### What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

#### ADT (Fall 2012)

What an amazing group of young people. It is so encouraging to see such a large group of people investing in their walk with God. We are excited for the friendships you will build and the insight into God’s plans for each of your lives. Enjoy every day you spend on this journey we are excited for each of you, and praying for your time away. Doug and Dale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester:</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>(please separate members with commas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What an amazing group of young people. It is so encouraging to see such a large group of people investing in their walk with God. We are excited for the friendships you will build and the insight into God’s plans for each of your lives. Enjoy every day you spend on this journey we are excited for each of you, and praying for your time away. Doug and Dale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AMT (Fall 2012)

The newly developed individualized per course number NATEF task list is less confusing for students. These course specific task list allows students a more logical progression when moving into automotive specialty area with better comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester:</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>AMT</th>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>Kevin Rogers, Brian Noel, Drew Carlson, Mike Pereira</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The newly developed individualized per course number NATEF task list is less confusing for students. These course specific task list allows students a more logical progression when moving into automotive specialty area with better comprehension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BIOL (Fall 2012)

Two-thirds of our students are successfully mastering the content in our courses as demonstrated by earning As, Bs, or Cs on final exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester:</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>BIOL</th>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>Andi Salmi, Susan Scott, Jena Bills, Fred Deneke, Susan Scott, Eric Neff, Julie Olin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-thirds of our students are successfully mastering the content in our courses as demonstrated by earning As, Bs, or Cs on final exams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLO Assessment "What Was Learned" Report

What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

Semester: Fall 2012  Department: BUS  Members: Granquist, Fagin, Miller, and Phan

What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

Semester: Spring 2012  Department: CHEM  Members: Jessica Wong, Clay Reece, Frank Hoang, Mark Lee, Dave Hodapp, Jim Symes, Dave Roman

What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

After in-class safety instruction, students scored better on a multiple-choice quiz on safe laboratory techniques and procedures and source(s) of chemical safety information. Chem 305 students that were 9.6% increased. Chem 306 scores increased by 21%, Chem 420 scores increased by 25%, and Chem 421 scores increased by 36%. Additionally, when scores are viewed from a sequence of courses (such as Chem 400-401-420-421 or Chem 305-306), both sequences show safety scores steadily rising with increasing course level. Assessment of lab safety in Chem 400 completed -- students took the pre-test, but not the post-test. Also, not all the instructors reported scores. These flaws indicate the department's assessment process could be improved. The tallying the department's results could send a late-term update reminding all Chemistry instructors to share score information, and instructional time pressures in Chem 400 should be addressed.

*Chem 400 instructors failed to administer the post-test, choosing instead to devote the remaining class time to covering the last lecture topic. In general this semester, Chem 400 instructors bring students to the desired level of mastery in the available time. In explaining the difficulty these instructors cited: (a) Class time earmarked for administering proficiency quizzes (these q relatively new addition to the course) (b) Seemingly less-prepared incoming students, requiring extensive review of lower-level topics (c) The compressed calendar, under which students may between classes to absorb challenging material (d) Many brand-new lab experiments, whose "bugs" need to be worked out if students are to finish them in the allotted number of lab sessions.
### SLO Assessment "What Was Learned" Report

**Semester:** Spring 2012  
**Department:** CHEM  
**Members:** Jessica Wong, Clay Reece, Frank Hoang, Mark Lee, Dave Hodapp, Jim Symes, David Kannan

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**

After in-class safety instruction, students scored better on a multiple-choice quiz on safe laboratory techniques and procedures and source(s) of chemical safety information. Chem 305 students that were 9.6% increased. Chem 306 scores increased by 21%, Chem 420 scores increased by 25%, and Chem 421 scores increased by 36%. Additionally, when scores are viewed across progressing courses (such as Chem 400-401-420-421 or Chem 305-306), both sequences show safety scores steadily rising with increasing course level. Assessment of lab safety in Chem 41 completed -- students took the pre-test, but not the post-test. Also, not all the instructors reported scores. These flaws indicate the department's assessment process could be improved. The fall tallying the department's results could send a late-term update reminding all Chemistry instructors to share score information, and instructional time pressures in Chem 400 should be addressed.

