I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

As department, behavioral sciences employed the Written Competency, Critical thinking/Problem Solving and Information Literacy rubrics during the 2011 and 2012 school years.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   - If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   - What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   - Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   - How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

Anthropology:

SLO's: Written Competency, Problem Solving/Critical Thinking
Assessment Tools: Exams: multiple choice (identify and recognize anthropological terms and concepts)/short answer (discuss, apply, compare/contrast and evaluate anthropological terms and concepts).
In class activities (worksheets): apply anthropological terms and concepts like the scientific method, genetics, primate taxonomy, natural selection, evolution, the fossil record, kinship, language, gender, marriage).
In class activities (movies): identify and discuss relevant anthropological themes and concepts.
Research or Creative Paper: analyze and discuss or apply anthropological terms and concepts.
Assessment Results: Students scored high in written Competency, however their critical thinking skills were weak.

Since using the Critical Thinking/Problem Solving rubric, I have added SLO's in the form of specific assignment objectives to all of my in class assignments for the current (2013 year) in an effort to make the goals of the assignments clearer to students. For their class paper, which requires critical thinking, analysis and application of anthropological concepts, I have dedicated time in class to for discussion, analysis of the concepts crucial to their papers.

Behavioral Science:

SLO'S: College-level literacy and basic computer literacy Critical thinking/Problem Solving
Assessment Tool: Research a topic in a specific field, and use database and APA style Assessment Results: 100-level students showed a limited understanding of APA/MLA research styles. Students are in need of Library and Computer research skills as well as improvement upon reading skills.

Psychology:

SLO'S: Critical Thinking/Problem Solving
Assessment tools: Research papers (utilizing journal periodical articles) Essays demonstrating ability to apply new concepts Periodical/journal reviews Assessment Results: Students showed inadequate basic skills preparation and had trouble synthesizing information. They showed excellent critical thinking skills.

Sociology:

SLO'S: Critical Thinking/Problem Solving
Assessment Tool: Media research project and a student-driven research project Assessment Results: Students need help developing their ability to navigate library
research methods. More interaction in small groups and one-on-one with the instructor would improve outcome.

II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

Anthropology:
(Anth 101)
Application of sociobiological and sexual selection theory to the evolution of mating.
(Anth 102)
Application of cultural anthropological concepts and terms--students create their own culture.

Behavioral Science:
Behavioral Science history/research, scientific method and description (assessment tools and results same as college wide SLO assessment).

Psychology:
Application of Scientific Method and research methods in Psychology (assessment tools and results same as college wide SLO assessment).

Sociology:
Analyze social groups and society sociologically (assessment tools and results same as college wide SLO assessment).

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

Anthropology:
I am planning on allowing more in-class time for discussion about papers as well as giving students an opportunity to work on their papers in class, so that I can give them immediate feedback if they have questions. I will also take rough drafts to go over content and will give students information about the online writing center for grammatical and structural writing support.
Student Learning Outcomes
BIOL-2012

I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

Different rubrics were used, but the shared assessment rubric that was used was the “Scientific Reasoning- Life/Earth/Social Sciences” rubric.

Some of the courses assessed were: Biology 99, Biology 100, Biology 107, Biology 110, Biology 112A, Biology 112B, and Biology 224. There are more courses to be assessed this semester.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   • If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   • What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   • Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   • How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

   This was the first time that the shared rubrics were used in some courses. Some results that were learned were what we as Biology faculty are seeing with more students struggling with mathematical skills. One approach to improve student learning in that area is to take some extra time in the lecture/lab course to review the mathematical steps of the exercise, so all the students understand along the way through the explanation. The plan of more explanation of mathematical steps will be implemented and assessed this semester.

