

### AA Program Learning Outcomes Report Summary 2022

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the Associate of Arts (AA) program for assessment cycle 2022. This process is conducted regularly as part of the annual learning results assessments, which measure two or three PLOs for each program each year. This summary report is to be submitted to the EEC upon its completion.

<b>Program</b>	Associate of Arts (AA)
<b>Assessment Period</b>	Summer 1 2021 through Spring 2 2022
<b>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</b>	<p>PLO 1: Demonstrate the ability to articulate contextually informed interpretations of biblical texts.</p> <p>PLO 4: Critically evaluate political, social, economic, or cultural issues through a historical perspective to develop as knowledgeable global citizens</p> <p>PLO 7: Analyze diversity as expressed in literature, the fine arts, religious traditions, or language.</p>
<b>Closing the loop (from the last time these same PLOs were assessed)</b>	<p>PLO 1: Reviewed PLO 2 in 2019 in BIBL 230, no changes were suggested at that time.</p> <p>PLO 4: Reviewed PLO 5 in HIST 202 in 2015. At that time it was connected to a different course and assignment.</p> <p>PLO 7: Reviewed PLO 8 in ART 110 in 2020. No changes were suggested at that time.</p>
<b>Standards of Success</b>	<p>Artifact Proficiency Standard: Each artifact is considered to have met the proficiency standard if two out of the three categories (or if all categories) of measurement achieve at least a “satisfactory” rating according to the artifact assessment rubric</p> <p>Aggregate Achievement Standard: Eighty percent of artifacts will meet the ‘Satisfactory’ level as measured by the ‘Direct Assessment’ rubrics developed for each assessment.</p> <p>Percentage benchmarks at U.S. universities used to measure competency range from 70-80 percent. Hence, a benchmark of 80% is consistent with major universities committed to academic excellence.</p>
<b>Evidence</b>	<p>PLO 1: BIBL 230: Signature Assignment, Part 3. Sample size: 7 students</p> <p>PLO 4: HIST 204: Historical Essay #4. Sample size: 2 students</p> <p>PLO 7: ARTS 110: Museum Visit, Part 2. Sample size: 7 students</p>
<b>Assessment Tool</b>	<p>PLO 1: <a href="#">PLO 1 Assessment Rubric</a></p> <p>PLO 4: <a href="#">PLO 4 Assessment Rubric</a></p> <p>PLO 7: <a href="#">PLO 7 Assessment Rubric</a></p>
<b>Assessors</b>	<p>PLO 1: Brant Himes, Scott Edgar; John Washatka (tie-breaker)</p> <p>PLO 4: Brant Himes, Lisa Hawkins</p>

	PLO 7: Patricia Tobin, Elizabeth Mackey; Brant Himes (tie-breaker)
<b>Results</b>	<p>PLO 1: Passed with 85.7%, 6 out of 7 artifacts passed.</p> <p>PLO 4: Failed with 50%. 1 out of 2 artifacts passed.</p> <p>PLO 7: Failed with 74.1%. 5 out of 7 artifacts passed.</p>
<b>Discussion of Results</b>	<p>PLO 1: BIBL 230 has been revised since, so the assessed artifact is no longer being used in the current course. This assessment did show that the previous iteration of the course was meeting the PLO goals. In the new course, the PLO is still being assessed but the assignment is now the Storybook project with research elements, instead of a formal research paper.</p> <p>PLO 4: The course has not been revised since approximately 2016. The course is due for a major course revision. The current major assignments are four essays and four chapter evaluation assignments, and these can be easily done with AI and plagiarism resources like Course Hero. We need to update the course to incorporate our latest best practices for course engagement and development. The reality of assessing students' historical critical thinking is becoming more and more difficult with the current state of technology.</p> <p>PLO 7: The papers seemed like a good representation of typical student work. The process and rubric worked well. Are there additional ways to build writing support into the course? Students seemed to struggle with paper organization and articulating their ideas. If the writing is right, it interferes with the content. This assignment is now different in the current course. Some of the assignments have been pared down since this assessment. However, regardless of the revised assignment, there is still a question of needing additional writing support.</p>
<b>Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 1: BIBL 230 has been recently revised. No changes were suggested for the course. Students do need continual instruction on the use and inclusion of scholarly sources.</p> <p>PLO 4: HIST 204 has not been revised since its creation in 2016. This course needs a major revision. Incorporating current best practices in teaching, content, and instructional design can help us meet the PLO standards of success.</p> <p>PLO 7: ARTS 110 needs a slight revision to the mastery level assignment in order to help students be more successful in meeting the PLO standards of success.</p>
<b>Rationale for Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 1: PLO is being met; assessors are satisfied with the current course.</p> <p>PLO 4: PLO is not being met; assessors are not satisfied with the current course and its ability to help students achieve the standard of success.</p> <p>PLO 7: PLO is not being met; assessors feel that some slight modifications will improve students' abilities to achieve the standard of success.</p>
<b>Financial Resources Required</b>	<p>PLO 1: N/A</p> <p>PLO 4: Major Course Revision</p> <p>PLO 7: N/A</p>
<b>Annual Learning Report Approved</b>	Approved by the EEC on November 5, 2024.
<b>Follow Up (Closing the Loop for PLOS assessed in previous assessment cycle)</b>	<p>PLO 2: No changes were proposed.</p> <p>PLO 3: Changes to the course content leading into the assignment were made subsequent to the 2021 course offerings. Changes included the way instructions were presented, additional content to explicate the material, and revised course</p>

	<p>content. As a result, the material has increased diversity.</p> <p>PLO 6: Presentation elements were clarified, updated, and detailed. Voice thread is no longer suggested for speech recording. Students record and upload speeches to YouTube.</p>
--	---