*Chem 400 instructors failed to administer the post-test, choosing instead to devote the remaining class time to covering the last lecture topic. In general this semester, Chem 400 instructors bringing students to the desired level of mastery in the available time. In explaining the difficulty these instructors cited: (a) Class time earmarked for administering proficiency quizzes (these q relatively new addition to the course) (b) Seemingly less-prepared incoming students, requiring extensive review of lower-level topics (c) The compressed calendar, under which students may between classes to absorb challenging material (d) Many brand-new lab experiments, whose "bugs" need to be worked out if students are to finish them in the allotted number of lab sessions.

---

### Semester: Fall 2012  
**Department:** CISP  
**Members:** Sonny Huang

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**

CISP400 and 401 are all online class. I can see more students are willing to stay in the class longer and take the challenge of the class. I also see that we are getting more quality students. These students are not afraid to express their opinion, ask questions, and come to see you face to face, and etc. They are highly motivated and driving to success.

---

### Semester: Spring 2012  
**Department:** CISS  
**Members:** Lance Parks

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**

I assessed the CISN/CISS Program Student Learning Outcome (P-SLO) Self-reliant learning: Make progress toward becoming engaged and self-reliant learners demonstrating habits of intelligence and self-reliance toward their maximum potential. When I compared the grades between an on ground CISS 300 course and an online one I found the following. The average grade in the on ground course was 88%. When compared an online CISN 300 to a hybrid one I found similar results. For the hybrid course the average grade was 51% while the online course was 70%. Upon direct reflection it was noticed that students entering the online courses tend to be more prepared and motivated than hybrid and on ground students--one could fairly say they are a completely different pool of student. This was further supported by direct observation of students and their work. In CISS 300 several projects involve hands-on and case-based projects. In addition, being higher the caliber of the work itself was significantly better. Now here lies the problem if we are catering to two different crowds can we really compare them? I believe we need to offer alternate courses online that will be available outside of the classroom.
What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

As indicated in the "planning" of Spring 2012, this report of Fall 2012 pertains to assessment for the Program Student Learning Outcome (PSLO #2): Apply effective listening skills to comprehend messages, analyze information critically and consider multiple perspectives. Among the assessment tools identified, the direct observation consisted of observing students providing verbal feedback (the listening process) to peers (student speakers) after observing speeches or during a group problem-solving exercise. In most sections of public speaking, the analysis of student products consisted of students completing worksheets that were designed as components of a speech and delivery to "listen" for when preparing feedback; in some of the courses that consist of oral communication products also consisted of written papers that required the student to provide feedback of presentations and/or to assess the listening that occurred among students during speech presentation discussion. In many sections, the exam and quiz questions that assess a student's understanding of the listening process or elements to listening skills were assessed. In two sections of COMM 331, and one section of COMM 331, students completed surveys to describe their self-reporting and reflection on experiences consisting of the listening process and their lifetime terms of self improvement. Based on these types of assessments, instructors learned the following: - A formal structure for students to record notes and evaluate other students was rigid, but students to participate as active listeners during group discussion and observation of other student speakers. When writing assignments required students to provide feedback after listening to had to proofread their papers or make additional insightful observations from the student comments given. Written feedback by students allowed for a more honest peer to peer feedback while the review of the feedback worksheets, the one area that many students (as listeners) needed to improve upon was a complete set of notes for the main points within the body of the speeches and more accurate identification of the type of speech design that student speakers utilized. One instructor is considering a refinement of teaching methods to convey different speech designs worksheets in such a way students will then have to correctly identify speech designs on feedback worksheets. - Per a review of students' listening skills after observing lecture and/or student instructor is considering instruction for the skill in the creation of mnemonics can increase retention/recall of information, a component of listening. - After direct observation of students' behavior interactions in which listening should be a key focus, one instructor has determined the need for a change in protocols regarding cells phones in the classroom, a prime distractor noted by spe

