions are intended to help guide analysis and discussion of assessment results – specifically to identify areas for improvement.

Preliminary Questions:

1. Compare the results with the criteria for success that were established in step 2 of the outcomes assessment process.
2. Were the criteria for success met?
3. Gap analysis: comparison of actual outcomes with intended/targeted outcomes – what worked and what needs to be changed?
4. How well are students doing compared to a standard? (rubric or established criteria for success)
5. In what outcome/skill areas are a large number of students still weak?
6. How much did students gain? (requires a pre- and post-test/evaluation)
7. What was surprising about the findings/results?
8. Are you collecting and recording assessment data with enough detail to answer the questions above (examples: specific areas of weakness, what specifically needs to be changed to improve student learning?) For example, instead of recording only the average score, add detail that will help you identify areas for improvement: The average score on the 20 assessment questions for this SLO was 65%. Many students in both of sections had difficulty with quantitative problem solving and concept questions, particularly those involving more than one variable. The students in the section that were provided more worksheets and practice problems performed better than the section that had fewer of these supports/assignments.

9. Are there other assessment methods that might be used to drill down and gain greater/different insight into student learning?

If Results Are Surprising, Review and Consider the Following:

1. Is the alignment correct? – Between the course-/program-level outcome(s) and the assessment instrument? – Between the outcome(s) and course activities? – Between the outcome(s) and the evidence (i.e., what was measured/collected)? – Between the outcome(s) and the curriculum? Are the SLOs congruent with the Course outline of record?
2. Were the assessment instructions clear?
3. Would a different assessment/tracking method be more appropriate? Would multiple measures give more information? (Example: If students are being assessed at one juncture, would comparing across multiple assignments (to track improvement) help? Can you then discern improvements across assignments?)
4. Do different groups of students perform differently on the assessments? If so, you might want to examine performance among subgroups of students – examples: completion of English/Math courses prior to enrollment in your course, demographic groups, learning style, college experience, etc.

Identify Areas for Improvement:

1. How can we improve student learning based on the results?
2. Discuss findings with all discipline faculty in your department, identify commonalities in areas that need improvement.
3. Are improvements needed in the following:
 - Assessment instruments and processes?
 - Pedagogy and curriculum?
 - Student support?
 - Faculty support (professional development opportunities)?
 - Resources (equipment/supplies/space/budget)?

Delve Deeper:

1. Consider collecting indirect assessment information to complement direct evidence collected through course-level assessment

2. Triangulate using multiple methods of assessment
3. Are students aware of the course-level outcomes? Can they articulate them? Note: Data have been collected through PEP student surveys since 2006.
4. How well do students do in subsequent courses?
5. Have students' attitudes changed? How? In what specific ways?

Some of the information included here was compiled from materials included in Resource Binder for WASC Retreat on Assessment in Practice, October 27-29, 2011

Appendix G

Example, ILO/GELO Assessment Template

ILO/GELO Area 3 Assessment

Semester: Spring 2020

ILO/GELO: Evaluate and apply the principles and methodologies used by the social and behavioral sciences.

Method of Assessment: Analysis of activities across multiple semesters in HIST 122, 123, 140, 150, POLI 120, 135, 140, 145, CFS 120, 140, 180, ADMJ 121, 122, 125, ANTH 130, 131, 145, 200, PSYC 124, 125, 220, SOCI 122, 123, 140, 154

Criteria: 70% of students will earn a 70% or higher on the activity

Results

Quantitative: 80% average on activities across 5 years

Reflections:

Students demonstrated strengths in evaluating and applying principles and methodologies used by the social and behavioral sciences when identifying key components of theories and how they align with debates, understanding who the key figures are associated with theories, and recognizing approaches used in studies. Students with strong reading and writing skills do well in courses. Overall, students are able to compare and contrast theories and utilize description.

Students display difficulties investigating/interrogating primary sources and secondary sources, performing text analysis, offering critique, and practicing thinking. Sustaining work effort and quality have proven challenging, as some students show a lack of ability to engage in systematic, analytical thought, possibly due to limited reading and awareness of writing structure.

Instructors include a number of activities in their courses: essays, research papers, projects, quizzes, experiential activities, on campus field trips. Introductory courses provide a survey of analytical frameworks, including experiences for using frameworks, small group work, and team presentations.

Future GE assessment could include focus groups of students.

Action Plans

Professional development needs: effective pedagogy for teaching online, big picture cross-disciplinary opportunities, support for utilizing routine guest speakers, funding for membership to professional organizations

Other institutional support needs: co-teaching opportunities, support to promote real-world scenarios for students to apply frameworks, long-term funding for Canvas tools (such as Canvas Studio), Proctorio, NetTutor, more loaner laptops for students, support for Accessibility (such as hiring an Accessibility specialist for faculty)

Blank ILO/GELO Assessment Template

GE Area 4 Assessment Template

Program:

Semester:

ILO/GELO:

Method of assessment: Analysis of student activities across ____ years in courses _____:

Criteria: Students will achieve an average of 70% on assignments and exams.

Results

Quantitative (Cumulative average of success rates, LOAC will provide preliminary data):

Qualitative (Examples of guiding questions below):

In what areas were students most successful?

What issues and needs were revealed?

How do the cumulative results compare to individual course-level data?

Were assessment methods effective, and if not, what needs to be revised?

Could a common assignment be utilized across courses to gain further insights? If so, what would you suggest?

Does the ILO/GELO language need to be refined? If so, how?

Planned Action:

What professional development opportunities would help support success?

What additional resources are needed to implement improvements (student support, equipment, supplies, space, etc.)?

