**Appendix 24-25 Assessment Reports**

**Name:** MariAnne Zavala-Lopez

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   Advising Syllabus (course outcomnamees 3 & 4)

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Students completing the Associate in Arts & Science degree are required to complete a designated-diversity course. Students may be unaware of this requirement. Counselors will design alternative approaches that inform students of the diversity requirement (for example, email and/or video recording). Additionally, counselors will inform students of the designated-diversity course options and how this course applies to the Associate in Arts & Science degree during advising sessions. This assessment activity aligns with Institutional/Program Outcomes 1 & 5. This assessment will inform the counselors of students’ knowledge of the diversity requirement and their understanding of how to satisfy the requirement. This will also provide counselors with students’ understanding of the diversity requirement. Winter quarter advising begins during fall quarter 2024. The student survey will occur during winter quarter 2025. The counselors will explore ways to increase the number of student survey responses.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 Counselors designed a student survey where students indicated their knowledge of the Associate in Arts & Science degree diversity course requirement. Additionally, students who had not completed the diversity requirement at the time of the survey were asked why this had not yet been satisfied.

The following seven questions were asked on the survey.

1) Are you aware that completing the Associate in Arts & Science Degree (AA&S DTA) requires a diversity course?

2) How did you first learn about the diversity course requirement for the AA&S DTA degree?

3) If you are pursuing the AA&S DTA degree, have you already completed the diversity course requirement?

4) Which course did you take to fulfill the diversity requirement?

5) Which distribution category of the AA&S DTA degree does this course fulfill?

6) Please indicate why this requirement has not been met yet.

7) Please name a course that satisfies the diversity requirement for the AA&S DTA.

Counselors sent an email to their advisees informing them of the diversity course requirement before winter quarter enrollment. Additionally, a document was included highlighting the designated-diversity courses offered for winter quarter.

An informational video regarding the diversity course requirement for the Associate in Arts and Science degree was developed prior to winter quarter enrollment. The counselors created the script, two M.E.Ch.A. students volunteered to do the recording, and Title V (The HEART project) staff produced the video for students to view via Tuesday Tips on Canvas.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​58 students responded to the survey.

The first question in the survey asked—Are you aware that completing the Associate in Arts & Science

Degree (AA&S DTA) requires a diversity course?— Students who answered “no” to this question were informed about the diversity requirement and provided information on how to obtain further information about this requirement. For these students, the survey concluded at that point.

67.2% (39) of students were aware of the diversity requirement. Of the 67.2% of students who indicated they were aware of the diversity requirement, 66.7% (26 students) indicated that they learned about it from their advisor. Other sources of information included New Student Enrollment, an instructor, and another student. One student responded that they were not sure how they became aware of the requirement.

At the time of completing the survey 48.7% of students indicated they had already satisfied their diversity

course requirement. Another 33.3% indicated that they have not completed the requirement, while 17.9% indicated they were not pursuing the AA&S degree. Of the 39 students who responded they were aware of the diversity requirement, 13 students answered the question about having satisfied it. Of those, 10 students accurately identified one of the 18 designated-diversity courses. Most students (61.5%) identified that the diversity course they completed also fulfilled a requirement within the Humanities distribution.

Students were asked why they had not yet fulfilled the diversity requirement at the time of the survey. The most common response, selected by 52.6% of students, was: “The diversity courses offered did not fit my schedule or conflicted with other classes.” This was followed by 36.8% of students who responded “I don’t know how to identify which courses fulfill the diversity requirement.”

As an incentive to participate in this assessment, students were invited to complete an online survey. Fifty-seven of the 58 students who completed the survey entered their names into the drawing for a $50 Amazon gift card, funded by the BBCC Foundation. Two students were randomly selected as winners.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of this assessment, the counselors will continue to explore ways for communicating the diversity course requirement such as, printed signs listing the designated diversity courses, student emails, and videos such as Tuesday Tips.

Counselors will continue to show students the completion status of their diversity requirement on their Advisement Report/educational plan.

The counselors reviewed data on diversity course enrollment (provided by Institutional Research) to gain a better understanding of courses students are selecting to fulfill their diversity requirement. For example, winter quarter was the quarter with the highest diversity course enrollment for the 2024-25 year. ART& 100 had the highest enrollment with 251 students, followed by REL 201 with 79 students. Thirteen diversity courses were offered in total—10 in humanities and 3 in social science. Five designated-diversity courses were not offered during the 2024-25 academic year.

This assessment has reinforced the counselor’s advising efforts regarding the designated-diversity course requirement. Counselors will examine ways to improve advising practices.
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Based on this assessment, the counselors are examining ways to share this information and advising resources with other advisors.

The college should recognize that students are learning about the diversity course requirement in multiple places. Information about this requirement needs to be easy to access, accurate, and readily available for students and advisors. It is important that instructors and advisors receive training and up-to-date information.

The college should make available for students a list of designated-diversity courses and develop an annual schedule that provides students multiple course selections, modalities, and times. For example, of the 30 diversity course offerings in 2024-25, 11 (37%) were hybrid, and 19 (63%) were online courses.

**Name**: Aaron Mahoney

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   AGR 120, Introduction to Precision AG, PO5 Students will use the appropriate tools and/or software related to the agricultural system

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ The agriculture industry relies heavily on spreadsheets for managing a wide array of tasks, such as tracking crop yields, monitoring expenses, analyzing soil data, and projecting future production. Spreadsheets are essential for organizing vast amounts of data in a clear and accessible manner, which aids in making informed decisions that enhance productivity and profitability.

However, many students possess a limited understanding of spreadsheet software, which can hinder their ability to effectively utilize these tools when they enter the workforce, revealing a significant gap in their skillset.

By learning where students are deficient in using spreadsheet and providing a better base knowledge, they can gain a broader understanding of data management and analysis.

This education can empower them with a versatile skillset, enabling them to handle complex data sets and perform sophisticated calculations and visualizations. As a result, students will become more proficient and effective in using spreadsheets, making them better equipped for careers in agriculture and other data-driven fields. This enhanced proficiency can lead to improved decision-making and efficiency in their professional lives.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 Students will complete a two-part assessment involving a general tutorial and an advanced tutorial on Excel skills. The first part will assess their basic proficiency in creating and formatting spreadsheets, while the second part will challenge them to apply more advanced features, including formulas and data visualization. Both parts will be graded using a rubric that evaluates accuracy, completeness, and application of skills learned. The goals of this assessment will be for students to effectively create and manipulate spreadsheets in Excel to analyze agricultural data. This assessment will also hopefully, remove the common misconception that spreadsheets are only for financial data and therefore, may not see their relevance in agricultural contexts. The following outcomes will be assessed by both parts:

1) Spreadsheet Basics: Understanding the interface of Excel, including cells, rows, columns, and basic formatting options.

2) Data Manipulation: Learning how to input, edit, and delete data within a spreadsheet.

3) Formulas and Functions: Introduction to basic formulas (e.g., SUM, AVERAGE) and understanding their application in data analysis.

4) Data Visualization: Utilizing charts and graphs to represent data visually and enhance understanding.

5) Active Learning Approach: Engaging students through hands-on activities and peer collaboration during the advanced tutorial.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​The first part assessed their basic proficiency in creating and formatting spreadsheets, while the second part challenged them to apply more advanced features and provided more in-depth procedures, increased visuals, and increased explanations on how to manage different applications in Excel, including formulas and data visualization (graphs). By using the same rubric to grade both assessments, I was able to evaluate accuracy, completeness, and application of skills learned.

The initial assessment revealed that students initially had a low understanding and basic knowledge of Excel, scoring around 50-60% based on the assessment rubric. Most students were able to complete both parts of the assessment using a general tutorial and the enhanced stepwise tutorial on Excel skills. However, moderate support and gaps in knowledge were observed.

In the initial assessment, most students were unable to effectively create and manipulate spreadsheets in Excel to analyze agricultural data without a moderate amount of support or further explanation of the process. However, after participating in enhanced tutorials, students demonstrated significant improvement, with scores rising to around 70-80% based on the rubric, indicating a better grasp and more effective use of Excel's capabilities.

Overall, this assessment suggested a low base knowledge of Excel, which is needed for many agricultural occupations or tasks. It also indicated that students are not learning spreadsheet applications before attending my precision AG course. Furthermore, it suggests that remediation is needed prior to students taking the required Business Information Management (BIM) courses to be able to effectively use spreadsheets in data-driven agriculture courses.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** As students needed moderate amounts of remediation and support prior to taking data-driven agriculture courses, this assessment suggests incorporating a computer or active-learning lab with a tutorial-based assignment for the precision AG course.

The students also needed moderate support with the basic tutorial, further supporting the need to incorporate the more enhanced, stepwise tutorial into future assignments. Since the Precision Agriculture (AG) course is a core course required for the AG degree, co-enrollment in a Business Information Management (BIM) course or providing this Excel assignment would be warranted for future curriculum improvements for the program or the AGR 120 course.

**Name**: Chris Dinges

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 4

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   AMT 150, AMT 152, AMT 253

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**
​ We found that there is a significant gap in the success rate of the non-traditional aged student populations, however, due to FAA requirements we are unable to make the scheduling changes that we feel would be needed to address that gap. We also found a significant difference between male and female student enrollment in the AMT program. For academic year 24-25 we are going to focus our efforts on addressing the enrollment gap with more targeted recruiting efforts directed at increasing our female identifying student population.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 Using the success dashboard we saw that during the 2023-2024 academic year there were 66 male students and only 4 female students enrolled in the identified courses.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​We had a significant increase in women in our program this year. We interviewed the students asking what brought them to aviation maintenance and what we could do to help enroll more women. They all had different reasons to attend our AMT program however there was a definite overall report of women being scared to enter a technical field due to lack prior maintenance experience. They had extremely positive reviews of our program due to us starting at a very beginner level.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** We are working with our media department to have a video made that interviews our female students to post on our webpage. Or goal is to have the students share their experience in our program and provide encouragement to those that would normally be afraid to apply to our program.

**Name**: Dustin Regul

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   ART230 Painting/Drawing Workshop

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ The gap in decision making confidence when posed with ambiguous visual problems (PO5). I attempted to devise situational reflections and forced diversions within course assignments.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 I approached this three ways; 1) Assigned readings from “Art & Fear.” This book discussed the common fears and struggles of artists when struggling with ambiguity. 2) Video reflections and written responses. Students would have weekly online videos to watch, each one being about a different artist and their creative process. The written response would be a reflection on their creative process and how it related to the reading from “Art & Fear.” 3) During in-class projects, there would be times students were forced to hand their project over to a peer, let them change or add anything they wanted to the artwork, then once they got their artwork back, they needed to accept the changes, consider alternatives, adapt, and continue to create.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Some of the strongest artwork I’ve ever received from an entry level art class. Students who previously were crippled by problems that weren’t simply black and white were confidently taking risks, assessing, reflecting, adapting, and creating.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to continue to build upon ways to develop confident decision-making students. Will these results change the way you teach? Yes. Why or why not? Because the experiments made in this course have shown me that they are successful and can be implemented in my other courses. Do the results confirm some aspect of your teaching? It confirms that creativity is something that can be taught. Not just some magical born-with ability.

**Name**: Richard Wynder

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 6

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   AUT 105 Computer Applications Course Outcome 4. Perform basic word processing operations using the current Microsoft Word Processing program

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Since COVID lockdown and subsequent changes in instruction to accommodate various changing protocols, I have noticed a disconnect with between students and on-time attendance and assignment completion. During COVID this course was substituted with BIM 110 as an online modality to allow for distancing. I heard a number of student complaints as we continued to use BIM 110 (difficulty, number of assignments, access to the lab, etc.). When I was allowed to resume AUT 105 in spring 2023 I noticed the disconnect. On-time attendance was rare, and assignments were slow in being returned. Another issue was the Microsoft switch to Office 365 from previous software versions. The students also prefer to use Office web apps and share documents rather than attaching them. This is because they like to use their phones for assignments. I frequently pointed out that phones and tablets were media consumers not media creators and that they should be borrowing computers, if need be, from the library. By the way, this trend is in all my courses.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 I included an attendance component to the students’ grade to encourage them to be in class each day on-time. That is especially important for an 8 AM class. Students tend to be late frequently to early classes. I also asked that they check-out a computer from the library to complete their assignments rather than use the web app. On day-one I did a presentation about my daily expectations of attendance and the need to do their daily assignments quickly or they will fall behind. They were handed a syllabus with the attendance policy which I read aloud with them and also emailed a copy to each of the students. I also asked students to print their assignments for me, but the 1802 printer was unreliable, so many sent me their assignments via “share” from a web app, just as I had asked them not to. One student claimed he did not have Word at home, I reminded him of my request on day-one to check out a computer from the library.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Regardless of the attendance policy and frequent progress reports, many students still performed somewhat poorly because of attendance and falling behind. Perhaps it is a general lack of interest in a computer related class. Some observations are that current students are coming into post-secondary education with limited email etiquette, poor word processing skills, and no knowledge of Excel. Interestingly, they do well in PowerPoint. The reason for the PowerPoint strength may be because I had them create a presentation on any topic that interested them.

One observation from students who performed better, which possibly may be extrapolated to include all the students if they were interested in working hard; is that they are quick to pick up what they are taught if they immediately apply it during class time. If they wait to do it at home or somewhere else later, they either forget, or they use a web-based program with different tool bars than the Microsoft 365 programs, which leads to confusion.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** It would appear that the structure of the course should be changed to a longer class time and perhaps later in the day rather than 8 AM. A requirement should be that students have a PC with the latest Microsoft programs available to them and/or access to a lab in their free time. As far as attendance is concerned, I have noticed the same issues with my auto classes. Whether this is some blip in the way students approach school or whether it is a trend, only time will tell.

