**LSC-PA Assessment Report for Fall 2010**

**Summary**

In the spring semester of 2011, Lamar State College-Port Arthur’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness completed a comprehensive assessment of all of the college’s 20 degree- or certificate-granting programs for the fall 2010 semester. The following document provides clear evidence that Lamar State College –Port Arthur has put into place a comprehensive, ongoing assessment program that defines expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which the college’s educational programs achieve the outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

**Processes and Procedures**

Assessment Coordinator Dr. David Sorrells spearheaded the college’s program assessment process. He determined coordinators for each program and created forms, tables, and instructions for gathering and using artifacts in a meaningful and uniform way. The faculty identified and codified program outcomes and program student learning outcomes, and these outcomes were reviewed by five professionals who either work or teach in the discipline. The program coordinators gathered artifacts from constituent groups across campus, including work produced by students in traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online classes. Using the faculty’s success criteria to assess artifacts, two raters scored each artifact on a faculty-designed rubric. Third raters were used to settle any outlying scores. When the artifact scoring was completed, Dr. Sorrells calculated the results and returned the findings to the program coordinators. The program coordinators in turn consulted with the faculty to determine ways to improve the programs. Those improvements are clearly identified on the 2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary tables (in blue) and were implemented during the spring 2011 semester. Throughout the semester, Dr. Sorrells conducted faculty development activities to train the faculty at large about outcomes-based assessment.

**LSC-PA Degree Programs**

Lamar State College – Port Arthur offers 20 programs culminating in 13 Associates of Applied Science, 1 Associate of Arts, 1 Associate of Arts in Teaching degrees, and 19 certificates. Click on the program name to go to that program’s section.

Table 1: LSC-PA's Programs and Degrees

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Associate Degree** | **Certificate** |
| [**Automotive Technology**](#AutomotiveTechnology) |  | Level 1 Automotive Technology  Level 1 Automotive Service Technician |
| [**Computer-Assisted Drafting**](#CAD) |  | Computer-Assisted Drafting |
| [**Commercial Music: Performance**](#Performance) | AAS |  |
| [**Commercial Music: Sound Engineer**](#SoundEngineer) | AAS | Sound Engineering  Live Sound/Sound Reinforcement |
| [**Cosmetology**](#Cosmetology) | AAS in Cosmetology  AAS in Cosmetology Instructor | Level 1 Cosmetology Operator  Level 1 Cosmetology Instructor |
| [**Esthetics**](#Esthetics) |  | Level 1 Esthetics |
| [**HVAC**](#HVAC) |  | HVAC |
| [**Instrumentation Technology**](#Instrumentation) | AAS |  |
| [**Medical Office Administration**](#MedicalOfficeAdmin) | AAS | Level 1 Medical Office Assistant |
| [**Network Specialist**](#NetworkingSpecialist) | AAS | Level 1 Network Specialist |
| [**Office Administration**](#OfficeAdmin) | AAS | Level 1 Administrative Assistant  Level 1 Receptionist |
| [**Paralegal**](#Paralegal) | AAS |  |
| [**Process Technology**](#ProcessTech) | AAS | Level 1 Process Technology |
| [**Software Developer**](#SoftwareDeveloper) | AAS | Level 1 Computer Programmer  Level 1 Computer Applications  Level 1 Multi-Media & Design |
| [**Surgical Technology**](#SurgicalTech) | AAS | Surgical Technology |
| [**Upward Mobility Nursing**](#UpwardMobility) | AAS |  |
| [**Vocational Nursing**](#VocationalNursing) |  | Vocational Nursing |
| [**Associate of Arts**](#AA2010) | AA |  |
| [**Associate of Arts in Teaching**](#AAT2010) | AAT |  |
| [**Associate of Science**](#AS2010) | AS |  |

**Automotive Technology**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Automotive Technology** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: Automotive Technology Level 1 Certificate** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students need to be aware of hazards and safety, both environmental and personal, in the workplace  PSLO #1 Demonstrate personal and environmental safety practices | We have found that 95% of the students in the Automotive Technology classes practice safety first. However, we think that more should be included in the class presentation, both in theory and in lab. | We have introduced at least one MSDS test per class.  Evidence: Sample AUMT 1345 MSDS Sheet Knowledge Test |
| In order to complete tasks properly, students need to know and understand the proper use of measuring and testing tools and equipment in the automotive industry  PSLO #2 Use appropriate tools, testing, and measurement equipment | We have found that 90% of the students in the Automotive Technology class use the appropriate tools. | We have introduced instructor check-off sheets that require proper use of the correct tools in order to successfully complete the task.  Evidence: Block, crank, and bearings job sheet |
| Students need to use and follow proper repair procedures as outlined in service and reference manuals.  PSLO #3 Use of current reference and training material from accepted industry publications and resources to diagnose and repair vehicles | We have found that 100% of the students in the Automotive Technology classes use the current standard of the industry service manuals and reference materials | We have modified the AUMT 1305 Intro to Automotive Technology class to include training on how to write repair orders using Shop Key, a standard of the industry service and repair guide and manual.  In all the lab classes, we have introduced a shop management system where the student writes up repair orders, and prints out the repair procedures.  Evidence: Lab Observation Sheet, sample repair order and invoice, and splash screen of ShopKey Service Manual. |
| To maintain today’s automobiles, students need to know the proper maintenance requirements and schedule and know where to find the maintenance data  PSLO #4 Perform routine automotive maintenance to industry standards | We have found that 90% of the students in the Automotive Technology class exceeds the expectations | We have implemented a hands on demonstration for the student to follow, with check-off areas for the instructor to OK before the student proceeds to the next step. This shows that the student is proficient in automotive maintenance and service practices to meet industry standards.  Evidence: Sample engine maintenance checklist |

The Automotive Technology program at LSC-PA prepares students for basic entry-level employment in the automotive service industry. Two Level 1 certificates are available: one is a two-semester program with an internship, and one has no internship and can be completed in one semester.

Assessment of the Automotive Technology program reveals that students generally succeed in the program. Ratings of all PSLOs show that 90% or more of all students in the program score a 2 or higher in the success criteria. The primary means of instruction for the program is active, hands-on participation in breaking down, repairing, and rebuilding mechanical parts of automobiles. Implementation of more hands-on demonstrations at the beginning of the Spring 2011 semester supplemented these authentic learning activities. The addition of tests to determine the students’ knowledge of terminology and proper procedures ensures that all students are prepared to work in the field professionally.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Automotive Program Assessment Coordinator: Dan Harriman Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrate personal and environmental safety practices | Direct: 5 student work observation worksheet/rubrics; 5 safety pre-and post tests; 5 shop safety tests; 5 final exams  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.95  (82.5%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This shows that 95% of students have demonstrated good personal and environmental safety practices. | We have modified the content of our courses to include more personal and environmental safety information to be included in all of the Automotive Technology classes.  Evidence: Sample AUMT 1345 MSDS Sheet Knowledge Test |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.887 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 30% |
| % of 5s | 40% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Use appropriate tools, testing, and measurement equipment | Direct: 15 final exams; 5 student work observation worksheet/rubrics  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.15  (85.8%) | 90 % of students met or exceeded expectations.  This shows that 90% of the students in the Automotive Technology course understand the correct usage of the tools of the automotive industry. | We have modified the content of our courses to describe and demonstrate in more detail the correct usage of hand, specialty, measuring, and testing tools. These practices are included in all of the Automotive Technology classes.  Evidence: Block, crank, and bearings job sheet |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.766 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 55% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Use current reference and training material from accepted industry publications and resources to diagnose and repair vehicles. | Direct: 10 final exams; 5 student work observation worksheet/rubrics  Indirect: 5 ShopKey service manual projects; program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | | Mean | | 5.1  (85%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This shows that 85% of the students in the Automotive Technology course understand how to use current service manuals and reference materials correctly. | | We have modified the intro to automotive technology class to include training on the correct usage of industry standards service manuals and reference material.  In the lab portions of the class, we have instituted the practice of the student filling out repair orders and spec sheets in entirety to get a passing grade for the repair performed.  Evidence: Lab Observation Sheet, sample repair order, and splash screen of ShopKey Service Manual | |
| Median | | 5 |
| Mode | | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | | 0.641 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 20 |
| % of 6s | | 25% |
| % of 5s | | 60% |
| % of 4s | | 15% |
| # Disputed | | 0 |
| ***PSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 4. Perform routine automobile maintenance to industry standards | | Direct: 7 final exams; 7 student work observation worksheet/rubrics  Indirect: 6 ShopKey service manual projects; program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 - Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | | 5.05  (84.2%) | | | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This shows that 90% of the students in the Automotive Technology course know the correct procedures to correctly perform maintenance on motor vehicles to industry standards. | | We have implemented a hands-on demonstration by the student with a check off list to be completed by the instructor showing proficiency in automobile maintenance and service practices to meet industry standards.  Evidence: Sample engine maintenance checklist |
| Median | | 6 | | |
| Mode | | 6 | | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.317 | | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 20 | | |
| % of 6s | | 55% | | |
| % of 5s | | 15% | | |
| % of 4s | | 20% | | |
| % of 2s | | 10% | | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | | |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Name of Program: Automotive Program Assessment Coordinator: Harriman Spring 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PSLO** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. Demonstrate personal and environmental safety practices | Always follows personal and environmental safety practices | Usually follows personal and environmental safety practices | Sometimes follows personal and environmental safety practices | No evidence. |  |
| 2. Use appropriate tools, testing, and measurement equipment | Always uses the proper tools and equipment for the task | Usually uses the proper tools and equipment for the task | Sometimes uses the proper tools and equipment for the task | No evidence. |  |
| 3. Use current reference and training materials from accepted industry publications and resources to diagnose and repair vehicles | Always uses and follows the repair procedures in industry service manuals | Usually uses and follows the repair procedures in industry service manuals | Sometimes uses and follows the repair procedures in industry service manuals | No evidence. |  |
| 4. Perform routine automobile maintenance to industry standards | Always follows routine maintenance procedures in the service manuals | Usually follows routine maintenance procedures in the service manuals | Sometimes follows routine maintenance procedures in the service manuals | No evidence. |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**Computer-Assisted Drafting**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| Educational Program: CAD at Gist | | |
| Degree/Certificate Award: Certificate Award | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| The student will use a computer-aided drafting program to create accurate architectural documents to meet professional drafting standards.  PSLO #1 Uses a computer-aided drafting program to create accurate architectural documents to meet professional drafting standards. | We now save all tests. | For 2011 class, we have drawings produced by students in Module One.  Supporting document CAD PSLO #1, small building project, 2011. |
| The student will use problem-solving and critical thinking skills to design and document solutions.  PSLO #3 Uses problem-solving and critical thinking skills to design and document solutions. | We now keep copies of all final exams for Module Two. | For 2011 class, we have house plans produced by students for Module Two.  Supporting document CAD PSLO #3, house plan 2011. |
| The student will participate in class activities and group projects in a professional manner.  PSLO #4 Participates in class activities and group projects in a professional manner. | We now have a checklist showing exactly which projects the student contributed to and/or produced. | For 2011 class, we have specific checklist showing which drawings students contributed to and/or produced.  Supporting document CAD PSLO #4, Group Projects Checklist 2011. |

The Computer-Assisted Drafting program is one of two LSC-PA programs that are taught only at one of the local Texas state prisons, in this instance the Gist Unit. Consequently, formal assessment beyond overall class grades in this program, done by persons other than the instructor of record, is inordinately difficult. Restrictions on student/inmate-produced material leaving the prison facility severely limit our ability to find strong, documentary evidence of student success. However, the Director of Inmate Instruction says that the students in the program are meeting the learning outcomes with mixed success.

The evidence we were able to gather are final exams that the instructor was able to retain at the end of the semester. Although the student/inmates’ authentic evidence in the form of actual CAD projects remains unavailable to us, the instructor has added drawings that require labeling as part of the final exam.

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: CAD at Gist Prison Program Assessment Coordinator: Huval Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Uses a computer-aided drafting program to create accurate architectural documents to meet professional drafting standards | Direct: 16 objective question, comprehensive final exams.  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.875  (97.9%) | All students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  This means that all students have a good grasp of basic drafting terms and can use their skills to produce a small, simple design. | We used hard copy of plans for final project of Module One (tool shed, deck, gazebo, etc.) in addition to objective tests over terminology. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | .5 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 16 |
| % of 6s | 93.7% |
| % of 4s | 6.25% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Selects appropriate architectural components to develop buildable assemblies. | Direct: 16 fill-in- the-blank comprehensive final exams.  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 2.875  (47.9%) | 50% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  This means that some students need more practice in deciding which components are applicable to a specific assignment. | Emphasized mastery of terminology and appropriate applications. |
| Median | 3 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 2.187 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 16 |
| % of 6s | 18.7% |
| % of 4s | 31.25% |
| % of 2s | 25% |
| % of 0s | 25% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Uses problem-solving and critical thinking skills to design and document solutions. | Direct: 16 comprehensive final exams labeling and creating elements using a computer-aided drafting program.  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.62  (77%) | 87.5% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  This means that most students mastered drafting principles sufficiently to draw a house plan. | We used hard copy of complete house plan, the final project at end of Module Two. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.4083 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 16 |
| % of 6s | 43.75% |
| % of 4s | 43.75% |
| % of 2s | 12.5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Participates in class activities and group projects in a professional manner. | Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.94  (82.3%) | 93.75% students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO, based solely on indirect assessment.  This means that almost all students were observed to perform well in a team environment. | Scores are recreated from instructor’s memory. There is no direct evidence to support finding. The State of Texas requires that computers used for inmate instruction be wiped clean at the close of each semester. It was impossible to resurrect any usable direct data.  We used a checklist showing specific drawings to which the student contributed ideas and/or execution in working as a team. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.124 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 16 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 4s | 43.75% |
| % of 3s | 6.25% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Name of Program: CAD at Gist Program Assessment Coordinator: Huval Date: 1/20/2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Developing (1)** | **Competent (2)** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| Uses a computer- aided drafting program to create accurate architectural documents to meet professional drafting standards. | Produces architectural documents which are sometimes accurate. | Produces architectural documents which are usually accurate. | Produces architectural documents which are always accurate. | Produces architectural documents which are lacking in accuracy. |  |
| Selects appropriate architectural components to develop buildable assemblies. | Selects architectural components which are sometimes appropriate to building requirements. | Selects architectural components which are usually appropriate to building requirements. | Selects architectural components which are always appropriate to building requirements. | Displays inability to select appropriate architectural components. |  |
| Uses problem-solving and critical thinking skills to design and document solutions. | Exhibits difficulty generating new ideas. Lacks ability to make connections between ideas. | Generates new ideas but lacks ability to connect those ideas. | Generates new, novel and interesting ideas. Spontaneously makes connections between ideas. | Generates no new ideas. |  |
| Participates in class activities and group projects in a professional manner. | Participates in group projects only when required. | Participates in group projects willingly. | Initiates group projects which are inclusive. | Refuses to participate in group projects. |  |
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**AAS in Commercial Music: Performance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College – Port Arthur**  **2009- 2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Commercial Music: Performance** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLOS’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation and Evidence of Improvement** |
| 1.i. Stage Presence.  Students will improve their stage presence by using appropriate body and facial expression during performance.  sub-PSLO 1.i. Exhibit appropriate facial expression and body movement during performance. | Modified performance course content so stage presence is addressed in applied music courses, ensemble, songwriting, Survey Music Business, and American Pop. Music.  We keep copies of all students’ work, which is a more representative sampling, and do more frequent and more targeted assessment.  Implemented a self-evaluation and electronic audience survey, in addition to faculty performance evaluations. | Assessment indicates a slight, insignificant increase in student outcomes (+0.03), as measured by faculty evaluations, a self-evaluation, and an electronic audience survey.  Evidence of faculty evaluations is in supporting document 1.  Evidence of self-evaluation is in supporting document 2.  Evidence of the electronic audience survey is supporting document 3. |
| 3.d. Permissions and Waivers.  Students will demonstrate an increase in understanding of legal issues.  sub-PSLO 3.d. Demonstrate an understanding of legal issues. | This topic is now addressed in several classes: songwriting, ensemble, applied music, MIDI, Finale, arranging and composition, and Survey of Music Business.  We keep copies of all students’ work, which is a more representative sampling, and do more frequent and more targeted assessment.  Assessment now includes direct questions in tests and quizzes in all these classes, in addition to the signing of waivers, etc., before performances. | Assessment indicates a slight, insignificant drop in student outcomes (-0.39), as evidenced by tests and quizzes administered early this semester. This may be attributed to a more diverse pool of assessments taken from several classes, as well as the introduction of direct measurement (test questions) versus the indirect measure of signing waivers previously measured.  Evidence of assessment is in supporting document 4. |
| 3.a. Performance Rights.  Students will demonstrate an increase in understanding of basic performance rights.  sub-PSLO 3.a. Demonstrate an understanding of basic performance rights. | Basic performance rights are more directly addressed in Survey of Music Business, and the presentation has been embedded into several other courses for reinforcement.  We keep copies of all students’ work, which is a more representative sampling, and do more frequent and more targeted assessment.  The assessment questions that address performance rights have been re-written to be clearer, and cover multiple levels of understanding. | Assessment indicates a +.48 increase in student learning outcomes, as evidenced by a quiz administered to Survey of Music Business students as well as performance students who had been exposed to performance rights in other classes. This may be attributed to 1) utilizing direct instruction, and 2) a complete re-write of the quiz questions.  Evidence of direct instruction and quiz are in supporting documents 5 and 6. |

The Commercial Music: Performance program is designed to prepare students for jobs as musicians in the recording studio environment of the music industry. It is a relatively new offering at LSC-PA; the first classes were offered in Fall 2008 and the first graduates walked the stage in Spring 2010. While some artifacts of evidence are text-based exams or projects, the vast majority of evidence is appropriately comprised of rubric assessments of live or recorded performance.

