

Department: Reading Class: Reading 150 Critical Reading
 Year: 2008 Semester: Fall
 Santiago Canyon College
 Program Review Sub-report for Sections C-D on SLO Assessment

1) Outcome to be assessed by department members	2) Means of assessment and criteria of success	3) Summary of data collected	4) Analysis and discussion of data	5) Describe how your department will utilize what you have learned through your analysis of your program's assessment of learning outcomes in your EMP and DPP planning process.
<p>Demonstrate the ability to apply critical reading and thinking skills to the interpretation, analysis, and evaluation of ideas encountered in academic readings and settings.</p>	<p>Students were provided with an editorial and asked to analyze the piece. Students identified the claim, the evidence, underlying assumptions/warrants, looked for logical fallacies and/or appeals to emotion etc. Students were provided with a list of questions that would guide them in this process of analysis.</p> <p>Students were expected to receive 70% or better on this activity to be successful. A rubric was used to score the student responses.</p>	<p>Two classes participated in the SLO assessment. Class 1 had a 50% pass rate and Class 2 had a 55% pass rate. These pass rates are significantly lower than the pass rates on the final exam.</p>	<p>These low scores may have been the result of the following:</p> <p>The response questions were too broad and allowed too much variation in the response. (e.g., List the support that Robinson uses to support his claim. Then characterize each piece of evidence according to its type.)</p> <p>The rubric was very specific in what was expected in the response. The response questions were broader in scope.</p> <p>Students were receiving extra credit for completing the assessment. They were told that doing the work (in class) would result in extra credit. The extra credit was not attached to the quality of the work.</p> <p>Students were familiar with the response questions, but did not have the rubric in advance. Inter-rater reliability was an issue. The assessment was analyzed by faculty who had not previously taught the course and faculty who had taught the course. The ratings by faculty who had taught the course were consistently higher. This may be due to familiarity with the course material and/ or bias on the part of the faculty who knew the students.</p>	<p>The department is not ready to utilize these assessment results in our EMP and DPP planning process. The assessment process needs to be refined as follows: Student will be told that this is part of the final exam, even though it will be an extra credit assignment worth 15 points. The assessment will be administered on the last day of finals week. The response questions will be rewritten to ensure a more focused response on the student's part. (e.g. List three pieces of evidence that Robinson uses to support his claim. Identify the paragraph where the evidence is located. Identify the type of evidence (facts, historical precedent etc.)</p> <p>The rubric will be reviewed and rewritten to match the response questions.</p> <p>Analysis will be conducted by faculty who are currently teaching the course. To ensure anonymity, student names will be concealed during the analysis of the responses.</p>