Going forward, because of administration’s push to lower Workforce program total degree credits and in conversation with other programs, I believe the AUT 105 course should be dropped as a graduation requirement and discontinued. I do believe, however, that a BIM course like BIM 110 should be a suggested elective to provide skills I think current students lack, but need for the future.

**Name**: Benjamin Altrogge

**Institutional Outcome**: Human Relations / Workplace Skills

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   AVF 252, AVF 253

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ We are addressing three areas of concern with our 2024/2025 school year assessment:

1. Course success rate and time to completion for student cohorts in stage 5 (AVF 252) and stage 7 (AVF 253) of commercial pilot program.

2. Equity in program success /enrollment rates with historically underrepresented groups.

3. Course outcomes in AVF 252 and AVF 253 related to PO5 (“students will be able to demonstrate the technical aspects of aircraft control”)

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 The tools that were used to assess areas of concern were as follows:

1. To assess overall student success rates the Course Success dashboards have been reviewed for the fall 2024 quarter through the spring 2025 quarter. In addition, program specific data on the average number of days to complete AVF 252 and AVF253 were tabulated and compared to our 2022/2023 assessment data for loop closing assessment.

2. Course success dashboards have been used to analyze historically underrepresented groups for course enrollment/completion against the overall student enrollment/program completion rates.

3. AVF 252 and AVF253 were both analyzed through data collected from the comprehensive stage checks given at the conclusion of training. This material was used to evaluate program outcome #5 “students will be able to demonstrate the technical aspects of aircraft control.”

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​AVF 252:

The use of the data dashboards for course success for AVF 252 for 2024-2025 cohort is not possible. Due to the significant delay in data being posted to the dashboard and the fact that the majority of the students in the BBCC flight program finish AVF 252 in the spring quarter, the dash boards will not likely reflect accurate completion rates for three to six months out from the writing of this report.

Looking at the overall trend for Historically Underrepresented Groups, we see on the dashboards 100% success rate in the 2021-2022 cohort, 89% in the 2022-2023 cohort and 86% in the 2023-2024 cohort. Respectively, the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 cohorts only had one student each from the HUG student group unsuccessfully complete the class. This compares to the non-HUG student group success rate of 68% in the 2021-2022 cohort, 96% in the 2022-2023 cohort and 92% in the 2023-2024 cohort. Preliminary data from within the aviation program indicate that 100% of the 2024–2025-year cohort have passed AVF 252 successfully. (Course success dashboards do show 1 failure that cannot be accounted for in our data.) This would indicate that all of our HUG students in the 2024-2025 cohort have been successful.

The information above can be confirmed with a 100% pass rate on the stage five flight check for AVF 252 in the 2024-2025 cohort of students with no deficiencies noted in PO 5 (“students will be able to demonstrate the technical aspects of aircraft control”).

Due to the nature of the comprehensive stage check and course completion being competency based, an additional assessment tool is reviewing the average days it takes a cohort of students to complete AVF 252. This year the 2024-2025 cohort of students averaged 107 days in AVF 252. This represents a 30% reduction in time to complete stage 5 from the high of 153 days for the 2022-2023 cohort. To further close the loop on assessment the 2021-2022 cohort averaged 134 days and the 2015-2016 cohort average 113 days.

AVF 253

Once again, the use of data from the dashboards for course success rate for AVF 253 is not possible for the 2024-2025 cohort. The current material reflected in the data dashboards for the 2024-2025 cohort of students is reflective of the students who completed their training in the summer of 2024 or were terminated from the program in the summer of 2024. This data is not inclusive of the students who have currently completed their training as part of the 2024–2025 school year cohort.

Looking at the overall trend for Historically Underrepresented Groups we see on the dashboards 83% success rate in the 2021-2022 cohort, 100% in the 2022-2023 cohort, 44% in the 2023-2024 cohort. This compares to the non-HUG student group success rate of 90% in the 2021-2022 cohort, 91% in the 2022-2023 cohort and 67% in the 2023-2024 cohort.

Preliminary program data from the 2024-2025 cohort indicate only seven students have completed AVF 253. The comprehensive stage 7 flight check yielded an 86% pass rate, with one failure related to stabilized approaches and landings that relates to PO 5 (“students will be able to demonstrate the technical aspects of aircraft control”).

Due to the nature of the comprehensive stage check and course completion being competency based an additional assessment tool is reviewing the average days it takes a cohort of students to complete AVF 253. This year the 2024-2025 cohort of students averaged 32 days in AVF 253. This represents nearly a 70% reduction in time to complete stage 7 from the high of 105 days for the 2022-2023 cohort. To further close the loop on assessment the 2021-2022 cohort averaged 92.7 days and the 2015-2016 cohort average 77 days.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** 1. AVF 252 is largely showing significant improvements in time to completion. In addition, there appears to be a solid course success rate both in the HUG student groups and non-HUG student groups. The overall trend in AVF 252 indicates we at this time should move our assessment focus to other areas of the program.

2. AVF 253 is showing positive trends with times to completion rates but the data on the course success dashboards as well as program data is largely incomplete for the 2024-2025 cohort, as most students in the current cohort will not complete AVF 253 until this summer quarter.

Looking back at the 2022-2023 assessment work, it appears the sole area of weakness still remains landings and the associated un-stabilized approaches. While this has not been a challenge for the vast majority of our students, this piece of assessment data has been written up on three assessment reports related to this stage of training. As of the writing of this report, our new Director of Operations is actively engaging the senior instructional team and Chief Instructor with updated guidance for our training course outline. At this time, we expect a revision of the TCO to be published by the fall of 2025 that will help address this area of concern.

With regards to the HUG group performance in stage 7 training, it appears their success mirrors the non-HUG group students. The number of students in the HUG group has been increasing in our student enrollment but still lags the rest of the college.

**Name**: Ryan Duvall

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   BIM 180A, B, C, PO5: Students will develop proficient Microsoft Office techniques by creating professional business documents. Course Outcomes: Outcome BIM 180A 1: Design, create, format, and edit basic Word documents. 2: Design, create, format, and edit basic Excel spreadsheets and charts. BIM 180B 1: Design, create, format, and edit basic PowerPoint presentations. 2: Design, create, format, and edit basic Access databases. BIM 180C 1: Design, create, format, and edit integrated projects encompassing basic features of Microsoft Office.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ I was not able to identify any equity gaps while I know there are some equity gaps, I was looking at the overall success of my students through this assessment.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 This year, I have removed the variable credit from my classes. This change is allowing me to structure my classes with a week by week schedule. Also, students’ grades can now be calculated based upon homework and test. Assignments will be worth 40 percent of their grade and test will be worth 60 percent of their grade. The changes from self-paced to a weekly schedule will allow students to not have to make their own schedule and follow a weekly schedule. I believe this will help students be more successful in their class. In the past, I always had students fall behind in their class and then not earn all credits of their class. With this new schedule and design, I believe it will help improve the success for my students in different areas related to possible equity gaps. I will use students’ submissions of their test for Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Access, and Integration. I will also look at the overall success and passing grades in the class. I think students will do better on their test knowing that homework counts for part of their grade. In the past, students used to skip assignments and just test and would take their test underprepared which resulted in lower success for students overall. I think having a grade attached to homework will great more buy in and produce better prepared students for their test in these three classes.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​By moving away from the variable credit and moving to standard classes it required students to work on there classes from week one of the quarter and not get behind resulting in an unsuccessful student. Students also learned better being required to complete weekly assignments that prepared them for the test and grades on those tests were higher with less retakes. Adding the structure to these classes gave students the structure needed to be more successful.

Looking at students who were enrolled in BIM 180 in Fall 2023, Winter 2024, and Spring 2025, we had a total of 56 students enrolled. During this time, this class was variable credit and so student could have been enrolled in credits 1-5. The problem of this class design was that students could be working at different levels and with the variable credit, it was self-paced. Of these 56 students, only 40 students earned the credits they were enrolled in. This is a 71.43% success rate. Looking at the student Enrollment in BIM 180A, B, C from fall, Winter, and Spring this year, we see that we had a total of 118 students enrolled over three quarter. These three classes together equal a 5-credit class. Of those enrolled students, 108 students finished and pass their class. This resulted in a 91.53% success rate in the class. It shows me that the changes that I made this year has helped to improve the success of our students keeping them on track in their class learning and gaining the knowledge to be successful and gain and develop proficient Microsoft Office Techniques.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** While we can see a 20% improvement between last year and this year, I want to keep moving forward with these changes. There is more that can be done to help improve student success. I think this now gives us a new baseline and we can better determine the equity gaps that may exist. In the variable credit model, it was hard to address those issues due to the nature of the classes. We now have a more accurate baseline to measure against.

**Name**: Theresa Calip

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   BIOL& 242 Anatomy & Physiology II 5. Course Outcome 2: Demonstrate an understanding of the physiology of the endocrine, cardiovascular, lymphatic, respiratory, digestive, urinary, and reproductive systems including both the chemical and neurological control mechanisms for each, drawing heavily from principles learned in Bio 241.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Although familiar with the concept of homeostasis from earlier Biology courses (including BIOL& 241), students still have difficulty when applying the concept to complex physiological systems, which is the focus of BIOL& 242. There was no identifiable equity gap found with this problem; it presents equally across all variables (race, gender, etc.).

This is a re-iteration of last year’s assessment, where I incorporated the technique of pattern recognition when learning and constructing feedback loops introduced in BIOL& 241 (Core Concepts in physiology: teaching homeostasis through pattern recognition. Chirillo, M, et al.,Adv. Physiol Educ 45: 812-828.2021),

The results of that exercise were mixed. While there was positive feedback from the students as to the clarity and usefulness of the tool, the test results (particularly the difference between the two sections) did not bear that out. This year, I would like to close this assessment loop, with regards to the effectiveness of this tool, by taking a different approach.

This year, assessment will focus on the endocrine/homeostatic loops of the reproductive system, rather than the digestive system. The rationale for this change is the following: the reproductive system is traditionally the last unit in the term, but ties strongly to the first unit, endocrinology. Because of time constraints, student understanding of ties between reproductive physiology and endocrine loops is compromised.

For the winter and spring sections of BIOL&242, I will be moving the unit on reproduction to follow the endocrine system.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 As with the previous assessment, students will be assessed on their ability to generate (draw) and explain the pathway of pituitary and gonadal hormones of the male and female, and their roles in sexual maturation and function of the gonads (testes and ovaries). There will be numerous supportive exercises and quizzes to assist student retention prior to exams.

Student learning will be assessed with the first exam (lab and lecture), and the final exam (lab and lecture). Lecture exams are comprised of objective multiple-choice/matching or short answer questions. Lab exams involve labeling, drawing, or short-answer explanations of organs, systems or processes.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​This assessment aimed to strengthen student comprehension of homeostasis within complex physiological systems by restructuring unit sequencing in BIOL& 242. The reproductive system was moved to follow endocrinology, with an emphasis on hormone feedback loops as the foundation for understanding male and female physiology.

Students engaged in in-class drawings to visually map these feedback loops, reinforcing connections between hormonal pathways and reproductive anatomy. While quizzes and supportive exercises remained unchanged, integrating endocrinology directly with reproduction created a more cohesive approach to concept retention.

A key adjustment in this year’s assessment was tracking exam scores for the endocrinology and reproductive system units, rather than focusing on the final exam. The results were as follows:

- Winter 2025 Scores:

- Lecture Exam: 78% (Winter 24: 71%)

- Lab Exam: 78% (Winter 24: 75%)

- Spring 2025 Scores:

- Lecture Exam: 79% (Spring 24: 70%)

- Lab Exam: 86% (Spring 24: 73%)

Additionally, all endocrine-based questions from the Comprehensive Final Lab Exam were reviewed, as they were identical to those used in the previous year’s assessment. Encouragingly, the overall percentage of correct responses for both Winter and Spring quarters was 80%, demonstrating consistent retention of endocrine concepts. Interestingly, the lowest correct response rates were observed in questions covering the earliest material from Unit 1, suggesting that students may benefit from additional reinforcement at the beginning of the term.

These findings indicate that the color-coded protocol for reinforcing homeostasis, combined with restructuring unit order, shows promise in improving student comprehension. While challenges remain in applying homeostasis across multi-system processes, this approach appears to support stronger retention and understanding. On the day that I return student exams, and after we go over the correct answers, I always have them submit in-class a d informal wrap-up of the exam. I have them include a) what they would have done differently to prepare for the exam and b) what do they think helped them with the unit. After Exam II (reproduction) I received ten responses (which included both classes) that mentioned transitioning from the Endocrine unit to the Reproductive “made sense” and helped them understand the importance of homeostasis.

Future refinements may include targeted reinforcement of early endocrinology concepts, expanded review activities earlier in the term, and incorporating case-based learning to further solidify student grasp of physiological interactions. Overall, this assessment provides valuable insight into optimizing curriculum sequencing for more effective learning outcomes.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Overall, this assessment was of value to me and to student outcomes. I will retain this change in format and continue utilizing and refining the color-coded methodology for teaching.

**Name**: Mariah Whitney

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   Biol&160 ; General Biology with Lab - Change impacts entire course not just specific LOs

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Low course success rates: All students in the class often struggle with developing study skills and ability to quiz themselves on content, these are often 1st gen or non-trad students.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 I used AI (ChatGPT) to help students develop more successful study skills. Specifically using it to help in making effective flashcards and quizzing them on Learning Objectives. When doing it in class, we additionally looked at the accuracy of the answers it gives and what it leaves out.