Findings show that the program is meeting with a great deal of success. Assessment of Program Student Learning Outcomes and sub-PSLOs indicates that students are meeting or exceeding program expectations, in most cases by a considerable margin beyond the goal of a rating of Developing (2) or higher.

The relatively high standard deviation of scores of most sub-PSLOs shows variability in the data collected, a problem that is remedied by the program’s new policy of saving all students’ work and producing more targeted assessments.

Modifications to the program based on this assessment round included expanding instruction of several key skills across multiple courses and performances and providing opportunities for more audience and critic feedback by use of survey instruments. Students now receive more formal instruction, across several classes, on legal issues for performing copyrighted work.

We have adopted a practice of investigation into three key areas that may be impacting those student learning outcomes: our educational practices and procedures; the assessment tools themselves; and the actual compilation of evidence. For compilation of evidence, we have adopted a department-wide commitment to saving all students’ work, and more frequent and targeted assessment for each sub-PSLO. The last column below individually addresses the other two key areas.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Comm Music: Performance Program Assessment Coordinator: Kemmerer Spring 2011**

**PSLO 1. Apply commercial music performance techniques to their professional practice.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.a. Tone quality  Demonstrate a professional tone quality. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.933  (82.2%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students have demonstrated a tone quality that is at least consistently focused, clear, and centered throughout the normal playing range of the instrument, but   * May be less controlled in extreme ranges, * Does not detract from the performance. | **Educational practice:**  We have modified the content of our applied courses, to include common performance skill competencies (such as tone quality) that are covered in more than just one class. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.0328 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| # of 6s | 46.67% |
| # of 4s | 53.3% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 1.b. Rhythm and Beat  Demonstrate a secure and accurate rhythm for the style of music being performed. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.933  (82.2%) | 86.67% of students met or exceeded expectations  This means that 86.67% of students have demonstrated a rhythm that is at least secure and mostly accurate, but   * May have a few duration errors * Does not detract from the overall performance. | **Educational practice:**  We have modified the content of our applied courses, to include common performance skill competencies (such as rhythm) that are covered in more than just one class. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. . Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.48645 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 60% |
| % of 4s | 26.67% |
| % of 2s | 13.3% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Commentary Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.c. Pitch  Demonstrate pitch accuracy. | Direct: 10 rubric evaluations of musical performances; 5 exams over ear training; 5 exams over dictation  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.53  (75.4%) | 79% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 79% of students have demonstrated a pitch that is at least accurate and secure most of the time, but may have a few isolated errors. | **Educational practice:**  We have modified the content of our applied courses, to include common performance skill competencies (such as pitch) that are covered in more than just one class. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.576 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 19 |
| % of 6s | 42% |
| % of 5s | 10.5% |
| % of 2s | 21% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.d. Dynamics  Demonstrate dynamic levels that are appropriate for the style of music being performed. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 93% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 93% of students have demonstrated a dynamic that is at least typically accurate and consistent. | **Educational practice:**  We have modified the content of our applied courses, to include common performance skill competencies (such as dynamics) that are covered in more than just one class. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 4.8 |
| Mode | 4, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.265 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 46.67% |
| % of 4s | 46.67% |
| % of 2s | 6.67% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.e. Phrasing  Demonstrate phrasing that is appropriate for the style of music being performed. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.067  (84.3%) | 93% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 93% of students have demonstrated a phrase that is at least usually consistent and sensitive to the style of music being performed. | **Educational practice:**  We have modified the content of our applied courses, to include common performance skill competencies (such as phrasing) that are covered in more than just one class. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.280 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 60% |
| % of 4s | 33% |
| % of 1s | 6.67% |
| # Disputed | 0 |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 1.f. Expression and Style  Demonstrate a creative nuance in response to the arrangement. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.267  (71%) | 69% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 69% of students have demonstrated an expression and style that is at least often performed with a nuance and style that is indicated in the arrangement. | **Educational practice:**  In addition to modifying our applied course content, we have added a new, required, credited course for all performance majors, “Performance Techniques”. This course is required for all students entering the program beginning fall 2011. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.554 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 33% |
| % of 5s | 6.67% |
| % of 4s | 33% |
| % of 3s | 6.67% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 1.g. Note Accuracy  Perform correct notes as required. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.29  (88%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students have demonstrated no more than an occasional inaccurate note in performance, but that inaccurate note does not distract from overall performance. | **Educational practice:**  We have modified the content of our applied courses, to include common performance skill competencies (such as note accuracy) that are covered in more than just one class. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.    **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.994 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 14 |
| % of 6s | 64% |
| % of 4s | 36% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 1.h. Memorization  Perform music from memory. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.93  (82%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 80% of students have memorized at least most of their music. | **Educational practice:**  In addition to modifying our applied course content, we have added a new, required, credited course for all performance majors, “Performance Techniques”. This course is required for all students entering the program beginning fall 2011. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes direct measure of students’ music memorization, as well as self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of performances. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3 and 4. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.667 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 66.7% |
| % of 4s | 13.3% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.i. Stage Presence  Exhibit appropriate facial expression and body movement during performance. | Direct: 10 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: 5 narrative audience reviews  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.33  (72.2%) | 93% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 93% of students performed with at least an acceptable stage presence that includes pleasant face and body movements. | **Educational practice:**  In addition to modifying our applied course content, we have added a new, required, credited course for all performance majors, “Performance Techniques”. This course is required for all students entering the program beginning fall 2011. Evidence of course modification is in supporting documents 1 and 2.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of class demonstrations; an online survey is distributed to audience members following the performance. Evidence of more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 3, 4 and 6. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.112 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 20% |
| % of 5s | 13.3% |
| % of 4s | 53.3% |
| % of 3s | 6.67% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO 2. Apply commercial music sound engineering technology to support performance practices.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.a. Microphone Technique  Apply appropriate microphone technique to performance. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.62  (77%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students handle the microphone appropriately for at least most of the performance, and appear at least somewhat comfortable with the microphone. | **Educational practice:**  We adopted a new, required, credited course for all performance majors, “Performance Techniques”. This course is required for all students entering the program beginning fall 2011. Microphone technique is one of the topics for this course. Evidence is found in supporting document 5.  **Assessment tool(s):** In addition to faculty reviewed performances, students’ evidence now includes self analysis/reflection papers, and peer reviewed evaluations of class presentations; an online survey is distributed to audience members following the performance. Evidence of a more comprehensive assessment is in supporting document 6. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.961 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 13 |
| % of 6s | 30.7% |
| % of 4s | 69.2% |
| # Disputed | 2 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 2.b. Sound Check  Conduct sound check for the venue, systems, and performance. | Direct: 10 rubric assessments of sound check before performances.  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.72  (95.5%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students conducted a sound check that is at least somewhat appropriate for the venue, systems, and performance. | **Educational practice:**  Sound check is already addressed in our Live Sound classes, particularly regarding systems. An emphasis on venue and performance has been adopted. Evidence of this emphasis is in supporting document 3.  **Assessment tool(s):** Questions about sound check appropriate for venue, systems, and audience have been added to the midterm and final exams, the performance assessment form, and self-assessments. Evidence of a more comprehensive assessment is in supporting documents 4 and 7. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.647 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 11 |
| % of 6s | 81.8% |
| % of 5s | 9% |
| % of 4s | 9% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO 3. Apply basic music industry principles to their professional practice.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.a. Performance Rights  Demonstrate an understanding of basic performance rights. | Direct: 4 exams about performance rights; 2 copyright and publishing quizzes; 5 scenario analyses  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.92  (65.3%) | 50% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 50% of the students demonstrated an understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test at least some of the time. | **Educational practice:**  Basic performance rights are more directly addressed in Survey of Music Business, and the presentation has been embedded into several other courses for reinforcement. Evidence of direct instruction is supporting document 8.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The assessment questions that addressed performance rights have been re-written to be more clear, and cover multiple levels of understanding. Evidence of more clearly written test questions is in supporting document 9. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 3, 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.782 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 12 |
| % of 6s | 25% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 16.67% |
| % of 2s | 16.67% |
| % of 1s | 8.3% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 3.b. Venues and Audience  Apply appropriate microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Direct: 20 rubric evaluations of musical performances  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.94  (82.5%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students used at least acceptable microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | **Educational practice:**  This had been adopted as an ongoing, embedded unit in our performing ensembles course. Evidence of this is supporting document 3 and 10.  **Assessment tool(s):**  In addition to assessment at musical performances, students will be directly queried during rehearsals and the results will be reported anecdotally; an online survey is distributed to audience members following the performance. Evidence of this is supporting document 6. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.026 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 19 |
| % of 6s | 31.6% |
| % of 4s | 52.6% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 3.c. Promotion and Marketing  Promote performances. | Indirect: 20 various types of advertising and promotional material  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.45  (90.8%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students promoted performances at least acceptably. | **Educational practice:**  This is now directly taught in Survey Music Business class. Evidence is in supporting document 6.  **Assessment tool(s):**  Students are given a scenario analysis and asked to respond to the question, “How would you promote XYZ”, in essay form. Evidence of this is supporting document 11.  On the final exam, students are given several best-practice promotion and marketing situations, and asked to respond via true/false and multiple choice.  An online survey is distributed to audience members following the performance, asking them how well they thought the concert had been promoted. Evidence of the survey is supporting document 6. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.5104 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 5s | 55% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 3.d. Permissions and Waivers  Demonstrate an understanding of legal issues. | Direct: 20 various agreement and release forms completed by students  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.89  (98.17%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  The agreement and release forms require minimal competency to complete.  This means that all students signed the necessary visual/audio waivers for most of the performances and collaborative work. | **Educational practice:**  In all performance classes, the components and legalities of contacts and waivers are now discussed. Evidence is in supporting document 1.  **Assessment tool(s):**  Assessment of permissions, waivers, contracts, etc is now done in all performance classes, measured by test questions. Evidence of test questions is supporting document 12. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.3153 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 19 |
| % of 6s | 89.47% |
| % of 5s | 10.5% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrate professional behavior as characterized by a commitment to the profession.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 4.a. Commitment to profession  Demonstrate a commitment to the profession with attendance, persistence in the program, and timeliness to classes, rehearsals and performances. | Direct: 5 rubric assessments of performers’ promptness and attendance at sessions  Indirect: 15 attendance records  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.5  (91.67%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students demonstrated at least an acceptable attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness to their profession. | **Educational practice:**  In all our classes, we have adopted a policy of emphasizing professionalism (commitment, persistence, timeliness, etc.) in the workforce, along with implications for lack of professionalism. Evidence is supporting document 13.  **Assessment tool(s):**  A survey for students’ employers has been developed; students will do a self-reflection on their perception of “commitment to profession.” Evidence is supporting document 14. |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.513 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 50% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Name of Program: Comm. Music: Performance Created by: Kemmerer Date: Spring 2011**

**PSLO: 1. Apply commercial music performance techniques to their professional practice.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** |
| 1.a. Tone quality  Demonstrate a professional tone quality. | Tone is consistently focused, clear, and centered through the entire range of the instrument. Tone has professional quality. | Tone is consistently focused, clear, and centered throughout the normal playing range of the instrument. Extremes in range sometimes cause tone to be less controlled. Tone quality typically does not detract from the performance. | Tone is consistently focused, clear, and centered but sometimes the tone is uncontrolled in the normal playing range. Extremes in range are usually uncontrolled. Occasionally the tone quality detracts from overall performance. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 1.b. Rhythm  Demonstrate a secure and accurate rhythm for the style of music being performed. | The beat is secure and the rhythms are accurate for the style of music being played. | The beat is secure and the rhythms are mostly accurate. There are a few duration errors, but these do not detract from the overall performance. | The beat is somewhat erratic. Some rhythms are accurate. Frequent or repeated duration errors. Rhythm problems occasionally detract from the overall performance. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 1.c. Pitch  Demonstrate pitch accuracy. | Virtually no errors. Pitch is very accurate. | An occasional isolated error, but most of the time pitch is accurate and secure. | Some accurate pitches, but there are frequent and/or repeated errors. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 1.d. Dynamics  Demonstrate dynamic levels that are appropriate for the style of music being performed. | Dynamic levels are obvious, consistent, and an accurate interpretation of the style of music being performed. | Dynamic levels are typically accurate and consistent. | Dynamic levels fluctuate but can be discerned. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.e. Phrasing  Demonstrate phrasing that is appropriate for the style of music being performed. | Phrasing is always consistent and sensitive to the style of music being performed. | | Phrasing is usually consistent and sensitive to the style of music being performed. | Phrasing is usually consistent and occasionally sensitive to the style of music being performed. | |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 1.f. Expression and Style  Demonstrate a creative nuance in response to the arrangement. | Always performs with a creative nuance and style in response to the arrangement. | Often performs with nuance and style that is indicated in the arrangement. | | | Sometimes performs with nuance and style that is indicated in arrangement. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 1.g. Note Accuracy  Perform correct notes as required. | Notes are consistently accurate. | An occasional inaccurate note is played, but does not detract from overall performance. | | | A few inaccurate notes are played, detracting somewhat from the overall performance. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 1.h. Memorization  Perform music from memory. | All of the piece was memorized. | Most of the piece was memorized. | | | The piece was not memorized. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 1.i. Stage Presence  Exhibit appropriate facial expression and body movement during performance. | Student has excellent stage presence with outstanding facial expressions and body movement. | Student has acceptable stage presence with a pleasant face and body movement. | | | Student has minimal stage presence with lack of facial expression and body movement. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|

**PSLO 2. Apply commercial music sound engineering technology to support performance practices.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** |
| 2.a. Microphone Technique  Apply appropriate microphone technique to performance. | Handles microphone appropriately for the performance; appears comfortable with the microphone. | Handles microphone appropriately for most of the performance; appears somewhat comfortable with the microphone. | Handles microphone appropriately for some of the performance; does not appear comfortable with the microphone. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 2.b. Sound Check  Conduct sound check for the venue, systems, and performance. | Performs a sound check that is appropriate for the venue, systems, and performance. | Performs a sound check that is somewhat appropriate for the venue, systems, and performance. | Performs a sound check but it is inappropriate for the venue, systems, and performance. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|

**PSLO 3. Apply basic music industry principles to their professional practice.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** |
| 3.a. Performance Rights  Demonstrate an understanding of basic performance rights. | Student has demonstrated understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test most of the time. | Student has demonstrated understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test some of the time. | Student did not demonstrate understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 3.b. Venues and Audience  Apply appropriate microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Utilizes excellent microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Utilizes acceptable microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Utilizes minimal microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| 3.c. Promotion and Marketing  Promote performances. | Effectively and appropriately promotes performance. | Promotes performance acceptably. | Minimal performance promotion. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
| 3.d. Permissions and Waivers  Demonstrate an understanding of legal issues by signing necessary waivers for performances and collaborative work. | Student has signed necessary visual/audio waiver for each performance and collaborative work. | Student has signed necessary visual/audio waiver for most performances and collaborative work. | Student has signed necessary visual/audio waiver for some performances and collaborative work. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|

**PSLO 4. Demonstrate professional behavior as characterized by a commitment to the profession.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** |
| 4.a. Commitment to profession  Demonstrate a commitment to the profession with attendance, persistence in the program, and timeliness to classes, rehearsals and performances. | Demonstrates excellent attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness. | Demonstrates acceptable attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness. | Demonstrates minimal attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness. |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**AAS in Commercial Music: Sound Engineer**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Commercial Music: Sound Engineer** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| 1.e. Budgeting  Students will develop a production budget for recording projects.  Develop a production budget for recording projects | 1. Budgeting is now included in the course objectives, as well as embedded in Survey Music Business for reinforcement. 2. We keep copies of all students’ work, which is a more representative sampling, and do more frequent and more targeted assessment. 3. The assessment is based on direct assessment of answers to test questions and response to a scenario analysis paper. | Preliminary evidence indicates that 50% of students are able to develop an acceptable budget for a recording project, as measured by a budget quiz. This was not previously measured.  Evidence of topic embedding in Survey Music Business is in supporting document 1.  Evidence of direct assessment of budget is in supporting document 2. |
| 1.b. Recording Techniques  Students will improve their placement and selection of microphones in a recording session.  Demonstrate proper microphone placement and use of room acoustics in a recording session. | 1. Microphone placement is now taught in Audio Engineering II. 2. We keep copies of all students’ work, which is a more representative sampling, and do more frequent and more targeted assessment. 3. The assessment questions have been re-written to be more clear. | Assessment indicates no increase in student learning outcomes, as evidence by no increase in student test scores. This may be attributed to a less diverse pool of assessments taken from one class (Audio II) versus assessment from instruction in Audio III.  Evidence of curricular inclusion is supporting document 3.  Evidence of test response is supporting document 4. |
| 1.g. Signal Flow  Students will improve their understanding of signal flow, as demonstrated on quizzes, tests, and practical assignments.  Develop a signal flow for instrument, microphone, preamp, and input. | 1. Signal flow is addressed multiple times in audio engineering classes, beginning in Audio I, and embedded into multiple units. 2. We keep copies of all students’ work, which is a more representative sampling, and do more frequent and more targeted assessment. 3. Signal flow is directly assessed through more frequent quizzes. Evidence of this is in supporting document 10. | Assessment indicates a slight drop in student outcomes, as evidenced by a slight decrease in test scores. This may be attributed to the assessment of younger, first semester students from multiple classes versus assessment to of upper level students.  Evidence of curriculum inclusion in Audio 1 is supporting document 5.  Evidence of test response is supporting document 6. |

The Commercial Music: Sound Engineer program is designed to prepare students for audio production jobs in the music industry. Appropriately, the majority of evidence is comprised of rubric assessments of sound engineering projects; this authentic assessment is supplemented by text-based exams or projects.