II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

   Various sections of Biology courses tested various SLOs from the COR to try and cover the different SLOs. One SLO that examines analyzing data from scientific studies was tested in 112A and 224. One homework assignment was handed out where the students were given a scientific study, and they had to analyze if the study followed the steps of the scientific method, and if not what changes would be needed to the study to comply with the scientific method. Later in the semester, another similar assignment with a different scientific study was given. The comparison between the “pre” and “post” assignments did show marked improvement on the “post” assignment.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

   Some improvements based on the example above was to spend more time in the laboratory correlating the steps of the scientific method with the lab activities students perform in the lab, to enhance student understanding and learning.
Student Learning Outcomes
Business-and-Information-System-2012

I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

Department
Business and Information Systems
Meeting Date
August 21, 2012
Number of Faculty/Staff in Attendance (# of fulltime and adjunct and total)
10
Number of Faculty/Staff sharing Assessment Results (# of fulltime and adjunct and total)
2
College-wide, degree, or course-level SLOs measured
Information Literacy and Critical Thinking
Assessment Tools
(Give examples of major assignments your faculty/staff used to measure the SLOs)
Design a database with a single table. The table will contain an inventory of a personal collection (books, audio CD’s or anything else that you might want to keep track of in your database.)
Assessment Results
(Summarize the overall results of your department)
What student needs and issues were revealed?
Were there any areas where student performance was outstanding?
Any areas where it can be improved?
Results for both courses analyzed showed good achievement by student in meeting the SLOs. Both courses showed 77-80% achievement for the Critical Thinking and the CIS 110 course showed 99% achievement in Information Literacy, a primary goal of the course. The technique used in the course and discussed with faculty was to have students take and re-take chapter exams over and over again until they were satisfied with their scores. Each test was comprised of a different selection of ten questions from a pool of more than 100 questions for each test. Allowing open book exams that could be taken anytime appeared to successfully expose the students to required course material: repetition and easy access appeared to be the key.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   • If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   • What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   • Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   • How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.
What student needs and issues were revealed?
Were there any areas where student performance was outstanding?
Any areas where it can be improved?
Results for both courses analyzed showed good achievement by student in meeting the SLO's assessed. Both courses showed 77-80% achievement for the Critical Thinking and the CIS 110 course showed 99% achievement in Information Literacy, a primary goal of the course. The technique used in the course and discussed with faculty was to have students take and re-take chapter exams over and over again until they were satisfied with their scores. Each test was comprised of a different selection of ten questions from a pool of more than 100 questions for each test. Allowing open book exams that could be taken anytime appeared to successfully expose the students to required course material: repetition and easy access appeared to be the key.

II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year?
Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Information Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 21, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Faculty/Staff in Attendance (# of fulltime and adjunct and total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Faculty/Staff sharing Assessment Results (# of fulltime and adjunct and total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College-wide, degree, or course-level SLOs measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy and Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design a database with a single table. The table will contain an inventory of a personal collection (books, audio CD's or anything else that you might want to keep track of in your database.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Summarize the overall results of your department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What student needs and issues were revealed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any areas where student performance was outstanding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any areas where it can be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results for both courses analyzed showed good achievement by student in meeting the SLO's assessed. Both courses showed 77-80% achievement for the Critical Thinking and the CIS 110 course showed 99% achievement in Information Literacy, a primary goal of the course. The technique used in the course and discussed with faculty was to have students take and re-take chapter exams over and over again until they were satisfied with their scores. Each test was comprised of a different selection of ten questions from a pool of more than 100 questions for each test. Allowing open book exams that could be taken anytime appeared to successfully expose the students to required course material: repetition and easy access appeared to be the key.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

As above.
Student Learning Outcomes
Distance-Education-2012

I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

DE courses are offered in many different disciplines so we have chosen to use Health Education/PE and Chemistry to assess the GE SLOs. The following courses used the Critical Thinking rubric which is designed to assess how students differentiate between facts, influences, opinions, and assumptions to reach reasoned and supportable conclusions.

The following courses were assessed:
HED 130- Contemporary Health Issue
HED/PE 114- Introduction to Kinesiology

The following course used the Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning rubric which is designed to assess how students locate, identify, collect, and organize data in order to then analyze, interpret or evaluate it using mathematical skills and/or the scientific method:
Chemistry 105- Chemistry in the Human Environment

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   • If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   • What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?
   • Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   • How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

DE is in a unique position as it covers many disciplines. We are in the process of creating DE Program SLO's specific to DE that will focus on student success. The SLO's will include students being able to identify online resources and develop effective planning skills so that the student will be able to advocate self needs that support their success in taking online courses.

