

Associate of Science Health Science Annual Learning Results Summary, AY 2017-2018

The following table summarizes the assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the ASHS 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 Science Health Science (ASHS)
Assessment Period	Summer 1, 2017 to Spring 2, 2018
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	<p>PLO 3: Demonstrate competency in written and oral communication</p> <p>PLO 4: Apply critical thinking skills through the development of analytical reasoning</p>
Standards of Success	<p>PLO 3: 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>
Evidence	<p>PLO 3: Argumentative Essay in ENG105; Sample size of 16, 100% of the students</p> <p>PLO 4: Graphic Organizer 3 in PHIL205; Sample size of 23, 100% of program students</p>
Assessment Tool	<p>PLO 3: 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>
Assessors	Dr. Scott Edgar, Dr. Brant Himes, Dr. Shana Koh, Ms. Laura Leeper, Dr. Tami Lincoln, Dr. John Washatka



Results	<p>PLO 3: 26 out of 44 samples passed (59%) PLO 4: 13 out of 23 samples passed (56.5%)</p>
Discussion of Results	<p>PLO 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Based on the results, the group brainstormed ideas on 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>POL 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The very last category was almost always a fail (mechanics, and APA) solution ● 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.
Proposed Changes	<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 3:</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.



Rationale for Proposed Changes	<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 3: 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>
Financial Resources Required	Approximately \$1,800.00 to revise two existing courses (PHIL 205 & ENG 105).
Annual Learning Report for (program) recommended for approval	Recommended for approval on 5/15/19 by EEC
Follow Up (Closing the Loop)	The ASHS PLOs that were reviewed in 2016-17 were PLOs 1 and 2. The 2017 report indicated a goal to clarify both of the PLOs. It is possible that additional refinement of the PLO wording could help reviewers more accurately measure whether students are meeting these two PLOs. There was some discussion of PLOs 1 and 2 during the 2017-18 academic year and a review of the ASHS PLOs was completed.