I will look at student success in the course as well as a student feedback survey at the end of the quarter.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​In the Fall quarter, AI use was limited due to access issues—ChatGPT required sign-ins, which discouraged many students. In Winter, I integrated it more intentionally, especially for quizzing, and collected end-of-quarter feedback. In Spring, I continued this approach and also shared the Winter survey results with students at midterms.

Winter Survey results shared with Spring Class:

 AI as a Study Buddy?

Out of the 15 students that filled out the survey, 13 used AI to help them and all 13 stated it helped them to be more successful. The 2 students that did NOT use AI stated they already had strong study skills (they earned the highest GPA as well >3.5).

The students reported using ChatGPT, Gemini, Siri, Quizlet and Gizmo.

The top uses were:

• Making quiz questions based on LOs

• Making flashcards (breaking them down to be on multiple cards was most popular)

• Explaining hard concepts

• Analogies

• Answer my questions

Two Student Quotes:

From a first-time student:

“Yes, I do think it helped because it was like having a professor available for me all day. I could ask any questions at any time and get a detailed response based on the book. It also helped me finish my flashcards faster. I normally use flashcards to study for any exam, and having ChatGPT was very useful because it would separate a learning outcome into three flashcards with a question and response, which normally takes me a long time to do, and with AI, this process was faster. When studying for upcoming exams, it was also very helpful because I would quiz myself on specific learning outcomes, I did not feel confident about, which I think is a very useful tool not only for me but for every other student who takes this course.”

From a student repeating this course:

“I used them to help ease my anxiety with testing. I believe they significantly contributed to my improvement. I observed a 15–20-point increase on my first two exams, especially compared to last quarter when I performed poorly. Additionally, my third exam showed a 10-point increase. It's worth noting that I had started using both platforms around this time last quarter.”

Spring Quarter summary:

Total responses: 18

Students who used AI: 16

Most commonly used AI platforms: ChatGPT

How students used AI:

• Creating and taking practice quizzes

• Summarizing chapters and learning objectives

• Clarifying difficult concepts

• Rewording questions for better understanding

• Acting as a “study buddy” when instructors weren’t available

Did students find AI helpful? All 16 mentioned it helped from a little to a lot.

Representative Student Quotes

“I feel like the use of AI has helped. Each exam score has increased (I started using after exam #1). It might not have been a SIGNIFICANT amount, but it was a little with each exam.”

“I believe it did help me as when I used it I scored better on exams , it helped me summarize LOs in a simpler more understanding way”

Fall Success (as a 2.0 or higher since this is what is needed to get into A&P): 45%

Winter Success: 55%

Spring Success: 60.9%

Note: Other things may have impacted the success rates in this course. In Spring, I began giving handouts to support our in class day instead of relying on students to take notes from what I did on the board (increased student participation and less students just took a picture of my work). Additionally, there have been changes in the Chem&121 faculty over the last 2 years and that feeds into this course as a pre/co-requisite.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** • Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to continue doing this activity. While I also still emphasize active recall techniques using their notes, this seems to have been received well by the students. Some students who did not utilize quizzing methods for study have now incorporated it into their study practices.

• I hope that the college continues to support professional development opportunities for using AI so that I can continue to learn how it can help me and the students.

**Name**: Christy Welch

**Institutional Outcome**: Human Relations / Workplace Skills

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   BIOL&221, 222 and 223 - Majors Biology

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ In viewing/analyzing the Course Success Dashboard for this Biology series, a gap in achievement was noted between males and females (but no difference between different ethnic/cultural groups). I will be gathering anecdotal evidence throughout this year in order to devise a more quantitative assessment of this discrepancy during the following school year. The unrelated problem that I am attempting to resolve in this year’s assessment is in cultivating the workplace specific skill of each student completing their own thorough and complete lab clean up. This included correctly putting all lab equipment away, doing dishes, sanitizing their lab station and restoring the lab to the condition it was when they first entered the lab room that day. In the past, this has not been accomplished in a sufficient, consistent manner.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 After each lab, I walked around each of the lab stations and filled out a 3 x 5 card with each of the student's name, date, and grade (0-5 points) for microscope storage. In addition, I would not let students leave the lab until I had checked and cleared their station for departure.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​I found that assigning points for microscope storage and penalizing students for not doing it correctly was the only way to sufficiently ensure consistent proper storage of each microscope. This method holds each student accountable for the correct storage of their microscope. In the past, I have verbally and repeatedly reminded students what to do, but this was not an effective strategy. Also in the past I have also made a large, illustrative poster for the laboratory showing the proper steps for the correct storage of the microscope, but this was not effective, either. Students either did not listen or remember to look at the poster, or care about proper microscope storage until I assigned a 5 point deduction to their lab for not doing so. I assigned 1 point for each of the correct steps required for proper storage. This was an effective strategy and resulted in 98% compliance with proper microscope storage consistently throughout the entire year. I also found that not allowing students to leave until I had checked their stations worked well (over 90% compliance).

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** I would like to recommend this strategy to the entire Biology Department and also to the Upward Bound program that is using the microscopes as well this year. The microscopes are expensive (over $1200 each) and need to be properly handled in order to maintain long-term availability. The careless handling of these high-quality microscopes will result in fiscal irresponsibility for the college, if this is not addressed. I plan to bring this up at our next department meeting, as well as discuss this with our lab coordinator so we can consistently implement this strategy with all programs that use our lab space.

**Name**: Guillermo Garza

**Institutional Outcome**: Human Relations / Workplace Skills

**Program Outcome**: 4

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   CDL100

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Students are given a Pre-Trip Inspection manual to read, study and practice on how to perform a Pre-Trip Inspection. During the third week of the CDL course, students will be evaluated on a Pre-Trip Inspection.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 I have each student walk me through a full Pre-Trip Inspection as I am evaluating their progress and ability to perform a Pre-Trip Inspection from beginning to end, using a Pre-Trip Inspection check-off score sheet.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Around 80% of the students had successfully and adequately preformed a Pre-Trip Inspection.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** With just 80% of the students successfully and adequately preforming a Pre-Trip Inspection, I will continue to evaluate and assess the students' performance in order to monitor what changes will need to be addressed in order to bring this number up.

**Name**: Kaja Devine

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 4

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   CJ 217 33004 Advanced Report Writing - 1. Students will show mastery of complicated technical reports related to criminal justice by using the appropriate forms and formats. 2. Students will complete a variety of exercises related to the writing of technical writing forms and reports. 3. Students will demonstrate report organization. 4. Students will become aware of automated field reporting and how it relates to their job and connects to the overall CJ system.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ The problem/concern I have been attempting to resolve through this assessment is students success in improving on their communication skills through writing. Particularly, writing related to working in law enforcement. The equity gap I am seeking to address is success rates of low income/single parent/working students.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 During week 1 of the quarter I had students complete a pre-assessment on communication, grammar skills, spelling, ELA skills, all very specifically addressing law enforcement related statements and jargon. At the end of the quarter during week 10, I then had students complete a post-assessment. The pre and post assessment were both the exact same (I made sure the pre-assessment was closed so students were not referring to the correct answers from that as they completed the post-assessment). The goal here was to be able to see how students improved on these writing and communication skills from the beginning of the quarter to the end.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Overall, the results were significant. Of the 10 students enrolled in this course (low number because all CJ majors), two students scores stayed the same, there was one student who did not complete the post test, and the remaining students scores increased. These results suggest that over the course of spring quarter, students were able to learn or relearn specific communication skills, grammar skills, spelling, ELA skills, etc. which were all very specifically addressing law enforcement related statements and jargon that played into their pre and post assessment scores.

In terms of the equity gap(s) I had in mind - I preferred that students complete the pre and post assessments in class, however, I understand that it can be a struggle to get to class given various circumstances. So, I allowed students to still complete the pre and post assessment online. With all of this in mind, all of the students who completed the pre and post assessments with scores either staying the same or improving, are passing CJ 217 with a 75% or higher (1 student in the 70% range, 1 student in the 80% range, and 6 students in the 90% range).

I do understand there are other various factors affecting students overall grades, but nonetheless I am satisfied with the pre and post assessment scores.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** This is the first time I have ever assigned a pre and post assessment and I am a huge fan of it. I feel as though the data is really telling and I would like to continue to implement them into my other courses for assessment purposes as well as overall CJ program purposes. This will be a reliable way of following students learning in my courses so I can make adjustments as needed throughout my courses.

**Name**: Mitchell Poth

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   CMST&220 [Demonstrate the ability to manage stage fright]

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ This assessment seeks to address differences in Public Speaking Anxiety (PSA) among students across age groups, with particular attention to younger students (e.g., Running Start students aged 16–18) versus traditional college-aged students (18–24+). The concern is that younger students may enter the course with heightened anxiety and fewer strategies for managing it.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 To assess PSA and track changes across the term, the following tools were used:

• A custom pre-/post-survey measuring student anxiety across 10 Likert-scale items related to public speaking comfort, performance anxiety, and self-perceived ability.

• An age group identifier was included to allow disaggregation by demographic.

• Students were given a lecture early in the course on managing PSA, paired with multiple speaking assignments to apply those techniques.

• Informal classroom observations were used to assess changes in student behavior and confidence throughout the term.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Key Findings:

• Response of PSA rates remained consistently low.

• Items measuring high-stress speaking situations (e.g., debates, large audiences) continued to yield high anxiety responses post-instruction.

• Discrimination indices were strong for many items, indicating the questions effectively distinguished between more and less confident students—but not that anxiety levels improved.

• Likert scale confusion may have affected results; some students may have misinterpreted the scale direction, skewing answers.

Equity Analysis by Age Group:

• Students in the Running Start age group (16–18) did not show substantially different patterns compared to older peers.

• No clear evidence suggests age was a determining factor in the effectiveness of the course’s anxiety-reduction strategies.

Qualitative Insights:

• Despite lectures and performance experience, students frequently selected high-anxiety answers in post-tests.

• Observations suggest confidence improved in practice, but this may not have been accurately reflected in self-report measures.

• Persistent high anxiety indicates that the current instructional design may not sufficiently support emotional regulation, particularly through surveys alone.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** In response to the assessment findings, the following instructional changes will be implemented:

• Clarify survey directions by explicitly stating that lower Likert scores represent lower anxiety.

• Implement a short training survey at the start of the course to ensure student understanding of scale-based questions. Give students 5 points extra credit for taking the quiz, in hopes to have more student responses.

• Replace or supplement the custom survey with a validated assessment tool, such as the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, to enhance reliability and interpretability.

• Reinforce coping strategies for PSA through ongoing discussions, peer-sharing, and modeled behavior, rather than a single instructional lecture.

While no immediate institutional programs are recommended, this assessment suggests the following college-wide considerations:

• Support for the development of a public speaking lab or coaching center where students can practice in a non-evaluative environment. Perhaps, a place in the English Lab.

• This skill is beneficial not only for public speaking but also for other courses and personal growth. It plays an important role in managing stress during performances, taking tests, and completing other college coursework.

• Offer workshops on managing performance anxiety, especially targeted toward Running Start and first-year students.

**Name**: Michell Valdivia

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 6

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   CS 103, CS 206

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ In the last two years I noticed there was a disconnect among first-year students about the purpose of a server. Students could define the physical aspects of a server, but could not connect the physical concepts with the software concepts. This year we looked to bridge that connection, and doing so in a way that was financially accessible to all students. Server equipment is expensive, and simulations are limited in covering the knowledge needed to work on server hardware and software. By working with the online simulation software that we use in CS 103 and CS 206, along with financially accessible online web server hosts, students can combine both the physical and software concepts of a server in an environment that emulates real world applications.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 We used TestOut in CS 103 for third-party simulations of hardware and software server integration to get a well-rounded experience of working with the physical hardware of servers in a work environment.

In CS 103 students were able to identify the physical aspects of a physical server using TestOut section 11.4, as well as configure DNS and DHCP on a simulated Windows server. This knowledge was carried over into CS 206, where students were walked through the process of creating a web server using Apache2, then Python, and managing the web servers using Linux commands. Code was hosted on Github and then deployed online, where communication between the server and client could be observed.

In CS 206 we used a website called PythonAnywhere.com to host a web server. PythonAnywhere.com is a free hosting site that allows students to sign up for their own dedicated online server space to and publish Python applications. PythonAnywhere.com further provided students with the opportunity to work with the back-end server communication in a real-world setting.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Students were able to successfully bridge the physical and software components of a server. After deploying the web server on PythonAnywhere, the verbiage covered in CS 103 section 11.4 helped them understand the process of deploying a web server and observing communication between the client and the server. Students were able to deploy their own Apache2 server on their virtual machines, and were able to troubleshoot errors based on the knowledge covered in CS 103.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** The loop was closed in spring quarter through CS 206, as fall/winter quarter CS 103 did not cover the deployment of server software, but did cover the software side of configuring DHCP and DNS.

While students were able to simulate the physical aspects, my recommendation would be to cover the whole process of setting up the physical servers and deploying software on those servers in a classroom setting. The process broken up between courses as it is now may further disconnect the concepts in the future if instructors are not vigilant in piping the knowledge between courses in the Systems Admin program.