II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

As we are in the process of developing DE Program SLO's we are also in the process of developing a tool in which to assess them. There is nothing in place as of yet. However, Ingrid Kelly gave her students an opportunity to assess her based on the 10 Principles of Effective Online Teaching: Best Practices in Distance Education. The results are available upon request.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

Once our DE Program SLO's are approved by the AS we will develop a means to measure our success.
Student Learning Outcomes
DENT-2012

I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

Twenty-five courses in the Dental Assisting Program were rated from 1 to 5 in each of the five categories of the College Learning Outcomes - Written, Oral, and visual Communication; Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning; Critical Thinking and Problem Solving; and Information Literacy. Most ratings were between 3 and 5. There were a few 2 ratings for Information Literacy. See College Learning Outcomes Matrix for Dental Assisting. For those dental courses rating GE SLOs at 4 and 5, faculty identified assignments/assessment tools used to assess these SLOs. No scoring rubrics were identified for these program assessment tools. The program did not use the college shared assessment rubrics.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   • If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   • What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   • Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   • How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

See above.

II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

The Dental Assisting Program has nine Student Learning Outcomes. The first seven address knowledge and skills necessary for the practice of dental assisting. The last two address being able to sit for the State Registered Dental Assistant Examination and the Dental Assisting National Board and to seek entry-level employment in the dental field.

All of the dental assisting courses have student learning outcomes, which are listed in each course syllabus. This is a requirement of the American Dental Association (ADA), Commission on Accreditation. Course syllabi, objectives, and course evaluations are all part of the accreditation standards.

Each of the evaluation sheets provides data to support the SLOs for the course. These evaluation sheets are collected and tabulated to see if revisions are needed in the curriculum, course content or course sequencing to reflect student learning. The Program needs assistance in compiling data from these evaluations and SLOs to determine what areas of curriculum, instruction, or evaluation need revision. We plan to confer with the research staff of the college to assist the Program in tracking and analyzing these data for future Program decision making.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

Student completion of the Program, passing the California Registered Dental Assistant Licensure Examination, and successful employment are indicators of meeting the needs of both the workforce and the student in order to be marketable.

The licensure exam was changed to reflect the new functions listed in the State Assembly Bill AB 2637. We wanted to know if we had successfully educated our students for this examination. The June 2010 graduates were eligible to take this exam August
2010. Results showed a 70% pass rate - 14 out of 20 graduates passed. Our exam results have been much higher than this in the past - 8/2009 - 86%; 8/2008 - 86%; and 8/2007 - 93% (Registered Dental Assistant Practical Examination Statistics February 2011 & April 2011). In evaluating this low pass rate, several causative factors were considered. First, the ADA indicated the need to incorporate these new procedures into the curriculum; however, there was limited time allotted for this additional material. Also, faculty needed additional training in methodology of these particular procedures. In addition, the ADA and the accrediting body require that certain procedures be taught, but there is no equipment to do this. For example, the Program is required to teach EKG procedure and reading, but there is no EKG machine in the lab. Students must learn the skill by video.

Changes should be made in the current curriculum to better address the new procedures. In addition, requests should be made for lab equipment, necessary for teaching select skills.
## Student Learning Outcomes

**EMT-2012**

### I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?
   - No

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   - If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   - What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   - Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   - How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.
   - N/A

### II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.
   - I have just started the Fire Science/EMT Program Coordinator position, and am unaware of SLO measures used, results of assessments and documentation. Additionally, we have had a too often change in our Health Sciences Department leadership which has not adequately supported my transition from faculty to added Program Coordinator role which I do only part-time.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?
   - It is our goal to increase access & enrollment, provide high quality EMT training & state certification success, and improve retention and course pass rates.
# Student Learning Outcomes
## Geography-2012

## I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes
1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

   No.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:  
   - If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)  
   - What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)  
   - Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.  
   - How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

   N/A

## II. Course Level Outcomes:
1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

   Having just finished my first semester, I do not yet have this data available. This information will be included in the next program review.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

   N/A
# Student Learning Outcomes

## Geology-2012

### I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

   No.