Findings show that the program is meeting with mixed success. Assessment of Program Student Learning Outcomes and sub-PSLOs indicates that, while students are meeting or exceeding program expectations in almost every category, scoring of two sub-PSLOs barely surpass the success criteria, and one sub-PSLO, budgeting, was not being addressed adequately in any courses in the program.

The relatively high standard deviation of scores of most sub-PSLOs shows variability in the data collected, a problem that is remedied by the program’s new policy of saving all students’ work and producing more targeted assessments.

Modifications to the program based on this assessment round included expanding instruction of several key skills, including budgeting, across multiple courses and providing more authentic learning opportunities in sound engineering and production.

We have adopted a practice of investigation into three key areas that may be impacting those student learning outcomes: our educational practices and procedures; the assessment tools themselves; and the actual compilation of evidence. For compilation of evidence, we have adopted a department-wide commitment to saving all students’ work, and more frequent and targeted assessment for each sub-PSLO. The last column below individually addresses the other two key areas.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Comm. Music: Sound Engineering Program Assessment Coordinator: Kemmerer Spring 2011**

**PSLO 1. Apply commercial music sound technology to their professional practice.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.a. Role, duties, and responsibilities of the producer.  Demonstrate an understanding of the role, duties, and responsibilities of the producer. | Direct: 7 quizzes; 7 exams  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.43  (73.8%) | 86% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 86% of our students can outline the role, duties and responsibilities of a producer in an acceptably comprehensive and clear manner. | **Educational practice:**  The roles, duties, and responsibilities of the producer are more directly addressed in Survey of Music Business, and the content has been embedded into audio engineering courses for reinforcement. Evidence of direct instruction is supporting document 1.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The assessment questions that addressed performance rights have been re-written to be clearer, and cover multiple levels of understanding. Evidence of more clearly written test questions is in supporting document 2. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 2.138 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 14 |
| % of 6s | 43% |
| % of 5s | 29% |
| % of 3s | 14% |
| % of 0s | 14% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 1.b. Recording Techniques  Demonstrate proper microphone placement and use of room acoustics in a recording session. | Direct: 5 rubric evaluations of capstone project; 5 rubric evaluations of mix project; 10 Likert scale evaluations of audio final  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.65  (77.5%) | 80 % of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 80% of our students demonstrate, in a recording session, at least adequate microphone placement; and demonstrate at least acceptable use of room acoustics. | **Educational practice:**  Microphone placement and use of room acoustics is more directly addressed in Acoustics, and the presentation has been embedded into audio engineering for reinforcement. Evidence of direct instruction is supporting document 3.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The assessment questions have been re-written to be clearer, and cover multiple levels of understanding (Bloom’s Taxonomy). Evidence of “application” is in supporting document 4. |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 4, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.226 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 30% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 35% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. c. Editing Techniques  Utilize editing techniques that are effective and appropriate. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of editing mix projects  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.4  (73.3%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 80% of students’ edits are at least acceptable, but sometimes they may not make musical sense. | **Educational practice:**  Students are given the opportunity to re-edit assigned materials until they are satisfactory. Evidence of this is in supporting document 5.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The assessment is based on editing improvements, rather than just a final product. Evidence of this is in supporting document 5. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.5492 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 4s | 40% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |
| 1. d. Mixing Techniques  Utilize mixing techniques that are effective and appropriate. | Direct: 5 Likert scale evaluations of projects; 10 rubric evaluations of editing mix projects; 5 exams  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.25  (71%) | 70% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 70% of students create a blend of instruments that is balanced, but may not always be appropriate for the genre. | **Educational practice:**  Students are given the opportunity to re-mix assigned materials until they are satisfactory. Evidence of this is in supporting document 5.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The assessment is based on mixing improvements, rather than just a final product. Evidence of this is in supporting document 5. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.552 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.e. Budgeting  Develop a production budget for recording projects. | None | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean |  | No evidence found.  This means that there is no evidence that students are able to develop a production budget for recording projects. | **Educational practice:**  Budgeting is now included in the course objectives, as well as embedded in Survey Music Business for reinforcement. Evidence of this is in supporting document 6.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The assessment is based on direct assessment of answers to test questions and response to a scenario analysis paper. Evidence of this is in supporting document 7. |
| Median |  |
| Mode |  |
| Standard Deviation |  |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* |  |
| % of 6s |  |
| % of 4s |  |
| % of 2s |  |
| # Disputed | 0 |
|  |  |
| 1.f. Music Markets  Apply sound technology techniques to projects, reflecting specific markets. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of mix projects  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.4  (73.3%) | 93.34% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 93.34% of students demonstrate an understanding of the music market by applying acceptable sound technology techniques to the project. | **Educational practice:**  A new text has been adopted in Survey of Music Business, that is used to embed music marketing into the curriculum. Evidence of this is in supporting document 8.  **Assessment tool(s):**  In Survey Music Business, a scenario analysis paper requires the student to outline a marketing plan. Evidence of this is in supporting document 7. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.1212 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 26.67% |
| % of 4s | 66.67% |
| % of 2s | 6.67% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 1.g. Signal Flow  Develop a signal flow for instrument, microphone, preamp, and input. | Direct: 10 signal flow quizzes; 3 Cubase exams; 5 audio quizzes; 1 signal flow narrative  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.44  (74%) | 82.8% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 82.2% of students develops at least an acceptable signal flow for instrument, microphone, preamp, and input. | **Educational practice:**  Signal flow is directly addressed in Live Sound, as well as embedded in audio engineering. Evidence of this is in supporting document 9.  **Assessment tool(s):**  Signal flow is directly assessed through more frequent quizzes. Evidence of this is in supporting document 10. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.149 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 18 |
| % of 6s | 22% |
| % 0f 5s | 22% |
| % of 4s | 38.8% |
| % of 3s | 11% |
| % of 2s | 5.56% |
| # Disputed | 0 |
| 1.h. Session Management  Manage session time. | Indirect: 20 studio time management records (time sheets)  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.55  (92.5%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students demonstrate at least minimally appropriate session management. | **Educational practice:**  Session management has been incorporated into audio engineering lectures using material from a new text, Managing Your Band, as observed in supporting document 11.  **Assessment tool(s):**  Students are required to complete a Session Management plan, as evidenced in supporting document 12. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.6048 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 60% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO 2. Apply commercial music performance skill to support sound engineering practice.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.a. Theory  Utilize theory skills in the recording, editing and mixing process. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of final mix projects  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.867  (64.4%) | 66.6% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that at 66.6% of students utilizes at least acceptable theory skills in the recording, editing, and mixing process. | **Educational practice:**  The theory, MIDI and Logic curriculum have been realigned so outcomes are coordinated. Evidence of this is in supporting document 13.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The project outline for final mix projects in Logic now lists theory skills (chord changes, key, etc) as a measureable outcome. Evidence of this is in supporting document 14. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.598 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 26.6% |
| % of 4s | 40% |
| % of 2s | 33.34% |
| # Disputed | 0 |
| 2.b. Keyboard  Utilize keyboard skills in the recording, in relation to the quality of the recording process. | Direct: 15 rubric evaluations of final mix projects  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.467  (57.8%) | 60% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 60% of students at least minimally understands and utilizes keyboard skills in relation to the quality of the recording process. | **Educational practice:**  The class piano curriculum and the MIDI curriculum have been realigned so outcomes are coordinated. Evidence of this is in supporting document 15.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The project outline for Reason Input Project in Logic now includes a piano skill as a measureable outcome. Evidence of this is in supporting document 16. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.767 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 15 |
| % of 6s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 40% |
| % of 2s | 33.34% |
| % 0f 0s | 6.67% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO 3. Apply basic music industry principles to their professional practice.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.a. Performance Rights  Demonstrate an understanding of basic performance rights. | Direct: 6 copyright quizzes; 6 excerpts from scenario analysis narratives  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4  (66.67%) | 74.7% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 74.7% of students demonstrated understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test at least some of the time. | **Educational practice:**  Basic performance rights are more directly addressed in Survey of Music Business, and the presentation has been embedded into several other courses for reinforcement. Evidence of direct instruction is supporting document 17.  **Assessment tool(s):**  The assessment questions that addressed performance rights have been re-written to be more clear, and cover multiple levels of understanding. Evidence of more clearly written test questions is in supporting document 18. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.279 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 12 |
| % of 6s | 16.7% |
| % of 5s | 8% |
| % of 4s | 50% |
| % of 3s | 8% |
| % of 2s | 16.7% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 3.b. Venues and Audience  Apply microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Direct: 10 rubric evaluations of capstone project  Indirect: 7 examples of various playlists  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.176  (69.6%) | 58.7% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 58.7% of students utilizes at last acceptable microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | **Educational practice:**  Venue and audience been adopted as an ongoing, embedded unit in our performing ensembles course. Evidence of this is supporting document 19.  **Assessment tool(s):**  In addition to assessment at musical performances, students will be directly queried during rehearsals and the results will be reported anecdotally; an online survey is distributed to audience members following the performance. Evidence of this is supporting document 20. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 3 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.334 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 17 |
| % of 6s | 23.5% |
| % of 5s | 17.6% |
| % of 4s | 17.6% |
| % of 3s | 17.6% |
| % of 2s | 5.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 3.c. Session Agreements  Demonstrate an understanding of legal issues by securing necessary session agreements prior to recording. | Direct: 20 various release and agreement forms signed by students  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.7  (95%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that session agreements have been signed by all of the performers. | **Educational practice:**  This had been adopted as an embedded unit in our Survey Music Business class, using information from Managing Your Band (Marcone). Evidence of this is supporting document 21.  **Assessment tool(s):**  Students are directly assessed with test questions. Evidence of this is supporting document 22. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.6570 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 80% |
| % of 5s | 10% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrate professional behavior as characterized by a commitment to the profession.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Method*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 4.a. Commitment to profession  Demonstrate a commitment to the profession with attendance, persistence in the program, timeliness to classes and recording sessions. | Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements  Indirect: 18 attendance records | 50% will score a mean of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.11  (85.2%) | 83.36% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 83.35% of students demonstrates at least acceptable attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness to classes and recording sessions. | **Educational practice:**  In all our classes, we have adopted a policy of emphasizing professionalism (commitment, persistence, timeliness, etc.) in the workforce, along with implications for lack of professionalism. Evidence is supporting document 23.  **Assessment tool(s):**  A survey for students’ employers has been developed; students will do a self-reflection on their perception of “commitment to profession”. Evidence is supporting document 24. |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.132 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 18 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 27.8% |
| % of 4s | 5.56% |
| % of 3s | 16.67% |
| # Disputed | 2 |

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Comm. Music: Sound Engineer Created by: Kemmerer Date: 2/2/11**

**PSLO 1. Apply commercial music sound technology to their professional practice.**

| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** | ***Rating*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.a. Role, duties, and responsibilities of the producer.  Demonstrate an understanding of the role, duties, and responsibilities of the producer. | Student outlines the role, duties, and responsibilities of the producer in a comprehensive and clear essay. | Student outlines the role, duties, and responsibilities of the producer in an acceptably comprehensive and clear essay. | Student outlines the role, duties, and responsibilities of the producer in a minimally comprehensive and clear essay. |  |  |
| 1.b. Recording Techniques  Demonstrate proper microphone placement and use of room acoustics in a recording session. | In a recording session, excellent demonstration of proper mic placement; proper use of room acoustics | In a recording session, demonstration of adequate mic. placement; acceptable use of room acoustics | In a recording session, demonstration of incorrect mic. placement; unacceptable use of room acoustics |  |  |
| 1. c. Editing Techniques  Utilize editing techniques that are effective and appropriate. | Creates clear and clean edits that are undetectable, so edits make musical sense. | Creates edits that are acceptable, but may not always make musical sense. | Creates edits that are unacceptable and do not make sense. |  |  |

| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** | ***Rating*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. d. Mixing Techniques  Utilize mixing techniques that are effective and appropriate. | Creates a blend of instruments that is well balanced and appropriate for the genre. | Creates a blend of instruments that is balanced, but may not be appropriate for the genre. | Creates a blend of instruments that are not balanced, and may not be appropriate for the genre. |  |  |
| 1.e. Budgeting  Develop a production budget for recording projects. | Develops an accurate and manageable budget for project. | Develops a budget for a project that is acceptable but may not be accurate or manageable. | Develops a budget that is acceptable but not manageable. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** | ***Rating*** |
| 1.f. Music Markets  Apply sound technology techniques to projects, reflecting specific markets. | Demonstrates an understanding of the music market by applying appropriate sound technology techniques to project. | Demonstrates an understanding of the music market by applying acceptable sound technology techniques to project. | Demonstrates an understanding of the music market by applying minimally acceptable sound technology techniques to project. |  |  |
| 1.g. Signal Flow  Develop a signal flow for instrument, microphone, preamp, and input. | Develops excellent signal flow for instrument, microphone, preamp, and input. | Develops acceptable signal flow for instrument, microphone, preamp, and input. | Develops minimally acceptable signal flow for instrument, microphone, preamp, and input. |  |  |
| 1.h. Session Management  Manage session time. | Demonstrates appropriate session management. | Demonstrates minimally appropriate session management. | Demonstrates inappropriate session management. |  |  |

**PSLO 2. Apply commercial music performance skill to support sound engineering practice.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** | ***Rating*** |
| 2.a. Theory  Utilize theory skills in the recording, editing and mixing process. | Utilizes excellent theory skills in the recording, editing, and mixing process. | Utilizes acceptable theory skills in the recording, editing, and mixing process. | Utilizes minimal theory skills in the recording, editing, and mixing process. |  |  |
| 2.b. Keyboard  Utilize keyboard skills in the recording, in relation to the quality of the recording process. | Demonstrates an understanding of, and utilizes appropriate keyboard skills, in relation to the quality of the recording process. | Minimally understands and utilizes keyboard skills in relations to the quality of the recording process. | Does not demonstrate an understanding of, and does not utilize appropriate keyboard skills in relation to the quality of the recording process. |  |  |

**PSLO 3. Apply basic music industry principles to their professional practice.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** | ***Rating*** |
| 3.a. Performance Rights  Demonstrate an understanding of basic performance rights. | Student has demonstrated understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test most of the time. | Student has demonstrated understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test some of the time. | Student could not demonstrate understanding of performance rights by correctly identifying characteristics, definitions, etc., on a test. |  |  |
| 3.b. Venues and Audience  Apply microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Utilizes excellent microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Utilizes acceptable microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. | Utilizes minimal microphone, staging, and set-list protocol for the venue and audience. |  |  |
| 3.c. Session Agreements  Demonstrate an understanding of legal issues by securing necessary session agreements prior to recording. | Session agreements have been signed by all performers. | Session agreements have been signed by some performers. | Session agreements we not signed. |  |  |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrate professional behavior as characterized by a commitment to the profession.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Accomplished (3)*** | ***Competent (2)*** | ***Developing (1)*** | ***Not Observed (0)*** | ***Rating*** |
| 4.a. Commitment to profession  Demonstrate a commitment to the profession with attendance, persistence in the program, timeliness to classes and recording sessions. | Demonstrates excellent attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness. | Demonstrates acceptable attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness. | Demonstrates minimal attitude, persistence, attendance, and timeliness. |  |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**Cosmetology**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Cosmetology** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: Certificate** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment PSLO** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence of Improvement** |
| Data indicated a deficiency in professional and ethical behavior suitable for salon standards  PSLO #1 Show professional and ethical behavior | Purchased specialized salon software to train students in the areas of telephone skills, interpersonal communication with clients, and appointment scheduling. | Implementation: Students went through extensive training for the software. Students rotated working reception desk for one week each.  Documentation: Letter from Shortcuts Salon and Spa Software |
| Data indicated a deficiency in sanitary and safety measures that protect individual and public health  PSLO #2 Practice all sanitary and safety measures that protect individual and public health | Contracted a professional video crew to tape instructors performing the correct safety and sanitation procedures that are required by law. | Implementation: Students are given access to view the video at their convenience as many times as needed.  Documentation: DVD Label. IEC Simulations taped and provided video free of charge. |
| Data indicated a deficiency in workforce behaviors  PSLO #4 Demonstrate appropriate workforce behaviors | Purchased specialized salon software to train students in the areas of interpersonal communications with clients and appointment scheduling. | Implementation: Students receive extensive training on salon software. Students assigned to work at the reception desk for one week rotations.  Documentation: Letter from Shortcuts Salon and Spa Software |

The Cosmetology program prepares students for a career as a cosmetology professional. The recommended courses of study are designed to meet licensure requirements established by the Texas Department of Licensing & Regulation.

