COLLEGE STATUS REPORT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IMPLEMENTATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Colleges are asked to use this report form in completing their College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation. Colleges should submit a brief narrative analysis and quantitative and qualitative evidence demonstrating status of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) implementation. The report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric). Colleges are asked to interpret their implementation level through the lens of the Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. The final report section before the evidence list requests a brief narrative self-assessment of overall status in relationship to the proficiency level, indicating what plans are in place to mitigate any noted deficiencies or areas for improvement. Narrative responses for each section of the template should not exceed 250 words.

This report form offers examples of quantitative and qualitative evidence which might be included for each of the characteristics. The examples are illustrative in nature and are not intended to provide a complete listing of the kinds of evidence colleges may use to document SLO status. College evidence used for one Proficiency level characteristic may also serve as evidence for another characteristic.

This report is provided to colleges in hard copy and also electronically, by e-mail, as a fill-in Word document. The reports must be submitted to the Commission by either the October 15, 2012 date or the March 15, 2013 date, as defined on the enclosed list of colleges by assigned reporting date. When the report is completed, colleges should:

a. Submit the report form by email to the ACCJC (accjc@accjc.org); and
b. Submit the full report with attached evidence on CD/DVD to the ACCJC (ACCJC, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949).

Although evidence cited in the text of the report may include links to college web resources, the Commission requires actual copies (electronic files) of the evidence for its records.

COLLEGE INFORMATION: DATE OF REPORT; COLLEGE; SUBMITTED BY; CERTIFICATION BY CEO

Date of Report: Feb. 11, 2013
Institution’s Name: Los Angeles Harbor College
Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Dr. Elena Reigadas, Assessment Coordinator
Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 310.233.4581  Reigade@lahc.edu
Certification by Chief Executive Officer: The information included in this report is certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.
Name of CEO: ____________________________
Signature: ____________________________
(e-signature permitted)
**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS ARE IN PLACE FOR COURSES, PROGRAMS, SUPPORT SERVICES, CERTIFICATES AND DEGREES.**

Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement Standards: I.A.1; II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; II.A.3[See II.A.3.a,b,c.]; II.A.6; II.B.4; II.C.2].

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Evidence demonstrating numbers/percentages of course, program (academic and student services), and institutional level outcomes are in place and assessed. Documentation on institutional planning processes demonstrating integrated planning and the way SLO assessment results impact program review. Descriptions could include discussions of high-impact courses, gateway courses, college frameworks, and so forth.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NUMERICAL RESPONSE**

**QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE/DATA ON THE RATE PERCENTAGE OF SLOs DEFINED AND ASSESSED**

1. Courses
   a. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 590
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 584
      Percentage of total: 99%
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 475
      Percentage of total: 81%

2. Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 45
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 44;
      Percentage of total: 98%
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 25;
      Percentage of total: 55%

3. Student Learning and Support Activities
   a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 23
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 16;
      Percentage of total: 70%
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 14; Percentage of total: 61%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 5
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 3
PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Student Learning Outcomes have been developed and assessed for courses, programs/pathways, non-instructional programs, and the institution (ISLOs). Assessment results are posted in Word format on the college assessment site (1.1 example from assessment site). Site visitors can view the history of assessment for any given course with the latest results posted at the top. The assessment forms allow the posting of the measure used, the assessment results, and the use of results. In addition, the first column to the left depicts the matching of course SLOs to the corresponding ISLO (1.2).

Course SLOs and authentic means of assessment are developed by faculty in the discipline. Institutional SLOs were decided by the Academic Senate. Degrees and certificates are measured as part of program or pathway assessment. Pathways were formed by grouping disciplines that had closely related SLOs and that could use common measures (1.3 Felt poster). This was the result of campus-wide discussion about how to make the process meaningful and sustainable when there is often only one or no full-time faculty member in a program. Outcomes and authentic means of assessment for programs/pathways (PLOs) are designed by discipline faculty.

Course and pathway assessment data are reported and discussed within departmental and division meetings while institutional data are discussed campus-wide. These discussions lead to curriculum changes and curriculum alignment through the program review process (Evidence????).

Student Services and Administrative services have also developed outcomes that are routinely assessed and reported. The results feed their program review and planning processes.

The assessment committee – a subcommittee of the curriculum committee- decides what ISLO will be assessed during any given year and the assessment tool to be used. For all SLOs a combination of qualitative and quantitative measures has been used (1.4 prompt for ISLO1, 1.5 questionnaire sample).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: THERE IS A WIDESPREAD INSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE ABOUT ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS.