2. **GE/College Wide Rubrics:**
   - If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   - What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   - Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   - How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

### II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

   I am in the process of completing my first SLOs, from data collected in the Fall 2012 term. This is not yet complete, and the next iteration of this program review will have better data.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

   n/a
Student Learning Outcomes

MATH-2012

I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

The mathematics department collects and maintains SLO data on all its courses according to its own rubrics. See II., Course Level Outcomes, below, for further information.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   • If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   • What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   • Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   • How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

It is our contention that such broad directives as represented by these rubrics can only be addressed at a course-by-course level, if at all. Consequently the math department is more concerned with the concrete problems faced in delivering its curriculum successfully. If a student is successful in these courses, it follows a fortiori that he or she has learned, in part, to do the following (from the College wide rubrics):
1. Communicate effectively in writing, orally and/or visually using traditional and/or modern information resources and supporting technology.
2. Locate, identify, collect, and organize data in order to then analyze, interpret or evaluate it using mathematical skills and/or the scientific method.
3. Differentiate between facts, influences, opinions, and assumptions to reach reasoned and supportable conclusions.
4. Recognize and identify the components of a problem or issue, look at it from multiple perspectives and investigate ways to resolve it.
5. Formulate strategies to locate, evaluate and apply information from a variety of sources - print and/or electronic.

Hence we will content ourselves by recording and analyzing results from specific questions in our curriculum.

II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

SLO data are compiled for each course in each semester. Specifically, on each final exam, three standardized questions from representative topics are asked, and the instructor reports the number of students who successfully answered that question: here, "success" means that they answered the question perfectly. This is a somewhat rigorous requirement, given that many questions require multiple operations: for example, if the student scored 4 out of 5 points, essentially performing the task correctly but perhaps dropping a minus sign or making a simple addition error, then that question is marked as a non-success. Hence the success rates reported below often run about 50%: any score below 50% raises a red flag, while anything above 60% is quite good, since a higher proportion than that will have answered the question nearly correctly.

The table below contains data from courses taught between Spring 2011 and Fall 2012; in most cases, data are combined across a calendar year in order to have sufficient sample size; the specific criteria for doing so appear below. The entries are: course number (column 1), semesters or year(s) included (column 2), number of students taking the final (column 3), and the percentage of students answering the given question 1, 2, or 3 perfectly (columns 4, 5, and 6).
SLO results By Course, combined data
Criteria: Any course requires more than 2 sections and at least 50 students in order to have a separate entry. Courses are combined by calendar year or across calendar years in order to meet both criteria. If one calendar year requires such a combination, then both calendar years are separately combined. If one calendar year fell short of 50 enrolled, then both calendar years were conflated. Exceptions: Math 101A had 47 students in 3 sections; Math 223 had 34 students in 2 sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>course</th>
<th>sem/yr</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>%correct</th>
<th>%correct</th>
<th>%correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>fall 2012</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spr 2012</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall 2011</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spr 2011</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101A</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insufficient data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>fall 2012</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spr 2012</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall 2011</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spr 2011</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103A</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103B</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>fall 2012</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spr 2012</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall 2011</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spr 2011</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>insufficient data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>insufficient data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>insufficient data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks, course by course:
Math 85: scores ranged from acceptable to very good, with only a drop in question 2 in year 2012. This is the "long division" problem (a five-digit number divided by a two-digit number), one of the more difficult algorithms taught in this course. Instructors are advised to spend a little extra time on this subject.
Math 95: scores were acceptable to very good across the board.

Math 101: Scores are generally good to very good on question 1 (solving a multi-term linear equation). On question 2 (simplifying an expression involving exponents), scores are generally poor (below 50%), and dropped precipitously to 18% in fall 2012. Similar scores occurred on question 3 (solving a quadratic with rational roots), although the drop in Fall 2012 was not as steep (31%).

Math 101A: Scores were acceptable to quite good.

Math 101B: insufficient data, however, for the very small sample size (16), scores were high, generally about 80%.

