

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) GENERAL EDUCATION

Academic Year:	AY 18 – 19	SU18	FA18	WI19	SP19
Annual Due Date:	8.9.19	Due Date:	Due Date:	Due Date:	Due Date:
Annual Submitted:	8.23.19	10.1.18	2.1.19	4.26.19	7.26.19
Campus:	Los Angeles	Submitted:	Submitted:	Submitted:	Submitted:
Prepared By:	René Bruckner	10.1.18	1.31.19	4.26.19	8.23.19

The General Education program is assessed according to the program learning outcomes.

Upon successfully completing the General Education program, students will be able to:

- GELO 1: Compose written communications in English with precise command of usage, organization, and expressive form.
- GELO 2: Discuss ideas with clarity and composure in oral communication settings.
- GELO 3: Execute research plans, from the initial identification of information needs through to the evaluation and utilization of findings.
- GELO 4: Utilize quantitative information with understanding of its applicability in real-world settings.
- GELO 5: Formulate conclusions/solutions as the result of a creative, critical thinking process.

Deadlines

Quarterly IERs are due Week 3 of the following quarter. Annual IERs are due Week 5 of summer quarter of the following Academic Year. Actual dates indicated in header.

Assessment Method

PLOs: Direct Assessment of student work.

Based on the course rubric, assign a score:

- Goal: > 3.0 0 = Not Present
 1 = Novice
 2 = Developing
 3 = Proficient
 4 = Accomplished

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

GELO 1: Compose written communications in English with precise command of usage, organization, and expressive form

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale 0-4.		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writers Workshop	18	1.64
F335 Production Workshop 3	15	2.73
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 GEOs were assessed according to GELOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writer's Workshop	39	1.67
GH152A History of Crit Analysis 1	33	2.21
HUM314NR MP History: Film Noir	18	2.5
Capstone: F335 Prod Workshop 3	14	2.75
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>This GELO received more assessment attention in Fall (along with GELO 5), after Summer quarter focused more on other outcomes. Four courses were included, adding up to a total of nine sections, covering the full range of levels. The results are essentially in line with expectations, with a typical score of 1.67 in the first year English Comp course, climbing incrementally to 2.75 in Production Workshop.</p> <p>However, the goal for that capstone-level course is to see scores at or above 3. In the assessment meeting, the discussion showed that instructors are encouraged by improved "mechanics" but not so much in the "presentation/development" of the essays.</p> <p>One other note on the scores: GH152A is a prerequisite for the higher level MP History course that was measured. The results this quarter help us to see whether there is improvement from that lower level course to the upper level cinema studies courses. The improvement is there—HUM314NR scores over ¼ point higher than its pre-req.</p> <p>Plans for improvement: The new Comp II course, just launched this quarter, will incorporate an earlier draft of the artist's statement. This will not be a full class for another 1-3 quarters, as it is part of the new GE requirements and will take time for new students to reach it. The artist's statement project is one of the concrete plans in the overall attempt to make the GE/Cinema links more active and obvious from early on in the degree.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writer's Workshop / HUMA101 Composition I: College English	30	1.55
HUMA201 Composition II	4	1.38
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	10	2.45
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>The scores in this GELO were low this quarter in all three courses assessed. There are a few factors that could explain the dip in each one. Taking them one at a time:</p> <p>In the assessment meeting, instructors reported seeing a very wide range of preparedness as well as a wide range in students' work ethic/commitment to the course. The overall scores ended up lower than they have been over the past few quarters, but still squarely within the range between "novice" and "developing." Plans for improvement: Instructors discussed some strategies for managing a class group with a wide range of skills coming in.</p> <p>Composition II: the sample size is very small (4 students). Secondly, this is a new course that ran for the first time in Winter 2019. The students who are eligible to take this course and for whom it is a requirement (new program students), were all transfer students from other schools. Plans for improvement: Given the small class size, we won't draw any major conclusions or make any decisions based on this quarter's data. Future sections of the class are expected to be more populated, and populated by students who've matriculated through CCH's intro course.</p> <p>The scores in Production Workshop were also lower this quarter, dropping from their previous comfort zone above</p>		

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

2.7, down a bit to 2.45. This is a course in transition, and Winter quarter did see an increase in writing support for the students working on the essay used in assessment. However, as the added support was still new, the instructors did not feel it had fully taken effect yet. Most students did not take advantage of the writing lab, as they were not required to do so, and there was only one visit to class by the writing instructor suggesting they make an appointment.

SP19

Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writer's Workshop / HUMA101 Composition I: College English	18	1.40
HUMA201 Composition II: Reading, Writing, Thinking	13	2.05
HUMA310 Critical Studies: Art, Media, Culture / G252A Hist. of Critical Analysis in Cinema 2	13	2.50
F335 Production Workshop 3	13	2.50

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

After seeing downward movement in all GELO 1 measured courses from Fall to Winter, we now see scores at different levels going in different directions from Winter to Spring. A few separate notes:

At the freshman level, the downward movement continues, leading us to ask questions about the possible reasons. There are multiple factors at play, so we will plot out some steps to take. **Plans for Improvement:** What appears necessary is further evaluation of why scores continued to drop for two quarters straight, and what has contributed to seeing scores below 1.5 (our aspiration for first year composition would be much closer to 2). In the assessment meeting, instructors did not seem to have any answers, but expressed some frustration. Breaking down the scores by performance indicator, we see that while scores are a bit below 2 in Mechanics of Writing, they are slightly lower in Presentation/Development of Writing; this was true in Winter 19 as well, but less pronounced. This may indicate that the assessed artifacts (final papers) are being given less time for revision and refinement. The coursework in the class has not changed (the team of instructors has remained fairly consistent and they have not changed their respective syllabi over the past 3 quarters), but the attention to presentation, organization, or overall cohesiveness of the writing is nonetheless decreasing. **It would be overly hasty to deduce that incoming students are arriving with lower writing competency, but this is a possible explanation that we will keep testing with our future assessments.**

At the year two level, the scores showed an upward swing. This quarter's average, at just over 2, suggests that (a) this new course is becoming more effective with more iterations; (b) the larger sample size tends to show us a score more in line with general expectations of a second Composition course; and (c) the plan to emphasize student use of resources (writing lab) could have had a positive effect.