Standards: I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.5.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on processes and outcomes of SLO assessment. Specific examples with the outcome data analysis and description of how the results were used. Descriptions could include examples of institutional changes made to respond to outcomes assessment results.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Assessment outcomes are regularly shared with the campus community through the assessment and curriculum committees, and through flex workshops open to faculty and administrators (2.1 link to PPT from workshop). The relevance of outcomes assessment in our campus led to the creation of specially designed workshops for new faculty members. The goal of these workshops is to integrate new faculty in the assessment process as soon as they join our institution (2.2 link to training PPT).

The office of Institutional Effectiveness works very closely with the assessment committee and
processes data/research requests. As a result of this SLO data-sharing dialogue, gaps in students’ success have been identified and interventions created to address them. For example, results from the ISLO #1 assessment (written communication) showed deficiencies in the writing performance of our students (2.3 results from ISLO #1). To address this issue the Puente program was recently established, a new ESL faculty member was hired, more basic skills classes were added to the schedule, and a license for Turnitin.com was purchased. The Teaching and Learning center has offered faculty training in using Turnitin to improve student writing. In addition, faculty who participated in the ISLO assessment committed to a pedagogical intervention for the post-test (2.4 commitment form). Data analyses from the post-test are in progress.

The Achieving the Dream Initiative (AtD) is supporting our outcomes assessment efforts in several areas, specifically in math. As a result of extensive data sharing and analyses, the Mathematics program is piloting changes to its developmental math sequence. (documentation from meetings?) The timing of our work with AtD coincides with our ISLO #2 measurement in regards to quantitative skills. We have started collecting data, using a longitudinal study design, so we will have data to analyze/report over the next 3 semesters (tracking students).

We also accomplished assessing ISLO #5 (personal growth/development) this year. We incorporated both qualitative and quantitative design into the data collection. We reported on the pilot testing at the Assessment committee meeting in November and will have the measurement complete in the Spring 2013 semester.

Assessment data are incorporated in program reviews (2.5 Accounting) and in unit plans to make decisions about resource allocation (2.6 unit plan example from Student services). In addition, each cluster (academic affairs, student services, and administrative services) uses assessment data to set their priorities that are then presented to the CPC for budget requests (2.7 still looking for a good example). As a college, we have strengthened our planning infrastructure to have at the source of all planning documents the use of data and evidence.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: DECISION MAKING INCLUDES DIALOGUE ON THE RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT AND IS PURPOSEFULLY DIRECTED TOWARD ALIGNING INSTITUTION-WIDE PRACTICES TO SUPPORT AND IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING.**

Standards: I.B; I.B.3; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.f; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation of institutional planning processes and the integration of SLO assessment results with program review, college-wide planning and resource allocation, including evidence of college-wide dialogue.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**

Our planning process is clearly depicted in our “planning document flow chart” (3.1 site link). This chart has been recently revised and improved from previous versions and it also shows its approval history. The flow chart depicts how data (from SLO and other sources) informs program reviews; these are the basis of college unit plans which in turn are incorporated into the annual cluster plans. All panning takes place within a climate of robust dialogue between the different stakeholders beginning at
faculty meetings discussing course level assessment results all the way to CPC (it would be nice to have some evidence here). The assessment dialogue among faculty members includes adjuncts who also serve in a variety of committees on campus.

The relevance that assessment data has in our planning process can be seen in the “Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures Manual.” This manual clearly delineates the program review process in a step-by-step fashion that includes the use of assessment results in the process (3.2 manual pages 12-13). In addition, the manual provides a helpful rubric consisting of 12 elements that need to be present in complete and thorough program review. Element 5 in this rubric calls for the inclusion of “robust assessment of student learning outcomes at the course and program levels” in the development of plans for the improvement of student learning; while element 10 on the rubric calls for a plan of action that is based on data, including SLO data (3.3 rubric).

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: APPROPRIATE RESOURCES CONTINUE TO BE ALLOCATED AND FINE-TUNED.**

Standards: I.B; I.B.4; I.B.6; III.C.2; III.D.2.a; III.D.3.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation on the integration of SLO assessment results with institutional planning and resource allocation.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**

Since the inception of the assessment process at Harbor College a SLO Coordinator has coordinated all assessment activities on campus and chairs the assessment committee. This faculty member is currently on a 60% reassigned time. The coordinator is responsible for the training of all faculty members on SLO matters at the course, program, and institutional level, consults and informs division chairs. In addition, the coordinator keeps the college informed about SLO results, especially institutional outcomes.