Math 103A had fairly low scores across the board, albeit flirting with the acceptable level of 50%, with the exception of question 2 in year 2012 (maximizing a linear function subject to constraints: an abstract linear programming problem; the score was 17%). This question is fairly complex in nature, requiring the student to graph several linear inequalities and then test the given function at the vertices of the region obtained. Consequently, it is very easy for a student to get most of the problem right, in fact, to have a good understanding of the problem, yet still not have a perfect answer.

Math 103B: Scores were good on questions 2 and 3 (solving a logarithmic equation from the definition and giving the equation of a circle from its radius and center). However, question 1 (solving a rational equation in two variables) did poorly in both years, 30% to 36%. This question differs from the other two in requiring several steps; moreover, it is an area of perennial difficulty in all algebra courses: students don't like fractions.

It is suggested that teachers in math 95, 101(AB), and 103(AB) spend more time on fractions and rational expressions.

Math 104: Scores were acceptable.

Math 105: Scores were acceptable, save for question 3 (an exponential equation leading to a quadratic upon substitution); this is a somewhat specialized topic, but still points toward a continuing difficulty with exponential expressions.

Math 115: Scores were generally very good across the board, except for question 3 in two of the four semesters: this is the conditional probability problem. While Math 115 emphasizes the applications of statistical theory, perhaps a little more time spent on the mathematical foundations (probability theory) might be in order.

Math 116: Insufficient data.

Math 117: Insufficient data.

Math 121: Scores were acceptable to good.

Math 122: Insufficient data.

Math 123: Scores good to very good; a noteworthy success is on question 3 (71%), the applied max/min problem. This is a complex word problem requiring a successful mathematical formulation followed by several computational steps.

Math 124: Scores were good except for question 3 (the interval of convergence of a power series). This is a fairly straightforward problem at this level; typically, students get the interval correct, but forget to check the endpoints. A little more time spent on convergent series in general, and on this problem in particular, should suffice here.

Math 223: Scores were good.

Summary.

Scores are generally acceptable to good or very good in the transfer level courses; this reflects many things, among them: one, the students are more mature and are consistently dedicated to their coursework; two, the students are by now well-
matched to the course at hand, as compared to the remedial students, for whom course placement remains problematic; three, class sizes are smaller.

Results point to two sore spots in the remedial curriculum: 1. fractions, rational expressions, and rational equations; 2. exponential expressions and equations. The difficulties in both begin early and persist through the curriculum.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

One of the difficulties in teaching the remedial courses effectively is accurate course placement and a consistency across sections in what constitutes a passing grade. With regard to the former, the department reviews course placement issues on a nearly annual basis; certainly, accuplacer was a big help. With regard to the latter, attempts have been made in the past to institute a common final for all remedial sections, but these have generally foundered on the shoals of "academic freedom."

Concerning the "sore spots" of fractions and exponents mentioned above, the department may consider adding a lab component to the remedial courses; this might be realized through an online tutoring program such as Aleks. While instructors are encouraged to spend some extra time on these topics, and perhaps to re-think their teaching strategies, the bottom line is that students need more practice with these problems. Departmental discussions are forthcoming.

Math 101AB and 103AB: in consequence of the poor success rates and student throughput from the stretch versions, the math department cut the number of sections of these courses and returned them to the regular 101 and 103. This is partially reflected in the SLO results, but the driving force was the throughput issue.
### I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

We reviewed all SLO's and courses in 2012. They may be approved for Fall 2012 schedule. We haven't assessed any of the courses yet.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   - If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   - What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   - Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   - How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

No data obtained yet

### II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

Student Learning Outcomes are specifically posted in my syllabus. Class evaluation and activities are oriented to meet these goals.

1. Written, Oral and Visual Communication: Students are required to write a paper about a specific topic. The purpose of this paper is to educate patients and answer commonly asked questions. Lab activities require students to perform effective communication with health team members and patients. Role play activities emphasize this specific goal.

2. Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning: N/A

3. Critical Thinking: Activities are proposed in class to solve common case scenarios. Students work individually and in groups to answer questions that arise in common medical settings.

4. Problem Solving: In the same critical thinking activities students are required to respond to specific scenarios and solve the problem presented.