The Cosmetology program offers four points of exit: Associate of Applied Science in Cosmetology, Associate of Applied Science in Cosmetology Instructor, Level I certificate in Cosmetology Instructor, and Level I certificate in Cosmetology Operator.

Findings show that students in the program readily meet or exceed program expectations. Assessment findings are based on both direct and indirect evidence; the students’ performances on quizzes and tests are important, but the satisfaction of the client is paramount in this service-based industry.

Because of findings in this assessment round, students now use new reception desk software to facilitate client appointments. Students now also watch video-recordings of safety and sanitary measures, cosmetology procedures, and all state board required skills.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Cosmetology Program Assessment Coordinator: Cindy Guidry Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Show professional and ethical behavior | Direct: 5 rubric evaluations of personal characteristics for cosmetologists; 5 exams over professional image  Indirect: 5 customer surveys; 5 records of disciplinary action;  Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.1  (68.3%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 75% of the students have demonstrated professional and ethical behavior while working with customers and following school policies on professional behavior. | We have implemented reception desk software to book appointments and check clients in and out more proficiently. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.373 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 20% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 40% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Practice all sanitary and safety measures that protect individual and public health | Direct: 5 exams over Essential Experience; 5 exams over cosmetology administrative rules; 5 exams over skin disorders  Indirect: 5 personal immunization records;  Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.65  (77.5%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 75% of students practice safety and sanitation measures that protect individual and public health.  \*May have times where safety and sanitation were not practiced  \*Does not take away from overall performance. | We have modified the content of our applied courses to include a pre-taped video demonstrating all safety and sanitation measures that are covered in more than one class. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.424 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 15% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Demonstrate proficiency in all cosmetology skills | Direct: 5 Jr weekly skill sheet, scored for completion; 5 Sr weekly skill sheet, scored for completion; 5 special haircutting assignments, scored for completion; 5 TDLR practical requirements, scored for completion  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.3  (88.3%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 95% of students have demonstrated proficiency in skills but may have a few isolated areas of deficiency that need to be improved in order to achieve accomplished status. | We have modified the content of our applied courses to include a pre-taped video demonstrating correct cosmetology procedures. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.979 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 60% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Demonstrate appropriate workforce behaviors | Direct: 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Applied Math; 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Locating Information; 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Reading for Information; 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Listening  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.2%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 75% of students met or exceeded the state’s requirement score to pass the state board exam. | We have modified the content of our required course to include a pre-taped video demonstrating all state board required skills. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.317 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 15% |
| % of 5s | 55% |
| % of 4s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Prepare to pass the State Board requirements | Direct: 5 local licensing and regulation exam; 5 Practical State Board Exam elements, scored with a checklist; 5 local cosmetology rules and laws exam  Indirect: 5 time cards for students (minimum hours required); program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.2%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students have successfully demonstrated the skills necessary to pass the state board exam. | We have implemented a pre-taped video demonstrating all state board required skills. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.356 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 10% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 25% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Cosmetology Created by: Guidry Date: Spring 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing(1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. Show professional and ethical behavior | Always shows professional and ethical behavior | Usually shows professional and ethical behavior | Sometimes shows professional and ethical behavior |  |  |
| 2. Practice all sanitary and safety measures that protect individual and public health | Always practices sanitary and safety measures to protect individual and public health | Usually follows all the sanitary and safety measures to insure individual and public health | Sometimes follows all the sanitary and safety measures to insure individual and public health |  |  |
| 3. Demonstrate proficiency in all cosmetology skills | Proficient in all cosmetology skills | Ability to perform most of the cosmetology skills | Ability to perform some of the cosmetology skills |  |  |
| 4. Demonstrate appropriate workforce behaviors | Prepared for successful employment | Almost ready for employment | Somewhat prepared for employment |  |  |
| 5. Prepare to pass the State Board requirements | Prepared to successfully pass the State Board | Almost prepared to pass the State Board | Somewhat prepared to pass the State Board |  |  |

**[~Back to Top~](#Top)**

**Esthetics**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Esthetics** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: Certificate** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment PSLO** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence of Improvement** |
| Data indicated a deficiency in esthetics skills  PSLO #3 Demonstrate proficiency in all esthetic skills | Contracted a professional video crew to tape instructors performing the correct facial procedures. | Implementation: Students are given access to view the video as many times as needed.    Documentation: DVD label. IEC Simulations taped and provided video free of charge. |
| Data indicated a deficiency in appropriate workforce behaviors.  PSLO #4 Demonstrate appropriate workforce behaviors | Purchased specialized salon software to train students in the areas of interpersonal communications with clients and appointment scheduling. | Implementation: Students receive extensive training on salon software. Students assigned to work at the reception desk for one week rotations.  Documentation: Letter from Shortcuts Salon and Spa Software |
| Data indicated a deficiency in state board passing requirements.  PSLO # 5 Prepare to pass the State Board requirements. | Contracted a professional video crew to tape instructors performing the correct facial procedures as required by the state licensing board. | Implementation: Students are given access to view the video as many times as needed.    Documentation: DVD label. IEC Simulations taped and provided video free of charge. |

The Esthetics program prepares students for a career as a professional esthetician. The recommended courses of study are designed to meet licensure requirements established by the Texas Department of Licensing & Regulation.

The Cosmetology program offers a Level I certificate in Esthetics.

Findings show that students in the program meet or exceed program expectations; PSLO 4, “Demonstrating appropriate workforce behaviors,” barely met the minimum expectation for the program.

Because of findings in this assessment round, students now use new reception desk software to facilitate client appointments. Students now also watch video-recordings of safety and sanitary measures, cosmetology and esthetics procedures, and all state board required skills.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Esthetician Program Assessment Coordinator: Guidry Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Show professional and ethical behavior | Direct: 15 examinations; 5 resumes  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.35  (89.2%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students have demonstrated professional and ethical behavior while working with customers and following school policies on professional behavior. | We have implemented reception desk software to book appointments and check clients in and out more proficiently. |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.745 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Practice all safety and sanitary measures that protect individual and public health | Direct: 5 exams; 10 essays addressing sanitary measures  Indirect: 5 student health certificates;  Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.2  (86.67%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 85% of students practice safety and sanitary measures that protect individual and public health.  \*May have times where safety and sanitation were not practiced  \*Does not take away from overall performance. | We have modified the content of our courses to include a pre-taped video concerning all safety and sanitation measures that are covered in more than one class. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.152 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 60% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Demonstrate proficiency in all esthetics skills | Direct: 15 weekly skill sheets, scored for completion; 5 advanced topics and treatments exams  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (80.8%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 80% of students have demonstrated proficiency in skills but may have a few isolated areas of deficiency that need to be improved in order to achieve accomplished status. | We have modified the content of our applied courses to include a pre-taped video, demonstrating correct facial procedures. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.137 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Demonstrate appropriate workforce behaviors | Direct: 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Applied Math; 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Locating Information; 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Reading for Information; 5 Worldwide Interactive Network unit levels for Listening  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.55  (59.2%) | 50 % of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that half of the students demonstrated appropriate workforce behaviors. Additional work is needed in this area. | Software was purchased to modify the deficiency in this area by improving client satisfaction while experiencing a more professional atmosphere upon arrival and departure of the school’s facility. |
| Median | 3.5 |
| Mode | 2 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.432 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 10% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 35% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Prepare to pass the State Board requirements | Direct: 5 final exams; 5 Practical State Board Exam elements, scored with a checklist  Indirect: 5 customer surveys; 5 time cards for students (minimum hours required);  Program coordinator narrrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 75% of the students met or exceeded the state’s requirement score to pass the state board exam.  \*Most requirements were met.  \*There were only minimum deficiencies. | We have modified the content of our required course to include a pre-taped video demonstrating all state board skill requirements. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.436 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Esthetics Created by: Guidry Date: Spring 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing(1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. Show professional and ethical behavior | Always shows professional and ethical behavior | Usually shows professional and ethical behavior | Sometimes shows professional and ethical behavior |  |  |
| 2. Practice all safety and sanitary measures that protect individual and public health | Always practices safety and sanitation measures to protect individual and public health | Usually follows the safety and sanitation measures to protect individual and public health | Sometimes follows the safety and sanitation measures to protect individual and public health |  |  |
| 3. Demonstrate proficiency in all esthetic skills | Proficient in all skills of esthetics | Able to perform most of the esthetic skills | Able to perform some of the esthetic skills |  |  |
| 4. Demonstrate appropriate workforce behaviors | Prepared for successful employment | Almost ready for employment | Somewhat prepared for employment |  |  |
| 5. Prepare to pass the State Board requirements | Prepared to pass the State Board | Almost ready to pass the State Board | Somewhat prepared to pass the State Board |  |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**HVAC at Stiles Prison**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: HVAC at Stiles** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: Certificate Award** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students will learn environmental safety practices.  PSLO #1 Demonstrates environmental safety practices | We now save all environmental safety tests. | We have distributed to students some guidelines for coping with test anxiety.  Supporting document HVAC PSLO#1 2011 |
| Students will troubleshoot, service, and repair air conditioning, heating, and refrigeration systems.  PSLO #2 Troubleshoots, services, and repairs air conditioning, heating, and refrigeration systems. | We now save all final exams for Module Two. | We have implemented checklist showing exactly which procedures/instruments the individual student has mastered.  Supporting document HVAC Individual Tasks Checklist. PSLO #2 2011 |
| Students will perform technician duties safely.  PSLO #3 Performs technician duties safely. | We now save all shop safety tests. | Instructor has installed videos on shop safety which each student will view and master.  Supporting document HVAC PSLO #3 2011 |
| Students will work effectively as a team member.  PSLO #4 Works effectively as a team member. | Supporting document HVAC PSLO #4 2010 | We have implemented checklist showing exactly which procedures the student mastered as part of a team.  Supporting document HVAC Group Projects Checklist PSLO #4 2011 |

The HVAC program is one of two LSC-PA programs that are taught only at one of the local Texas state prisons, in this instance the Stiles Unit. Consequently, formal assessment beyond overall class grades in this program, done by persons other than the instructor of record, is inordinately difficult. Restrictions on student/inmate-produced material leaving the prison facility severely limit our ability to find strong, documentary evidence of student success.

The evidence we were able to gather include final exams that the instructor was able to retain at the end of the semester, results from the ESCO HVAC certification exam, safety exams, and rubric evaluations of student participation in group activities. The Director of Inmate Instruction says that the students in the program are meeting the learning outcomes with good success.

To improve student learning, instructors have incorporated tools for students to cope with test anxiety into their lecture material. Broader use of the ESCO exam is encouraged, and instructors now use checklists of mastery of content and group participation.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: HVAC at Stiles Prison Program Assessment Coordinator: Huval Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrates environmental safety practices. | Direct: 13 environmental safety tests (objective tests)  Direct: 5 ESCO tests. The ESCO is a nationally recognized HVAC certification test. For incarcerated students, the only information available is whether they passed or failed the test.  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4  (66.67%) | | | 83.4% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that most students have an excellent grasp of environmental safety requirements. Some students did not score as highly on the ESCO test, an outside test, possibly because of test anxiety. | Incorporated into lectures, tools to cope with test anxiety.  Encouraged wider use of the ESCO test. |
| Median | | 4 | | |
| Mode | | 4 | | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.715 | | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 18 | | |
| % of 6s | | 22% | | |
| % of 5s | | 5.56% | | |
| % of 4s | | 55.56% | | |
| % of 3s | | 5.56% | | |
| % of 0s | | 11% | | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | | |
| ***PSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 2. Troubleshoots, services, and repairs air conditioning, heating, and refrigeration systems. | | Direct: 12 comprehensive final exams  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.83  (80.5%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that all students have basic knowledge of HVAC principles and repair procedures. | | Developed a checklist showing specific tasks which each student will master before graduation. |
| Median | | 4 |
| Mode | | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.030 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 12 |
| % of 6s | | 41.67% |
| % of 4s | | 58.3% |
| # Disputed | | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Performs technician duties safely. | Direct: 13 Hand Tool Safety exams  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4  (66.67%) | 84.6% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that most students have a good grasp of shop safety procedures. | Continued to stress shop safety procedures and test rigorously on knowledge of those procedures. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.1547 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 13 |
| % of 6s | 15.4% |
| % of 4s | 69% |
| % of 2s | 15.4% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Works effectively as a team member. | Direct: 13 rubric evaluations of student performance in group activity  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.31  (71.8%) | 84.6% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that most students worked well in a team environment. | Developed a checklist showing exactly which projects each team member worked on. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.377 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 13 |
| % of 6s | 31% |
| % of 4s | 54% |
| % of 2s | 15.4% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: HVAC at Stiles Created by: Huval Date: 1/20/2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Developing (1)** | **Competent (2)** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. Demonstrates environmental safety practices. | Demonstrates difficulty understanding safe levels of handling refrigerants. | Performs at an acceptable level in safe handling of refrigerants. | Performs at a superior level in safe handling of refrigerants. | Lacks understanding of safe handling of refrigerants. |  |
| 2. Troubleshoots, services, and repairs air conditioning, heating, and refrigeration systems. | Repairs HVAC systems that have been previously diagnosed. | Identifies, diagnoses, and repairs HVAC systems at an acceptable level. | Identifies, diagnoses, and repairs HVAC systems at a superior level. | Displays inability to repair HVAC systems. |  |
| 3. Performs technician duties safely. | Follows some safety rules in HVAC lab when reminded. | Follows most safety rules in HVAC lab. | Consistently follows all safety rules in HVAC lab. | Ignores safety rules in HVAC lab. |  |
| 4. Works effectively as a team member. | Participates in team efforts only when required. | Participates in team efforts willingly. | Initiates team efforts which are inclusive. | Refuses to participate in team efforts. |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**Instrumentation Technology**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Instrumentation** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS Degree** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| The students need to improve the analyzing of gas measurements to determine proper operating parameters.  PSLO #3 Analyze level and gas measurements to determine proper operating parameters of specific process and electrical equipment | The students needed more training in Chromatography | We authorized the creation of a training video  Evidence: Purchase Order of training video |
| The students need to improve their training of the panel board instruments and how they work.  PSLO #1 Identify control panel indicators, calibration tools, electrical parts, and how they work. | The students need more hands on exposure to panel board instruments. | We purchased an analyzer trainer with panel board instruments.  Evidence: Purchase Order of analyzer equipment |
| The students need to improve on their knowledge of safety procedures.  PSLO #4 Implement standard safety procedures as required in industry | The students require more training on safety procedures. | We added additional an video lab with a focus on safety training using the lockout /tag out of electrical and process equipment.  Evidence: Video lab exam with student grades. |

The Instrumentation Technology program leads to an Associate of Applied Science degree in Computer Maintenance and Instrumentation Technology, with specialization in Instrumentation Technology.

Assessment of the Instrumentation Technology program indicates a fairly high level of student success in the program, with 80% or more students meeting the success criteria for 3 of the 4 PSLOs. New to the program as a result of this assessment round was the purchase of analyzer training equipment so that students can now train with the tools used in area chemical plants. Chemical plant training software was also purchased and is used for additional hands-on training with authentic software. Two training videos were also purchased. Overall, the improvements made as a result of this assessment round offer students in the program more authentic learning opportunities.