**Name**: Rosemary Parsons

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   ELA (English Language Aquisition) DVS 031 , 032, 013 and HSC (High School Completion) Courses

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Program Outcome (PO) 5 of the Basic Education for Adults (BEdA) program states that students will be able to engage in respectful discussions on the concepts of diversity, inclusion, and equity. To support students in reaching this goal, BEdA instructors should have a strong working knowledge of these concepts. We have a large number of part-time faculty in BEdA; for the 2024-2025 academic year, we welcomed eight new faculty members to BEdA. Many of these instructors have professional backgrounds in areas other than education. This can create a gap in integrating diversity, inclusion, and equity into their teaching approach. Our goal was to use quarterly in-service meetings to introduce DEI educational methodology, so that instructors could better cultivate an inclusive learning environment.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 \*Note: For this year's assessment period, BEdA switched information tracking systems from WABERS to LACES, so we did not have complete access to data from our program. For this reason, we decided to focus on the faculty as a whole, rather than look at student data from specific courses.

We began the academic year by conducting a faculty survey during the BEdA fall in-service to establish a baseline on how comfortable instructors felt, including best teaching practices in diversity, inclusion, and equity. A second identical survey was conducted at the end of the academic year, and the results from both surveys were analyzed.

During the Winter 2025 and Spring 2025 BEdA in-services, the full-time faculty provide professional development focused on building a shared vocabulary that includes best teaching practices in diversity, inclusion, and equity. We included best practices from the Faculty Assessment Toolkit created by Jeni Richline. We also included training from the ESCALA Cookbook, with a focus on making syllabi more welcoming to Latinx students. In addition, in the Spring of 2025, all BEdA faculty were asked to complete a WA State BEdA 101 online training course, which included a section on DEI in the BEdA classroom.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​The first survey was conducted on September 19, 2024. Faculty were asked five questions about their confidence levels and experience in teaching students from different languages, cultures, and backgrounds. They were asked to rate their abilities on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree".

The survey also asked instructors to answer the following question: "I currently have some type of Equity or Respectful Classroom Conduct Statement in my syllabus." In the fall of 2024, instructors responded as follows: 8-Yes, 6-No, and 3-I'm not sure. In the spring of 2025, all instructors responded "yes" to this question. This data seems to show that the quarterly in-service training regarding inclusive syllabi language had a positive impact on Program Outcome 5.

With regard to the data on the five questions about instructor confidence levels and experience in teaching students from different languages, cultures, and backgrounds, in fall 2024 the scores ranged from 2,3,4 and 5. In spring 2025, the scores improved to 4 and 5. This would suggest that BEdA instructors increased their knowledge and confidence in areas of diversity, inclusion, and equity within the classroom.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on our results, we will continue to allot time in our BEdA in-service meetings for teacher development in the area of diversity, inclusion, and equity. We would recommend that instructors complete ESCALA training. It is our understanding that part-time faculty at BBCC are only required to attend one in-service per year. Because of the wide range of cultures, ESL/ELL learners, and non-traditional students in the BEdA program, and because we have a large number of revolving part-time faculty, we would recommend that BEdA faculty meet at least quarterly for in-service training, rather than just once per year.

**Name**: Dawnne Ernette

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   ENGL 099 English Skills 10. Compose short essays that are appropriate for an academic audience, are unified around a clear thesis, follow academic standards for critical thinking, incorporate adequate details and support, and show sound structure and mechanics.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ I am addressing non-completers in ENGL 099 and ways to help students complete the class. I chose the outcome 10 because it encompasses the work of the course and I'm looking at those who do not complete work.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 For this assessment, I was concerned that some ENGL 099 students do not earn at least a 2.0. This groups is considered non-completers because if they earn less than 2.0, they must retake ENGL 099. For some students, impact of not earning a 2.0 in ENGL 099 may cause them to quit college all together.

For fall '24, winter '25, and spring '25, I put in place several supports that should have helped students in completing the course: individual conferences in Week 2, Week 6, and finals week to check in on students' progress; multiple modes of support materials; assignments to help students plan and control; their own successes (Week 3 Plan for the quarter, Week 6 Mid-quarter update, final reflection for Portfolio); follow-up with students who seemed to have disappeared; students chose their own research topic; quick and targeted feedback on first drafts of writing projects; combination of group and individual projects; flexible late work policy; drop-in and by appointment student hours; labor-based grading to alleviate the stress of traditional grading systems.

I looked into non-completers credit loads and success in all classes for the quarter they took ENGL 099 to see if there were any correlations or patterns that could be interpreted usefully.

Students in ENGL 099 have the opportunity to earn ENGL & 101 in that quarter. One result that remains steady through all quarters and previous years is that students who complete the assignments learn the skills earn ENGL & 101 or pass ENGL 099 with at least a 2.0. Therefore, the assessment question that remains is why do some students not compete the assignments and what changes can I make to encourage and support more students to complete?

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​FA'24: 52 students, 10 non-completers

W'25: 25 students, 9 non-completers

Sp'25: 45 students, 11 non-completers

30 non-completers of 122 = 24% non-completers

3 NC took less than 12 credits the quarter they took ENGL 099. The rest took between 13-19 credits.

2 are continuing; 28 left college (Except that the 11 from spring cannot be counted yet as they might not have enrolled for summer/fall yet. In this case, 17 seem to have left college.)

11 NC passed no classes the quarter they took ENGL 099. 19 passed one class the quarter they took ENGL 099.

A few qualitative responses include

1. I'm having too much fun right now to do homework

2. I am working too much at my job (This was what I heard the most.)

3. My kids/mom/myself too ill (This was the next biggest one.)

Credit load: I was not able to find a clear correlation between course completion and credit load. 9 NC took 13 credits and 18 took 16-19. Regardless of credit load, the NCs did not complete work and so could not earn at least a 2.0.

I do find a possible correlation between being a first-quarter student and struggling to complete; however, those students who did complete were also first-quarter students.

The most probable correlation, then, would be between too many hours at work and family emergency/illness. There is also a connection between NCs and leaving college.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** ENGL 099 is not a program, but it is connected to and foundational for students who place into ENGL 099 for the programs we have here at BBCC. I am not able to close this assessment loop yet.

I will return to themed courses as I used to do. I think that, looking at last year '23-'24) and before, the themed courses provide more collaboration opportunities fore students and that those opportunities do help to strengthen student engagement. I will also provide more than 3 check-ins, not conferences necessary, but short projects to help students better see their own progress.

I need to reflect on what and how much students really need to do to accomplish the class and its concepts. I'm not sure if I am giving them too much work, but we only have 11 weeks instruction at best to accomplish the course outcomes. It may be that the English Department should review the composition classes' MCOs and discuss what we should be doing in our classes to meet the final expected outcomes.

I would like to see the College provide a more-in-depth orientation process especially for those in ENGL 099 so that students can think deeply about how many credits they should really take their first quarter and whether online or on campus instruction will really be best for their success. Also, because writing/reading classes are intensive, students should be guided toward taking a balance of classes their first quarter. For example, taking two classes with a heavy load of writing would not be beneficial but taking a writing-type class, a math-type class, and one other completely different class would be better for their brains--better for processing concepts.

I understand that taking a full load of classes each quarter (or 15 credits) gets students their degree in 2 years which is optimal. But for some students in ENGL 099, taking fewer classes the first quarter could help them.

**Name**: Zach Olson

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   ENGL 102 9. Recognize the importance of proper documentation style, and the differences between the various styles used in different college disciplines 10. Develop and improve habits of lifetime literacy. (really, our assessment touches on all outcomes).

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ There are not any specific equity gaps that we identified in the English courses, in the program audit. In this area, many of our faculty already have a focus on historically marginalized groups and an awareness and eagerness toward trying to bridge those gaps.

We used the course success dashboard to find issues, in order to inform the program audit. However, there were no conclusive equity gaps identified in relation to English 102.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 With an increase in AI technology, there is a possibility for improvements in many areas. However, there is an increased risk students submitting dishonest writing (writing created by AI). This risk is a concern for all students but we worry, increasingly, about students that may not possess prerequisite reading and writing skills and who use AI as a crutch which allows them to avoid acquiring these skills. AI does a disservice to those students. It allows those students to continue on to other courses without the skills they should have.

The English Department would like to increase in-class writings to do two things. First, it allows us to see which students might be having issues and focus extra help or attention toward them. Second, it allows us to safeguard against potential dishonesty—or, alternatively, to alleviate our own bias concerns about academic dishonesty. We plan on doing an in-class writing at the beginning and ending of the quarter.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​The above language is the department assessment plan, however I modified it for my courses, as I only taught ENGL& 102 online, asynchronous, and in-class writing proctored by the instructor isn’t feasible in that modality. Instead, I had students use a Chrome extension called “Draftback” which records student typing in google docs and creates a kind of super version history where I am able to view everything they type in a video (that displays just the document page, nothing else on their computer or around them as it doesn’t require camera or microphone technology) and watch their essays develop across multiple writing sessions. In my class, students were required to compose all three major essays in Google Docs with the Draftback extension enabled to receive credit.

While students still have ways to integrate AI source material into their essays, it did seem to significantly reduce the amount of AI content. In previous quarters without Draftback enabled, I would get around 6 to 7 essays that likely included AI content per essay assignment. On average, I now get 1 to 2, and the Draftback videos have helped me both identify when AI content is included, but more importantly get a better look at the composition process my online students use and give more directed feedback. I think that even in a world without AI or any form of dishonesty, I’d still use this tool. Student feedback indicated that they didn’t find it to be particularly invasive to their privacy or a difficult technological hurdle. A week one practice assignment ensured all students were prepared to use the technology and that I could give support as needed before major homework was due.

Only formal essays require the use of Draftback, and as such I do notice different rates of likely AI use on assignments such as discussions. One discussion assignment from this quarter had about 12/25 students submit an analysis of a short story that wasn’t really supported by a reasonable reading of the text but was what AI would produce when prompted with my assignment. In meetings with the students, the majority admitted to AI use on that assignment and showed me how they had used it to construct the discussion. By contrast, on an essay due the same week, only 2 students had likely AI-generated language in their essays.

Overall, my belief is this tool aids instruction in online asynchronous courses by allowing me to give better feedback, and it improves the security and integrity of the course.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on this assessment, I plan to continue to use Draftback and also seek ways to incorporate regular, spaced review of the student work into the course to give more frequent feedback. In addition, I plan to adjust my discussion post assignments in such a way that there are better incentives to do one’s own work. I intend to start each post with an example of an AI-produced response which I critique, and also to incorporate some sort of peer grading process that focuses on whether or not students feel their peers are adding value to the course with discussion contributions. My hope is that these practices will incentivize students to consider the value of the human element in their coursework and use AI less often.

I think that accountability and increasing the likelihood that we catch academic integrity violations is an important piece of addressing the challenges posed by AI, but it should also be paired with incentivizing the behavior we want and adjusting our approach to discussing the value of reading, writing, and critical thinking not because of their academic or economic products, but because of their transformative effect on human minds.

The software costs about $40/year for someone who wants to view the Draftback videos. Students can install and use it for free and get limited use. I’d recommend that the college shows this tool to all teachers, but especially those with online courses.

**Name**: Patricia Jones

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   ENGL102

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Please note: The following was discussed during zero week and was completed by one member of our department.

"There are not any specific equity gaps that we identified in the English courses, in the program audit. In this area, many of our faculty already have a focus on historically marginalized groups and an awareness and eagerness toward trying to bridge those gaps.

We used the course success dashboard to find issues, in order to inform the program audit. However, there were no conclusive equity gaps identified in relation to English 102."

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 Please note: The following was discussed during zero week and was completed by one member of our department.

With an increase in AI technology, there is a possibility for improvements in many areas. However, there is an increased risk students submitting dishonest writing (writing created by AI). This risk is a concern for all students, but we worry, increasingly, about students that may not possess prerequisite reading and writing skills and who use AI as a crutch which allows them to avoid acquiring these skills. AI does a disservice to those students. It allows those students to continue to other courses without the skills they should have.

The English Department would like to increase in-class writings to do two things. First, it allows us to see which students might be having issues and focus extra help or attention toward them. Second, it allows us to safeguard against potential dishonesty—or, alternatively, to alleviate our own bias concerns about academic dishonesty. We plan on doing an in-class writing at the beginning and ending of the quarter.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​I did do a slightly different assessment that did not focus on in-class, handwritten writing. I focused on start-to-finish writing, beginning with a narrative style that, to the best of my knowledge, has never been compromised by AI. Then, midway, the students legitimately used AI, which most students were not particularly good at or enjoyed using. As part of the final project, the students wrote an opinion piece about the literature and a final reflection. I reviewed the first assignment and compared the writing throughout, but used the last one as the other half of the assessment. Although the students were still at various levels of writing proficiency, they all showed signs of improvement in writing style, understanding of audience and tone, and confidence in choosing a side in the debate.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the assessment results, I plan to incorporate AI more extensively throughout all my classes. We ask our students to use all of their resources, but we often point to AI and say, “But not that one.” I plan to teach my students how to use AI properly as a resource and what lines not to cross.

Based on the results of the assessment and my own experiences with inequities in ENGL102 (they do exist), my teaching will change, and my attitude toward certain types of AI has also changed. In addition to the student outcomes in the courses, my personal goals for my students are to foster their confidence in writing and research, while also teaching them various writing styles that will be used in the real world. AI is part of that now and is not going away. It can also help bridge the gaps that some students have in their education, such as their ability to spend more or less time on homework due to jobs, families, illness, or language learning. Additionally, understanding AI better is something that businesses and other industries are expecting of recent graduates.

The results were excellent overall, but I am not one to rest on my laurels. I aim to deepen my understanding of the subjects I teach, the business requirements for job applicants, and the technologies our students are utilizing. The slight obsession certain members of my department have with hating, avoiding, or policing AI got me thinking about how I can help my students embrace it as a resource or even an educational partner rather than using it to skate by in college leaving here with little or no knowledge they need to succeed at university or within industry.

