

Associate of Arts Annual Learning Results Summary, AY 2017-2018

The following table summarizes the assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the AA program for assessment cycle 2017-18. 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.

Program	Associate of Arts (AA)
Assessment Period	Summer 1, 2017 to Spring 2, 2018
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	<p>PLO 1: Apply key elements of a Christian worldview to personal and professional values, ethics and commitments</p> <p>PLO 4: Apply critical thinking skills through the development of analytical reasoning</p> <p>PLO 6: Demonstrate competency in written, oral, informational, and digital forms of literacy.</p>
Standards of Success	<p>PLO 1: Artifact Proficiency Standard:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Eighty percent of artifacts will meet the ‘Satisfactory’ level as measured by the ‘Direct Assessment’ rubrics developed for each assessment.</p> <p>PLO 4: Artifact Proficiency Standard:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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::</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Eighty percent of artifacts will meet the ‘Satisfactory’ level as measured by the ‘Direct Assessment’ rubrics developed for each assessment.</p> <p>PLO 6: Artifact Proficiency Standard:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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:</p> <p>Eighty percent of artifacts will meet the ‘Satisfactory’ level as measured by the ‘Direct Assessment’ rubrics developed for each assessment.</p>
Evidence	<p>PLO 1: Capstone/Signature assignment in REL105; Sample size of 10, 100% of program students</p> <p>PLO 4: Graphic Organizer 3 in PHIL205; Sample size of 10, 100% of program students</p> <p>PLO 6: Argumentative Essay in ENG105; Sample size of 11, 100% of the students</p>
Assessment Tool	<p>PLO 1: A standardized, direct assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise completed. Satisfactory level equates to an 80% pass rate.</p> <p>PLO 4: A standardized, direct assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise completed. Satisfactory level equates to an 80% pass rate.</p> <p>PLO 6: A standardized, direct assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise completed. Satisfactory level equates to an 80% pass rate.</p>
Assessors	Dr. Scott Edgar, Dr. Brant Himes, Dr. Shana Koh, Ms. Laura Leeper, Dr. Tami Lincoln, Dr. John Washatka
Results	<p>PLO 1: 7 out of 10 samples passed (70%)</p> <p>PLO 4: 7 out of 10 samples passed (70%)</p> <p>PLO 6: 8 out of 11 samples passed (72%)</p>
Discussion of Results	<p>PLO 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Despite the small sample size, the assessment of this PLO is close to what we are looking for ● PHIL 205 covers worldview material in much greater detail and depth ● The value of this class, given the overlap of similar material in other classes, is not great. This class is not a significant value add to the AA degree ● During the review and assessment of the PLO, the course has been found to be dated; the course material and assignments are no longer connected with LAPU distinctives <p>PLO 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Based on the results, the group brainstormed ideas of how to better meet the assessment standard. Ideas included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Providing an exemplar of the graphic organizer to improve organizational scores ○ Provide more links to the correct reading to improve analysis scores ○ Embed Sire’s responses into the forums to provide students with a better understanding of his position ○ Reduce the number of assignments to permit students to focus more in depth on less, but more relevant, material <p>PLO 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The very last category was almost always a fail (mechanics, and APA)

	<p>solution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● APA style was something that kept recurring as a shortcoming. Possible disconnect between ENG101 and ENG105 ● Overall, more explicit instructions may benefit student results regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ APA ○ Research databases (“you mean I can’t use ‘google’?”) -- particularly peer reviewed articles ○ Direct quotes vs. paraphrasing ● The AD and PDC will examine the content of MO101, ENG 101, ENG 105 to assess what APA skill-building content exists and follow up with a more comprehensive strategy to improve how we teach APA across these foundational courses.
<p>Proposed Changes</p>	<p>PLO 1: Given the PLO assessment, and the dated nature of the course, the best proposed change to improve PLO proficiency is to retire the course and create a new class better aligned with LAPU distinctives and AA program PLOs. Work has already begun on a new course; REL 120 Foundations for Christian Life. Once the REL 120 course is created, it will take the place of REL 105 in the AA degree requirements.</p> <p>PLO 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review the CLOs to determine alignment with the PLO ● Provide a more detailed and descriptive narrative in the curriculum that addresses the course learning outcomes ● Provide more explicit instructions regarding the required reading associated with the artifact assignment ● Review the number of hours students spend in homework as self-reported in the end of course surveys. ● Utilize the Rice University course workload estimator to calculate course workload. ● Use those two data points to adjust the assignments in order to align more closely with the LAPU expectation that students will spend 14 hours per week doing homework, with the result that students will be able to spend the appropriate amount of time better focused on more relevant content. <p>PLO 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Insert instructions in the week 2 forum “ask the librarian” exercise to ask the librarian about “peer reviewed articles” ● Embed an argumentative essay exemplar to give a clearer expectation to students ● Work with PDC to assess instructional activities in MO 101, ENG 101, and ENG 105 that prepare students in APA style basics.
<p>Rationale for Proposed Changes</p>	<p>PLO 1: A replacement of the course will include more intentional language and assignment requirements that will more intentionally and explicitly address PLO 1 and LAPU distinctives.</p> <p>PLO 4: First, there is some consideration providing more explicit instructions related to the artifact assignment assigned reading would increase the students’ likelihood of reading the right material.</p> <p>Second, data based on a small sample of end of course surveys, indicates course assignments could be revised to accommodate the 14 hour per week guideline.</p>

	<p>While the proposed changes are modest in scope, the thought is that, as a result, the PLO success rate would meet the standard.</p> <p>PLO 6: Students are struggling with the basics of APA style. Correctly citing sources is an issue in many of the courses at LAPU. We need more focus on APA in the foundational courses that students are enrolled in.</p>
<p>Financial Resources Required</p>	<p>Approximately \$4,000.00 to create one new course(REL 120) and revise two existing courses(PHIL 205 & ENG 105).</p>
<p>Annual Learning Report for AA program recommended for approval</p>	<p>Recommended for approval on 5/15/19 by EEC</p>
<p>Follow Up (Closing the Loop)</p>	<p>The previous year's AA PLOs (2017 report) to be assessed were PLOs 4 and 6. The 2017 report indicated that program PLOs had been revised, in conjunction with elements of the AA curriculum, during the 2017 academic year, and so the sample collected had been too small to evaluate. So, the assessment for those two PLOs was delayed until academic year 2018.</p> <p>The year the AA was assessed prior to 2017 was 2015. Apparently no program PLO assessment took place during academic year 2016. Since the AA curriculum and PLOs were revised subsequent to 2015, any changes made to 2015 PLOs were updated as a result of the 2017 AA program curriculum and PLO revisions</p>