Artifacts from traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online courses were used in the assessment process.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Instrumentation Program Assessment Coordinator: William Andress Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Identify control panel indicators, calibration tools, electrical parts, and how they work. | Direct: 5 loop quizzes; 5 embedded test questions; 5 chapter tests; 5 industrial elements worksheets  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.9  (81.67%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  All students were able to identify industrial panel board instruments, however, because students lacked hands on training, new equipment was purchased to add hands on exercises. | Purchase of new analyzer training equipment allowed students to see and use actual equipment that exists at area chemical plants.  Evidence: Purchase order detailing equipment purchase. |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.483 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Analyze temperature and flow results to determine proper operating parameters of specific computerized equipment | Direct: 5 lab tests; 5 workbook tests; 10 class work assignments with drawings  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.2  (86.67%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  All students were able to analyze industrial computerized equipment, however, because students lacked hands on training, new training software was acquired to enhance computerized equipment training. | Installation of new computerized training software to allowed students to see and use actual software that exists at area chemical plants.  Evidence: Website from where software was downloaded and memo from computer service showing software was installed. |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.951 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Analyze level and gas measurements to determine proper operating parameters of specific process and electrical equipment | Direct: 5 lab tests; 5 workbook tests; 10 class work assignments with drawings  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.55  (75.8%) | 65% of students met or exceeded expectations.  All students were able to analyze panel measurements of specific equipment; however, students needed more training in chromatography. | A training video was created to improve students understanding of analyzers and gas measurements.  Evidence: Authorization to create video. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.468 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 25% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Implement standard safety procedures as required in industry | Direct: 5 disassembly of valve test; 5 online test of elements; 5 NEC Classification flowcharts; 5 analytical instrument tests  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.25  (87.5%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  All students were able to implement standard safety procedures, however, student need additional safety procedures as required in industry. | Implement additional video lab on specific safety procedures with focus on lockout/tagout procedures.  Evidence: Video lab exam with student grades. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.164 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 65% |
| % of 5s | 10% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Instrumentation Created by: Andress Date: Spring 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. Identify control panel indicators, calibration tools, electrical parts and how they work. | Able to identify all control panel indicators, calibration tools, electrical parts and how they work.. | Able to identify most control panel indicators, calibration tools, electrical parts and how they work. | Able to identify some control panel indicators, calibration tools, electrical parts and how they work. | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 2. Analyze temperature and flow results to determine proper operating parameters of specific process computerized and electronic equipment | Able to correctly analyze temperature and flow results to determine proper operating parameters of specific process computerized equipment | Usually able to correctly analyze temperature and flow results to determine proper operating parameters of specific process computerized equipment | Sometimes able to correctly analyze temperature and flow results to determine proper operating parameters of specific process computerized equipment | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 3. Analyze level and gas measurements to determine proper operating parameters of specific process and electrical equipment | Able to level and gas measurements to determine proper operating parameters of specific process and electrical equipment | Usually able to analyze level and gas measurements to determine proper operating parameters of specific process and electrical equipment | Sometimes able to analyze level and gas measurements to determine proper operating parameters of specific process and electrical equipment | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 4. Demonstrate standard safety procedures as required in industry | Understands and implements all standard safety procedures as required in industry | Usually understands and implements most standard safety procedures as required in industry | Sometimes understands and implements some standard safety procedures as required in industry | Not enough information to assess |  |

**[~Back to Top~](#Top)**

**Medical Office Administration**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Medical Office Administration** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| Key Assessment Program SLO’s | Results and Analysis | Implementation & Evidence  of Improvement |
| Students will acquire an understanding of electronic health records and improve their skills in using medical software.  PSLO 3: Use specialized medical computer applications. | Students need more capability in understanding and using electronic health records in a healthcare setting. | Modified the curriculum to include a course in electronic health records.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments |
| Students will improve their resume and interviewing skills.  PSLO 2: Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, office procedures, and professionalism in the healthcare setting. | Students need more skill in creating resumes and in interviewing for a position in the healthcare industry. | Added a resume generator software program to the internship course.  Evidence: Copy of website |
| Students will increase their understanding of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).  PSLO 4: Apply current trends in medical insurance, HIPAA guidelines, and coding systems. | Students need more in-depth coverage on the rules and regulations of HIPAA. | Added a HIPAA textbook to the capstone course.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover and assignments |

The Medical Office Administration program leads to an Associate of Applied Science degree in Medical Office Administration or a Level 1 Certificate in Medical Office Assistant.

Most artifacts for the assessment of the program come from a capstone course, which provides a clear summation of student achievement in the program. Artifacts from traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online courses were used in the assessment process. Though the success criteria were exceeded, two areas of potential concern were revealed throughout this assessment round: Students had some difficulty identifying and using medical jargon, and they had difficulty with HIPAA guidelines and associated content.

As a result of this assessment round, the faculty adopted more authentic learning assignments, including more case study-type projects in which medical terminology is used in written reports. Additionally, faculty added software to simulate medical record keeping, and they adopted a new textbook to address concerns about HIPAA. To prepare students for their job search, the faculty added new resume-writing software.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Medical Office Administration Program Assessment Coordinator: Sheila Guillot Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Identify and use medical technology, jargon, and abbreviations correctly. | Direct: 5 final exams; 2 exam 1s; 10 chapter quizzes; 4 chapter tests  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4  (66.67%) | 65% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 65% of students have memorized the prefixes, suffixes, and word root of medical terms, medical jargon, and healthcare abbreviations. | We have added a “projects” section to this course so that students must research and use medical terms, jargon, and abbreviations in reports.  We increased the percentage that quizzes were worth to ensure student retention of material.  Evidence: Spring 2011 Syllabus (supporting document A) |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 2 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.686 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 30% |
| % of 5s | 10% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 2s | 35% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, office procedures, and professionalism in the healthcare setting | Direct: 2 final presentations; 8 chapter-based assignments; 5 rubric internship evaluations; 1 chapter exam; 2 chapter quizzes; 1 oral presentation  Indirect: 1 medical office procedures schedule and phone messages activity;  Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.2  (86.67%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 85% of student demonstrated appropriate etiquette, ethics, office procedures, and professionalism in a medical setting. | We added a resume generator software program to the internship program so that students could develop more professional resumes and interviewing skills.  Evidence: Website page (supporting document B) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.361 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 65% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Use specialized medical computer applications | Direct: 13 chapter exams; 6 MediSoft Simulation worksheets; 1 electronic health records final exam  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (80.8%) | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 90% of students were able to demonstrate the efficient use of specialized medical computer applications. | We added a course to the curriculum for using electronic health records software.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments (supporting document C) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation |  |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Apply current trends in medical insurance, HIPAA guidelines, and coding systems | Direct: 12 chapter exams; 8 final exams  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.25  (70.8%) | 70% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 70% of students were able to relate current trends in medical insurance, HIPAA guidelines, and coding systems. | We added a textbook on HIPAA to the capstone course.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments (supporting document D)  We changed our textbook in the medical coding course.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments (supporting document E) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.585 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 30% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 25% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Medical Office Administration Created by: Guillot Date: January 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | | **Accomplished (3)** | | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | | **Lack of Evidence** | | **Rating** | |
| 1. Use medical terminology, jargon, and abbreviations correctly. | Always define terms correctly with all prefixes, word roots, and suffixes used as part of the definition. | | Usually define terms correctly with most prefixes, word roots, and suffixes used as part of the definition. | | | Occasionally define terms correctly with some prefixes, word roots, and suffixes used as part of the definition. | | Not enough information to assess. | |  |
| 2. Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the healthcare setting. | Always differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse in a healthcare environment. | | Usually differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse in a healthcare environment. | | | Occasionally differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse in a healthcare environment. | | Not enough information to assess. | |  |
| 3. Use knowledge of specialized medical computer applications. | Always uses medical office software features successfully. | | Sometimes uses medical office software features successfully. | | | Occasionally uses medical office software features successfully. | | Not enough information to assess. | |  |
| 4. Apply current trends in medical insurance, HIPAA guidelines, and coding systems. | Exceptional insight and analysis of insurance trends and mastery of the technique for locating a medical code. | | Moderate insight and analysis of insurance trends and usually able to locate a code. | | | Occasional insight of insurance trends and understands current coding systems. | | Not enough information to assess. | |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**Network Specialist**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Network Specialist** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| Key Assessment Program SLO’s | Results and Analysis | Implementation & Evidence  of Improvement |
| Students need to improve internet research skills and technical writing skills..  PSLO #3: Describe current trends in computer and network systems. | Modified class to include more internet research and technical writing. | Targeted internet research topics for which students will write a technical essay. For targeted topics, students researched the topic on the internet and write a short essay on what they found.  Evidence: Assignments for research and writing. |
| Students were not getting enough hands-on troubleshooting and maintain computer systems.  PSLO #1: Maintain computer and network systems  PSLO #2: Troubleshoot computer and network systems | Change to a workbook that contains hands-on troubleshooting and computer maintenance. | Changed ITSC 1325, PC Hardware book to a workbook that provides hands-on exercises to troubleshoot and maintain computer systems.  Evidence: Copy of cover of workbook and an example of assignment. |
| Not enough classroom observation of students working on projects.  PSLO #4: Demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field | Developed rubrics to demonstrate ethics, professionalism, participation, and teamwork. | More rubrics for classroom observations displaying ethics, professionalism, participation, and teamwork.  Evidence: Weekly chart of observation rubrics. |

Students in the Network Specialist program can earn an AAS or a Level 1 certificate in Network Specialist. The majority of student work used in this round of assessment came from capstone classes. Artifacts from lab work projects and computer maintenance projects represent authentic assessment of skills. These hands-on experiences are complemented by embedded exam questions designed specifically to measure student learning. Artifacts from traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online courses were used in the assessment process.

Students appear to enjoy quite a bit of success in the program; all students met or exceeded expectations on three of the four PSLOs, and 85% met or exceeded expectations for the fourth PSLO. Although this program is doing well, improvements for learning were nonetheless implemented. Three main areas of concern presented themselves: Students needed to improve internet and research skills, they needed more authentic learning experiences in troubleshooting computers, and they needed more guidance in group activities.

To meet these needs, faculty in the program implemented new assignments for research and writing, chose a new textbook with more interactive exercises, and designed and put to use a new rubric for measuring group participation.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Networking Specialist Program Assessment Coordinator: Granger Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Maintain computer and network systems | Direct: 12 lab work projects; 4 comprehensive final exams with test map; 4 rubric evaluations of computer maintenance project  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.6  (93.3%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  All students were able to maintain computer and network systems using built-in and add-on utilities, however, students need additional hand-on activities in computer maintenance. | The book for ITSC 1325 PC Hardware was changed to a workbook with more hands-on assignments for computer maintenance. Additional rubrics were created to assess observed student skills.  Evidence: Copy of workbook cover and an example of assignment. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.821 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 80% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Troubleshoot computer and network systems | Direct: 12 lab work projects; 4 comprehensive final exams with test map; 4 rubric evaluations of computer maintenance project  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.6  (93.3%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  All students were able to troubleshoot computers and network systems using built-in and add-on utilities, however, students need additional hand-on activities in computer troubleshooting. | The book for ITSC 1325 PC Hardware was changed to a workbook with more hands-on assignments for computer troubleshooting. Additional rubrics were created to assess observed student skills.  Evidence: Copy of workbook cover and an example of assignment. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.821 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 80% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Describe current trends in computer and network systems. | Direct: 16 lab work projects; 4 comprehensive final exams with test map  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 6  (100%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  All students were able to use the internet to research current trends in computer and network systems, however, students need additional activities in researching and writing technical essays on targeted topics. | Additional assignments with rubrics were created that required the students to research targeted topics on the internet and write a short technical essay on what they find.  Evidence: Rubrics of research and writing assignment |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 100% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field | Direct: 4 Interview practice/performances, scored by checklist; 4 student resumes; 4 ethics evaluations, scored by a rubric; 4 professionalism evaluations, scored by a rubric; 4 teamwork evaluations, scored by a rubric.  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.75  (79.1%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Most students were able to demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field. | Additional rubrics were created to assess observed student behaviors in class. Behaviors include: ethics, professionalism, participation, and teamwork.  Evidence: Rubrics for assessing student behaviors. |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.445 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Name of Program: Networking Specialist Created by: Granger Date: 1/21/11**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 1. Maintain computer and network systems | Always apply proper maintenance processes for computer and network systems | Usually apply proper maintenance processes for computer and network systems | Occasionally apply proper maintenance processes for computer and network systems | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 2. Troubleshoot computer and network systems | Always applies processes for troubleshooting computer and network systems successfully. Repair most computer and network systems. | Sometimes applies processes for troubleshooting computer and network systems successfully. Repair some computer and network systems. | Occasionally applies processes for troubleshooting computer and network systems successfully. Repair few computer and network systems | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 3. Describe current trends in computer and network systems | Exceptional insight to current trends in computer and network systems. Apply most new technologies | Moderate insight to current trends in computer and networking systems. Apply some new technologies. | Occasionally insight to current trends in computer and networking systems. Apply few new technologies. | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 4. Demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field | Always differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse within the computer field. | Usually differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse within the computer field. | Occasionally differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse within the computer field | Not enough information to assess. |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**Office Administration**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Office Administration** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| Key Assessment Program SLO’s | Results and Analysis | Implementation & Evidence  of Improvement |
| Students will improve their skills in integrating information among software applications.  PSLO 4: Use word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation software. | Students need more experience in software integration. | Modified the curriculum to include a course on software integration.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments |
| Students will increase their proofreading and grammar capabilities.  PSLO 5: Proofread, edit, and apply basic rules of grammar to general business correspondence. | Students need more familiarity with proofreading and editing business correspondence. | Modified the curriculum to include a proofreading and editing course.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments |
| Students will demonstrate an increase in the understanding of office etiquette, ethical issues, and professionalism.  PSLO 1: Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the business office setting. | Not enough observation of specific assessments (e.g., etiquette, ethics, professionalism) in the internship course. | Modified student internship evaluations to reflect a more targeted assessment of etiquette, ethics, and professionalism.  Evidence: Internship evaluations |

The Office Administration program leads to an Associate of Applied Science degree in Office Administration, a Level 1 Certificate in Administrative Assistant, and a Level 1 Certificate in Receptionist.

Most artifacts for the assessment of the program come from a capstone course and provide a clear summation of student achievement in the program. Artifacts from traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online courses were used in the assessment process. All success criteria were met or exceeded; however, assessment revealed a need for students to improve the integration of material among software applications and to become better editors and proofreaders. Faculty also determined that the assessment of professional and ethical behavior was not being measured well.

Consequentially, the faculty added two new courses to the curriculum, one that addresses software integration, and one that emphasizes proofreading and editing. The faculty also revised student evaluation forms to target etiquette, ethics, and professionalism.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Office Administration Program Assessment Coordinator: Sheila Guillot Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the business office setting. | Direct: 2 business English tests; 8 professional workforce tests; 2 quizzes on parliamentary procedure; 3 quizzes on appropriate workplace behavior; 2 quizzes on office procedures; 2 final exams on professional workforce; 1 final presentation on professional workforce  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.9  (81.67%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 85% of students demonstrated appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the business office setting. | We modified the student internship evaluations to reflect a more targeted assessment of etiquette, ethics, and professionalism.  Evidence: Student Internship Evaluation (supporting document A) |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.373 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Illustrate the ability to work in a team environment. | Direct: 2 PowerPoint presentations, scored by rubric; 8 team-building projects, scored by rubric; 3 internship evaluations, scored by rubric; 7 exams or quizzes  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.1  (85%) | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 90% of students were able to illustrate the ability to work in a team environment. | We modified the administrative systems course to include team-building exercises.  Evidence: Team-building exercises (supporting documents B-F)  We added the section “team-building” to the syllabus so that it would be worth a percentage of the student’s overall grade.  Evidence: Syllabus (supporting document G) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.373 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 65% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Use office procedure skills. | Direct: 10 quizzes or exams; 10 projects or activities  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.3  (88.3%) | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 90% of students used office procedure skills correctly. | We added a second course in administrative office procedures to the curriculum.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments (supporting document H) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.342 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 75% |
| % of 4s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Use word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation software. | Direct: 9 exams or quizzes; 11 projects or assignments.  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.7  (78.3%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 85% of students correctly used word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation software. | We modified the curriculum to include a course on software integration.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments (supporting document I) |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.302 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 4s | 40% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Proofread, edit, and apply basic rules of grammar to general business correspondence. | Direct: 8 exams or quizzes; 12 projects or workshops  Indirrect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.15  (69.2%) | 70% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This means that 70% of our students were able to proofread, edit, and apply basic rules of grammar to general business correspondence. | We modified the curriculum to include a course in proofreading and editing.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover & assignments (supporting document J) |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.599 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 35% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 25% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Office Administration Created by: Guillot Date: January 21, 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 1. Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the business office setting. | Students can always differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse in a business environment. | Students can sometimes differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse in a business environment. | Students can occasionally differentiate between good ethical practices and an ethical lapse in a business environment. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 2. Illustrate the ability to work in a team environment. | Participates in the majority of team building exercises and oral/visual presentations | Participates in some of the team building exercises and oral/visual presentations | Participates in a few of the team building exercises and oral/visual presentations | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 3. Use office procedure skills. | Routinely uses correct office procedures to accomplish tasks. | Generally uses correct office procedures to accomplish tasks. | Seldom uses correct office procedures to accomplish tasks. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 4. Use word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation software. | Independently locates and uses all necessary features of word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation software. | Can locate and use some features of word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation software. | Needs assistance to use features of word processing, spreadsheet, database, and presentation software. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 5. Proofread, edit, and apply basic rules of grammar to general business correspondence. | Expresses and organizes ideas, grammar, and spelling with a high degree of effectiveness. | Expresses and organizes ideas, grammar, and spelling with some degree of effectiveness. | Expresses and organizes ideas, grammar, and spelling with limited effectiveness. | Not enough information to assess. |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**Paralegal**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Paralegal** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| Key Assessment Program SLO’s | Results and Analysis | Implementation & Evidence  of Improvement |
| Students will acquire an understanding of the Westlaw online research program to broaden their online legal research computer ability.  PSLO 5: Illustrate the ability to use computer, accounting, and organizational skills. | Determined that students needed to learn the Westlaw program for most law offices. | Purchased membership in the Westlaw online legal research program for our students.  Evidence: Copy of American Bar Association-required (our Paralegal Program approval body) course outline for LGLA 1401 Legal Research and Writing course. |
| Students will improve their understanding of legal ethics.  PSLO 3: Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the legal environment. | Students need greater exposure to ethical reading. | Changed to a Real Property course (LGLA 2309) textbook with ethics material in every chapter.  Evidence: Copy of textbook cover |
| Students will improve their document-drafting ability.  PSLO 2: Apply correct drafting procedures to transactional and court documents. | Students need additional document-drafting ability early in their paralegal education. | Added a form-drafting exercise to their introductory paralegal course, LGLA 1307.  Evidence: Copy of assignment. |

LSC-PA’s Paralegal program provides students with the necessary knowledge and skills to function successfully as a paralegal in law offices, corporations, government offices, and private industry. Upon completion of the program, students receive an Associate of Applied Science degree.

