

## AA Program Learning Outcomes Report Summary 2019

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the AA program for assessment cycle (2018-19). 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
<b>Assessment Period</b>	SU I, 2018 to SP II, 2019
<b>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</b>	<p>PLO 2: Articulate contextually-informed interpretations of biblical texts through key themes.</p> <p>PLO 3: Demonstrate competency of empirical methods (including quantitative reasoning) that illustrates the complexity and diversity of the created world.</p>
<b>Closing the loop (from the last time these same PLOs were assessed)</b>	<p>PLO 2: Resources were to be added to the course to help students acquire requisite interpretive skills, to be implemented SP II, 2014. Changes were completed as indicated in FA II 2015 syllabus as part of a major course revision.</p> <p>PLO 3: PLO was assessed in what is now MATH125. First, MATH125 was revised in SP II, 2017; second, MATH099 was identified as a prerequisite for college-level math courses; third, a college-level math class (Math 105) was developed to replace MATH125 as a more suitable class, FA I, 2016.</p>
<b>Standards of Success</b>	<p>PLO 2: 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 or higher rating according to the artifact assessment rubric.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">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>PLO 3: 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 or higher rating according to the artifact assessment rubric.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Aggregate Achievement Standard:        Eighty percent of artifacts will meet the 'Satisfactory' level as measured by the 'Direct Assessment' rubrics developed for each assessment.</p>
<b>Evidence</b>	PLO 2: The artifact used for assessment was the Signature Assignment, part 3 in BIBL230.

	<p>The sample size was 13 students.</p> <p>PLO 3: The artifact used for assessment was the Integration and Application Paper in MATH105.</p> <p>The sample size was 8 students.</p>
<b>Assessment Tool</b>	<p>PLO 2: A standardized rubric was created using the assignment rubric as a template. The assessors developed the rubric after creating a draft and then participating in an interrater reliability exercise.</p> <p>PLO 3: A standardized rubric was created using the assignment rubric as a template. The assessors developed the rubric after creating a draft and then participating in an inter-rater reliability exercise.</p>
<b>Assessors</b>	<p>PLO 2: Dr. Scott Edgar, Dr. Brant Himes, Dr. John Washatka</p> <p>PLO 5: Ms. Sara Admiraal, Ms. Sarah Garcia, Mr. Gordon Jorgenson</p>
<b>Results</b>	<p>PLO 2: Of the 36 artifacts, 30 passed and six failed. The success rate was 83.33%, surpassing the aggregate achievement standard of 80%.</p> <p>PLO 3: Of the 32 artifacts, 17 passed and 15 failed. The success rate was 53.13%, failing to meet the aggregate achievement standard of 80%.</p>
<b>Discussion of Results</b>	<p>PLO 2: The assessment findings indicate a clear alignment between the PLO and the assessment artifact such that the artifact was a valid measure for the In addition, clear alignment exists between the assignment rubric and assessment rubric. Clear alignment also exists between the assignment requirements and the assignment rubric.</p> <p>PLO 3: An essay may not measure competency of quantitative reasoning as well as the scores of various exams in the class. An essay may be a better measure of reflective and critical thinking regarding quantitative reasoning, rather than the quantitative reasoning itself.</p>
<b>Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 2: None at this time.</p> <p>PLO 3: Replace essay as assessment artifact with the scores of quizzes and exams within the course. An evaluation of various tests would identify which ones would be appropriate.</p>
<b>Rationale for Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 2: N/A</p> <p>PLO 3: Artifacts of students who are proficient in quantitative reasoning but are not good writers may not be an accurate reflection of their quantitative reasoning because they may not be able to verbally express themselves. The inverse (good writing but not good math skills) would also be corrected.</p> <p>The result would be a collection of assessments that would correlate more directly with the PLO.</p>
<b>Financial Resources Required</b>	<p>PLO 2: N/A</p> <p>PLO 3: \$0. The course would not be revised; only the assessment measure would</p>

	change.
<b>Annual Learning Report for (program) Approved</b>	Approved by the EEC on 12/11/2019 Approved by the AC on 12/17/2019
<b>Follow Up (Closing the Loop for PLOs assessed in previous assessment cycle)</b>	<p>PLO 1: Given the PLO assessment, and the dated nature of the course (Rel 105), the best proposed change to improve PLO proficiency is to create a new class better aligned with LAPU distinctives and AA program PLOs.</p> <p>PHIL 210 (new course) was developed in 2019 to better align to PLO 1. The signature assignment in PHIL 210 is much better aligned to the LAPU distinctives, the PLO and the ILO.</p> <p>PLO 4: 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 on 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> <p>PHIL 205 has just finished going through a major revision. The new version of this course will launch in SP2 2020.</p> <p>PLO 6: For peer-reviewed articles: insert instructions in the week 2 forum “ask the librarian” exercise to ask the librarian about “peer-reviewed articles.” Embed an argumentative essay example in the curriculum. Work with PDC to assess instructional activities in MO 101, ENG 101, and ENG 105 that prepare students in APA style basics.</p> <p>ENG 105 is on the course development schedule for a moderate revision in SP2 2020. These items will be addressed along with some additions to the course from the Elementary Subject Matter Matrix. Updates to the APA assignments in MO 101 will be in place beginning SP1 2020.</p>