In the new third year course, HUMA310, scores appear to be more in at the lower end of an expected third-year range at 2.5. A factor that may limit how much we can conclude from that score: the course was cross-listed with an old program course, GH252A, which has CLOs similar enough that all coursework could be identical for the whole class, but with different prerequisites. As such, half of the students in the class had fulfilled the Comp II prereq, while the other half had fulfilled the GH152A prereq. Glancing at the numbers by which code students were signed up for, we can see some more detail. Five out of the seven students in HUMA310 scored above 2.5 in GELO 1, while no student in GH252A scored over 2.5. In this small sample size, students who had to have taken at least 2 composition courses tended to be more competent at writing than students who had one or fewer required Composition classes under their belt. This is not only one of those moments where assessment shows the obvious, but is also a good reality test, to show us that our hypotheses about competency scaffolding are affirmed by our assessment process.

The average for senior students in F335 bumped back up slightly this quarter. The average is still well below the aspirational number of 3+ for graduating seniors. **Plans for improvement:** It has proven difficult for the team who teaches F335 to devote in-class time and attention toward the essay assignment. It appears that more full attention to the writing portion of the class may have to wait until the transition over the coming year into the new Cinema program's **split thesis course** sequence (TW 1 2, 3 + CPD 1, 2, 3). In the meantime, the GE Faculty Lead will make further attempts to work with the PW 1, 2, and 3 students. In addition, as we launch the first GE seminar course this coming Fall, some of the burden of assessing near-graduation students in this GELO.

GELO 2: Discuss ideas with clarity and composure in oral communication settings

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale 0-4.

Goal:	Average > 3.0
-------	---------------

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

SU18		
Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	21	2.22
F335 Production Workshop 3	15	2.83
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 GELOs were assessed according to GELOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
Capstone: F335 Prod Workshop 3	14	2.71
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Significant efforts have been put into the design and launching of the new required course, HUMA105 Fundamentals of Oral Communication. With its first ever section running in the Winter 19 quarter, this course will soon be a regular, multi-section staple in the measurements. A first look at it will be featured next quarter (or the quarter after, depending on enrollment).</p> <p>In PW, the one course where GELO 2 was measured for Fall, we saw a 3% drop after a series of three very consistent quarters in a row. We'll keep tracking that to see if it is a trend or an outlier. The PW presentations will be managed differently after a staffing change, so the next few quarters will be telling.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH304 Mythology & Symbolism	15	2.43
Capstone: F335 Production Workshop 3	10	2.9
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Long term plans for GELO 2 assessment include regular inclusion of scores from the new required course, HUMA105 Fundamentals of Oral Communication. The course launched in Winter 19, but its students were not assessed because, as a brand new requirement, enrollment was low (only 4 students) and, due to unexpected circumstances, the instructor was not available after the end of the quarter to participate in scoring them. We will use the Spring 19 sections, which are considerably more populous, to start establishing a baseline set of Oral Communication scores for Freshmen.</p> <p>The two courses that were assessed, an upper level literature course and the Cinema capstone course, give us a snapshot of the oral communication skills of (mostly) upperclassmen. The students in Mythology & Symbolism scored within the middle-zone between developing and proficient—not as high as we would hope to see for a 300-level course. However, on closer analysis, the actual levels of the students in that section ranged widely from freshman to senior (this is a familiar symptom of the prior program's design). Looking in more detail, matching scores with the students' class level, the numbers appear quite in line with expectations after all. This makes the 2.43 average less concerning, but it also limits how much significance we can place on the average. It is worth noting that the instructor gives clear and detailed instructions on what a presentation should consist of, and uses a rubric to break it down. The students who scored well in indicator A, relation, were the ones who attended closely to the rubric's components and seemed to have practiced ahead of time. However, the faculty doing the assessing noted that Indicator B scores seem to be partly contingent on personality rather than effort or proficiency (i.e., it is difficult to assign high scores for participation to students who are shy or less talkative, and easier for more outspoken students to score higher). Plans for improvement: Indicator B, participation, has shown itself to be an area that needs attention. This should be the subject of a set of discussions with faculty to review the effectiveness of the GELO performance indicators that were put in place in 2017 (not just about this indicator, but all of the GELO indicators we've now measured for two years to attain the averages).</p> <p>When it comes to PW, the capstone course, graduating seniors' scores on GELO 2 have continued to climb closer to proficient. It stands to reason that the persistent focus on composition and preparation is continuing to bring the scores up slowly. We will keep monitoring that progress, especially as students matriculate through the new program having taken the new foundational course in this competency.</p>		
SP19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
HUMA105 Fundamentals of Oral Communication	15	1.77
HUMA310 Critical Studies: Art, Media, Culture / G252A Hist. of Critical Analysis in Cinema 2	12	2.29

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

F335 Production Workshop 3	13	2.54
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>This quarter's GELO 2 assessments look at a wider range than over the past two quarters, giving us a chance to triangulate the oral communication competency at the initial benchmark level, a third year level, and near graduation. The data shows some positive signs, but also some need for work.</p> <p>In its first quarter being measured (and in its second quarter of existence), we get a benchmark score in HUMA105 Fundamentals of Oral Communication, which was explicitly added to the curriculum to provide that first-year oral communication benchmark. The coursework used here was different for the two sections (as instructors were given a few quarters to craft their sections before we ask them to share notes and build some level of consistency), so we will refrain from deriving too much meaning for this quarter. One section was measured in a mid-quarter persuasive speech assignment and the other in a Week 9 debate assignment. Nonetheless, the rubric provided a good norm and a yardstick for how both kinds of assignment can make visible the specific performance indicators we measure (relation and participation). Average scores are neither alarmingly low or surprisingly high.</p> <p>Another new entry into the GELO 2 assessment process this quarter is GH252A/HUMA310. The course also shows some useful insights and room for improvements. For a third year course, we would hope to see numbers much closer to 3, if not at that goal. As with all of the other GELOs, however, we can take a closer look to see that the students enrolled in GH252A, with the pre-req of GH152A only, averaged lower than those enrolled in HUMA310, with its pre-reqs of 2 composition courses (and in many cases, it is likely that the students enrolled in HUMA310 also came prepared with an introductory oral communication course as well, either HUMA105 or, in many of these students' cases, as a transfer credit). Even still, the scores are lower than desired. We will keep an eye on this class to see if, as our population begins to matriculate through the GE curriculum that requires HUMA105, the scores get better.</p> <p>In PW3, after a significant improvement during the 2018 AY, we now see slippage back downward in to oral communication scores. The PW faculty report that much of the problem here, this Spring quarter, has to do with the historically large number of students in this course pressing its resources to the breaking point. The key factor regarding GELO 2 is that the time and effort students are given to prepare and rehearse their final presentations has drastically reduced. Plans for improvement: Work with the PW team to try and restore more time and attention to the presentations.</p>		