5. Information Literacy: Students are encouraged to search for specific information using our Library resources or specific internet sites.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

I was able to redirect the activities assigned and create new ones so SLOs can be met. Knowing our courses SLOs guide us to re-orient our lectures and assignments in order to have more effective tools to valorate the outcomes of our courses.
# Student Learning Outcomes

## Natural History/Field-2012

### I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

   I used the Scientific an Quantitative Reasoning rubric. Marine Biology.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   - If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   - What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   - Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   - How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

   - I learned that I need to develop more analytical labs for students to practice so they can interpret scientific studies.
   - I will add more lab sessions that give participants practice interpreting data and conclusions.
   - No additional resources will be needed.
   - I have not made the changes yet but plan to report back with results after changes are made in the next program review.

### II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

   - I have been concentrating on assessing interpretation of data and critical thinking SLOs in most courses I teach.
   - Early in the courses I give examples of scientific studies, have students write papers using rubrics and then grade the papers. I then analyze areas where more understanding is needed, review those areas and be sure all students understand them and then I repeat the assignment with a similar but different subject scientific study.
   - The results were significant and I found that the early assessments allowed me to determine what areas need to be worked on for success.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

   Provide more laboratory opportunities for students to review scientific research and practice analyzing and interpreting data and results.
Student Learning Outcomes  
Nursing-2012

I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes

1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

In May, 2011 the College Learning Outcomes Matrix was completed. For each course in the nursing curriculum a rating was given for how important each outcome was. Critical Thinking/Problems Solving were given a top rating of 5 in all courses. The other SLOs - communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and information literacy were given either a 4 or 5 rating in all nursing courses. The program did not use shared assessment rubrics. Individual instructors have used rubrics such as The Care Plan Grading Rubric and the Clinical Judgment Rubric (Lassater, 2007) in selected courses. Program SLOs, Caring, Critical Thinking, Therapeutic Nursing Interventions, Teaching/Learning, Communication, Management, and Ethical Practice are evaluated in every clinical course using The Clinical Evaluation Level II or Level III Tool. Full text of the Program SLOs can be found on page 26 of the College of Marin Registered Nursing Program Student Handbook. http://www.marin.edu/departments/HealthSciences/Nursing/. Further work is needed during the curriculum revision process to develop assessment rubrics for program and course level SLOs.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
- If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
- What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?
- Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
- How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

See above #1.

II. Course Level Outcomes:

1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

All course outlines contain student learning outcomes. The Program's current seven SLOs are threaded throughout our courses and leveled from Semesters I-IV. They are described in the College of Marin Registered Nursing Program Student Handbook 2012-2013 pp. 21-24;26-37. The Nursing Program has an extensive Program Evaluation Plan which was revised in 2011-2012 and again in 2012-2013. Data for 2011-2012 were collected and analyzed using the 2011-2012 plan. Data will be collected and analyzed using the 2012-2013 plan in May 2013. For report data and analyses of courses for the last three years, see Course Evaluation Summary 2009-2012 in Follow-Up Report for NLN-AC Reaccreditation, February, 2013, Appendix 12, p. 294-328. Aggregated evaluation findings inform decision-making and are used to maintain or improve student learning outcomes. The Program utilizes student surveys, graduate surveys, Assessment Technology Institute (ATI) RN Comprehensive Predictor Assessment, and the National Council Licensing Examination (NCLEX-RN) RN Program Report from the National Council of State Boards of Nursing to collect aggregated data related to the NCLEX-RN test plan. Course level benchmarks are established for all SLOs. In the event that course level SLOs fall below benchmark, courses are revised and results evaluated.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

Student Surveys: In order to create valid surveys, the Program revised them in 2012
with assistance from the college research office to allow for numerical scoring, the addition of a "Not Applicable" category, and improved clarity of questions. The college also switched to Survey Monkey in 2012. For 2011-2012 all courses were evaluated and results discussed in May 2012 and Fall 2012 at faculty meetings. Student Learning Outcomes were among areas evaluated. Faculty agreed to use 80% as a benchmark for student satisfaction with meeting learning outcomes. Faculty discuss survey data at faculty meetings, identify SLOs that do not meet the benchmark, and discuss plans for improvement. For example, one course did not meet the Management Leadership benchmark. To improve the management area, faculty increased the use of management test questions in each course and stressed that certain actions were management interventions. In the revised curriculum, management will be incorporated throughout to correct this deficit; in every course emphasis will be placed on management of care at that level of knowledge and skill.