**Name**: Sean Twohy

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 10

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   English 101

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ There are not any specific equity gaps that we identified in the English courses, in the program audit. In this area, many of our faculty already have a focus on historically marginalized groups and an awareness and eagerness toward trying to bridge those gaps.

We used the course success dashboard to find issues, in order to inform the program audit. However, there were no conclusive equity gaps identified in relation to English 101.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 With an increase in AI technology, there is a possibility for improvements in many areas. However, there is an increased risk students submitting dishonest writing (writing created by AI). This risk is a concern for all students but we worry, increasingly, about students that may not possess prerequisite reading and writing skills and who use AI as a crutch which allows them to avoid acquiring these skills. AI does a disservice to those students. It allows those students to continue on to other courses without the skills they should have.

The English Department would like to increase in-class writings to do two things. First, it allows us to see which students might be having issues and focus extra help or attention toward them. Second, it allows us to safeguard against potential dishonesty—or, alternatively, to alleviate our own bias concerns about academic dishonesty. We plan on doing an in-class writing at the beginning and ending of the quarter.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Sean Twohy: For two sections of English 101, I had students complete an in-class writing on the second day of class. This assignment was very simple, with a short lecture video describing the expectations provided to the students the night before and the day of the writing. Students could watch the lecture on their own, but it was also played right before they did the writing, in class. The writing asked them to choose a thesis from an option of two supplied statements, and to write two body paragraphs on that thesis. The body paragraphs should have topic sentences, evidence, and analysis (which were described in the lecture video). The evidence, for this assignment, would be made up, but the made-up in-text citation of the evidence should be as close to correct as the students could manage. These writings were handwritten. I used a simple evaluation of the completed in-class writings. A green check meant that the student met the expectations of the assignment. A green and orange check meant that the student was mostly meeting expectations but had one or two larger concerns. An orange check, with no green, meant the student’s writing had some larger concerns. Of the introductory in-class writing submissions, the following was found:

Rubric measure

# of Students in 9:15 Class: 25

Met Expectations: 19

Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues: 5

Significant Issues: 1

# of Students in 10:30 Class: 24

Met Expectations: 12

Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues: 8

Significant Issues: 4

There were significant differences between two classes, with the students in the 9:15 class outperforming the 10:30 class in this prewriting. There could be implications to the start time of classes, based on this result.

At the end of the quarter, the students did a second in-class writing, worth 10% of their grade. For this, I chose to qualify anything above an 84% as “Met expectations”, anything from a 74-84% as “Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues”, and anything below 74% as “Significant Issues.” The results were as follows:

Rubric measure

# of Students in 9:15 Class: 24

Met Expectations: 23

Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues: 1

Significant Issues: 0

# of Students in 10:30 Class: 24

Met Expectations: 17

Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues: 2

Significant Issues: 5

Overall, there was significant improvement in both courses. This seems to imply that actual learning did occur.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to continue to look for ways to discourage dishonest AI. I am also going to continue to use in-class writings as a way to see where students are at in their writing skills and how much they’ve improved.

I recommend the college continue to look for ways to help faculty to solve AI issues.

**Name**: Sean Twohy

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 10

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   English 102

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ There are not any specific equity gaps that we identified in the English courses, in the program audit. In this area, many of our faculty already have a focus on historically marginalized groups and an awareness and eagerness toward trying to bridge those gaps.

We used the course success dashboard to find issues, in order to inform the program audit. However, there were no conclusive equity gaps identified in relation to English 102.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 With an increase in AI technology, there is a possibility for improvements in many areas. However, there is an increased risk that students submitting dishonest writing (writing created by AI). This risk is a concern for all students but we worry, increasingly, about students that may not possess prerequisite reading and writing skills and who use AI as a crutch which allows them to avoid acquiring these skills. AI does a disservice to those students. It allows those students to continue on to other courses without the skills they should have.

The English Department would like to increase in-class writings to do two things. First, it allows us to see which students might be having issues and focus extra help or attention toward them. Second, it allows us to safeguard against potential dishonesty—or, alternatively, to alleviate our own bias concerns about academic dishonesty. I plan on doing an in-class writing at the beginning and ending of the quarter. In addition, I plan on requiring students to complete in-class reading quizzes with a minimum average grade of 50% or higher, to be able to receive credit on the essays. This ensures that students have read the material.

This is a continuation of an assessment done in 2023-2024 of English 102, and an assessment done in Fall of 2024-2025 of English 101.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​For one section of English 102, had students complete an in-class writing on the second day of class. This assignment was very simple, with a short lecture video describing the expectations provided to the students the night before and the day of the writing. Students could watch the lecture on their own, but it was also played right before they did the writing, in class. The writing asked them to choose a thesis from an option of two supplied statements, and to write two body paragraphs on that thesis. The body paragraphs should have topic sentences, evidence, and analysis (which were described in the lecture video). The evidence, for this assignment, would be made up, but the made-up in-text citation of the evidence should be as close to correct as the students could manage. These writings were handwritten. I used a simple evaluation of the completed in-class writings. A blue check meant that the student met the expectations of the assignment. A blue and green check meant that the student was mostly meeting expectations but had one or two larger concerns. A green check, with no blue, meant the student’s writing had some larger concerns. The first in-class writing was worth 10 Points, or 1% of their grade. They received all 10 points, regardless of assignment feedback. Students were allowed to read feedback, but the writing was re-collected by the instructor. Of the introductory in-class writing submissions, the following was found:

# of Students: 25

Met Expectations 19

Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues 4

Significant Issues 2

At the end of the quarter, the students did a second in-class writing. The grading of these assignments was based on 200 Points, or 20% of the final grade. For this, I chose to qualify anything above an 84% as “Met expectations”, anything from a 74-84% as “Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues”, and anything below 74% as “Significant Issues.” The results were as follows:

# of Students: 25

Met Expectations 23

Mostly Met Expectations/Some Issues 2

Significant Issues 0

Of this second assessment, no student fell below the “Mostly Met Expectations” threshold. 15 students received a 100% on the final and all of the rest of the “Met expectations” group got an “A” on the final. The two students that scored “Mostly Met Expectations” were on the cusp of the cutoff, each scoring a 150 (the cutoff was a 148). One of these students scored in the “Mostly Met” category on the first in-class writing, and the other student had scored in the “significant problems” category. One of the two students had significant AI/plagiarism concerns at the beginning of the quarter, and failed a few assignments because of it.

No student fell below the 50% average grade requirement on the in-class reading quizzes and 21 students had above an 80% on those reading quizzes. The average grade on the reading quizzes was a 88% (up from 77% last year).

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to continue to use in-class writings to assess student skill, and continue to seek ways in which I can discourage AI dishonesty in my courses.

Online course content is facing unprecedented concerns. Based on the success rates shown on the dashboard, the concern related to modality and success is not limited to one class, one course, or one program. Take, for instance, my English 235 course (Technical Writing). This course, as a hybrid, typically saw success rates in the upper 70% range (an exception being Covid 2019/2020 where success rates were higher for a number of reasons). When the course first moved online (2021/22), the success rates jumped to 91%. This is likely due to my inexperience in rooting out different types of academic dishonesty in a course like this. I adjusted and began using more plagiarism detection and success rates moved back down to 79% (2022/23). Last year, AI made leaps and bounds and the success rates jumped to 87%. I adjusted in 2024/2025 and success rates are back down to 79%. But my adjustments are failing to meet the concerns that AI is creating.

English 235 is not the only course this can be seen in. Take, for example, Math 146. Face-to-face success rates are below the success rates of online courses, which has never been the case, previous to widespread AI and technology advancements. 2021/22 F2F success was 70%, whereas online success rates were at 52%. 2022/23 F2F success rates were at 60%, whereas online was 54%. In 2023/24, online success rates suddenly soared to 81%, whereas F2F rates dropped to 57%. Course seems to have been somewhat adjusted this year, but F2F success rates still lag behind online course success rates by 2%.

My recommendation, to the administration, is the following:

• Online classes need to have a face-to-face component (a final). There are too many ways for students to bypass the safeguards of online instruction.

• There needs to be an administrative-level coherent tracking of student AI issues. I have students in my English course who use AI, get caught, fail my class, who then go on to other courses where the instructor may be unaware of what is happening or how to look for it. Academic dishonesty can no longer be this sort of case-by-case thing. We need a mechanized system to track students caught using AI dishonestly in a way that both deters its use and holds students accountable.

• Lots of training needs to be given on how to detect and deter AI being used dishonestly in the classroom.

• Institutional Data should be used to determine the courses where dishonest AI use is likely an issue, and steps should be taken to determine how to best try and put a stop to rampant dishonest AI usage.

• It cannot be put on an individual instructor to solve AI issues in only their classroom. Policies that focus on one instructor maintaining academic integrity, leave that instructor with a “do not take my course” sign around their neck. Just last week, I had a student looking to find a few instructors. I asked them if I could help them with something and they said they wanted to ask the instructors if they use Honorlock in their classes. The student said they wanted to take online classes, but not any classes that use Honorlock. My Technical Writing course had four students drop after watching a lecture about how any AI detection would be failed or sent up to the administration. Students are learning how to pick classes that are easier to cheat in.

• The college should be urging the SBCTC and the accrediting bodies to come up with wide-ranging policies to detour and account for AI. In the same way that individual faculty cannot make necessary changes without turning themselves into a pariah, colleges cannot be making changes individually, without risking enrollment issues. The solution needs to come from the top down.

**Name**: Preston Wilks

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   FALL2024; ACCT262 Intro to QuickBooks; Record financial information in the company file using the appropriate functions + Edit the recorded company financial information using the appropriate functions. + Prepare reports of the company financial information using the appropriate functions. + Export company financial information to other appropriate computing software.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ The accounting program enrollment is primarily female Hispanic students. When looking at the course success dashboards, we found a small dip in the success of economically disadvantaged (EDS) students in 2023-24; however, when we looked at the numbers, we found there was a total of 4 and 1 of them was unsuccessful; hence the dip (1 of 4 students).

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 To better prepare students for the comprehensive final, we added a comprehensive project that students completed near the end of the quarter, prior to the final. In previous years, students learn the software in “chunks” based on the accounting task completed and were not required to work with these tasks together until the comprehensive final. By adding a project that addresses the cumulative learning before the final, we hoped to provide students with a better idea about their skill level and better prepare them for their final.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​In Fall 2023, we had no cumulative learning project prior to the final exam, and the average score on the comprehensive final exam was 83%.

In Fall 2024, we implemented a cumulative assignment prior to the final exam, and the average score on the cumulative case was 90%. It appears that this pre-final exam project definitely helped with the overall learning of the software, as the class average on the comprehensive final exam was 92%.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** -In future offerings of our ACCT262 class, we will continue providing the students with a cumulative assignment prior to the final exam.

-This experiment has heightened my understanding of the need for cumulative projects in our accounting technology classes and will look to implement wherever possible.

-None for the college.

**Name**: Jody Quitadamo

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   HIST&136

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ We identified an achievement gap between students who are in the following age groups: younger than 20 and 20-24. The younger cohort completes this course with a 77% success rate. The older cohort completes with an 86% success rate. The concern we’re trying to address is how to close that achievement gap. The plan is to identify hidden barriers in a current assessment and modify it to remove those barriers with the hope that the younger cohort will have a higher success rate overall.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 The plan is to require a different book for a Socratic Seminar, specifically The Wordy Shipmates, which may be more approachable for students than the previous book used – The Other Slavery. The subject matter is different, but the themes are the same as they relate to Course Outcome 5. My hope is that by utilizing this book for the Socratic Seminar, students will have more success in achieving this course outcome than in previous years.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Of the 25 students enrolled, 23 completed the Socratic Seminar assessment on The Wordy Shipmates. Among those who participated, 23 passed the assessment, with 20 students (80%) earning a score of 70% or higher. Notably, 10 students achieved scores of 90% or above, demonstrating strong engagement and understanding. Two students did not complete the assessment.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** With 92% of students passing the assessment, the results indicate that the current instructional strategies and course materials are generally effective in supporting student learning. However, to close the assessment loop and continue improving outcomes, I plan to implement more structured pre-seminar activities to support the remaining students who struggled. These may include guided reading questions, scaffolded note-taking, and small-group discussions to build confidence before the full seminar.

Additionally, I will incorporate more opportunities for formative feedback throughout the unit to help students better prepare for the summative Socratic Seminar.

At the program level, I recommend continued support for professional development focused on facilitating student-led discussions and assessing critical thinking, as these are key skills reinforced in this type of assessment.

**Name**: Lindsay Groce

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   HIST/SCI 105 - Introduction to the History of Science (no specific course outcome)

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ My original project was to look at error analysis for my general chemistry series via an updated edition of the ACS exam, but I did not move quick enough to purchase them at the beginning of the year prior to the budget freeze and I missed my opportunity to get a new data set. I have built it into my budget request for next year and am hoping to follow up with general chemistry at that time.

So, pivoting, then. As an institution, we are looking at AI usage in the context of IO1 regarding Communication. I have always been reluctant to both personally use and want to incorporate AI in my classes, so I thought I would try to create an assignment this year that incorporated it and then collect some baseline data on student perceptions about it to see what I should do moving forward. I don't have any data about equity gaps to back this up because I am using my HIST/SCI 105 course and this is only the second time I have taught it, so there isn't enough data year to year to parse out any particular patterns in student success, but I think in giving guidance on AI usage in a different way than they might have seen or used it before, there might be a salutary effect in giving the tools to the less tech saavy, or English Language Learning students in the class. I am also trying to address my own anti-AI biases.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 The students completed a midterm project that involved writing a lab report about an important historical science experiment. This is the second year I have done the assignment, but this year, I incorporated an AI component. As like last year, I had to teach the students about how to write a good lab report, including the different sections required, and the particular features of each of those sections (Procedure, Data, Results and Discussion, etc.). This year, I did two things differently. First, I narrowed down the choices to some relevant historical experiments to the content we covered over the quarter (this was in response to some of the choices I got last year that left it too open ended and there were a lot of random ones). Second, I wrote a prompt for them to use in their choice of AI and I took a little class time to model how to do it with them and show them how it worked. The prompt asks the AI to act as that historical scientist and perform and interview about their specific work. I modeled with ChatGPT, but the students could use whatever they were comfortable with (thought the majority used ChatGPT).