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

GELO 3: Execute research plans, from the initial identification of information needs through to the evaluation and utilization of findings

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale 0-4.		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writers Workshop	18	1.36
GS406 Theories of Performance	7	2.93
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 GELOs were assessed according to GELOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writer's Workshop	39	1.59
HUM314NR MP History: Film Noir	18	2.39
GN444 The Posthuman Experience	7	3.1
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Information Literacy scores appear to be moving in a positive direction. At this point in the cycle, GELO 3 is measured more extensively. In the three courses, a total of 6 sections, 54 students were assessed (as compared to 3 section, 25 students in the Summer).</p> <p>In GH101 Writer's Workshop, the rise in scores is likely due to the fact that significantly more attention was placed on research this quarter—Fall was the first time instructors were asked to require GH101 students to complete Credo's online Info-Lit Modules (tutorials, videos, and quizzes about research). The scores on indicator B, "utilization" of information, were noticeably lower in previous quarters. In Fall, they came up closer to the level of the indicator A, "research."</p> <p>In HUM314NR, an upper level film history/analysis course, research was the focus of the final paper. Scores are moderate, but could be considered a little low for a course in the 300 level. No real disparity between the two performance indicators here. The instructor's thoughts were generally that research skills are developing, and tend to be inconsistent, in the group at this level.</p> <p>In GS444 The Posthuman Experience, scores are above 3, which is excellent. Students progress through a process in which research is done, then checked and critiqued; by the time they finish, if they've put in the effort, they generally achieve a proficient/advanced level. One student out of his group of seven did not get there this quarter, but all others made it to the 3-4 range. As in past quarters, if there is inflation here it may be more because of self-selection, as this is an elective course. See plan for improvement below.</p> <p>Plans for improvement: Continue to track whether performance indicator B improves further or levels out in the first year composition course. From here on, the Info-Lit Modules will be a staple of that course and the new Fundamentals of Oral Communication course. That is intended to give a strong foundation in research skills as well as the understanding of what information literacy is about, appreciation for its importance. We will follow the eventual developments with interest.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writer's Workshop / HUMA101 Composition I: College English	30	1.42
HUMA201 Composition II	4	1.25
GH304 Mythology & Symbolism	15	2.63
GS251 Social Psychology of Sex & Gender Roles	8	3.0
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>In the lower division courses, GELO 3 scores are somewhat below norms and expectations, and in the upper level courses they are closer to previous scores (although still below our ultimate goal). Taking the courses one at a time: We see a drop in the scores for GH101/HUMA101 here. Plans for improvement: All instructors will require students to do the Info Lit modules, and discussed strategies for successfully incorporating info literacy into the final</p>		

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

paper. We will keep an eye on the scores going forward looking for more consistency across sections.
 In HUMA201, the scores for GELO 3 are notably lower than the scores in the prerequisite course, but this can be seen as an anomaly, for the same reasons noted in the GELO 1 scores (see above).
 Mythology & Symbolism was populated by a wide range of class levels, as discussed in the GELO 2 notes above, and as with that GELO, on close inspection the scores here tend to line up with the student's level, generally.
 The upper level Social Science course assessed this quarter shows outcomes are being consistently achieved at the proficient level, with an average of 3.0.

SP19

Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writer's Workshop / HUMA101 Composition I: College English	18	1.46
HUMA105 Fundamentals of Oral Communication	15	1.73
HUMA201 Composition II: Reading, Writing, Thinking	13	1.97
HUMA310 Critical Studies: Art, Media, Culture / G252A Hist. of Critical Analysis in Cinema 2	12	2.33
BHVS321 Topics in Social Psychology	6	2.92

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

Information Literacy was a major focus in the planning of this GE curriculum. As we teach in the new programs, the hope would be to see the 1st year average score increase, and a year later, to start seeing the 2nd and 3rd year courses improve. While the 1st year scores have not increased steadily each quarter, there is an overall upward movement; this Spring is still lower than the high spike in FA18, but it has climbed slightly since W19. This means there is nothing concerning or particularly noteworthy in this quarter's Writer's Workshop / Composition I scores for this GELO.

There is, however, some reason to closely monitor the SP19 scores in Fundamentals of Oral Communication and Comp II. As the second and third parts in a 3-course sequence, we do see the competency level to increasing incrementally, but not reaching and exceeding 2 just yet. In the scoring meeting the discussion revealed that the Oral communication course, which is still in an earlier stage of development in this curriculum roll-out, has a less solidified approach to supporting Information Literacy. With the Comp II course, the sense was that students are simply not coming through the process just yet, as more than half transferred in the prerequisite and this show varying levels of readiness. **Plans for improvement:** FT Faculty Lead will work with the Oral Communication instructors to shore up their use of the online Information Literacy modules AND to better emphasize research and usage of info as a key component of the coursework.

