

## AA Program Learning Outcomes Report Summary 2020

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the AA program for assessment cycle (2019-2020). 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, 2019 to SP II, 2020
<b>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</b>	<p>PLO 5: Critically evaluate political, social, economic, or cultural issues through an historical perspective to develop knowledgeable global citizens</p> <p>PLO 8: Analyze cultural diversity as expressed in literature, <b>the fine arts</b>, religious traditions, and language.</p>
<b>Closing the loop (from the last time these same PLOs were assessed)</b>	<p>PLO 5 had a 90% pass rate. No changes or improvements were recommended.</p> <p>PLO 8 had a 78% pass rate, missing the overall assessment pass minimum of 80%. Results indicated that a misalignment existed between the PLO and the assignment, and the assignment and the rubric. The misalignment indicated a revision to the assignment and rubric to better align with the PLO was needed. ART 110 was revised in the fall of 2017. Changes to the Art Museum Visit assignment and rubric were made during the revision process.</p>
<b>Standards of Success</b>	<p>PLO 5: 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>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 8: 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>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>	<p>PLO 5: The artifact is Historical Essay #4 from HIS204 U.S. History from 1865</p> <p>A total of 3 student artifacts were assessed, representing 100% of AA students who took the course</p> <p>PLO 8: The artifact is Art Museum Visit, Part 2 Essay from ART 110</p> <p>A total of 4 student artifacts were assessed, pulled from 8 students who took the course. The eight students represent 100% of the AA students who took the course. Four students did not complete the assignment</p>
<b>Assessment Tool</b>	<p>PLO 5: 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 8: A standardized rubric was created using the assignment rubric as a template. An interrater reliability exercise was not conducted. The assessors and I concluded one was not needed given 1) the assessors experience in prior years working together assessing the same PLO, and 2) the relatively few artifacts to be assessed.</p>
<b>Assessors</b>	<p>PLO 5: Dr. Erik Dahnke &amp; Dr. Brant Himes</p> <p>PLO 8: Mr. Cameron Luft (tie breaker), Ms. Elizabeth Mackey, &amp; Dr. Patricia Tobin</p>
<b>Results</b>	<p>PLO 5: Three artifacts were collected, one was used for the interrater reliability exercise, leaving 2 to be assessed.</p> <p>Both artifacts passed.        The success rate was 100%, surpassing the aggregate achievement standard of 80%.</p> <p>PLO 8: All four artifacts passed, with a tie-breaker required for two out of the four artifacts.</p> <p>The success rate was 100%, surpassing the aggregate achievement standard of 80%.</p>
<b>Discussion of Results</b>	<p>PLO 5: Assessment rubric did not really focus on student learning as related to the assignment. However, there was good alignment between the rubric, the artifact, and the PLO.</p> <p>Erik noted differences when shifting from being an instructor to an assessor, with the changed emphasis on assessing the artifact in relation to the PLO rather than grading the assignment for the class.</p> <p>While the PLO was met, the fact that only two artifacts were assessed may limit the applicability and validity of the results. However, the assessors also</p>

	<p>instruct the class, and it is their opinion the artifacts are fair samples/representation of student work</p> <p>PLO 8: There may have been a lack of specific details in the assignment rubric, and between the assignment requirements and assignment rubric; the assignment rubric was closely aligned to the assessment rubric, but may have revealed a gap between the assignment requirements and assignment grading rubric.</p> <p>While the PLO was met, the fact that only four artifacts were assessed may limit the applicability and validity of the results. CO-VID 19 may have limited opportunities for completing the in person museum visit.</p> <p>However, the assessors also instruct the class, and it is their opinion the artifacts are fair samples/representation of student work.</p>
<b>Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 5: None at this time.</p> <p>PLO 8: Possibly revisit the assignment requirements to ensure a closer alignment with the assignment rubric.</p> <p>Consider offering remedial writing aids for those students whose writing skills are lacking, suggestions to use Tutor.com before submission.</p>
<b>Rationale for Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 5: Since the PLO was met, and the assessors state that the artifacts represent student learning, and that the rubric aligns with the PLO, no changes are proposed</p> <p>PLO 8: Given that the success rate was 100%, no proposed changes are being considered as a result of this assessment activity.</p> <p>The assessors may follow up with informal, individual recommendations for minor revisions.</p>
<b>Financial Resources Required</b>	<p>PLO 5: N/A</p> <p>PLO 8: N/A</p>
<b>Annual Learning Report for (program) Approved</b>	<p>Approved by the Educational Effectiveness Committee Feb 10, 2021</p>
<b>Follow Up (Closing the Loop for PLOs assessed in previous assessment cycle)</b>	<p>PLO 2: No proposed changes to the PLO or the assessment artifact were recommended in the last cycle of PLO assessment.</p> <p>PLO 3: The PLO was revised in 2020 to better reflect the focus on Quantitative Reasoning. The team determined that a better measure of meeting the PLO would be to gather and calculate the quiz and test scores from MATH 105. eLearning will pull the quiz and test scores for us the next time this PLO is up for revision and we will use that data to determine how</p>



	well students are meeting PLO 3. This will give a better indication on whether the students are meeting this PLO.
--	---