Students barely eked by the success criteria for PSLO 1, “Identify legal terms, structure of a law firm, and the paralegal’s role,” and PSLO 2, “Apply correct drafting procedures to transactional and court documents.” However, their performance on the remaining three PSLOs is strong.

Faculty recognized the need for students to be able to use the Westlaw online research program to broaden their online legal research capabilities; consequentially, the college purchased membership in the Westlaw program, and the faculty have included its use in classes. A change in textbook in LGLA 2309 provided a needed emphasis on legal ethics, and a form-drafting exercise has been added to LGLA 1307 to make up for a deficit in the ability to draft legal documents. To encourage success in identifying legal terms and the paralegal’s role in a law firm, faculty members have encouraged students to find voluntary employment in a law firm.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Paralegal Program Assessment Coordinator: Ed Quist Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Identify legal terms, structure of a law firm, and the paralegal’s role. | Direct: 15 exams; 5 internship evaluations  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.75  (62.5%) | 50% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One-half of students were able to identify legal terms, structure of a law firm and the paralegal’s role. | Encouraged part-time, unpaid student law firm employment, during their education, to whatever extent student’s time allows. |
| Median | 3.5 |
| Mode | 3 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.410 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 20% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 30% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Apply correct drafting procedures to transactional and court documents. | Direct: 15 projects; 5 internship evaluations, scored using a rubric  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.8  (63.3%) | 50% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One-half of students were able to apply correct drafting procedures to transactional and court documents. | Added form-drafting exercise to students’ introductory paralegal course, LGLA 1307. |
| Median | 3.5 |
| Mode | 3 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.472 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 30% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the legal environment. | Direct: 15 exams or tests; 5 internship evaluations, scored using a rubric  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.3  (71.67%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Large majority of students demonstrated appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the legal environment. | Changed to a Real Property course (LGLA 2309) textbook with ethics material in every chapter. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.979 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 15% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 50% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Conduct proper client and witness interviews. | Direct: 15 exams or tests; 5 projects.  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.2%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Large majority of students demonstrated that they can conduct proper client and witness interviews. | Added more in-class role-playing scenarios to improve students’ ability to accomplish this PSLO. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.103 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 20% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Illustrate the ability to use computer, accounting, and organizational skills | Direct: 15 assignments; 5 internship evaluations.  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.6  (76.67%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Three-quarters of students illustrated the ability to use computer, accounting and organizational skills. | Purchased membership in, and introduced into a course, the Westlaw online legal research program. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.570 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Paralegal Created by: Guillot & Quist Date: February 1, 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 1. Identify legal terms, structure of a law firm, a corporation, government entity and the paralegal’s role in each of these areas. | Independently uses correct legal terminology and consistently understands the structure of a legal firm, corporation, government entity and the role of a paralegal in each of these. | Frequently uses correct legal terminology and often understands the structure of a law firm, a corporation, government entity and the role of the paralegal in each of these. | Seldom uses correct legal terminology and rarely understands the structure of a law firm, a corporation, government entity and the role of the paralegal in each of these. | Not enough information to be assessed. |  |
| 2. Apply correct drafting procedures to transactional and court documents | Consistently applies correct procedures when drafting both transactional and court documents. | Usually applies correct procedures when drafting both transactional and court documents. | Seldom applies correct procedures when drafting both transactional and court documents. | Not enough information to be assessed. |  |
| 3. Demonstrate appropriate etiquette, ethics, and professionalism in the legal environment. | Always differentiates between appropriate ethical practices and a lapse in ethics in a given legal scenario. Polite and respectful to others and uses appropriate language and manners in legal situations. | Usually differentiates between appropriate ethical practices and a lapse in ethics in a given legal scenario. Usually polite and respectful to others and as a rule uses appropriate language and manners in legal situations. | Occasionally differentiates between appropriate ethical practices and a lapse in ethics in a given legal scenario. Sporadically polite and respectful to others and rarely uses appropriate language and manners in legal situations. | Not enough information to be assessed. |  |
| 4. Conduct proper client and witness interviews. | Always applies correct interviewing principles and methods when interviewing clients and witnesses. | Usually applies correct interviewing principles and methods when interviewing clients and witnesses. | Occasionally applies correct interviewing principles and methods when interviewing clients and witnesses. | Not enough information to be assessed. |  |
| 5. Illustrate the ability to use computer, accounting, and organizational skills. | Always applies correct commands and file/disk techniques using computer software Consistently completes assignments and meets deadlines. | Often applies basic commands to software. Can sometimes apply appropriate file/disk management techniques. Usually completes assignments on time and meets deadlines. | Occasionally completes basic commands on software. Rarely applies appropriate file and disk management techniques.  Seldom completes assignments or meets deadlines. | Not enough information to be assessed. |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**Process Technology**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Process Technology** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS Degree** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students need to improve their knowledge of process operating requirements and methods.  PSLO #1: Use technology to access operator-specific documentation and training. | Students needed more specific training of process industry operating procedures. | A new online training video displaying common process industry operating processes was created.  Evidence: Purchase Order for online training video. |
| Students need to improve analysis skills of common process industry operating parameters.  PSLO #2: Identify specific equipment and operating parameters to meet industry standards. | Students needed more hands on training in common operating parameters, (pH, conductivity, turbidity). | A new process analyzer trainer with graphic analytical results displays was purchased.  Evidence: Purchase Order of analyzer training equipment. |
| Students need to improve capability to identify process control schemes to meet industry requirements.  PSLO #3: Identify and adjust controls to meet product requirements for safe and effective operation. | Students needed more specific training to identify process industry control schemes. | An overhead projector with an ELMO was installed in the classroom.  Evidence: Test with student grades. |

Lamar State College-Port Arthur offers a two-year program of study leading to the Associate of Applied Science degree in Process Technology. Students can also earn a one-year Level 1 Certificate.

Students in the Process Technology program enjoy good success, with the success rate of all PSLOs considerably higher than the college’s minimum success criteria. Most artifacts are the result of authentic student learning by use of sophisticated computer simulations and models. These authentic assessments are supplemented by quizzes and tests that ensure knowledge of basic vocabulary and processes.

Enhancements to the program included securing a new, online video of common process industry operating processes was acquired to ensure student improvement in process requirements and methods. The college purchased a new process analyzer trainer with graphic analytical results displays to give students more hands- on training in common operating parameters (pH, conductivity, turbidity). The college installed a new overhead ELMO projector so that students could see process control schemes to meet industry requirements more easily.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Process Technology Program Assessment Coordinator: James Powell Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Use technology to access operator-specific documentation and training. | Direct: 5 online video tests; 5 process trainer flow path tracing assignments; 5 rubric assessments of simulated operation of DCS; 5 rubric assessments of simulated operation of Process Trainer PLC.  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.75  (79.2%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations. | A new online training video displaying common process industry operating processes was created.  Evidence: Purchase Order for training video. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.372 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 5s | 10% |
| % of 4s | 35% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Identify specific equipment and operating parameters to meet industry standards. | Direct: 5 online video tests; 5 pneumatic actuated control valve operation quizzes; 5 manual valve identification quizzes; 5 final exams on equipment.  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.2  (86.67%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations. | A new process analyzer trainer was purchased. This allows students to use actual equipment that exists at chemical plants and refineries and monitor results of operation with graphic trends.  Evidence: Purchase order detailing equipment purchase. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.399 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 55% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Identify and adjust controls to meet product requirements for safe and effective operation. | Direct: 5 process instrumentation final exams; 5 online video tests – maintenance professional; 5 systems final exams; 5 Process trainer startup and shutdown checklists  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.3  (93.3%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations. | An overhead projector with an ELMO was installed in the classroom.  Evidence: Test with student grades. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.081 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 60% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Implement standard safety procedures as required in industry | Direct: 5 safety, health, and environment final exams; 5 rubric evaluation observations of LOTO safety procedures; 5 rubric evaluation observations of process trainer shutdown procedures; 5 research papers on heat stroke  Indirect: Department chair narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5  (83.3%) | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations. | Added a class video on confined space entry requirements common to Process Industries.  Evidence: Test with student grades. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.170 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Process Technology Created by: Powell Date: Spring 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. Use technology to access operator specific documentation and training | Ability to access operator specific documentation and training through the use of technology | Ability to access most operator specific documentation and training through the use of technology | Ability to access some operator specific documentation and training through the use of technology | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 2. Identify specific equipment and operating parameters to meet industry standards. | Ability to identify specific equipment and operating parameters to meet industry standards. | Usually able to identify specific equipment and operating parameters to meet industry standards. | Sometimes able to identify specific equipment and operating parameters to meet industry standards. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 3. Identify and adjust controls to meet requirements for safe and effective operation | Able to identify and adjust controls to meet requirements for safe and effective operation | Usually able to identify and adjust controls to meet requirements for safe and effective operation | Sometimes able to identify and adjust controls to meet requirements for safe and effective operation | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 4. Implement standard safety procedures as required in industry | Understands and implements all standard safety procedures as required in industry | Usually understands and implements most standard safety procedures as required in industry | Sometimes understands and implements some standard safety procedures as required in industry | Not enough information to assess. |  |
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**Software Developer**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Software Developer** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAS** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students need to understand basic computer concepts and apply them to programs.  PSLO #1: Apply program design processes to create computer programs. | Determined that students needed additional assignments and chapter pre-tests to evaluate incoming knowledge of the material. | Implemented a pre-test/post-test process to evaluate student knowledge of computer program design upon entering their advanced programming class.  Evidence: sample pre-test/post-test results for chapter 8. |
| Students needed additional assignments requiring original graphics.  PSLO #3: Troubleshoot computer and network systems | Included additional assignments requiring students to use their own creativity and originality in applying their knowledge of graphic software. | Implemented additional assignments asking students to produce original graphics.  Evidence: Assignment/Rubric |
| Using an Internship course did not provide accurate measurement of ethics and professionalism.  PSLO #4: Demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field | It was determined that the program needed to be redesigned to allow a valid measurement of professionalism and ethics. | The program was redesigned to include a capstone course and a course in professional development.  Evidence: Old program and new program |

The Associate of Applied Science in Software Developer is designed for students interested in programming business and game applications, database administration, and webpage design. Level 1 Certificates are also available in Computer Programmer, Computer Applications, and Multi-Media & Design.

Most artifacts for assessment of this program were gathered from final examinations with embedded questions or final projects with hands-on components. Artifacts include rubric evaluations of actual student-written computer programs and games. Hands-on, authentic learning activities are supplemented by tests and quizzes designed to ensure basic knowledge and vocabulary.

Pre-test/post-tests have been designed and added to advanced programming classes to measure student knowledge of basic computer concepts and apply them to programs. More authentic learning activities were added to assist the students’ with their ability to create original computer graphics. Faculty discovered that the internship did not provide an accurate measure of students ethics and professionalism, so the program was redesigned to include a capstone course and a course in professional development.

Artifacts for Software Developer were gathered from traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online classes.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Software Developer Program Assessment Coordinator: Schipplein Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Apply program design processes to create computer programs | Direct: 12 embedded test questions; 8 assignments  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative of description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.95  (65.8%) | 60% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students were able to apply design processes to create computer programs. However, a development of a pre-test/post-test process was implemented to increase student awareness of design concepts. | Began course with a pre-test to determine what knowledge students lack.  Embedded pre-test questions into the end of chapter test to evaluate student development. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.572 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 10% |
| % of 5s | 50% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 35% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Apply a software development process to develop and troubleshoot a software product | Direct: 10 comprehensive final exams; 10 rubric scored computer programs  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative of description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.55  (75.8%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students were able to develop and troubleshoot software products. However, a development of a pre-test/post-test process was implemented to increase student awareness of design concepts. | Began course with a pre-test to determine what knowledge students lack.  Embedded pre-test questions into the end of chapter test to evaluate student development. |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.234 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 10% |
| % of 5s | 70% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Create computer graphics for inclusion into a software product | Direct: 12 final game project scored on Likert scale; 7 original graphics  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative of description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.3  (88.3%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  Students were able to create computer graphics for inclusion into a software product. | Assignments were created to encourage students to create original graphics.  Evidence: Assignment/Rubric |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.801 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 30% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field | Direct: 5 rubric evaluations over ethical practice; 5 rubric evaluations over professionalism; 5 rubric evaluations over teamwork; 5 internship evaluations using Likert scale  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative of description of program goals and achievements | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.65  (94.2%) | All students met or exceeded expectations.  Students were able to demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field. | Program revisions were made to include a capstone course to evaluate student ending knowledge of the software development and a class in professional development to evaluate students’ ethics and professionalism. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.489 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 65% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Name of Program: Software Developer Created by: Granger Date: January 21, 2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. Apply program design processes to create computer programs. | Always develop complete processes of planning, implementing, testing, and documenting computer programs | Usually develop processes of planning, implementing, testing, and documenting computer programs. | Occasionally develop processes of planning, implementing, testing, and documenting computer programs | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 2. Apply a software development process to develop and troubleshoot a software product | Always design, write, and implement computer programs successfully | Usually design, write, and implement computer programs successfully, however may have some errors. | Occasionally design, write, and implement computer programs successfully. Often programs have errors that prevent running | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 3. Create computer graphics for inclusion into a software product | Creates graphics to be included in a software product. | Usually creates graphics to be included in a software product. | Occasionally creates graphics to be included in a software product. | Not enough information to assess |  |
| 4. Demonstrate ethics and professionalism within the computer field | Always demonstrate good, ethical practices. | Usually demonstrate good, ethical practices. | Occasionally demonstrate good, ethical practices. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Surgical Technology Program** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: Certificate or Associates of Applied Science** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students need to use medical terminology and recognize root words, suffixes, and prefixes.  PSLO 1. Use appropriate terminology related to anatomy and physiology, instruments, suturing, accessory equipment, and specialized equipment associated with surgical procedures. | 80% of students in the Surgical Technology Program met or exceeded expectations for the use of appropriate terminology; More emphasis should be included on medical terminology in the class presentation. | Revised Power Point presentation to stress more medical terminology in the surgical procedure chapters.  Evidence: Sample SRGT 1541 Ch. 15 OB-GYN Power Point in outline view |
| Students need to be able to perform basic surgical skills in an operating room environment.  PSLO 2. Operate as a surgical technologist in the scrub role during all basic surgical procedures.  Students must be able to use aseptic technique and maintain the sterile field during a surgical procedure | 84% of the students in the Surgical Technology Program are able to perform the skills needed in all basic surgical procedures. | Introduced revised clinical skill check-off sheets into the clinical setting that requires a step by step procedure to be performed in sequence before advancing to the next step.  Evidence: Sample Clinical skills check- off sheets for basic hand washing |
| Students must be able to work within their scope of practice and know the legal and ethical ramifications of their actions.  PSLO 4. Practice within the legal and ethical framework of the surgical technologist. | 80% of the students in the Surgical Technology Program are able to answer the legal, moral, and ethical questions on the Program Assessment Exam. | Showed the students the Association of Surgical Technology Web site and gave the classes the AST Recommended Standards of Practice.  Evidence: Table of Contents for the Association of Surgical Technologist Recommended Standards of Practice. |

**Surgical Technology**

The Surgical Technology program provides instruction to prepare graduates for entry-level surgical technology positions. Courses allow students to acquire the skills and demeanor necessary to function in the surgical suite and deliver competent care to surgical patients. LSC-PA offers an Associate of Applied Science degree and a Certificate in Surgical Technology.