The upper level courses show some variation in this GELO. GH252A/HUMA310 is difficult to interpret, as is the case with this new, cross-listed course in all of the GELOs. We will mainly be using this quarter's scores as an initial glimpse or benchmark for future assessments. As in the other GELOs, the GH252A students' scores trended lower than those of the HUMA310 students, suggesting that **more preparation through college level composition prerequisites is beneficial when it comes to information literacy.** The HUMA310 students averaged a 2.50—still somewhat below aspirational goals for a third year course, but reasonable nonetheless. The upper level behavioral science course BHVS321 shows advanced students working at a higher level, much closer to the goal but still shy of that goal of 3. **Plans for improvement:** We will continue to see, as students matriculate through the lower levels of the new GE curriculum, whether info lit competency continues to increase. We look forward to being able to measure information literacy (and other GELOs) in a GE seminar course, to be offered for the first time in the Fall. Once factor making assessment difficult thus far has been the simple fact that CCH's curriculum structure allows for a wide range of students to take upper level courses. Gradually, this will cease to be the case and our assessments should be somewhat more useful as a result.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

GELO 4: Utilize quantitative information with understanding of its applicability in real-world settings

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale 0-4.		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GN105A Math Essentials+	13	1.8
GS217 Technology & Pop Culture	6	2.5
GS406 Theories of Performance	7	2.36
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 GELOs were assessed according to GELOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GN105A Math Essentials+	17	1.91
GN444 The Posthuman Experience	7	2.79
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>In GN105A, Fall marks a third quarter in a row of slow but steady increase. No significant changes have been made during those quarters to help explain this; it could be just normal fluctuation.</p> <p>The instructor involved in this quarter's GELO 4 assessment expressed a concern about institutional support for students with difficulties in math. While the student peer tutoring program often suffices to give struggling students the help they need, he reports that there are also students for whom that program is not enough. Additional help from a math expert is needed. The instructor reports that the assessments do show an effect of this lack.</p> <p>In GN444, the scores are just below proficient, but still higher than the comparable courses measured last quarter.</p> <p>Plans for improvement: In the immediate future, the required Math course is getting some slight retooling, and the instructor is working on instituting a Critical Thinking aspect to the coursework. Most likely, this will include some questions on quizzes and exams that will allow us to judge students' ability to create a hypothesis about data and then solve the problem (reach a conclusion) by using Q.R. In other words, an integration of Q.R. into critical thinking tasks that will allow us to better gauge Q.R. and C.T. from cross angles.</p> <p>Further, based on the GN105A instructor's concerns about tutoring, we are looking into establishing a lab or tutoring service led by a math instructor.</p> <p>In the longer term, more rigorous training in Q.R. is in the process of being institutionalized, as more of the science and social/behavioral science courses have been asked to emphasize it. The new GE curriculum is structured so as to give a more complete picture, with upper level courses that make a point of teaching Q.R. and requiring coursework that gives students quantitative challenges.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GN105A Math Essentials+ / MATH101 General Math (cross-listed)	16	1.53
GS217 Technology & Popular Culture	17	2.24
GS251 Social Psychology of Sex & Gender Roles	8	3.06
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>Winter 2019 brought new level of institutional support for Q.R., as the Math Lab was introduced during the quarter. During the first weeks of W19, the instructor for GN105A (now also MATH101) reiterated his concern about the need to have a math instructor tutoring students with higher needs (there were specific students in his section with more need than could be fulfilled by a peer). As a result, the academic team fast-tracked the hiring of an experienced math and science instructor who would be available to tutor. Beginning mid-way through the quarter, he set up shop in the library computer lab for 2 hours per week (the 2 hours preceding the on-ground math course's meeting time). On the first week, the tutor met with the GN105A instructor to go over the syllabus and coursework, and also introduced himself to the class, encouraging them to come see him for help on homework and studying. The Math Lab is being administered similarly to the Writing Lab that was launched in 2017. We have started with 2 hours per week to gauge how much demand there is, with an expectation to grow those hours if needed. The tutor is paid the non-teaching hourly rate for the time, and keeps record of each student he sees by having them fill out a standard</p>		

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

form, much like the Writing Lab form.

Two Social Science courses were used for the upper level Q.R. assessment this quarter. Insights from those two courses are difficult to draw from the averages alone, but it may be valuable to note the difference in approaches taken by each instructor:

In GS217 Technology & Pop Culture, the instructor uses a pair of exercises in class to gauge Q.R. The first uses a linear multiplication problem involving presidential candidates and how many hands they are able to shake over a given campaign, given a certain presumed rate. The instructor encourages students to stop at certain points in their work on this question, to assess whether the numbers they are getting seem reasonable. These two problems are carefully designed math exercises, which stand quite apart from the course topic and are given by the instructor as a sort of supplement, which does not get used in their larger projects.

GS251 Social Psychology of Sex & Gender Roles, tests students' Q.R. within the research and analysis they do for a specific project related to the topic of the course. Students conduct research on their chosen paper topic and are required to utilize quantitative data. They are assessed on how proficiently they analyze it, make needed calculations, and then communicate the implications and draw conclusions based on it. The motivation behind their work with the numbers, in this project, is partly to support their research and argumentation.

The standalone GS217 exercises led to a lower average in Q.R. than the GS251 approach in which Q.R. was integrated into a research project. We may speculate that, on the one hand, the more "motivated" quantitative work in GS251 led students to do better on it. On the other hand, the more "pure math" exercises could be taken to be more accurate, as they are expertly designed to measure exactly what this GELO is looking to assess. These two readings are not mutually exclusive, but they do lead us to ask whether something like the "pure" Q.R. assessment may be more organically incorporated into coursework in order to inspire more focused attention on it.

Plans for improvement: The two Social Science instructors will be asked to converse about the differences in what they use to gauge Q.R., with the explicit goal of asking whether it is better to integrate it into a larger class project or keep it separate. This will be a topic to return to the next time the GS217 course (or similar course by the same instructor) is on the schedule again—most likely in the Fall 2019 quarter.

SP19

Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GN105A Math Essentials+ / MATH101 General Math (cross-listed)	17	1.74
HUMA310 Critical Studies: Art, Media, Culture / G252A Hist. of Critical Analysis in Cinema 2	13	2.81
BHVS321 Topics in Social Psychology	6	2.79

Comments & Plans for Improvement:

Quantitative Reasoning received well-rounded assessment this quarter, with first, third, and fourth year courses represented.