ATI Predictor Test and NCLEX-RN Program Report: The ATI Predictor test gives results for three of the seven SLOs: critical thinking, therapeutic nursing interventions, and management of care/leadership. Faculty planned to augment low score areas with content/experiences in lecture, skills lab, simulation lab, clinical, and the ATI remediation work. For example, in 2011-2012, the areas of safety and infection control (therapeutic nursing interventions) were trending down. In response, faculty integrated ATI assignments for HIPPA, specimen collection, and personal hygiene. 75% of the 1st year class completed these modules. This will need to be reviewed with the ATI scores in 2014 to assess results.

Faculty reviews the yearly NCLEX-RN Program Reports. In all areas of the nursing process, except for "planning," our median graduate did as well or better than graduates in the country. In response to the "evaluation" score trending down, faculty are now stressing the evaluation step of the nursing process in each course lecture. Faculty have discussed that they do not have a tool to analyze the NCLEX-RN Program Report. This is yet to be developed. Faculty will be using the NCLEX test plan to develop the new course content and to validate tests. The program worked with the research department to develop an online tool that can be used for this purpose; however, they will wait to use this tool until the new curriculum is implemented.

Development of Assessment Tools: Pending support and collaboration with COM statistician, Faculty are interested in developing valid tools for direct measurement of students learning outcomes. Student Learning Outcomes for the revised curriculum are based on the Quality Safety Education for Nurses (QSEN) competences and NCLEX-RN test plan, which will allow for easier measure of whether they are achieved. For example, "Caring" in the current curriculum was changed to "Integrate patient preferences, values, and cultural differences when providing care, acknowledging the worth and dignity of individuals and families (Patient Centered Care)." This can be measured by the NCLEX-RN Program Report and the ATI Predictor test, under basic care and comfort. The Nursing Department hopes to work with the College Research and Development office in developing an online rubric in which to record SLO assessment. The Nursing Program has participated in the first phase, which is to map out the SLO assessment and compare SLOs to college SLOs. See http://www.marin.edu/SLO/faculty/PDF/2012 AS NursingRegisteredSLOMatrix.pdf.
Student Learning Outcomes
Puente-2012

I. General Education/College Wide Outcomes
1. Did you use the shared assessment rubrics and if so which one(s)? Which courses were assessed?

Puente English 150: the instructor uses the college-wide SLO rubric to provide feedback on student essays throughout the course.

2. GE/College Wide Rubrics:
   • If you used the shared rubrics, what did you learn? (Report your findings.)
   • What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?)
   • Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.
   • How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

The rubrics are very useful for students in learning what the requirements are for written work at the transfer level (based on student feedback forms completed at the end of the semester)

Changes I made, based on what I learn from the rubrics, include more of a focus on how to use MLA citation styles (something many students are weak in); and a greater focus on explaining and showing them how to analysis evidence from sources.

I don't know yet how the changes have affected student learning, except to show how they have improved on their scores on the rubric over the semester.

II. Course Level Outcomes:
1. What Student Learning Outcomes have you assessed from your course outlines over the last year? Describe the assessment, the sections where the assessment was used, and summarize the results.

The College-Wide Writing rubric assesses several SLO's for writing, and it is used in Puente English 150. see discussion above.

An assessment rubric is also used in Puente English 120, developed by Blaze, which assesses students skills in thesis development, essay structure, use of transitions, use of evidence, clarity and fluency and use of introduction and conclusions.

The rubrics indicate that students improve in thesis, structure, use of evidence, introductions and conclusions. Students also improve a great deal in their use of MLA citation style. Improvements in clarity/grammar and fluency are made, but they are not as dramatic.

Students appreciate getting feedback on the rubric as it helps them see where their strengths are and where they can improve.

