Approximately 207 SLO cycle assessment forms were submitted for the 2009-2010 school year, a 15% increase over the 2008-2009 school year (180 forms). Upon reviewing these forms, specifically the Course Improvement and Process Effectiveness sections, the following categories of improvement were noted. (Please note there are more than 207 comments below because faculty members frequently mentioned more than one way the SLO process allowed them to recognize possible course and SLO strategies for improvement.)

**Pedagogical Improvements**

There were 84 comments describing the following pedagogical improvements: revised assignments, changes in class activity sequence, added demonstrations, increased or revised in-class and/or out-of-class activities, more spent time on critical thinking, assignment instructions redesigned for increased transparency; study guides provided; and more individual assistance made available to students.

**SLO Process Improvements & Verification of Student Learning Outcomes Process**

There were 26 comments describing how improvements are being made to the SLO process: increased number of F/T and P/T faculty getting involved in outcomes process, learning assessments reconsidered, valuable assessments derived from exam results, SLOs divided into more outcomes to increase assessment validity, increased number of faculty using the same assessment tool to make assessing data easier, positive results from the strength training program, and confirmation of rubric efficacy. There were at least three comments about the challenge of getting faculty together to discuss the outcomes process and increase participation.

**Verification of Learning**

There were 59 comments about the degree to which students were achieving the course level outcomes: increased percentage of students demonstrating acquisition of outcomes and improved knowledge of students’ abilities and skills. Faculty members are starting to compare data collected one semester to another semester and compare online with face-to-face classes. For example, through a cross-semester comparison, it was noted that less plagiarism occurred because it was being better addressed in class.

**Improvements to Evaluation Techniques**

There were 25 statements describing how faculty members planned to make changes or additions to evaluations. Faculty are considering various assessments and changing them through this process; for example, while one instructor was moving to multiple-choice assessments another was abandoning them. Other assessment changes included adding a log to record student progress, adding pre/post tests, adding performance tests, changing the timing of assessments, and increasing the number of DSPS visits per student.

**Emphasis on Communication Skills and Study Habits**

There were 28 faculty comments describing measures they’re using to improve the writing, reading, and study habit skills of students: Tutoring Center referrals, books placed on reserve at the Library, reminders for students to buy course books, course textbooks replaced with more stimulating textbooks, source citation rubrics included, more student-friendly illustrated texts, more time spent on bibliographies and papers, a lab session dedicated to scientific writing, English issues reviewed, an increased number of students attempting class exams, and plagiarism and English language issues discussions. Several comments concerned students being unprepared for the demands of their current course level and of courses being more challenging than students expected.

**Miscellaneous**

Eleven respondents either left the miscellaneous section blank or commented that there would be no improvements based on assessment of data.

Three faculty members expressed a need for more assistance with the SLO process. These comments indicated a need for more opportunities to dialogue about the SLO process, improved faculty participation, added financial assistance for SLO trainings, and the implementation of an institutional mechanism for ILO compliance.