Here was the information about the AI usage from the assignment (including the AI prompt):

"You'll start by doing some preliminary research on your chosen scientist and their experiment. Then, I want you to use AI to 'interview' your scientist about their experiment. You can use ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, or whatever else you're comfortable with. Here are some parameters/guidance for that part - start with this prompt:

"I'm a student in a History of Science class at a community college. We have a project where we need to interview an historical scientist about an important experiment they performed. I need you to act as that scientist and I would like to ask you some questions about your work. Is that okay? What information do you need from me to help with this?"

The AI will probably respond that it needs certain info and you will give it that information. It will tell you when its ready for you to ask questions. Make sure to ask at least 5 questions of the AI. Once the conversation is done, then thank the AI for the help with your project and copy paste the text into a Word or Google doc (this will be uploaded with your project, as well). The information you used from this conversation needs to be cited."

I also gave them information about how to cite the conversation with AI and looked for both the transcript as well as the citation as part of the score for the assignment.

Then, in a survey at the end of the course, I asked: "What did you think about the use of AI in the Midterm project? Pros/cons? Was it useful? Different than the way you've used AI in the past?" and collected that as data.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Keeping in mind that the goal of this assessment is to collect some baseline data on the student perception of this use of AI, there were some overall trends in the qualitative surveys. 22 of the respondents (n=24, it was administered with their final exam) liked, really liked, or loved the use of AI with the project. One of the students who didn't didn't do the midterm project and the other just said they don't like AI at all. Of the 22 that responded favorably, here are some representative comments:

"I quite enjoyed the midterm project, with the inclusion of AI it was different and engaging as we role played an interviewer asking questions to a public figure that came before us. I thought it was useful as it highlights a useful way we could use AI for the better in the future."

"I loved it. It was interesting and unlike anything I've done before."

"It was useful and helped me learn history and the use of AI at the same time. I've learned to assign it roles to receive better answers. It was different and it was worth it."

"I was really impressed by the use of AI in the midterm. I kind of didn't realize you could have AI do anything you want it to before I used it for that."

"THAT WAS SO COOL. I loved that project! I didn't even know AI could do that. I have 0 complaints because it was not hard and a great way to use our current technology."

"I like that we're implementing AI nowadays. I've never tried to use it to interview someone that was a great idea (after I interviewed Lebron James for fun). I thought it gave some pretty good insight, it was a direct answer to my questions, and was an interactive way to research."

"I found it really cool and I'm glad we addressed the fact that AI is a useful tool and when used for research as this it's a great way to have conversations you would've never thought possible."

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** My major takeaways from this are:

1. I obviously need to keep doing this project. The students really enjoy it and I think incorporating the AI (against my own wishes) was a good call. Seeing that the students valued the teaching them how to use it part made me feel good and that maybe I should beef up that part more.

2. I would like to take another run at that professional development that Jenni Richline did in the Fall. I started the course, but it was just too much on top of everything else this year and I didn't finish. Now that I have dived into the thinking (in no small part because of the work I DID complete in that course) about how AI could be incorporated in my classes, I think I'm better prepared to take on that workload. I hope that it will be offered again next year. I think this will just help in writing better and better prompts and helping me use the right language in teaching the students about using AI in a research context.

3. Thinking about institutional change based on this, I would just hope that it's an encouragement to the college to continue giving us resources and trainings on using and teaching AI. The students seem to really value shifting their thinking on it for different ways they can use it as a tool.

This was a very small project, and obviously not what I had originally planned. This means that the Chemistry department was light on assessment work this year and I take responsibility for that. I will hopefully remedy it with next year's work getting back to the ACS (as long as it's funded).

**Name**: Melissa Heaps

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   HSC/OPD 010 & 011 – English 1 & 2, HSC/OPD 015 Career Math, HSC/OPD0 016 – Algebra, HSC/OPD 017 – Geometry, HSC/OPD 021 – Non-Lab Sci, DVS 031 & 032 – Beginning & Intermediate ELA

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Program Outcome (PO) 5 of the Basic Education for Adults (BEdA) program states that students will be able to engage in respectful discussions on the concepts of diversity, inclusion, and equity. To support students in reaching this goal, BEdA instructors should have a strong working knowledge of these concepts. We have a large number of part-time faculty in BEdA; for the 2024-2025 academic year, we welcomed eight new faculty members to BEdA. Many of these instructors have professional backgrounds in areas other than education. This can create a gap in integrating diversity, inclusion, and equity into their teaching approach. Our goal was to use quarterly in-service meetings to introduce DEI educational methodology, so that instructors could better cultivate an inclusive learning environment.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 \*Note: For this year's assessment period, BEdA switched information tracking systems from WABERS to LACES, so we did not have complete access to data from our program. For this reason, we decided to focus on the faculty as a whole, rather than look at student data from specific courses.

We began the academic year by conducting a faculty survey during the BEdA fall in-service to establish a baseline on how comfortable instructors felt including best teaching practices in diversity, inclusion, and equity. A second identical survey was conducted at the end of the academic year, and the results from both surveys were anayzed.

During the Winter 2025 and Spring 2025 BEdA in-services, the full-time faculty provided professional development focused on building a shared vocabulary that includes best teaching practices in diversity, inclusion, and equity. We included best practices from the Faculty Assessment Toolkit created by Jeni Richline. We also included training from the ESCALA Cookbook, with a focus on making syllabi more welcoming to Latinx students. In addition, in the spring of 2025, all BEdA faculty were asked to complete a WA State BEdA 101 online training course, which included a section on DEI in the BEdA classroom.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​The first survey was conducted on September 19, 2024. Faculty were asked five questions about their confidence levels and experience in teaching students from different languages, cultures, and backgrounds. They were asked to rate their abilities on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree".

The survey also asked instructors to answer the following question: "I currently have some type of Equity or Respectful Classroom Conduct Statement in my syllabus." In the fall of 2024, instructors responded as follows: 8-Yes, 6-No, and 3-I'm not sure. In the spring of 2025, all instructors responded "yes" to this question. This data seems to show that the quarterly in-service training regarding inclusive syllabi language had a positive impact on Program Outcome 5.

With regard to the data on the five questions about instructor confidence levels and experience in teaching students from different languages, cultures, and backgrounds, in fall 2024 the scores ranged from 2,3,4 and 5. In spring 2025, the scores improved to 4 and 5. This would suggest that BEdA instructors increased their knowledge and confidence in areas of diversity, inclusion, and equity within the classroom.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on our results, we will continue to allot time in our BEdA in-serving meetings for teacher development in the area of diversity, inclusion, and equity. We would recommend that instructors complete ESCALA training. It is our understanding that part-time faculty at BBCC are only required to attend one department in-service per year. Because of the wide range of cultures, ESL/ELL learners, and non-traditional students in the BEdA program, and because we have a large number of revolving part-time faculty, we would recommend that BEdA faculty meet at least quarterly for in-service training, rather than just once per year.

**Name**: Justin Henley and Gina Cutts

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 6

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   IST 102, Technical Drawing Interpretation, #3 Demonstrate knowledge of drawing nomenclature, symbols, notes and abbreviations.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ We will assess student information retention regarding technical drawing nomenclature, symbols, notes and abbreviations from IST 102 into MPT 125 and MPT 145, and if there are any equity gaps.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 A pretest was utilized in MPT125 to measure students’ current understanding of print reading before giving them additional instruction on the subject moving forward in the course. Additionally, reflective discussions were used after providing a print reading review.

The MPT 145 class focused specifically on increasing knowledge of print reading and part analysis. The use of quizzes, projects, and lab exercises throughout the quarter assessed students’ current level of understanding.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​There was no significant Equity Gap found in MPT 125; with Female and Latinx students performing as well or better that Male/White. However generally, students reflected on not having as good a grasp on different view types, dimensioning standards, title block features and notes as they had thought.

In MPT145 the results did not explicitly highlight disparities among underrepresented groups or students with accommodation needs. However, it was observed that many students required substantial review and prompting them to engage in critical and independent thinking.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, additional assignments will be incorporated focusing on analyzing prints and their features as well as view standards. A flipped classroom model and interactive quizzes will be integrated into IST 102. This proactive approach builds upon successful strategies planned for other courses and aims to improve student success throughout the program.

**Name**: Rhonda Kitchens

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 3

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   LIB 101 Introduction to libraries and information resources Discuss academic integrity and plagiarism Formulate a research question Create search strategies and broaden keywords Discuss information formats and evaluation Overview of Internet research Demonstration and evaluation of databases Select, locate, and retrieve resources Create an annotated bibliography that incorporates academic-level research methodology

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ I collected 3 years and 9 classes of LIB 101 Module 7 where I ask three key questions:

Q1: Did you learn something you want to share?

Q2: What has your lowest point of this project been?

Q3: What has been your highest?

I believed that Module 4 was the difficult module, but I tweak it a bit each quarter. However, this review showed several issues and that Module 6, the module I thought of as a "break" was the hardest to many students. It uses three different evaluation methods on one scholarly article. The methods are WWWW, CRAAP, and Lateral Reading.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 This is a baseline. To be honest, I am not finished. I also see I may have a publishable paper. I am at 77 pages of notes and ideas. It is a qualitative method research. I am using thematic analysis. I am working on three different types of coding using word maps, ChatGPT, and some other basic methods like FIND on Word.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Q1: Students were excited to learn about Google Scholar (full text search), Boolean logic (search strategy), & database use. Many wished they had this information their first quarter. Some were very excited to learn about the areas where AI was working well and making a difference like healthcare and mental health. Others reflected on how procrastination hurt them in the course. Some were surprised how social media and other information sources didn't tell them about the larger and often positive artificial intelligence story.

“I didn’t know what AI was until this project. Now I get how it works and why people are scared and excited about it.”

“I was shocked how many fake sites are on the first page of Google. You really have to dig deeper.”

Q2: Students mentioned time management issues. They also found learning APA Style to be daunting. In Module 4, they found quantitative methods the most difficult to find. Module 6 was the most difficult and then Module 6. Module 6 is the research evaluation module. Module 4 is the finding a scholarly research article with quantitative and also another with qualitative methods. One use of mixed methods is aceptable.

“Every. Single. Source. And citations and references and the authors. I generally do not understand anything.”

“My lowest point was just turning in my work late because so much has happened in my life...”

Q3: Students were glad to gain confidence. Finding so many ways to look at research provided them with power. They liked quick, detailed, and personal feedback.

“I loved researching scholarly articles and reading them!”

“When I found an article that fit my topic exactly, I knew I could finish strong.”

“Professor Rhonda’s feedback videos really helped me know what to fix...I’ve never had that before.”

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** I am going to draw back from some scaffolding I did with APA Style and annotations. I am going to develop 2 deadlines a week. I felt that I had created a low stakes course, but students are changing. They have less time. I allow students to make up all points after feedback. Each week builds a final project. Nothing is wasted. However, students see the 2 credit hour class and it falls to the bottom of their time management practices. Perhaps, the course needs to be in their mind more, and have 2 weekly research assignments with 1 source each. I am going to change the introduction to have APA flashcards and varied introductions.

As to whole campus issue, teaching MLA versus APA Style does not support our transfer students. LIB 101 teaches APA Style. History courses teach Chicago. Chemistry uses ACA. Sociology uses ASA. We need to expose students to being able to work with citations of their profession. Copy/pasting URLs is not acceptable. Copy/pasting the suggested citation in a database, isn't going to help them in their academic journey.

My unrequired course should not be the first place BBCC students work with databases, varied source formats, documentation, synthesizing research, and ethical use of information.

ENGL not using library instruction and collaboration continues to be a disservice to students.

**Name**: Rhonda Kitchens

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   Library

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Taneka et al. (2021) suggests that Google is more real to students than the library itself. As the call for library instruction and drop in research questions fall, this project was undertaken to try to get ahead of change or fix what was at hand for information literacy at the William C. Bonaudi Library. First, as Taneka et al. finds, faculty doesn’t speak information literacy. They speak about media literacy, lenses, and critical thinking. Meantime, studies show that students want to be self-serve versus asking for help.

On Wednesdays, I answer questions from all over the globe but especially America with an emphasis on the West coast. Faculty are assigning research. Students are asking for help. I help more students from California higher education institutions than I do here at Moses Lake, Washington.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 A survey that in Spring 2024 was only answered by 11 faculty. This wasn't enough to get any statisitcally valid information.

I want to fill in the missing two portions of the assessment I didn't have time to do and have the survey added to the Spring inservice in order to get more respondents.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Not enough respondents. Want to try again with the help of administration.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** TBD. Spring 2024:

In response to this 2024 assessment, I will implement the following beginning Fall 2024.

Change instruction goals from students to Faculty and Staff beginning Week 0.

Use posters to reach students about Library resources and service, not just for events.

Create a “more than a laptop...” campaign.

Create real office hours

Continue to blend the four identified statistical areas. For instance, Ask a Librarian transcripts need to be reviewed individually to collect data.