All artifacts for this assessment round were drawn from the Surgical Technology capstone course. Component area scores came from the Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting, administered locally.

Finding show that students are meeting with good success in the Surgical Technology program. Weaknesses in students’ ability to know and recognize medical and surgical terminology resulted in the creation of a new PowerPoint presentation to accompany book chapters on surgical procedures. Newly revised clinical skill check-off sheets that require a step by step procedure to be performed in sequence before advancing to the next step were introduced to enhance basic surgical skills in the operating room environment. Legal and ethical practices are reinforced by showing the Association of Surgical Technologists website and giving the students the AST Recommended Standards of Practice.

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Surgical Technology Assessment Coordinator: Hamilton/Buckner Date: Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Use appropriate terminology related to anatomy and physiology, instruments, suturing, accessory equipment, and specialized equipment associated with surgical procedures. | Direct: 20 capstone exam component area scores from the Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting, administered locally.  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.75  (62.5%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  This PSLO was evaluated with the success criterion of 50% of students earning a mean score of two or higher by the rubric of the Program Assessment Exam. This was exceeded by 30%. | Lectures and Power point presentations were revised to stress more terminology. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.096 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 5% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 4s | 70% |
| % of 2s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Operate as a surgical technologist in the scrub role during all basic surgical procedures. | Direct: 25 capstone exam component area scores from the Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting, administered locally.  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.92  (65.3%) | 84% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  This PSLO was evaluated with the success criterion of 50% of students earning a mean score of two or higher by the rubric of the Program Assessment Exam. This was exceeded by 34%. | Clinical skill check off sheets were revised and evaluated for the next semester. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.038 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 25 |
| % of 6s | 8% |
| % of 5s | 8% |
| % of 4s | 68% |
| % of 2s | 16% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Demonstrate a surgical consciousness that promotes maintenance of a sterile field. | Direct: 20 capstone exam component area scores from the Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting, administered locally.  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4  (66.67%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  This PSLO was evaluated with the success criterion of 50% of students earning a mean score of two or higher by the rubric of the Program Assessment Exam. This was exceeded by 35%. | New DVD series was utilized in lab and in lecture to teach surgical consciousness and sterile field maintenance. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.076 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 10% |
| % of 5s | 10% |
| % of 4s | 65% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Practice within the legal and ethical framework of the surgical technologist. | Direct: 20 capstone exam component area scores from the Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting, administered locally  Indirect: Program coordinator narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4  (66.67%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  This PSLO was evaluated with the success criterion of 50% of students earning a mean score of two or higher by the rubric of the Program Assessment Exam. This was exceeded by 30%. | Association of Surgical Technologist recommended Standards of Practice were distributed and the AST web site was shown to students for reference. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.17 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 15% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 4s | 60% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Surgical Technology Created by: Hamilton/ Buckner/Hare Date: January 18, 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Use appropriate terminology related to anatomy and physiology, instruments, suturing, accessory equipment and specialized equipment associated with surgical procedures. | Student can always use appropriate terminology related to anatomy and physiology, instruments, suturing, accessory equipment and specialized equipment associated with surgical procedures. | Student can sometimes use appropriate terminology related to anatomy and physiology, instruments, suturing, accessory equipment and specialized equipment associated with surgical procedures. | Student can occasionally use appropriate terminology related to anatomy and physiology, instruments, suturing, accessory equipment and specialized equipment associated with surgical procedures. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 2. Operate as a surgical technologist in the scrub role during all basic surgical procedures. | Can operate as a surgical technologist in the scrub role during all basic surgical procedures. | Can operate as a surgical technologist in the scrub role during most basic surgical procedures. | Can operate as a surgical technologist in the scrub role during some basic surgical procedures. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 3. Demonstrate a surgical consciousness that promotes maintenance of a sterile field. | Always demonstrates a surgical consciousness that promotes maintenance of a sterile field. | Sometimes demonstrate a surgical consciousness that promotes maintenance of a sterile field. | Occasionally demonstrate a surgical consciousness that promotes maintenance of a sterile field. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 4. Practice within the legal and ethical framework of the surgical technologist. | Always practices within the legal and ethical framework of surgical technologist. | Usually follows the legal and ethical framework of surgical technologist. | Sometimes follows the legal and ethical framework of surgical technologist. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
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**Upward Mobility Nursing**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Upward Mobility Nursing** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: Associate of Applied Science Degree in Nursing** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students must be aware of the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards which govern the practice of the registered nurse (RN).  PSLO #1 Practice within the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards for the professional nurse. | We found that only 45% of the Upward Mobility nursing students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO. | We added discussion on the Texas Nursing Practice Act and its impact on the student’s nursing practice.  We added Code of Ethics Case Study #3.  Evidence: Legalities Assignment printed from website.  Code of ethics case study directions printed from website. |
| Problem solving is an integral component of nursing process.  PSLO #2 2. Use a systematic, problem-solving process to provide individualized, evidence-based nursing care and coordinate care for a limited number of patients who have complex needs in various health care settings. | We found that 76% of students met  the problem solving criterion as evidenced by the program exit exam. | To provide the students more opportunities to practice problem solving additional Evolve Case Studies were added to the curriculum.  Reinstituted requirement for NCLEX 4000 exams throughout the program.  Evidence: List of additional case studies  List of NCLEX 4000 exam topics |
| Safety must be a primary consideration for providing care to patients regardless of the healthcare setting.  PSLO #3 Employ an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the health care team. | We found that 68% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO. | Added additional safe care environment items to exams.  Faculty attended  Texas Organization of Associate Degree Nursing (TOADN) Meeting where one of the focuses was rethinking clinical education with a focus on safety and clinical education.  Evidence: Unit exam with safety questions highlighted  Agenda from TOADN meeting. |

The Upward Mobility Nursing program leads to the Associate of Applied Science degree and prepares graduates for the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX-RN) to become a Registered Nurse. The program provides an opportunity for the LVN/LPN to advance to the RN level with minimal duplication of basic education and skills courses.

All artifacts for this assessment round were drawn from the Upward Mobility Nursing capstone course. Component area scores came from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve, administered locally.

Findings show that students failed to meet the success criteria for one PSLO, “Practice within the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards for the professional nurse.” The faculty added discussion of the Texas Nursing Practice Act and its impact on the students’ nursing practice, and added a case study for assessment. Additionally, additional case studies were added to improve problem-solving skills, and reinstated the NCLEX 4000 exams throughout the program. Additional safe care environment items were added to nursing exams to improve students’ practice of safety regardless of healthcare setting.

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Upward Mobility Nursing Program Assessment Coordinator: Janet Hamilton Date: Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Practice within the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards for the professional nurse. | Direct: 20 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 3.5  (58.3%) | | 45% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  Scoring for this PSLO is below the minimum success criterion.  Since only 45% of the students met this criterion it is significantly below the Success Criterion. | | Added discussion on the Texas Nursing Practice Act and its impact on the students’ nursing practice.  Added Code of Ethic Case Study #3. | |
| Median | | 2 | |
| Mode | | 2 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.820 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 20 | |
| % of 6s | | 30% | |
| % of 5s | |  | |
| % of 4s | | 15% | |
| % of 3s | |  | |
| % of 2s | | 55% | |
| % of 1s | |  | |
| % of 0s | |  | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | |
| ***PSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 2. Use a systematic, problem-solving process to provide individualized, evidence-based nursing care and coordinate care for a limited number of patients who have complex needs in various health care settings. | | Direct: 25 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.96  (82.6%) | | 76% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  Students exceeded the criterion of 50% by 26%, but there is still room for improvement. | | Added additional Evolve Case Studies.  Reinstituted requirement for NCLEX 4000 exams throughout the program. |
| Median | | 6 | |
| Mode | | 6 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.74 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 25 | |
| % of 6s | | 72% | |
| % of 5s | |  | |
| % of 4s | | 4% | |
| % of 3s | |  | |
| % of 2s | | 24% | |
| % of 1s | |  | |
| % of 0s | |  | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Employ an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the health care team. | Direct: 25 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.52  (75.3%) | 68% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  The students exceeded the success criterion by 18%. | Added additional safe care environment items to exams. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.85 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 25 |
| % of 6s | 56% |
| % of 5s | 4% |
| % of 4s | 8% |
| % of 3s |  |
| % of 2s | 32% |
| % of 1s |  |
| % of 0s |  |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Collaborate with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, safe care to patients. | Direcrt: 25 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.48  (74.67%) | 100% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  100% of the students met this PSLO. | Implemented SBAR in clinical simulations. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.94 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 25 |
| % of 6s | 60% |
| % of 5s |  |
| % of 4s | 4% |
| % of 3s | 36% |
| % of 2s |  |
| % of 1s |  |
| % of 0s |  |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program**: Upward Mobility Nursing **Created by**: Browning\Douglas\Hamilton\MacNeill\Gongre **Date**: 01/2011

| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Practice within the legal, ethical and regulatory standards for the professional nurse. | Always practices within the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards of the professional nurse. | Usually practices within the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards of the professional nurse. | Sometimes practices within the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards of the professional nurse. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 2. Use a systematic problem-solving process to provide individualized, evidence-based nursing care and coordinate care for a limited number of patients who have complex needs in various health care settings. | Always uses a systematic problem-solving process to provide individualized, evidence-based nursing care and coordinate care for a limited number of patients who have complex needs in various health care needs. | Usually uses a systematic problem-solving process to provide individualized, evidence-based nursing care and coordinate care for a limited number of patients who have complex needs in various health care needs. | Sometimes uses a systematic problem-solving process to provide individualized, evidence-based nursing care and coordinate care for a limited number of patients who have complex needs in various health care needs. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 3. Employ an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Always employs an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Usually employs an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Sometimes employs an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 4. Collaborate with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Always collaborates with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Usually collaborates with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Sometimes collaborates with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
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**Vocational Nursing**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Vocational Nursing** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: Vocational Nursing Level 1 Certificate** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLOS** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Problem solving is an integral component of nursing process, but the process is being bypassed.  PSLO #2 2. Use a systematic, problem-solving process in the care of multiple patients who have predictable health care needs to provide safe, individualized, goal-directed nursing care. | We found that 50% of the students meet the problem solving criterion as evidenced by the program exit exam. | We started the students submitting one plan of care weekly beginning with the third week of clinical in the first level of the program.  A second day of discussion of the nursing process and care planning was added to the schedule later in the semester after students have several weeks of clinical and before the major case study assignment is due.  Evidence: Clinical Objective Guide  Class schedule |
| Safety requirements are either not recognized or practiced.  PSLO #3 Adopt an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the health care team. | We found that 55% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO. | We edited the course and unit objectives to reflect the emphasis on safe patient care so faculty can include them in their class presentations.  Copies of the SBAR Communication Standardization Implementation Tool Kit were distributed to each faculty member for use in their teaching.  Evidence: VNSG 1500 and VNSG 1509 Syllabi; Front page and table of contents from SBAR handout. |
| Communication among the members of the interdisciplinary health care team is critical for providing patients with competent nursing care; however, communication is not always clear.  PSLO #4 Cooperate with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, safe care to patients. | We found that 50% of the students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO. | The Department Chair distributed copies of SBAR Communication Standardization Implementation Tool Kit to each faculty member.  Added the use of SBAR (situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) technique to communication lecture in VNSG 1304.  Evidence: Front page and table of contents from SBAR handout.  VNSG 1304 Syllabus |

The Vocational Nursing program is a Certificate program that provides instruction in courses which prepare graduates for the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX-PN/VN) to become a Licensed Vocational Nurse (LVN).

All artifacts for this assessment round were drawn from the Vocational Nursing capstone course. Component area scores came from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve, administered locally.

Students met the success criteria for this program, but just barely. Two PSLOs received scores that exactly equal the success criteria, while the other two PSLOs have scores only scarcely above the minimum standard.

Weaknesses in problem-solving in the healthcare setting, establishing and practicing safety, and communicating clearly mar the success of the program. To remedy these major problems, faculty in the program have begun requiring that students submit weekly care plans throughout the first level of the program. Additionally, the course and unit objectives were revised to emphasize safety, and faculty began using the SBAR Communication Standardization Implementation Tool Kit.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Vocational Nursing Program Assessment Coordinator: Janet Hamilton Date: Spring 2011**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Function within the legal, ethical, and regulatory standards of the nursing profession. | Direct: 20 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.4  (73.3%) | 65% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  The students exceeded the 50% success criterion by 15%. | A nursing jurisprudence objective was added to address the relationship of unprofessional behavior to disciplinary sanctions by the Texas Board of Nursing.  Faculty attended The Texas Association of Vocational Nurse Educators Meeting where the Texas Board of Nursing provided an update on the rules and regulations governing VN Education. |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.90 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 55% |
| % of 5s |  |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s |  |
| % of 2s | 35% |
| % of 1s |  |
| % of 0s |  |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Use a systematic, problem-solving process in the care of multiple patients who have predictable health care needs to provide safe, individualized, goal-directed nursing care. | Direct: 20 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.8  (63.3%) | 50% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  The success criterion of 50% for this PSLO was met. However, because this is the crux of nursing practice, that is not acceptable. | The requirement of students submitting one plan of care weekly starting with the third week of clinical was added in the first level of the program.  A second day of discussion of the nursing process and care planning was added to the schedule later in the semester after students had several weeks of clinical and before major case study assignment is due. |
| Median | 3 |
| Mode | 2 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.936 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s |  |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s |  |
| % of 2s | 50% |
| % of 1s |  |
| % of 0s |  |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Adopt an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the health care team. | Direct: 20 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.9  (65%) | 55% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  The success criterion for this PSLO was exceeded by 5 %. | The course and unit objectives were edited to reflect the emphasis on safe patient care. |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 2 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.89 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s |  |
| % of 4s | 15% |
| % of 3s |  |
| % of 2s | 45% |
| % of 1s |  |
| % of 0s |  |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Cooperate with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, safe care to patients. | Direct: 20 capstone course/licensure exam questions from the Professional Nurse Exit Exam. It is the Reach Test Exit Exam by Evolve.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.8  (63.3%) | 50% of students met or exceeded expectations for this PSLO.  The success criterion was met for this PSLO, but communication is one of the most important activities a nurse uses in providing patient care. | Added the use of SBAR (situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) technique to communication lecture in VNSG 1304. |
| Median | 3 |
| Mode | 2 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.936 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s |  |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s |  |
| % of 2s | 50% |
| % of 1s |  |
| % of 0s |  |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**LSC-PA Technical Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Vocational Nursing Created by: Hamilton/Mulliner/Buckner/Gongre Date: 01/2011**

| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Practice within the legal, ethical and regulatory standards for the vocational nurse. | Always practices within the legal, ethical and regulatory standards for the vocational nurse. | Usually practices within the legal, ethical and regulatory standards for the vocational nurse. | Sometimes practices within the legal, ethical and regulatory standards for the vocational nurse. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 2. Use a systematic problem-solving process in the care of multiple patients who have predictable health care needs to provide individualized, goal-directed nursing care. | Always uses a systematic problem-solving process in the care of multiple patients who have predictable health care needs to provide individualized, goal-directed nursing care. | Usually uses a systematic problem-solving process in the care of multiple patients who have predictable health care needs to provide individualized, goal-directed nursing care. | Sometimes uses a systematic problem-solving process in the care of multiple patients who have predictable health care needs to provide individualized, goal-directed nursing care. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 3. Employ an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Always employs an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Usually employs an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Sometimes employs an approach to nursing practice that promotes safety for patients, significant others, self, and members of the healthcare team. | Not enough information to assess. |  |
| 4. Collaborate with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Always collaborates with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Usually collaborates with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Sometimes collaborates with members of the interdisciplinary health care team to provide optimum, evidence-based, and safe care to patients. | Not enough information to assess. |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Associate of Arts** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AA degree** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLOS** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students will improve ability to distinguish if information is based on fact or opinion.  **PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**  3 b. Differentiates the facts from opinion as relates to situation | With only an 82% rating in PSLO 3.b it was recommended that assignment instructions be clearer this semester and more class time spent in discussing the significance of recognizing the difference between facts and opinions. Implemented revised instruction sheet and added lecture time to this topic. | Students were able to identify supportive information in the informative speech as being either fact or opinion by labeling the analytical outlines clearly.  Support 1. SPCH 1315 Outline instructions  Support 2. Samples of Spring 2011 SPCH 1315 student outlines  Support 3. Samples of Fall 2010 student outlines |
| Students will improve ability to justify their use of logical, sound reasoning when explaining their conclusions.  **PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**  3d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Only 74.6% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This score is very similar to the 2009 scores showing that students need further practice at justifying their conclusions. It is recommended that course assignments specifically ask for students to explain why they have constructed their possible solutions or consequences. | Added online essay using critical thinking skills particularly asking for justification of their conclusion for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  Support 4. Student Essay Exams PHIL 1301 |
| Students will improve their ability to demonstrate awareness of cultural differences and similarities  **PSLO 2: Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities.**  2a. Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices)  2b. Interprets works of human expression within cultural context  2c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | 63.3% of students met or exceeded expectations for PSLO 2. a and 86% of students met or exceeded expectations for PSLO 2. b and 81.5% of students met or exceeded expectations for PSLO 2. c.  The score of PSLO 2.a is lower than 2009 scores in this sub criterion and is still the lowest of PSLO 2. Recommended that course assignments have clearer instructions to improve identification of cultural characteristics or additional assignments that are looking for multiple examples of cultural characteristics and increase the students’ ability to interpret works of human expression within cultural contexts and to show awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  Support 5. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions  Support 6. ENG 2326 Student Essay Samples |

**Associate of Arts**

The Associate of Arts degree curriculum is designed for students who plan to pursue a baccalaureate degree but are undecided about a specific major. The degree plan provides a Core Curriculum that will transfer to any state-supported college or university in Texas. It includes the general education requirements for almost any baccalaureate degree. Electives beyond the Core Curriculum allow students to explore various disciplines in order to determine a major.