The scores in Math Essentials+ / General Math are back up a couple of points from last quarter and very close to the average over the past 4 quarters. Instructors noted that the added option of a faculty tutor (in addition to previously available peer tutoring support) has helped give more support for students they see struggling.

The scores in the two 300-level GE courses are not far apart from each other, but both are a little below the goal of 3. Comparing the score in BHVS321 to the scores from upper level Social/Behavioral Science courses over the past year, we see fluctuation up and down, with this quarter's score being average in that category. We can make use of the scores in GH252A / HUMA310 as a benchmark going forward, as that course will continue to be measured for GELO 4 during terms when Q.R. is focused on. **Plans for improvement:** CCH's math instructor team have been asked to evaluate the Q.R. assignments used in this course, and to make recommendations for how it might be improved.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

GELO 5: Formulate conclusions/solutions as the result of a creative, critical thinking process

Assessment Method: Review student work. Assign score based on rubric. Scale 0-4.		
Goal:	Average > 3.0	
SU18		
Course Code and Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	21	2.36
GS406 Theories of Performance	7	3.36
F335 Production Workshop 3	15	2.47
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
SU18 GELOs were assessed according to GELOs of the previous program version, data, summary and plans for improvement are indicated in the FY 2018 IER.		
FA18		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH152A History of Crit Analysis 1	33	2.08
HUM314NR MP History: Film Noir	18	2.36
GN444 The Posthuman Experience	7	3.0
Capstone: F335 Prod Workshop 3	14	2.68
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>This GELO was a slightly higher point of focus in the assessment cycle Fall quarter. One additional course was added compared to the previous 2 quarters; we had not measured Critical Thinking in an upper level Humanities course recently, so the 300-level MP History course was added, with intention of giving a rounder picture of this outcome.</p> <p>The score for GH152A dropped significantly, but looking back further, the fluctuation is not surprising. That course's scores in C.T. have swung wildly. This could be a delayed adjustment to the recalibrating process we underwent 2 quarters ago (see last year's IER), but it may also be indicative of a basic design flaw of this course. Previous data and faculty discussions have suggested that the CLOs and some of the material for this course are simply geared toward more advanced students, and the students taking the course tend to be at a range of levels. In assessment meetings, it is often reported that those who come into the course with less background knowledge and skills (and study habits) tend to struggle and it shows very clearly in the C.T. performance indicators.</p> <p>The relatively low scores for the graduating PW students has been a concern (it was at 2.47 for the past 2 quarters). We see an uptick of almost 5% this quarter, a positive sign if it continues in coming quarters. However, this quarter's score of 2.68 is still below the aspirational 3+ for graduating students. The issue here may have more to do with the coursework used to assess students than with the students actual abilities (see plans for improvement).</p> <p>Plans for improvement: For GH152A, the plan is already underway, in that the course is being taught out and we will hope that the new GE structure has solved the mismatch problem of student level vs. course expectations.</p> <p>For PW, the longer term plan is also underway but will take longer to see results. Again, the new GE design has a stronger focus on the core competencies in general, all of which support GELO 5. If the curriculum succeeds in this regard, this should help scores go up in the long run.</p> <p>Probably more significant, however, is the fact that PW's coursework is not ideal for measuring Critical Thinking. The solution will be the upcoming ability to measure C.T. at the pending grad level in GE courses. We are better able to use assignments that are consistent and effective for measuring C.T. in those courses. Focus over the next few years can be on putting more such courses (400 level humanities and social/behavioral courses) into the schedule and using those to assess this GELO. Eventually the teach-in will reach the point where we will begin offering the planned senior Seminar courses, which will be more centrally designed to look at GELOs than this thesis course is able to do.</p>		
WI19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GN105A Math Essentials+ / MATH101 General Math (cross-listed)	16	1.47
GS217 Technology & Popular Culture	17	2.44
GS251 Social Psychology of Sex & Gender Roles	8	3.06

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Comments & Plans for Improvement:		
<p>This quarter's GELO 5 assessment was based on a different set of courses than previously assessed. One reason for this is to move away from reliance on courses in teach-out (such as GH152A History of Critical Analysis) and also reduce the need to assess F335 Production Workshop for this GELO, as the instructor team has continued to find the coursework inadequate to do so.</p> <p>The other reasoning behind the change this quarter was to focus on courses that explicitly incorporate quantitative reasoning as one of the tools students use to perform their Critical Thinking. The results were not overly surprising but still useful. In the introductory math course, the CT scores were lower than they have tended to be in our History of Critical Analysis. The metric being used here is quite different: unlike in a critical analysis context, the math instructor is using word problems to gauge how successfully students can first recognize what needs to be done to solve the problem (develop a position) and then follow through to find a solution (reach a conclusion), all based on QR. In Critical Analysis, this process is generally based on a combination of outside information (research) and pure reasoning, rather than on math. Thus, the lower scores here suggest that QR, as one of the tools that can be used for CT, is less well developed in the population of students taking this intro math course. This can be added to the evidence we see in the GELO 4 assessments, that QR appears to need more attention in the curriculum. When it comes to conclusions specifically about GELO 5, we will have to consider the other two courses assessed this quarter along with this one.</p> <p>GS217 Technology & Pop Culture has now run twice, and served to assess GELOs 4 and 5 both times. The instructor uses two different assignments to assess the two different GELOs. Critical Thinking is assessed based on the students' large final project, in which they postulate how popular culture would look different if a certain technological development had not taken place. They engage in a detailed world building process in groups, and present the world to the class. QR plays a part in how their critical thinking advances this project, but so do other critical tools (especially research and the taking of logical steps). The complexity of the project, and the openness of the project, probably contribute to the scores being below 2.5 in a class of this level. The instructor also reported that some students in the group did not engage fully with the project, which brought the average down.</p> <p>GS251 Social Psychology of Sex & Gender Roles is a course we have assessed in past quarters, and its numbers have been consistent, right around the proficient level. The instructor uses the students' research project to assess this GELO (the same project used to assess GELO 3). It is a project for which students choose a socially relevant issue to research and write about, and generally this course's larger topic provides ample subject matter for students to find a topic that they have strong personal feelings about, leading them to remain engaged in the projects. The instructor clearly defines what is expected (including the analysis of quantitative data) and tracks each student's progress individually, checking that they develop clear theses and follow through with their research and argumentation—all of which appear to lead to a high success rate of students' level of proficiency in this outcome.</p> <p>The overall state of Critical Thinking in the student population is difficult to ascertain. We used Math and Social Science courses this quarter in order to gain some insights about how well students use quantitative data in the critical thinking process. Overall, we can feel good about the improvement from the intro Math course through to the upper level courses. However, the instructor for the intro math course may need a few more quarters' practice at administering questions with Critical Thinking in mind, for us to draw more confident interpretation.</p>		
<p>Plans for improvement: We will continue tracking CT in various courses, and return to this focus on QR again for the Fall 2019 assessment cycle. This trial assessment focused on QR will have to be revisited then, but we seem to have established a good baseline.</p>		
SP19		
Course Code & Title	# of Students Measured	Average score
GN105A Math Essentials+ / MATH101 General Math (cross-listed)	17	1.53
HUMA201 Composition II: Reading, Writing, Thinking	13	1.88
HUMA310 Critical Studies: Art, Media, Culture / G252A Hist. of Critical Analysis in Cinema 2	13	2.65
BHVS321 Topics in Social Psychology	6	3.21
Comments & Plans for Improvement:		