Create a marketing campaign that highlights resources and support.

Create and sustain associate faculty efforts

Go back 3 years and check in on “new” faculty

Continue to monitor and follow up on MCOs

**Name**: Michele Reeves

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 2

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   Math 132 - but this assessment is tied to all courses and all Program outcomes - the form just doesn't allow for that

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ We have a 19 point gap in 2.0 or higher success rates for Hispanic students vs. white students in online classes. In Hybrid classes that gap is 6%. Several other factors have been removed from this data so it does not reflect issues addressed since the end of 2024 AY.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 • We surveyed for student input on F2F methods that are especially helpful to their success. This assessment will be a two year process as this year we are implementing some F2F classes and plan to see which portions of those classes are helpful and could be modified to be included in online classes. The resulting data will drive changes for the 2025-2026 AY

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​We surveyed students at the end of Spring quarter in Math 132 (f2f/hybrid model) Here are the results:

Overall Theme: In-Person Learning Helped Most Students Succeed

What Helped Students Succeed:

• Hands-on activities and manipulatives made math easier to understand.

• Face-to-face explanations helped clarify confusing topics better than videos or readings.

• Peer discussions and small group work helped reinforce concepts and build confidence.

• Real-time Q&A with the instructor made it easier to stay on track and get specific help.

• Exit tickets and practice problems in class were useful for memory and test prep.

• Visuals and step-by-step instruction supported students who identify as visual learners.

 Social/Emotional Benefits:

• In-person class helped students overcome shyness and feel more comfortable asking questions.

• Many felt more motivated and accountable attending class weekly.

• Hearing other students' questions provided reassurance and built a sense of shared struggle.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Would Students Have Been Successful in an Online-Only Format?

• Most said no. Common reasons:

o Difficulty focusing or understanding the material alone.

o Poor internet access at home.

o Lack of direct interaction with the teacher and peers.

• A few students said they might have managed online, but preferred in-person for better engagement and comprehension.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Notable Quotes:

• "Face-to-face made the difference. I would have been lost watching just videos."

• "The hands-on experience and being able to ask questions on the spot helped me understand."

• "I don’t like watching lectures online — I wouldn’t have learned anything."

• "Sketch notes, group work, and having the teacher explain things were key to my success."

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to attempt the following in several classes:

Implement Optional In-Person Study Groups Facilitated by bilingual student workers or peer tutors

• Scheduled weekly with a clear focus (e.g., “Math Tuesday,” “ECE Discussion Hour”)

• Incentivize participation with small extra credit or swag

• This action is dependent on the hiring of a bilingual student worker who is in year two to facilitate this

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Bilingual Peer Support Boards

• Set up informal Spanish-language discussion spaces in Canvas or Yellow for optional participation

• Use prompts that ask students to explain concepts or share strategies in either English or Spanish

• Train bilingual student workers to monitor and encourage respectful, supportive interaction

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. Weekly "What Helped Me This Week" YD posts

• Students record 1-minute videos explaining what strategy helped them the most

• Helps normalize challenges and build community asynchronously

• Encourages metacognition and peer modeling

4. This is an ongoing problem. Students readily admit they perform better in face to face classes but also continue to enroll mostly in online classes. We will continue to try various strategies to close the achievement gap for hispanic students in online classes

**Name**: Math Department

**Institutional Outcome**: Quantitative Reasoning

**Program Outcome**: 2

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   Math 99 and Math 141, We focused on success rate overall in the transition from 99 to 141, more program outcome

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ We will consider how race and gender play into successful transition from MATH 099 to MATH 141.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 We were interested in student success in MATH&141 after taking the redesigned MATH 099 (or 099X) course that did not have a MATH 98 prerequisite. We requested data from IR to break down MATH 141 students who completed MATH 099, including data sorted by race and gender. We compared data from the 2022–2023 academic year (Fall, Winter, Spring) to Fall and Winter data from the 2024–2025 academic year. We excluded 2023–2024 data to ensure maximal cleanliness of our data.

We updated MATH 99 curriculum in the summer of 2023, after our first data set and before our second data set. We obtained this data from Institutional Research & Planning on pass rates for MATH&141 for students who previously completed MATH 99 at a 2.0 level.

We changed the scope and sequence of MATH 99 in hopes of increasing success rates across the board. We added additional support with more videos along with concomitant summary and reflection questions in pre-made notes. We hope that these changes will foster higher thinking during lectures.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Success rates went from 37.5% to 36% which is not a significant change indicating the change implemented in the summer of 23 had no statistically significant impact on student success rate. Comparing gender and race revealed no significant changes in terms of equity gaps.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** These results suggest that the issue lies not with our curriculum but with the emporium model itself, specifically as our student body has evolved since its implementation. Long term data suggests that since Covid the emporium model is not adequately serving students.

Starting in 25-26 we are piloting a live lecture version of all pre-college math courses in response to this year’s assessment data and student feedback and in hopes to meet students where they are at and form better student teacher relationships. ESCALA training emphasized being asset minded and playing to common strengths of Latino students responding well to relationships that can form in the traditional classroom setting, both peer to peer and teacher to student.

We have been allowed to pilot the in-person lecture next year and we hope the college continues to support us in change to help student engagement and success. As potential class changes need to be made it might be helpful to have access to curriculum stipends that would help student success.

**Name**: John Owens

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   MUSC 134, Beginning Group Guitar

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ This assessment focused on musical communication. Specifically, using a blues progression and scale, students applied melodic and harmonic structures to demonstrate blues form and create improvised solos within specified parameters. This was done in a group setting (jam session) with a focus on students ability to communicate musically through improvisation.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 After students had a solid grasp on the fundamentals of playing the guitar, they were provided the melodic (scales), harmonic (chords), and rhythmic tools to play the blues and improvise. Once the musical core was established, students were given a pre-test to see how they musically communicated in a "jam session." Over the next 6 weeks students were guided through a method that added one note per session to use for improvisation, which focused on rhythmic ideas and playing "the right" notes and "rhythmically responding." At the end of this instruction (treatment) students took a post-test focused on their musical communication and improvisation.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​While the intention was to give the students a strong foundation of the blues rudiments prior to improvisation, students mastered the fundamentals over time and through repetition. Regarding the one note at a time approach to blues improvisation on the guitar, this seemed to work very well. During the pretest 14% of the students were able to improvise and communicate musically based on the blues structure and 42% of students could improvise at a nascent level, but not really communicate fluidly. After the treatment and the time of the post test, 92% of the students were able to improvise within specified parameters and 85% were able to communicate musically, which means to improvise and rhythmically interact within the blues structure (progression, strumming patterns, rhythms, etc.).

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** The note-by-note approach to musical communication within the blues form and improvisation worked well. Almost all students in the class were able to improvise to some degree and most (85%) were able to hold a musical conversation and not just go through the changes and scales at a beginning level. While these results were good, I believe the improvisation skills can be started on day one and taught simultaneously with other fundamental aspects, such as chords, note reading, scales, and so on, as this was how students learned anyway. While the idea was to have students learn the guitar basics, then improvise (how improvisation is traditionally taught), they seemed to learn it as they were still mastering the fundamentals of the instrument. In response, the next step will be to start improvisation on day and treat it like all the other skills on the guitar.

**Name**: Katherine Christian

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 2

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   none

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ The Medical Assistant program has struggled with enrollment and retention for several years. One of the identified issues was the length of the clinical program and lack of readiness for the courses.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 We met with employers and students to identify concerns

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Lack of success in HED support courses made it difficult for students to progress in the program; Friday classes were a barrier for many students

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** with 23-24, the curriculum was revamped to put Medical Terminology and the HED 121 as pre-requisite courses; we also combined MA 111 with 112 and renumbered as 115, revised 113 and renamed as 114 so that students had only two clinical courses after the prerequisites. We moved the courses to Saturday rather than Fridays. While enrollment was still lower than desired, retention was improved; 90% of students enrolled in MA 115 completed 116 as well. We want to continue these changes and work at improving the pipeline through HED 119 and 121.

**Name**: Emily Eidson

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 4

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   NUR 135, Nursing Skills Lab I, Course Outcome 5) Demonstrate safe medication administration procedures for a variety of routes.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ In this course in Fall 2023, faculty noted that several students did not pass the medication administration check-off on their first attempt. In fall of 2023, only 70% of students passed the medication administration skills check-off on the first attempt. Historically, this lab has had a poor first-time pass rate, with only 48% of students passing the medication administration skills check off on the first attempt in Fall of 2022. Faculty determined that action needs to be taken to improve this initial pass rate.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 For our assessment activity, faculty wanted to determine if they could make changes to the preparation for this lab to improve the first-time pass rate for the medication administration skills check lab. Faculty added one more practice day to the skills lab schedule. The focus of the extra practice day was to have students practice recalling and communicating important information about each medication to the patient as they administered medications, which is an expectation in the skills check off and consistent with the patient’s right to education about the medication as well as in alignment with safe medication administration practices.

In addition, faculty delayed this skills lab by one week later in the quarter. Faculty discussed that student success could be impacted by the demanding schedule that students encounter during fall quarter of their first year in the program. Therefore, delaying the medication administration lab and skills check seemed reasonable to try to improve both student success on the medication administration skills check as well as overall attrition rates.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​The medication administration skills check had a success rate of 69.5% on the first attempt. This is a slight decrease from 70% the year prior. Therefore, it seems that adding an extra day of practice and delaying this lab and skills check by one week did not seem to impact student success in this skills check.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** After discussing results of the assessment in our faculty meeting, we intend to keep the extra practice day and delayed schedule to see if it will help future cohorts, recognizing that each cohort of students is unique and therefore if would be helpful to assess any potential impact over several years. In addition, faculty have discussed adding additional pre-work in which students practice providing patient education on the medications they may see during their skills check.

**Name**: Emily Eidson

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 4

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   NUR 235, Nursing Skills Lab IV, Course Outcome 6) Apply critical thinking to selected scenarios.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Level 2 students are expected to utilize their assessment skills and clinical judgment to determine appropriate interventions for select patient scenarios as part of their skills checks. In fall of 2024, students were noted to have difficulty utilizing assessment and clinical judgment to determine appropriate interventions for patients in selected scenarios. Students are required to pass a skills check on previously learned level 1 skills. However, rather than just perform the skill, students are provided a patient scenario in which they must assess the patient, determine the concept of concern based on their assessment findings, communicate findings to the provider, and then perform the skill as instructed. Students were noted by faculty to have difficulty utilizing assessment skills in this skills check, and rather were very focused on the task only instead of the assessment that leads to the task. In fall of 2024, only 82% of level 2 students passed their level 1 skills check on the first attempt. With this data and the noted task-oriented mindset of students who did not pass on the first attempt, faculty determined that level 1 students should receive specific instruction in spring quarter to better prepare them for the assessment-based format of level 2 skills checks. The hope is that students will be better prepared to utilize assessment data to determine appropriate tasks in their skills check of level 1 skills in the fall quarter of second year.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 With this data and the noted task-oriented mindset of students who did not pass on the first attempt, faculty determined that level 1 students should receive specific instruction in spring quarter to better prepare them for the assessment-based format of level 2 skills checks. The hope is that students will be better prepared to utilize assessment data to determine appropriate tasks in their skills check of level 1 skills in the fall quarter of second year. Therefore, faculty implemented a new skills lab in NUR 137 in which level 1 students are introduced to the format that will be utilized for level 2 skills checks. Students were provided a patient scenario, asked to perform an assessment, determined concepts of concern with guidance from faculty, and then communicated their findings to the “provider” (aka the faculty member). At the end of lab, faculty debriefed with students to review expected assessment process and actions, as well as review the expectations in level 2 skills checks. By doing this, we are hopefully better preparing students for success in NUR 235 skills checks in their second year.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Since our classes are only running once a year, we have yet to see the impact of the changes made in NUR 137 on the success rate of the level 1 skills check in NUR 235. We will monitor the success rate on the first attempt at passing the level 1 skills check and determine next steps at our December 2025 faculty meeting.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Since we have yet to see the effects of our assessment activity, we do not plan to make any further changes at this time. However, faculty does plan to add a simulation for level 1 students in their fall quarter that focuses on utilizing their assessment skills. We hope that this continued focus on building assessment skills in level 1 students will have an impact on the success of level 2 students in their skills checks and beyond.

**Name**: Dennis Knepp

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   PHIL210 Ethics, course outcome 4: Evaluate important topics in a philosophical manner

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ I looked at the success gap between Hispanic students and overall in my PHIL210 Ethics course.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 Final grades as recorded in the Success Dashboard with success defined as 2.0 or better.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​I looked at the success gap between Hispanic students and overall. Hispanic students Fall 2022 had a success rate of 70% compared to 87% overall and the class was a hybrid that met twice a week in the mornings. Hispanic students in Fall 2023 had an 80% success rate compared to the 95% overall and the course met twice a week in the afternoons. Fall 2024 the course met twice a week in the mornings and the Hispanic student success rate was 100% compared to the 96% overall.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to offer my philosophy seminar courses in the mornings.

**Name**: Samuel Shuman

**Institutional Outcome**: None

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   PHYS&221 Engineering Physics I, [CO3]: Solve various problems using the problem-solving strategy of drawing a suitable diagram, listing the knowns and unknowns, deriving a proper equation, substituting for the given values, and obtaining a numerical value for the unknown.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ I want to address the inequity between running start and non-running start students in PHYS&221. Last year, only 5/9 non-running start or former running start students achieved a 2.0 or better in PHYS&221. By contrast, 9/10 running start students achieved a 2.0 or better.