Appendix H

Example ILO/GELO Data Disaggregated by Subpopulations

General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment

Analysis of Assessment Results among Student Subpopulations, Based on Data Collected Spring 2021 within Language and Developmental Studies Division

Demographics among Students Assessed for General Education Learning Outcomes within Language and Developmental Studies Division, Spring 2021 (N = 630)		
	Number	Proportion
Gender		
Female	413	66%
Male	214	34%
Unknown*	3	< 1%
* Not included in analysis		
Race/Ethnicity		
African American/Black	28	4%
Asian	15	2%
Filipino	60	10%
Latinx/Hispanic	305	48%
Two or More Races	47	7%
White	157	25%
Other ^A	18	3%
First Generation		
Yes	224	36%
No	406	64%

Veteran		
Yes	13	2%
No	617	98%
Economically Disadvantaged		
Yes	320	51%
No	310	49%
Disability on Record		
Yes	49	8%
No	581	92%

^AOther includes Native Americans and Pacific Islanders, due to low N among those two groups.

Foster Youth and LGBT Affiliation are not reported due to low N (< 10) of those two groups among students who were assessed within the Language and Developmental Studies Division in spring 2021.

Assessment Scores by Student Subpopulation			
	Proportion of Student Subpopulation		
	Below Expectations	Met Expectations	Exceeded Expectations
Gender			
Female	20%	31%	49%
Male	24%	33%	43%
Race/Ethnicity			
African American/Black	36%	36%	29%
Asian	13%	40%	47%
Filipino	20%	45%	35%
Latinx/Hispanic	22%	32%	46%
Two or More Races	19%	23%	57%
White	20%	27%	53%
Other ^A	22%	22%	56%

First Generation			
Yes	24%	30%	46%
No	20%	32%	48%
Veteran			
Yes	23%	15%	62%
No	21%	32%	47%
Economically Disadvantaged			
Yes	20%	34%	47%
No	23%	29%	48%
Disability on Record			
Yes	29%	31%	41%
No	21%	32%	48%

Yellow highlights denote cases flagged for disproportionate impact.

Detailed Findings from Disproportionate Impact Calculator

Percentage Point Gap Index (PPG): When the between the focal cohort's outcome is at least 2% lower than the average of all other groups and the gap is also larger than the margin of error (MOE), DI is indicated and cells are highlighted in pink.

80% Index: Values less or equal to 80% are considered to reflect disproportionate impact (i.e., pink highlighted cells).

Proportionality Index (PI): Values less than or equal to 0.80 are generally considered to reflect disproportionate impact (i.e., pink highlighted cells).

Strong by Race/Ethnicity:

Cohort Name	Cohort Count	Outcome Count	Percent (Cohort)	Percent (Outcome)	Outcome Rate (OR)		Percentage Point Gap (PPG)	MOE	Proportionality Index (PI)	80% Rule	Minimum Equity	Full Equity Number
1 afr am	28	8	4.44	2.69	28.57		-19.44	-16.73	0.606	49.74	1	6
2 asian	15	7	2.38	2.36	46.67		-0.49	-25.25	0.990	81.23	N/A	N/A
3 filip	60	21	9.52	7.07	35.00		-13.42	-12.07	0.742	60.93	1	9
4 latinx	305	141	48.41	47.47	46.23		-1.77	-5.60	0.981	80.47	N/A	N/A
5 2+	47	27	7.46	9.09	57.45		11.13	-14.14	1.219	100.00	N/A	N/A
6 white	157	83	24.92	27.95	52.87		7.62	-7.81	1.121	92.03	N/A	N/A
7 other	18	10	2.86	3.37	55.56		8.66	-22.96	1.178	96.71	N/A	N/A
Total		630		297	100	100	47.14		1.00			
Overall OR (Includes Comparison Group)												
47.14												
Reference Group OR (Highest OR)												
57.45												

Meets Expectations (Includes Strong) by Race/Ethnicity:

Cohort Name	Cohort Count	Outcome Count	Percent (Cohort)	Percent (Outcome)	Outcome Rate (OR)	Percentage Point Gap (PPG)	MOE	Proportionality Index (PI)	80% Rule	Minimum Equity	Full Equity Number
1 afr am	28	18	4.44	3.63	64.29	-15.12	-17.75	0.817	74.18	N/A	N/A
2 asian	15	13	2.38	2.62	86.67	8.13	-17.20	1.101	100.00	N/A	N/A
3 filip	60	48	9.52	9.68	80.00	1.40	-10.12	1.016	92.31	N/A	N/A
4 latinx	305	239	48.41	48.19	78.36	-0.72	-4.62	0.995	90.42	N/A	N/A
5 2+	47	38	7.46	7.66	80.85	2.29	-11.25	1.027	93.29	N/A	N/A
6 white	157	126	24.92	25.40	80.25	2.03	-6.23	1.019	92.60	N/A	N/A
7 other	18	14	2.86	2.82	77.78	-0.98	-19.21	0.988	89.74	N/A	N/A
Total			630	496	100	100	78.73				1.00
Overall OR (Includes Comparison Group)											
78.73											
Reference Group OR (Highest OR)											
86.67											

Strong among Veterans:

	Cohort Name	Cohort Count	Outcome Count	Percent (Cohort)	Percent (Outcome)	Outcome Rate (OR)	Percentage Point Gap (PPG)	MOE	Proportionality Index (PI)	80% Rule	Minimum Equity	Full Equity Number
1	vet	13	8	2.06	2.69	61.54	14.70	-26.45	1.305	100.00	N/A	N/A
2	not	617	289	97.94	97.31	46.84	-14.70	-3.94	0.994	76.11	67	91

Total	630	297	100	100	47.14	1.00
-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------	------

Overall OR (Includes Comparison Group)

47.14

Reference Group OR (Highest OR)

61.54