2. What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment?

More focus in class and in written responses to students work on clarity issues. More use of sentence combining exercises to improve fluency.
Puente success data: 126 students (Fall 2008 – Spring 2012 = 4 cohorts) -- Data generated by Dashboard

Course-level success:

Percent succeeded in English 120 (passed with C or higher):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Took 120 during semester…</th>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All other English 120 sections (excluding Puente)</th>
<th>Hispanics in all other English sections (excluding Puente)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent succeeded in English 150 (note: some new students added into Puente in the spring 2009-2010 and 2011 cohorts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Took 150 during semester…</th>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All other English 120 sections (no Puente)</th>
<th>Hispanics in all other English sections (excluding Puente)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent succeeded in English 151/155 (after passing Eng 150) – of those that continued on to the next English level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (passed 150 during this semester)</th>
<th>Puente success in 151/155 after 150</th>
<th>All students success in 151/155 after 150 (includes Puente)</th>
<th>Hispanics (including Puente) success in 151/155 after 150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison with non-Puente students who started their English 120 the same fall semesters as the Puente cohorts—analysis through Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puente students (N = 126)</th>
<th>Non-Puente students (N = 999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11% earned degrees/certificates (14 degrees/certs)</td>
<td>8% earned degrees/certificates (79 degrees/certs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% transfer prepared (have earned 60+ COM units) = 41 students</td>
<td>11% transfer prepared (118 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73% still enrolled at COM (92 students)</td>
<td>59% still enrolled at COM (590 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 transfers of 126 = 9%</td>
<td>105 transfers of 999 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:

- Puente students pass their English 120 and English 150 at much higher rates than non-Puente students (and at higher rates than Hispanics in other similar English courses)
- Puente students (for some cohorts) have passed English 151/155 at lower rates than non-Puente students
- Puente students persist in enrolling at COM at a higher rate that non-Puente students who were at the same English level;
- Puente students are more likely to be transfer prepared (60+ units) than non-Puente students
- Puente students are more likely to have earned degrees/certificates.
- The GPA of Puente students is about the same as it is for non-Puente students.
- Puente students have transferred at a slightly lower rate than non-Puente students so far (the first two cohorts are the most likely to be ready to transfer, yet the recruitment of these cohorts did not sufficiently focus on transfer-oriented students, due to the last-minute hiring of part time counselors by the district). Statewide transfer rates for Puente are around 55% and we fully expect our transfer rate to increase as the program has matured and our recruiting is more effectively targeting transfer-oriented students.
Puente Project Success Data: 2008-2010 (first two years)
Two Cohort Groups: Fall 2008-Spring 2010 and Fall 2009-Spring 2010. End Term: Spring 2010

Course-Level Success:

Percent Succeeded (passing) English 120 (Fall 2008 + Fall 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All ENG 120 sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% (37 of 46)</td>
<td>60% (324 of 536)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persistence (percent moving into English 150 after Succeeded in English 120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All ENG 120 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92% (33 of 37 students)</td>
<td>81% (264 of 324 students)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Succeeded (passing) English 150 (Spring 2009 + Spring 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All ENG 150 sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88% (29 of 33)</td>
<td>75% (198 of 264)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persistence (percent Succeeded in English 150 after English 120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All ENG 150 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63% (29 of 46 students)</td>
<td>37% (198 of 536 students)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of certificates/degrees earned: (Cohort Fall 2008 + Cohort Fall 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All ENG 150 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (2+0) 4% (2 of 46)</td>
<td>28 (19+3) 5% (28 of 536)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of transfers:

No Data
Cohort Student ENG 120 Success Rate on Puente vs All Students
Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 (FA 2008-SP2010 and FA 2009-SP2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Puente</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG120 All</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG120 Hispanic</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG120 Asian</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG120 Black</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG120 Multi-Race</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG120 White</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG120 Other</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENG 120

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Multi-Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cohort Student ENG 150 Success Rate on Puente vs All Students
Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 (FA 2008-SP2010 and FA 2009-SP2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENG 150</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Multi-Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cohort Students Enrolled in ENG 120, Continued, and Succeeded in ENG 150
Puente vs All Students
(Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 (FA 2008-SP2010 and FA 2009-SP2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Multi-Race</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puente Enrolled in ENG120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succeeded in ENG 150</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Enrolled in ENG120</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succeeded in ENG 150</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Puente Project
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