My hypothesis is that this difference in outcomes stems from non-running start students struggling in MATH&151 (Calculus I), which is a corequisite and is often taken concurrently with PHYS&221. This is supported by last year’s data. 8/13 running start students achieved a 2.0 or better in MATH&151 last Fall, while only 3/12 of the rest of the students in the course achieved a 2.0 or better.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 This assessment focused on rewriting my homework assignments to make sure I evaluated students on skills beyond applied calculus and algebra. My intention was that students that are struggling with MATH&151 should still have a way to show their understanding of physics concepts. To deemphasize calculations in the homework grade, some of the problems (called “Context-Rich Problems” in the syllabus) required students to be more in depth about how they set up the problem as well as requiring them to make sense of their answer by drawing on other resources or comparing to their own experiences. The additional setup evaluated in Context-Rich problems allowed me to evaluate CO3, while the requirement that students check that their answer is sensible evaluated PO5.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​There are several limitations in evaluating the effectiveness of this assessment that I would like to start with. First, I do not have access to information regarding whether specific students are running start or non-running start, so my analysis is limited to the students who have discussed that with me. Second, to my knowledge, the dashboard does not yet include data for the 24-25 academic year, so it is difficult to evaluate how this may have affected success rates in the course. Third, this is my first year at BBCC, which means there have been many changes from how the course was run last year; changes in success rates cannot be attributed to something as specific as how I structure my homework assignments. With those caveats out of the way, I will still attempt to draw some reasonable conclusions from my experience with context-rich problems.

First, the context-rich problems have been a great way to evaluate student understanding. It forces them to make sense of their answers and relate the math they are doing to the physical phenomena that it represents. This is a very important part of doing physics, and I have been happy to students grow at this skill throughout the year.

Second, based on my anecdotal understanding of which students were in running start, the context-rich problems did not seem to close the equity gap in the way I had hoped. My non-running start students seemed to struggle significantly more with the context-rich problems than they did with standard calculation problems, which undermines my initial assumption that the gap might be explained by a difference in math-readiness between the two groups.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** I will definitely continue to use context-rich problems as an assessment tool next year. Sensemaking and good communication are important skills, and I am not willing to compromise on evaluating those skills. That being said, I may need to scaffold the context-rich problems a bit more at the beginning of the term to make sure they understand the expectations.

I will take some time and have discussions with colleagues about other ways to close this equity gap. I cannot think of any changes the college as a whole should consider at this time. However, I do not think the gap between running start and non-running start students is limited to physics and math, so it is worth considering what is contributing to this and how we can better support non-running start students.

**Name**: Christopher Riley

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 4

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   POLS&202: American Government

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ According to college data available on the BBCC Institutional Research Course Success Dashboard, an achievement gap exists between students who are over the age of 20, but younger than 24, and students who are younger than twenty years. The younger cohort completes the course with 80% success rates while the older cohort completes with 63% success rates. There is irony in this given that the majority of students enrolled in the course are Running Start and thus consider themselves too young to be involved in the political process.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 A research and discussion assignment tied to the course outcome in Yellowdig—a social-media-type discussion board. This assignment will be used across two quarters with the second incorporating any necessary changes from the first attempt.

In order to best demonstrate their understanding of political issues and institutions, it’s been our belief that students should be allowed to freely express their opinions based upon research. The goal is to assist students in forming their political beliefs in a non-confrontational, non-judgmental arena in which they are encouraged to take risks and not simply provide the information they think their professors want to see.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​To attempt to better engage the older students, the assignment asked that student relate their observations to recent US Supreme Court decisions which might have an impact upon themselves or members of their families. What we discovered was that there was no discernable difference from one quarter to the next. Students who responded directly to the discussion prompts included articles and videos to illustrate their opinions, and those who avoided the prompt tended to critique the Supreme Court roleplay taking place concurrently to the discussion. In both cases, those students who were engaged were active in sufficient measure to achieve the points on offer for the assignment. In Fall quarter 73 percent of the students participated fully in the discussion. In the spring quarter, 46 percent participated fully. Lesser numbers in both quarters either participated minimally or not at all.

The main difference between the two quarters in terms of the assignment was that if the fall quarter, it arrived during the third week, and in the spring, students completed it during the eighth week. Student enthusiasm in their courses and assignments can be impacted by the timing of those materials in relation to holidays, seasons, and the proximity of graduation. They can also be impacted by class dynamics, which may be at issue in this case. The spring quarter class was caught in a large-scale measure of cheating on quizzes by the professors in the fifth week of the quarter. Following this, scores dropped generally as students adjusted to the stricter expectations for their online assignments. Several also withdrew from the class.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, we are still unable to determine why students older than 20 years tend to perform worse than those younger than twenty. The blunt reality is that faculty cannot legally request that students reveal their ages in order to perform an assessment of an achievement gap, any more than we could request any other demographic information listed in the available dashboard. As a result, it was impossible to determine which students within the various age groups performed better on the assessment. Additionally, the results of the single assessment—let’s call them assignments since that’s what they really are—are lumped into the course success number provided by the college’s data collection system. As a result, there’s no way for faculty to be able to determine whether the individual assessment was successful in closing the achievement gap. Other variables are at play which are not measured or recorded overtly, but which are included within the final course success numbers. As a result, although changes are being made to the course, there is no way to know whether these will have the desired impact based upon the assessment datasets available to us.

Due to the nature of the information provided to faculty from the institutional research dashboard regarding student success, it’s impossible to be able to find correlation between an assessment assignment, achievement gaps identified by the dashboard, and the institutional or program outcomes.

The worthlessness of this approach was discussed at length in the department’s audit in 2024. Although it appears the college is attempting to address some of the issues raised within those pages, the college appears unwilling to address the true problem—that its course success data is ineffective at assessing its institutional or program outcomes using the single-assignment/quarter, one-and-done system.

Our recommendation to the college is that it hire an assessment professional whose job is to redesign the entire program—including how it relates to institutional outcomes, the college mission, and vision—and stop asking faculty to perform the impossible, to wit seeking to explain how a course grade average can explain an achievement gap in the ability of students to clearly communicate. See—we closed the loop on that one!

To put it more simply: the college needs to assess its assessment program to determine whether it’s really measuring what it thinks it measuring. (hint—it’s not!)

As a suggestion—perhaps a better approach could be to develop a college-wide assessment program in which courses from across campus are chosen randomly, faculty are trained in the desired institutional outcome, and data collected on across the chosen course, rather than a single assignment or pre/post test. These don’t measure student improvement levels or demonstrate the effectiveness of instruction within a particular outcome. For example: if the outcome were “cultural humility,” faculty would be trained in what this means to different elements of the institution, and given opportunities to work together to develop methods of instruction which could be easily implemented across the chosen course over the length of an assigned year. The datasets created would be based not on demographic dashboards tied to the overall success rates of a course without the ability to break that apart in meaningful fashion. Instead, they would be reflective of an actual study performed across multiple quarters with faculty able to easily discern the results in a manner actually useful to the institution.

Of course, this still leave the elephant in the room—how does a single course faithfully represent an entire department or program?

**Name**: Suzanne Reilly

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   SOC&101, Students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively. Communicate sociological concepts, theories and findings through writing and speaking, follow appropriate norms of small group and classroom discussion interactions by listening to fellow students and responding respectfully.

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ In previous quarters students had difficulty communicating effectively about sociological theory on assessments.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 In Fall quarter, I will ask students to do peer review of group work in which I ask students to discuss sociological theory. Peer review will allow students to share a draft of an assignment related to sociological theory with a classmate and to get feedback on the clarity of their understanding of theory and their ability to communicate it through writing. I will conduct a comparative examination of student responses regarding theory on the midterm with their responses in Winter quarter.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​In Fall quarter, I had students review and evaluate each other’s written work on sociological theory in order to receive feedback on how their understandings of theory could be improved. In this activity students discussed the three major sociological theories and reviewed each other’s written work. In Winter quarter, I did not do this activity. For my assessment activity, I compared student responses from Fall and Winter on the same essay question on theory on the midterm. The responses to the essay question in the Fall were much better than in Winter.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to incorporate more peer review and discussion of concepts in my class. It appears that talking with peers and peer review of each other’s work helps to stimulate thinking and improves communication around these more abstract concepts.

**Name**: Angela Waites

**Institutional Outcome**: Communication

**Program Outcome**: 1

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   SPAN& 121 SPAN I SPAN& 122 SPAN II SPAN& 123 SPANIII

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ In Spanish, verb endings (conjugations) indicate a tense and subject. In order to communicate one’s thoughts correctly, and to understand what others are trying to communicate, it is necessary to recognize and use these verb endings. Some students of the language grasp this concept and these patterns more easily than others and are able to understand others, as well as communicate their thoughts. Other students do not gain an understanding of these concepts as quickly and therefore struggle to understand what others are saying to them as well as to communicate their own thoughts.

With this assessment, I am seeking to provide scaffolding throughout the quarter to help students recognize the conjugation patterns for Spanish verbs.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 • At the beginning, middle and end of Fall quarter, I gave a “pre-test/post-test” to students in SPAN 121 to assess students’ recognition of present and past tense verb endings. I did not provide any intervention to students during this quarter and any recognition of correct conjugations in the post-test came from common daily class observations. Likewise, the same procedure was followed in SPAN 122 during Winter quarter.

• In Winter quarter, I gave the same “pre-test/post-test” to students in SPAN 121. However, I introduced intervention activities every two to three weeks that gave specific instruction on verb conjugations.

• In Spring quarter, I introduced the intervention activities to the SPAN 122 section. I then compared the scores of the pre- and post-test for SPAN 121 and SPAN 122 students to determine if the intervention activities improved verb conjugation recognition.

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​SPAN& 121, Fall 2024 pre-test scores are as follows:

• 50 students completed the the pre-test in the two SPAN& 121 sections for Fall 2024;

• the average score on the pre-test was 7.36/15, or a 49% average;

• Post-test scores for students who continued on to SPAN& 122 were 71% without intervention activities which was 22;

SPAN&121, Winter 2025 pre-test scores:

• Enrollment in SPAN& 121 during Winter 2025 was much smaller than in Fall 2024 with only 11 students completing the pre-test. Average scores for these students was the same as the Fall 2024 average score: 49%;

• Due to poor attendance, only 6 students were present to complete the post-test for this quarter. The average for the post-test for this section was 65%, a 16% increase from the post test.

My interest in using this assessment tool was based on the past trends of enrollment in Spanish 121 through 123. Generally, students who enrolled in Spanish 121 continued into Spanish 122 and Spanish 123. I believed that would be continued during this academic year and I would be able to compare the scores on pre-tests and post-tests with the same students over the different quarters, with and without the intervention activities. My hope was to therefore be able to assess whether student comprehension of the grammatical concept of verb conjugation could improve with intervention activities over only the use of the current language acquisition methodology of TPRS. However, with the exception of very few students, the students who enrolled in SPAN& 121 in Winter quarter did not enroll in SPAN& 122 for Spring quarter so I was unable to adequately compare the learning from quarter to quarter.

There was a significant improvement in pre-test (49%) and post-test scores (65%) in SPAN& 121 for Winter 2025. I don’t believe, however, that the improvement can be seen as statistically significant due to the small number of students participating in the assessment for that class.

There was a large number of students who did continue from SPAN& 121 in Fall quarter 2024 to SPAN& 122 in Winter quarter 2025. I did not utilize the intervention activities with those students however, since that was not part of the assessment plan. Interestingly, I did see a significant improvement from the scores on the pre-test (49%) to the post-test for these students (71%), without utilizing intervention activities, which would seem to indicate that student comprehension of common verb endings in present and past tense conjugations was absorbed even without the intervention activities.

\*A side concern about this assessment tool is that there were heritage speaking students enrolled in all quarters who took the pre-test and post-test. Due to their experience in the language, their scores (oftentimes 95-100%) skewed the percentage even higher on the pre-test.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** • Based on the results of the assessment:

 I would like to continue using similar intervention activities for hybrid courses as a supplement to in- class instructional methods. The intervention activities were useful for certain students who prefer this type of instruction. Additionally, many universities continue to focus on grammar centered instruction and continuing to utilize these types of activities will be a benefit to any students who choose to continue language courses if they transfer to a university. In the future however, I would ask students to self-select as heritage speakers and true first-time language learners so to that the results are more indicative of growth in comprehension.

• Will these results change the way you teach? Why or why not? Do the results confirm some aspect of your teaching?

 As mentioned above, I will continue to use the intervention activities as online content as a supplement to in-class instruction. The results from the SPAN& 121 Fall to the SPAN& 122 Winter quarter does seem to indicate that the pedagogical methods used already in our Spanish courses (TPRS) is allowing students to naturally acquire the understanding of the verb conjugation patterns in Spanish. I would really like to utilize this assessment tool again and see if there are similar results with future classes.

**Name**: Shawn McDaniel

**Institutional Outcome**: Quantitative Reasoning

**Program Outcome**: 5

**Course(s) and Outcome(s)**:   WLD 151, WLD 206, WLD 207

**What equity gap are you seeking to address AND what is the problem/concern you are attempting to resolve through this assessment?**​ Economically disadvantaged students show a lower success rates. We are attempting to use additional resources and tools to assist with instruction.

**What tools/measures did you use for your assessment (what did you do for your assessment and why)?**

 Pretest - post test

**What were the results of your assessment**?

​Adding additional resources and training helped increase the students' scores related to measured quantitative reasoning.

**What now? How are you going to close the assessment loop or what changes are you making to your program as a result of this assessment? AND/OR If not addressed above, what changes or recommendations do you have for the college as a result of your assessment?** I plan to continue to provide additional resources and individualized assistance where appropriate.