Faculty training and SLO workshops take place every semester under the SLO coordinator’s direction (see 2.1). Adjunct faculty members are encouraged to participate in all SLO activities and are required by contract to assess SLOs in their courses. The college has made available funds to support adjunct assessment work in those disciplines without a full-time faculty member. In addition, during institutional assessment, adjuncts are paid a stipend for their participation in coding data.
PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS EXIST AND ARE COMPLETED AND UPDATED ON A REGULAR BASIS.

Standards: I.A.1; I.B; I.B.3; I.B.5; I.B.6; II.A.2.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the process and cycle of SLO assessment, including results of cycles of assessment. Copies of summative assessment reports, with actual learning outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

All courses and academic and non-academic programs/pathways have their assessment forms posted on the assessment area of the campus web site after review by the Assessment Coordinator (see I.1). These forms include the list of SLOs, how they were assessed, assessment outcomes and the use of results. Each form is a summative report in itself, and division chairs and other interested stakeholders can easily access these forms to be used in program reviews and/or unit plans. Program pathways, academic and non-academic support services use a similar form for their assessment that can also be found on the assessment site (5.1 program assessment form example). Supporting detail can be found in the department office.

The assessment coordinator keeps a comprehensive database of all courses being offered that includes the status of the course (active/archived), the semester that was last offered, its name and number, the number of SLOs and how many have been measured, and the number of assessment cycles completed (5.2 database). This report is updated twice a year using a triangulation process whereby each course is matched with the corresponding course outline of record, the assessment form posted on line, and the college catalog. The purpose of this process is to ensure that our catalog and our records are continuously updated and matched. The latest database review revealed discrepancies between the college catalog and the status of courses posted on the ECD system. This prompted the creation of a second database to be used by the college catalog coordinator (5.3 2nd database). This database highlights the discrepancies between the catalog and the course status on our ECD system. In turn, the catalog coordinator can easily detect them and update the catalog accordingly. Reports are sent to the division chairs at the start of each semester for verification and planning (5.4 reports?).
**Proficiency Rubric Statement 6: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.**

Standards: II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i.

**Examples of Evidence:** Documentation on the alignment/integration of course level outcomes with program outcomes. Description could include curriculum mapping or other alignment activities. Samples across the curriculum of institutional outcomes mapped to program outcomes.

**Proficiency Rubric Statement 6: Narrative Response**

Course SLOs are aligned to institutional and pathway SLOs. For each course SLO the assessment form indicates its alignment to the corresponding ISLO (see 1.1). The course outline of record is also aligned to SLOs through a link that takes the user to the web location where the course SLOs are posted (6.3 course outline section).

Our pathways/programs adopted a nested alignment approach with ISLOs. To the extent that is possible, outcomes from ISLOs are used as a model for program/pathway outcomes (6.1 Behavioral Sciences). Additionally, pathway curriculum maps have been created in Excel format. The courses in each degree and certificate are ranked by competency level to each program outcome. These are routinely updated and posted side-by-side to the corresponding program/pathway assessment form on the assessment site (6.2 curriculum map).
PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AWARENESS OF GOALS AND PURPOSES OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEY ARE ENROLLED.

Standards: I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on means the college uses to inform students of course and program purposes and outcomes. Samples across the curriculum of: course outlines of record and syllabi with course SLOs; program and institutional SLOs in catalog.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The most direct method for students to learn about course SLOs is through syllabi. Faculty members are required to list the course SLOs, goals, and objectives in their syllabi (7.1 syllabus example). Many instructors inform their students if an assignment is designed to measure a SLO (7.2 example).

The catalog –available in electronic and hard copy format- describes the programs offered, their requirements, and goals and provides a hyperlink to the program/pathway SLOs on the college web site. The ISLOs are prominently posted on the college website (7.3 site link) and course and program SLOs are also accessible to students on the website.

There is also considerable outcomes data (retention) in our college Factbook. The college received a commendation from the ACCJC Visiting Team in 2012 for the availability of institutional data, and in name credited the college’s Factbook. We were further commended for our extensive use of data in the AtD initiative.

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:

YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS? WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Harbor College has fully embraced the development of an assessment culture to support student success. As such, we have made tremendous strides in assessing our courses, our programs, and our institutional learning outcomes. The robust assessment dialogue that takes place within and between the different units attests to the commitment to authentic assessment from all stakeholders involved. And despite the implementation of budget cuts across the college, resources continue to be allocated to fund and support our assessment efforts. For the most part, our college meets the criteria of proficiency level outlined in the “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes.”