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Isolating the Critical Thinking scores this quarter, we appear to have a predictable progression from lower to upper level courses that makes sense. The scores in the first through third year courses are a little below aspirations, but not to an alarming extent. In last quarter's comments, the concern was that there had been some downward trends visible. However, keeping in mind that the types of courses assessed changed significantly from Fall to Winter, we can now see that the change in that previous period may have been more the result of the change in the process. With more consistency in the process going from Winter to Spring, we also see more consistency in the scores.

That said, there was one new course assessed this quarter, HUMA310 / GH252A, which was a new addition in all GELOs, above. Here we can break down the scores of students in the two different courses cross-listed, to get a more useful third-year benchmark going forward. Since the HUMA310 will no longer need to be cross-listed in future quarters (GH252A will cease to be offered), for future comparisons, it is worth noting that the GELO 5 average for HUMA310 students was very slightly higher than the overall average. HUMA310 standalone average for GELO 5: 2.71 (with GH252A average at 2.58). The discrepancy here is fairly minor, but consistent with the sense from other GELOs that the increased leveling of pre-reqs may be positively effective in Critical Thinking as well (HUMA310 requires Comp II, Oral Communication, and Comp I, while GH252A only requires GH152A).

Plans for improvement: Overall averages are still falling below the goal of 3. The question we need to approach is, on the assignments we are assessing, could an increased attention to the explicit instructions and expectations/rubrics help engage students to perform better in these specific indicators? And further, would stronger and more explicit attention to those performance indicators in first- and second-year courses have the desired effect of instilling lasting habits in the third year and beyond? Again, this quarter we are only beginning to settle into a consistent progression with the courses being the same from quarter to quarter. We will continue tracking the scores and discussions with instructors in next quarter's (SU19) assessment meeting will revolve around how to stress critical thinking habits in assignment/rubric design.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) GENERAL EDUCATION

QUARTERLY SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

Summer 2018	
Summary Comments:	<p>Overall, the notes written above for SU18 are not positive. This is not because there were no positive improvements in what our courses are accomplishing. It is more a result of gearing the notes toward areas that need improvement (constructively). The basic summary is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The curriculum design is continuing to make it difficult to fully analyze the data, but this quarter I took a closer look at some of the numbers behind the averages in the GELO scores and found some useful insights. Along with that same point is the fact that certain areas continue to point out holes in the curriculum (most obviously this quarter, in GELO 4 Q.R.). We also continue to see shortcomings in Written Communication. 2. A final not-so-positive comment has to do with the continued trend of low scores on the survey question about whether GE informed students' production work (thesis). This is extremely important information to bear in mind. <p>And just to point out a few positives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The notes from the GELO meetings show that our instructors are feeling comfortable with the adjusted process (having the meetings and coming to consensus on each student). By and large they seem to appreciate the opportunity to consider their students and their courses from the angle that this approach provides. The two instructors who worked on the Quantitative Reasoning GELO were particularly happy to be part of the process to analyze and improve what we do in that area. 4. The new process (developmental rubrics, meetings, consensus on scores) is also getting us more valuable data already. Aside from the instructors' being on board with it, the numbers themselves make a clearer and more reliable picture than we saw going back to Winter 2018 and earlier.
Plans for Improvement:	<p>Improvement plans in the specific GELO notes are inflected by the fact that GE is primed to transition from the existing GE structure to a newly designed structure to go along with the new majors. While this new program was not officially rolled out in Summer quarter, those changes are subtly inflecting all of the courses whose instructors are involved in redesigning their classes (meetings have led up to a number of new CLOs, courses redesigned to conform to the new structure, etc.—and the “old” versions of those courses have already begun to incorporate some of those ideas. See the notes on Writer's Workshop for one example.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lots of planned improvements (we hope) can be seen in the new GE design, which starts its launch this Fall quarter in a few courses and will launch more fully in 2019! 2. Those low scores on Q #6C on the survey will continue to guide some work on curriculum in a number of ways. Plans are in place from the very first courses students will take, up through the thesis experience, where GE courses and discipline courses alike will be tuned to feed each other more productively and in more evident ways to the students themselves (see notes on that question's SU section for explanation). 3. The GELO scoring meetings are going well and instructors like the process, but also time-consuming. The simple fact that the instructors are all part-time means that the meetings are generally pressed for time. It would be helpful to have more full-time GE faculty. That is a long term hope, but in the short term perhaps we can take the assessment meeting schedule into account while building the next quarter's schedule? That would allow us to try and book the instructor meetings in better

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

	coordination with those instructor's classes as well as coordinating all of that with the staff involved.
--	---