Semester: Fall 2012 Department: COMM Members: Daniel DuBray; Ellen Arden-Ogle; Colette Harris-Mathews; Chris Wagner

What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

We learned that there are different philosophical underpinnings that are confusing to students. We need to strengthen observation, reflection and inquiry in all our courses. We need to stress the need for more rigorous and attendance. We started to require the APA style for all research papers. As a group we attended two professional development opportunities and continued with a planned dialog to strengthen the method.

Semester: Fall 2011 Department: ECE Members: Linn Viloett, Miriam Beloglovsky, Sheryl Ballard, Iris Dmond, Erika Otiono, Evelyn

What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

Students understanding of basic theories is not solid (PSLO 1). They also don't know how to apply the theories correctly. Students do not understand the focus or purpose of observations, are an objective observation and they don't know how to respond to what they observe (PSLO 4).
### SLO Assessment "What Was Learned" Report

**Semester:** Spring 2012  
**Department:** EMT  
**Members:** Matthew McHugh

#### What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

**The objective we were assessing; SLO #1:** The student will be able to demonstrate knowledge of current information they need to work in the field of emergency medicine as an EMT. •Recognize and seriousness of the patient's condition or extent of injuries to assess requirements for appropriate emergency medical care. Identifying the symptoms/signs of a major medical and traumatic pre-hospital arena. •Recognize the indications and demonstrate the techniques for administering medications that are within the EMT-Basic scope of practice. •Utilize communicating, transporting skills with patient care. •Demonstrating critical thinking techniques and how to apply them to sick and injured patients in the pre-hospital arena. perform safely and effectively the standard expectations of an Emergency Medical Technician. •Comprehend patho-physiology of common diseases and how they manifest in patients. •Understand and be able to use basic medical terms. The student success rate for passing the NREMT exam - 2010 89 students with 81% first time pass rate 2011 80 students with 94% first time pass rate

### Semester: Fall 2012  
**Department:** ENGWR  
**Members:** David Weinsilboum, Emmanuel Siguake, Norman Hom, Lisa Abraham, Heather

#### What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

The process reinforces what we have already been doing.

### Semester: Fall 2012  
**Department:** MATH  
**Members:** Mike Yarbrough, Jorge Baca, Mary Martin

#### What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

It seems to be a good idea to emphasize certain topics. The students will grasp the concept better. In one particular section of MATH 30, when asking a question that was related to the SLO "Enhance the ability to think logically, critically, and abstractly." 49% of the students got that question correct. After emphasizing that topic, 53% of the students got that question correct when asking it later in the semester. (The PSLO that we were targeting "Enhance the ability to think logically, critically, and abstractly."
## Fall 2012
### Department: MUSIC
### Members: (please separate members with commas)

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**

All of our assessment tools are valid for the specific courses they are used. This reaffirms that our teaching modalities are accurate and appropriate to achieve student success in courses and

## Spring 2012
### Department: PHYS
### Members: Michael Lawlor

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**

Instructional videos were produced for Phys 380 - specifically covering the calculus-based material specific to that course. Previously, only written explanations were available. Students scores on questions from Sp 12 were compared to similar questions from Sp 11. There was not a significant variation in the exam scores. Students performed relatively well (about 80% success) on both exams, with the notable exception that students were poorly prepared for one particular topic - use of proper angle units (radians, specifically) in wave motion equations. Students performed poorly (30% success) on both exam.