Course and institutional assessment has been meaningful and authentic, with campus-wide involvement of both full-time and adjunct instructors. Program/pathway assessment has been more challenging due to structural problems at our district. For example, the current Student Information System makes it
very difficult for students to declare a major or intent. As a result, we do not know which program of study a student follows. Many students do not apply for a degree or certificate at all, transferring to a four-year institution instead. In the short term, the problem is being addressed by classroom surveys that ask students about their areas of interest. Within the next few years, the district will be fielding a new Student Information System that should make it easier for students to declare a major.

The linkage between assessment data and planning has been progressing but there is still room for improvement. For example, more assessment data need to inform program reviews and the overall planning process for resource allocation.

As courses and programs embark on repeated cycles of assessment, it is beyond the capabilities of our Microsoft Office document system to effectively manage and compare the data. Harbor College needs a web based assessment database system for data entry and analysis. The funds are not currently available to purchase and support a commercial system. We are depending on the district to provide access to a system developed in-house. In the near future, this system will make it easier to locate and use relevant data for planning.

The college-wide data generated in the assessment process have put a strain on our office of Institutional Effectiveness staff members. As the demand for data analyses grow, so does the need for more support personnel in this office. Currently the office is staffed by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and one Research Analyst.
TABLE OF EVIDENCE: LIST THE EVIDENCE USED TO SUPPORT YOUR NARRATIVE REPORT, SECTION BY SECTION.

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

1.1 Main College Assessment Page

Course Assessment Page
1.2

Course Assessment Form editing in Word
1.3 Pathway Meeting Discussion Board
1.4 Example of qualitative measure

**ISLO # 1 PROMPT FOR PSYCH 01**

**Guideline for Independent Project # 4 Individual assignment (Due 11/15)**
**Institutional Learning Outcome (ISLO) # 1 Re-assessment**

Groups play an essential part in our lives and can bring out the best—and worst—in our personalities. Group activities sometimes lead to positive outcomes (e.g., Habitat for Humanity) or negative outcomes (e.g., terrorist groups). Using one of the social/psychological theories as a framework, explain how/why individuals join different types of groups.

Your explanation will be in essay format, with at least 2 pages (no less than 500 words). The essay should have the following sections:

1. Introduction, where you introduce the topic and end with a clear thesis statement or question that you hope to answer in your paper.
2. Body (several paragraphs), where you will answer your question or thesis from the introduction.
3. Conclusion, where you summarize what you wrote and bring together the paper.
4. You may cite the theory or theories in your introduction or you may introduce them in the body of your paper.

Students must use at least three sources (printed or on-line) to support their theses; one of them must be the textbook. Keep in mind that information derived from Wikipedia is not an acceptable source of references in college (you should have stopped using Wikipedia in 8th grade). The sources will be appropriately listed in APA format in a “Reference” page.

**Criteria**
An A paper should demonstrate the following:

- **Competency 1:** Narrows the topic appropriately and cites a specific theory or theories.
- **Competency 2:** States a thesis/specific purpose
- **Competency 3:** Provides supporting material
- **Competency 4:** Follows the appropriate organizational pattern as stated in the guideline
- **Competency 5:** Uses appropriate psychology language
- **Competency 6:** No grammatical errors are detected.
- **Competency 7:** Covers the content requested including the integration of theories and concepts.
- **Competency 8:** Credits at least three sources in an appropriately formatted reference page (APA style)

1.5 Example of quantitative/objective measure

**SLO # 4 ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS**

1. You believe that working women are happier than are women who do not work outside the home. You **predict** that working women are less socially isolated than women who work at home. You have just formulated a(n)

   a. representative sample
   b. operational definition
2. A researcher wants to study the effects of caffeine on student performance on quiz scores. The researcher gives a caffeinated drink to half of the students and a non-caffeinated drink to the other half of students. The researcher then measures quiz scores by counting the number of correct answers. Given the above scenario, what is the dependent variable?

a. the number of students reporting that they consume caffeine everyday
b. whether or not students like drinking caffeinated beverages
c. whether or not the students received a caffeinated drink during the study
d. the number of correct answers on the quiz

3. A psychologist is studying the effects that different noise levels have on stress. In the experiment, noise levels are

a. control
b. dependent variable
c. independent variable
d. control group

4. In a study of effects of alcohol on driving ability, the control group should be given

a. a high dosage of alcohol
b. one-half the dosage given the experimental group
c. a driving test before and after drinking
d. no alcohol at all

5. The members of which group receive the independent variable?

a. the experimental group
b. the control group
c. the independent group
d. depending on the research, any of the above might receive the independent variable

2.1 List of Flex Workshops

2.2 Latest SLO Training Workshop
2.3 PPT results from ISLO # 1 (few slides sample)

**ISLO # 1---Communication**

IF NOT NOW.....WHEN?