Fall 2018	
Summary Comments:	<p>Generally, the insights from this quarter revolve around two developing curricula: the new program GE requirements and the relatively new online courses.</p> <p>The assessment process itself has settled into its new form. We have completed three quarters with the developmental rubrics and assessment meetings for the GELOs. Instructors have made some minor adjustments to their approach in class and in scoring, but the consistent assessment process is making the data more useful.</p> <p>New GE curriculum: The teach-in of CCH's revamped GE structure will be a major part of the process for helping resolve the issues that are noted each FA18 section above. Of course, this will be a gradual change, timed with the 3+ year teach-in/teach-out process. This applies to the three most clear, actionable issues from Fall, which are interrelated: (A) the concern that Written Communication outcomes are not being met at a high enough level in PW; (B) the continued concern that students in PW are not seeing a strong enough connection between their GE experiences and their major/thesis projects; and (C) the concern that Critical Thinking scores are low in PW, in this case perhaps because of a general</p> <p>Online courses: On a smaller scale, there were issues raised about the online courses in both the Summer and Fall instructor evaluations (Assessment 9.A). The issue is that students are rating their online courses & instructors lower than students have been rating those same courses/instructors for on-ground courses.</p>
Plans for Improvement:	<p>New GE curriculum: [referring to at A, B, and C in the summary comments directly above] (A) may be helped by inserting a writing coach into PW, or if not that, otherwise putting in place strategies that will the students' focus and effort on the written essay. At the same time, the new GE curriculum is set up to preemptively address this earlier on, in a very specific way, with the artist's statement assignment in Comp II. (B) may have the same solution as A, essentially, to link the student's career identity early on in Comp II with their writing skills. Other solutions implanted into the new curriculum follow the same logic, such as the inclusion of media industry-related work in Fundamentals of Oral Communication, the addition of more structured film and media studies/history coursework, etc. And (C) will be helped by working toward more GE courses with appropriate coursework for measuring Critical Thinking in the at or near graduating population (as explained in the FA18 GELO 5 comments).</p> <p>Online courses: Questions about the online course offerings will be addressed as a joint effort with the Director of online education and the GE chair at the Chicago campus, as explained in the Assessment 9A comments.</p>

Winter 2019	
Summary Comments:	<p>The teach-in of the new Cinema program began this quarter, which meant that the newly structured GE curriculum needed to continue rolling out at full speed ahead. As noted last quarter, this process is expected to help fill many of the gaps and resolve many of the lingering issues that have not been filled/resolved through minor changes and patchwork. Of course, that process will be slow. For the time being, we are seeing scores and survey responses that reflect upon both the new program(s) and the program in teach-out; the students in the college are now a mix of two populations, those being taught in and those being taught out. These concluding comments will only be able to make substantive comments on the "legacy" population and their respective</p>

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

	<p>programs.</p> <p>The previous Cinema and Cinema/TV programs allowed for students to progress deep into their college experience before taking fundamental GE courses such as Writer's Workshop and Math Essentials+, thus leaving the assessment process in the fog about how to evaluate overall progress. Average scores have tended to combine students from all levels. This issue continues to have an effect on the interpretations of GELO scores above, especially in classes filled mainly by legacy students. We try to look in more detail, when possible, at the correlation between scores and class level. Over the past few quarters, wherever we have taken time to do that closer look at the scores, we see some increase in scores for students who are further along, but in many cases we also see the opposite: students who have been at the school longer do not necessarily build their skills. This is old news, but in this particular quarter what we saw was a more direct correlation. In other words, students who are further along did appear this quarter to have higher scores, for the most part. This may reflect positively upon those minor improvements we've endeavored to make for the past two years, to shore up the GE curriculum.</p> <p>We see both positive and negative movement regarding graduating seniors, both from assessments and their survey responses. The positives include a continued upward trend in oral communication proficiency and an upward movement in how positively quarter's seniors view their core competencies. The negatives are in the continued fluctuation in the written communication scores (downward this quarter) and the drop in students' perception of how relevant the GE curriculum is to their work in cinema.</p>
<p>Plans for Improvement:</p>	<p>New program population: This group of students is still very small and it is too early to draw conclusions yet. They are just begin to make their mark in the data from this quarter's GELO assessments and student evaluations.</p> <p>In future quarters we will make some efforts to assess sections that reveal data from each group distinctly from each other, as much as possible. The goal will be to allow us to analyze each population's progress while also maintaining a sense for the cross-programmatic, mixed population courses' effectiveness.</p>

Spring 2019	
<p>Summary Comments:</p>	<p>Overall, the Spring quarter's GE assessments and other numbers showed no cause for alarm or celebration: most fluctuations were minor and most of the above analysis points to a need for continued work in the same areas identified over the past few quarters. That said, there are some areas of concern to address, and some promising signs to highlight.</p> <p>Promising signs: This quarter ushered in the new 3rd year GE requirement, HUMA310 Critical Studies: Art, Media, Culture, which was cross-listed with the old program course, GH252A History of Critical Analysis in Cinema 2. This cross-listing was serendipitous because it provided a direct comparison between students who entered the course with differing prerequisites. In every GELO category, the students who came to the course with the HUMA310 prereqs of a pair of composition courses scored at least a little higher than those whose prereq was GH152A History of Critical Analysis 1. This highlights one of the key issues that the GE redesign was meant to address: the poor scaffolding of GE courses that could allow students to advance to second and third year courses with one or even zero core composition courses. Furthermore, even though there was a small sample size here, we do get the suggestion that the stacking of two composition prereqs may be partly responsible for increased core competencies.</p> <p>Also, we saw a general uptick in the areas of student input this quarter (both the student evaluation averages and the two pending graduate survey questions) which had threatened to be moving in downward directions last quarter and prior. This uptick is especially reassuring when we consider the graduating senior group, which was</p>