## Spring 2012
### Department: PHYS
### Members: Michael Lawlor

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**
ASSESSMENT #2 A survey of instructors in all production classes during the Spring, 2012 semester was conducted about PSLO #9 "Operate essential post production equipment for editing radio, television and film, including non-linear computer based audio or video editing and delivery." The census of 8 class sections revealed 90.0% (151/168 duplicated students) satisfactorily meet this Student Learning Outcome. Success rates in this P-SLO mirrors the results for another P-SLO survey conducted during the same semester. Analysis: In the area of post-production, partic TV/Film side, while video editing is a capstone skill, it is clear from the departmental discussion that it is rapidly becoming more of a basic requirement for success in almost any specialty or no. Whether video editing is in support of other computer graphics classes, or news production, it is clear from the departmental discussion (much of which was my email trail) that students need as a supporting skill no matter what career path they may be following. In addition to specific changes that are proposed below based on the survey of instructors, several departmental options: handout with step by step instructions for a beginning editor on how to get a project started should be made available, and 2) a one-day non-credit optional lab or workday where students with can receive remediation on basic video editing may be useful.

What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:

See previous submission

ASSESSMENT #1 A survey of instructors in all production classes during the Spring, 2012 semester was conducted about PSLO #8 "Utilize basic production equipment. For television or film: creatively use field camcorders and lights, and control room equipment such audio mixers, switchers, video editing, character generation and TelePrompter. For radio: correctly and creatively field recording equipment, microphones, editing and delivery equipment." The census of 8 class sections revealed 89.3% (150/168 duplicated students) satisfactorily meet or exceed this Student Learning Outcome. An on-going challenge for the department is the various skill levels of students entering the production courses. Some have taken the prerequisite courses, while others bring extensive experience. This creates a complex teaching environment where learning must be both slowed for entry level students, and accelerated for more advanced students ready for higher-level chal...
**SLO Assessment "What Was Learned" Report**

**Semester: Fall 2012  Department: SPAN  Members: Thomasina Turner, Gabriel Torres, Celia Samaniego, Blanca Gill**

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**
We learned that the native speakers are generally misplaced and are at levels in which they are not learning at their level.

**Semester: Fall 2012  Department: SPORT  Members: Travis Parker, Ron Preble, James Giacomazzi, Cheri LaDue, Jeannie Calamar, Kris**

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**
Overall the 37 students who were surveyed indicated they were better prepared to transfer as a result of their experience at CRC: 85% -- better prepared academically 92% -- better prepared to be an effective teammate and a more coachable athlete 95% -- better prepared to set realistic goals 95% -- better prepared to accomplish future goals.

**Semester: Fall 2012  Department: WELD  Members: Jason Roberts**

**What did you learn from your outcomes assessment:**
During the completion of Spring 2012 and the mid-semester review of Fall 2012 I learned the following: I created a student procedure document for the electric arc welding procedure to reduce frustration and injury for operating an electric arc welding machine for the welding 100 course. The creation of this document led to the discovery that the document needs to be broken down to welding machine, not one form for all types of machines (way too generic). The document was a complete failure. However the idea to solve the problem became clear from the discovery of the confusion. Challenge: Each welding machine manufacturer has a different operating procedure to perform a specific task. I created a general document which creates more confusion for the students because each student lacks the knowledge of machine operations and procedures (hence the document). I will need to create a procedure document for each machine in the welding or reduce the confusion for students to operate each electric arc welding machine. This task will also need to be included in the WELD 135, 136 and 120 courses.
WELD 100 is a course that focuses on safety procedures and safety regulation. PSLO #1 does not directly apply to this course even though welding procedures are taught. However, PSLO #3 does apply to WELD 100 because of the safety training and safety codes. Safety codes and procedures are analyzed by the application of hands-on exams and written exams. The WELD 100 course checks knowledge of safety with the following documents: 1. Written safety exam 2. Written Exam #1: a knowledge-based exam pertaining to safety information 3. Hands-on exam with oxygen acetylene 4. Written Exam #2 with electric arc welding safety. All test scores show that the course content is meeting the objectives of PSLO #3 safety training of safety procedures and safety regulation.