IF NOT ME.....WHO?

**Outcomes for Today**

- Heightened Awareness of how we can help students achieve their goals
- Commitment from participants to try some of the activities discussed and developed
- Commitments from faculty to participate in the fall 2011 ISLO assessments
- Periodic progress reports through the summer and fall on the status of activities

**Process 2010/2011**

1. Early Fall: Prompts and rubric reviewed by Assessment Committee
2. 2nd Half: Essays collected in classes
4. April 2011: Review results and suggest instructional changes
   Here we are!

**Process 2011/2012**

1. Fall 2011: Make changes in instruction
2. 2nd Half: Collect essays
3. Jan ‘12: Score essays
4. March ‘12: Review Results – What worked?
5. April ‘12: Review the Assessment process
2.4 Commitment Form

2.5 Program Review from Accounting

2.6. Unit Plan from Student Services

2.7 Example of assessment data being used in clusters’ priorities

3.1 Flow chart
3.2 Program review manual pages
http://www.lahc.edu/govplanning/planning/programreviewmanual.pdf

3.3 Program review rubric

5.1 and 6.1 Program assessment form

LA HARBOR COLLEGE
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Assessment Report
Program Assessment

Program/Pathway Name: Social and Behavioral Science
Division (if applicable): Social and Behavioral Science
Program Contact Person: Ellen Joiner

Reviewed by: Lora Lane, SLO Assessment Coordinator Date: Dec. 2011

Attach additional pages as necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO Number</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment and Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Program Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1) Students will summarize and critically analyze graphic and textual information.</td>
<td>Fall 2010: Psychology Pre-test data were collected from 119 students in Psych 41 and 51 from Psych 01. Results showed that consistent with expectation the majority of essays in advanced courses (60%) scored at least a 2. The pattern of results for the introductory course showed that about 44% of students scored at least a 2.</td>
<td>Fall 2011: Each participating discipline committed to at least one instructional change to be implemented for the post-test data collection.</td>
<td>Spring 2011: Faculty gathered on April 8th for the “ISLO 1 feedback session,” where results were shared with participating faculty members. Working collaboratively the faculty made decisions as to the implementation of instructional changes for the fall 2011 post-test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2) Students will communicate a clear argument both orally and in writing. The argument will include a thesis statement, support data, and citations.</td>
<td>History 87 &amp; 52, Pol Sci 1, and Psych 1 &amp; 41 participated in the Fall 2010 pre-test of ISLO #1. Participating students wrote a 500-word essay on a shared topic to the three disciplines, “Explain how individuals affiliate to groups.” The majority of students (at least 60%) were expected to score a 2 or better on a rubric designed to evaluate the essays. In this rubric a value of 1 = Emerging, 2 = Developing, 3= Advanced.</td>
<td>History 52 &amp; 87: Modules developed to focus student attention on thesis writing, essay organization, and citations; mandatory library tutorial and in-class tutorial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Political Science:** 76 students were assessed. Each student was rated by 2 separate graders (152 total scores). Out of the 152 scores recorded, 19 were scored 11 or higher. 13% of the scores were deemed to be a 2 or higher average on the rubric (“developing”).

3. **History 52**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>3) Students will identify field-specific theories/perspectives and apply the theories to new information or situations.</th>
<th>19 students were assessed. Each student was rated by 2 separate graders (38 total scores). Out of the 38 scores recorded, 16 were scored 11 or higher. Therefore, 41% of the scores were deemed to be a 2 or higher average on the rubric (“developing”).</th>
<th>Classes were surveyed to examine link between proficiency and essay grades.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4) Students will locate, identify, and evaluate relevant sources of traditional and electronic information and demonstrate an ethical use of these sources.</td>
<td>Two introductory psychology courses participated in the assessment of ISLO #3 during the Fall 2011. Students were instructed to observe someone’s behavior for a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specified period of time and write about this observation while addressing developmental stages. Then, students are to compare the observed behavior to someone’s of similar age in another culture. The last part of the project asks students to use their textbook and other sources to explain (in writing) how someone of the same age and sex might be different in another culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.2 Course Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Catalog Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Curriculum Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Syllabus Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 SLO-assignment example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Site link</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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