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

	<p>historically large, and as a group they were below the norms on several other survey questions. This tells us that students' perception over the past year has, at the very least, not trended downward.</p> <p>Areas of concern: Many of the GELO scores in upper level courses continue to fall below the goal of 3. It is worth noting that we are still measuring students whose lower level work was done in the less carefully structured previous curriculum, but we still would hope to see more improvement based on the large number of changes that have been made and that affect all courses, not just the new ones. The trouble may partly be inertia: the simple fact that courses that had been operating with certain assumptions about outcomes may not have fully adapted to newer expectations. In other words, courses such as PW, which is our stand-in capstone GE course in GELOs 1 and 2, may not be capable of fully incorporating the kinds of changes that would allow written and oral communication to be emphasized enough. Efforts still continue in that area, but as outlined in the comments for GELOs 1 and 2, our larger hope lies with the coming split of the PW course into two distinct, but concurrent, courses, Thesis Workshop and Creative Professional Development. With that division of the students' attention, we hope that much more focus can be put on the work of writing and presenting.</p>
Plans for Improvement:	Improvements will follow previous trajectories, with a focus on: infusing the liberal arts approach into discipline courses; continuing to analyze side-by-side data from the students in the legacy and new programs, when possible, to help tell us what is working better and what is not; and working on improving the core competencies in the upper level courses with students from the pre-existing program.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) GENERAL EDUCATION

ANNUAL SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

Fiscal Year:	2018-19	Date Prepared:	08/26/19
Campus:	Los Angeles	Date Submitted:	08/26/19
Prepared By:	René Bruckner	Title:	Associate Dean of Liberal Arts, Chair of GE

Summary Comments:	<p>This academic year saw momentous changes in the General Education curriculum, as the college acted on the previous year's wholesale review and redesign process. Implementation of the new GE curriculum began in the Fall 2018 quarter along with the launch of the LA campus' two new programs, VFX and GDIM, and continued as the college began the teach-out of the pre-existing Cinema & Cinema/TV programs and teach-in of the new Cinema program in Winter 19 (new GE courses can be distinguished from the pre-existing codes by their four-letter prefixes).</p> <p>A new foundational communications sequence: A key component of the GE's restructuring, and also among the first new courses that needed to be rolled out, is the set of three foundational courses in written and oral communication: HUMA101, HUMA105, and HUMA201. As evident in the 2018 reports and early in this report, time and resources were put into that trio of courses in preparation for their initial launch. The team of instructors collaborated on the CLOs and coordinated how the coursework builds through the sequence, and also decided to assign students in the first two of the three courses to complete the online Credo Information Literacy modules that CCH licensed last year. In other words, planning was extensive. That said, in the actual execution of the courses for these past few quarters, some initial adjustments have been necessary, and the instructors have been quick to respond (see notes specifically for GELOs 1 and 3 for Fall 18 and Winter 19, in particular). It is also worth noting that these new courses are being treated as a package in the assessment process; as the course sequence is now fully in place, the entire team of instructors is being asked to participate and assess students from sections besides their own.</p> <p>Teaching out and teaching in: The pre-existing Cinema and Cinema/TV programs continue to be taught out as the population matriculates through their degree program. A significant amount of the data and analysis in this year's report has been inflected by the coexistence of the old and new programs as teach-out began. The new GE curriculum was designed to coordinate in many ways with the old (e.g., the Social/Behavioral and Natural Science requirements became more structured but this only required some retooled CLOs and minor additions and adjustments to the existing course offerings, not a wholesale rebuild), but there are a few requirements in the pre-existing program that will simply be taught out. We have begun to exclude these courses from the GELO assessment as much as possible, in order to keep the process efficient. The pre-existing program students are measured in a number of cross-listed courses and, until new upper level courses are needed for the newer students, also in old program's upper level courses. Wherever it is potentially revealing, we are distinguishing between the assessment scores for students who advanced through the old and new curricula (e.g., see the Spring 2019 discussions of GH252A / HUMA310 in all five GELO comment sections).</p>
--------------------------	--

COLUMBIA COLLEGE HOLLYWOOD

Columbia College Hollywood • 18618 Oxnard Street • Los Angeles • CA • 91356

	<p>Senior level competencies: PW3 students have had declining assessment scores based on their essays and presentations over the past 4 quarters (GELOs 1 and 2). Not long ago, we had made upward progress almost reaching our goal in both (average scores of 3). It is difficult to say why this happened, except that the emphasis on those two assignments has fluctuated as the class size goes up and down and different instructors come and go. A newly re-written set of instructions for both courses has not had the immediate effect they were designed to create: that of sharpening the work by clarifying the expectations.</p>
Plans for Improvement:	<p>In order to approach some answers, not only will we be paying close attention to the data on this new group of students, but we will also bring up this concern as part of the discussion at upcoming HUMA101/105/201 assessment meetings, to allow the faculty to reflect on whether a change in standards has taken place, or whether the competencies evident in our artifacts is indeed pointing to a decline. However, rather than waiting to see what answers can be found, we will work proactively to improve the writing skills—and general academic competency—of the incoming students by various means, including through the planned First Year Experience course.</p> <p>First Year Experience (FYE) course: As part of the college's evolving retention initiative, an 8-week FYE course will be launched in the Fall of 2019. This will be a graduation requirement, non-credit course. The GE department will design and execute the course, starting with an initial "test run" in the Fall with students limited only to those conditionally admitted and/or admitted in the final two weeks prior to the start of the quarter (these groups have been identified as the most highly at risk). The initial run of the course will be taught by the GE faculty lead and, in subsequent quarters with the full incoming class required to take the course, specialized faculty are expected to be determined/hired by the Academic team in order to staff the course with, potentially, multiple sections. The course will be designed to set students up for college success through introductions to the full range of campus and community resources, trainings in practical college skills, a focus on wellness, and of course, coaching in sound academic habits. The coming year's GE reports will track the creation and progress of that course.</p> <p>Senior level competencies: Those who have worked with the tutors have significantly improved their work. A more comprehensive approach would be to set aside some number of sessions during class time, when students actively work on their essays and, in other sessions, their presentations. As stated above in the Spring 2019 comments, we also expect the eventual split of PW into two courses (TW and CPD) to help formally establish time for these capstone assignments, as they will be an explicit part of CPD.</p>