Students in the Associate of Arts enjoyed a remarkable level of success in this round of program assessment. We looked at artifacts from both 2010 and 2009 and discovered that the lowest scoring sub-PSLO, “Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices),” still exceeds the college’s success criteria. Nonetheless, we discovered opportunities to improve the program significantly.

Artifacts for assessment of the AA degree were gathered from across the disciplines contributing to the degree. Artifacts were gathered from traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online classes. Indirect evidence includes graduation data.

To increase awareness of students’ own cultures in relation to others, faculty created a new assignment for sophomore-level literature students. Furthermore, the assessment team recommended that all assignments have clearer instructions to improve the identification of cultural characteristics. Improving critical thinking skills was identified as another area that needed improvement. Online and traditional delivery essays were either added or modified to require critical thinking to draw specific conclusions. While students had relative success distinguishing between fact and opinion, this ability is fundamental to so many other critical thinking skills. To enhance students’ capacity to discern fact from opinion, exercises that required students to label fact and opinion on analytical speech outlines was put into place.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Associate of Arts Program Assessment Coordinator: Stafford Date: 2010**

**PSLO 1: Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals and groups.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1a. Demonstrates thesis clarity. | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 case studies; 4 letters to elected officials; 3 research documents; 12 PowerPoint presentations, scored by rubrics; 5 online philosophy test questions  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.1%) | 82% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.121 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 33 |
| % of 6s | 24% |
| % of 5s | 27% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 3% |
| # Disputed | 2 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1b. Organizes information | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 psychology reports; 5 case studies; 6 poster presentations; 4 history presentations scored with rubric; 5 online philosophy questions; 5 letters to elected officials; 4 art presentations  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.49  (74.8%) | 82.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.19 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 39 |
| % of 6s | 23% |
| % of 5s | 28% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 7.7% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1c. Uses support | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 letters to elected officials; 4 presentations scored by rubric; 6 online philosophy questions; 5 case studies; 5 poster presentations scored by rubric; 5 history reports.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.70  (78.3%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.10 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 33 |
| % of 6s | 27% |
| % of 5s | 33% |
| % of 4s | 24% |
| % of 3s | 12% |
| % of 2s | 3% |
| # Disputed | 3 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Direct: 5 letters to elected officials; 4 art projects scored by rubric; 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 1 research project; 5 case studies; 6 online philosophy test questions; 5 research projects in hybrid class; 5 poster presentations scored by rubric.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.12  (85.8%) | 94.1% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Highest skill level exhibited by the artifacts collected in 2010. The improvement in textbook material in the English 1301 may contribute to these scores. Recommended to further enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.946 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 34 |
| % of 6s | 44% |
| % of 5s | 29% |
| % of 4s | 20.6% |
| % of 3s | 5.9% |
| # Disputed | 3 |

**PSLO 2: Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2a. Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices) | Direct: 5 composition research papers; 3 sociology test questions with test map; 10 online discussion board questions; 5 video reports; 1 literature post-test; 5 final exam essays; 5 diversity projects; 1 original poem.  Indirect: 10 critiques of public performances; narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.37  (72.8%) | 63.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This score is lower than 2009 scores in this sub criterion and is still the lowest of PSLO 2. Recommended that course assignments have clearer instructions to improve identification of cultural characteristics or additional assignments that are looking for multiple examples of cultural characteristics. | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.262 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 35 |
| % of 6s | 22.9% |
| % of 5s | 28.6% |
| % of 4s | 17% |
| % of 3s | 25.7% |
| % of 2s | 11% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2b. Interprets works of human expression within cultural context | Direct: 4 online philosophy questions; 1 literature post-test; 5 discussion board questions on acts of protest; 5 library projects; 3 sociology test questions; 5 literature final exam questions; 5 historical reports scored with rubric; 5 poster projects scored with rubric.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.21  (70.17%) | 86% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Higher score than 2009 and it is recommended that course activities continue to improve the students’ opportunities to interpret works of human expression within cultural contexts. | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions) |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.293 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 33 |
| % of 6s | 18% |
| % of 5s | 24% |
| % of 4s | 33% |
| % of 3s | 9% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | Direct: 4 composition research papers; 5 video reports; 5 final exam essays; 5 sociology test questions with map; 5 online discussion board questions about dominant culture; 5 online philosophy questions; 3 letters to elected officials; 1 literature post test.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.375  (73.9%) | 81.5% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Very similar score from 2009 and it is recommended that course activities continue to improve the students’ opportunities to show awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.211 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 32 |
| % of 6s | 15.6% |
| % of 5s | 37.5% |
| % of 4s | 28% |
| % of 3s | 6% |
| % of 2s | 12.5% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

**PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3a. Identifies problem, argument, or issue to determine extent of information needed | Direct: 2 pretest/post-test essays on citizenship; 5 response essays to smoking and lung cancer; 1 set of online philosophy discussions; 2 online discussion board responses on social deviance; 2 mileage calculation worksheets; 4 literature essays; 2 online discussion board questions about breast feeding and breast cancer; 7 student essays; 2 literature character analyses; 6 composition research papers; 5 drama self-evaluations;  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 5  (83.3%) | | | 94.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  A significant increase in scores from 2009 indicating that the activities added to courses had an impact in results. Also a wide variety of artifacts were assessed which added to the increased results. It is recommended that additional course activities enhance student critical thinking skills. | | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student essay exams PHIL 1301)  3. GOV 2302 expanded the Class Project scope of analysis to include State and National legislature issues.  (Support 5. Instruction Sheet GOV 2302) |
| Median | | 5 | | |
| Mode | | 5, 6 | | |
| Standard Deviation | | 0.848 | | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 34 | | |
| % of 6s | | 35% | | |
| % of 5s | | 35% | | |
| % of 4s | | 23.5% | | |
| % of 3s | | 5.8% | | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | | |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| 3b. Differentiates the facts from opinion as relates to situation | | Direct: 1 pretest/post-test on citizenship; 5 responses on social deviance; 4 responses on smoking and breast cancer; 2 responses on origins of life; 3 character analyses; 12 research papers; 1 final exam essay; 5 learning self-assessments.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.44  (74%) | 82% of students met or exceeded expectations.  A slight increase in scores from 2009 but can add more specific course enhancing activities to demonstrate student abilities to differentiate between facts and opinions. | | 1. In SPCH 1315 Public Speaking: student analytical outlines now identify if the verbal supportive materials used in the speech are facts or opinions.  (Support 6. Speech Outline Instructional Samrple Outlines)  2. Using new textbook in SPCH 1315 which emphasizes differences in fact and opinion particularly sections on propaganda, misinformation, and disinformation.  (Support 7. Textbook table of contents Ch. 8, 9, 10, & 11) | |
| Median | | 5 |
| Mode | | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.22 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 27 |
| % of 6s | | 18.5% |
| % of 5s | | 37% |
| % of 4s | | 25.9% |
| % of 3s | | 7% |
| % of 2s | | 11% |
| # Disputed | | 4 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Direct: 15 online responses to smoking and lung cancer, breast cancer, reverence for life, social deviance, protagonists and self; conclusion paragraphs/sections of 11 research essays.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.52  (75.5%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Not as high as the 2009 scores but still in the acceptable range. It is recommended that course assignments specifically ask for students to construct possible solutions or prediction of consequences to improve their critical thinking skills. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student Essay exams) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.985 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 25 |
| % of 6s | 16% |
| % of 5s | 40% |
| % of 4s | 24% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Direct: 2 pretest/post-tests on citizenship; 3 mileage reports; 7 online responses to jobs, meaning of life, social deviance; conclusion paragraphs/sections of 4 research essays; 3 psychology exam questions with test map; 4 nutrition exam questions.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.74  (79%) | 74.6% of students met or exceeded expectations.  The scores are very similar to the 2009 scores showing that students need further practice at justifying their conclusions. It is recommended that course assignments specifically ask for students to explain why they have constructed their possible solutions or consequences. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student Essay Exams PHIL 1301) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.287 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 23 |
| % of 6s | 34.8% |
| % of 5s | 34.8% |
| % of 4s | 4% |
| % of 3s | 21.7% |
| % of 2s | 3.7% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

**PSLO 4: Demonstrates technology literacy**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Direct: 5 library projects; 5 online discussion board discussions; 9 PowerPoint projects scored with rubrics; 4 internet research projects for biology; 16 graphic arts design projects.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 87.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. New textbook in SPCH 1315 emphasized Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Support 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.894 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 39 |
| % of 6s | 17.9% |
| % of 5s | 56% |
| % of 4s | 12.8% |
| % of 3s | 12.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Direct: 3 case studies; 5 online discussion board projects; 3 internet research projects for biology; 16 graphic design projects scored by rubrics; 1 letter to elected official; 3 library research projects; 2 psychology essays;  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.51  (75.2%) | 89.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Using new textbook in SPCH 1315 which emphasizes Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Support 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.901 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 10.8% |
| % of 5s | 43% |
| % of 4s | 35% |
| % of 3s | 8% |
| % of 2s | 2.7% |
| # Disputed | 2 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4c. Presents information using the appropriate tool or device | Direct: 4 PowerPoint projects scored with rubrics; 1 internet information search for biology; 2 composition research papers; 6 online discussion board discussions on food pyramid; 2 case studies; 22 graphic arts design projects.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.19  (86.5%) | 87.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Used new textbook in SPCH 1315 which emphasizes Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Support 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.844 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 43% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 18.9% |
| % of 3s | 12.7% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program.**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program. | Indirect: Graduation data only.  2006: 71  2007: 80  2008: 67  2009: 68  2010: 58 |  |  |  | There is a drop in the graduate rate due to the lower enrollment figures of 2009 which was influenced by the local economic job market and loss of student population after two hurricanes. Advertisements for the college focused on starting your education close to home at affordable rates and more scholarships were offered to encourage attendance. | To accommodate increased enrollment in Spring 2011 and an additional section of DRAM 1310 Introduction to Theater was offered because DRAM 1330 Stagecraft closed at capacity and 21 additional students needed a course that would met the Visual and Performing Arts component of the Core Curriculum.  Also an additional online ENG 1301 and an on campus ENG 1302 were added.  (Support 10. F.2.22 course additions to schedule ) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Associate of Arts Created by: Gongre/Stafford/Dupuis/Askew/Huval/Sorrells Date: Spring 2011**

**PSLO 1.** **Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals or groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 1. a. Demonstrates thesis clarity | Thesis and purpose are clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are fairly clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are vague to audience; only loosely relates to communication task |  |  |
| 1. b. Organizes information | Fully & creatively supports thesis & purpose with effective transitions & sequencing of ideas | Organizational elements support thesis & purpose but could improve transitions & sequencing of ideas | Signs of logical organization but may have abrupt shifts & less than effective flow of ideas |  |  |
| 1. c. Uses support | Substantial, logical & specific development of ideas; details are relevant, original, credible and correctly documented when appropriate | Solid but less than original reasoning with some appropriate details or examples and limited documentation if relevant | Obvious support that may be too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to thesis, or repetitive with little or no relevant documentation |  |  |
| 1. d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Style of presentation is appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is fairly appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is underdeveloped for specific audience and loosely matches communication task |  |  |

**PSLO 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 2. a. Identifies cultural characteristics (including beliefs, values, perspectives and/or practices) | Identifies multiple cultural characteristics | Identifies at least two  cultural characteristics | Identifies one cultural characteristic |  |  |
| 2. b. Interprets works of human expression  within cultural context | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with specific details that reveals insights to understanding the value of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with generalizations that include some details showing an awareness of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with description and limited details in a ethnocentric way |  |  |
| 2. c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others | Illuminates with multiple specific details the understanding between self and others | Articulates with some details the understanding between self and others | Shows limited understanding between self and others |  |  |

**PSLO 3.**  **Uses critical thinking skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 3. a. identifies problem, argument, or issue (to determine extent of information needed) | Key concepts and terms are identified and extensive information is used | Identifies concepts related to the situation to develop some details of information | Unable to formulate clearly what is needed to examine the situation and uses limited details |  |  |
| 3.b. Differentiates the facts from opinions as relates to situation | Multiple and diverse sources of information are used to distinguish between facts and opinions | Some facts and opinion are clearly distinguished but not consistently | Separation between fact and opinion is unclear and minimally related to situation |  |  |
| 3. c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Generates new , creative, interesting ideas as solutions or consequences; makes appropriate connections between ideas | Provides some connected ideas and a reasonable solution or consequence | Ideas are limited and the connection between ideas is vague and solution is obvious or not conclusive |  |  |
| 3. d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Able to integrate information from a variety of sources to draw appropriate conclusion; articulates the use of a recognizable reasoning pattern for the justification of conclusion | Can integrate information from sources and draws a conclusion by using a reasoning pattern | Shows limited ability to integrate information from sources and draws a weak conclusion by using a reasoning pattern incorrectly |  |  |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 4. a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully implements use of technological tool or device for assigned task | Appropriate tool or device is used with some errors or multiple attempts | Displays difficulty in identifying or using appropriate technology tool or device |  |  |
| 4. b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Demonstrates exemplary skills in layout or format of information | Shows some skill in layout or format of information | Shows limited understanding in layout or format of information |  |  |
| 4. c. Presents information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully completes project utilizing a word processing program, and or other necessary software, with a variety of resources if needed | Displays some skill in presenting information effectively with technological tools or device but may have errors or multiple attempts | Limited use of appropriate technology tool or device to complete task |  |  |

**PSLO 5. Transfers to a baccalaureate program**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| a. Exhibits student contact hours completed at LSC-PA |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Number of AA majors who graduate |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. Number of AA graduates who request transcripts sent to other colleges or universities |  |  |  |  |  |
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**Associate of Arts 2009**

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Associate of Arts Program Assessment Coordinator: Stafford Date: FALL 2009**

**PSLO: 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals and groups.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1a. Demonstrates thesis clarity. | Direct: 5 written paragraphs; 2 written essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 4 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 3 monolog reports with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (81%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.a and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify thesis clarity in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which identified thesis clarity to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.089 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 30% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1b. Organizes information | Direct: 5 written paragraphs; 2 written essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 4 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 3 monolog reports with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.95  (82.5%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.b and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify the organization of information in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which demonstrated clearer organization techniques to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.191 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1c. Uses support | Direct: 5 chapter question short paragraphs; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 3 rubric evaluations of project; 4 comprehensive research outlines; 5 dramatic critiques of a public performance | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.2  (86.67%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show this to be the most developed of abilities in PSLO #1 and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify the use of support in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which identified support materials used successfully to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.951 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Direct: 5 chapter question short paragraphs; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 5 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 2 monolog projects with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (80.8%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.d and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to evaluate delivery elements in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which are used to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.137 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2a. Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices) | | Direct: 7 online discussion board responses; 18 exam questions with test maps; 1 internet research project; 3 essays on interpersonal communication; 10 critiques of public performances | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.72  (72.9%) | | 76.9% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Analysis reveals this is the weakest of skills in the PSLO #2 and it is recommended that additional assignments or supplemental material be added to course work to improve student ability to identify cultural characteristics. Also noted that instructor instructions could be clearer in asking for this type of information. | | The discussion board questions for online and on campus classes became a required element in the following courses and the questions pertained to specific cultural issues in which cultural characteristics were identified.  Courses:  SOC 1301  PHIL 1301  GOV 2301 and  GOV 2301  (Support 3. Syllabi from the above courses) |
| Median | | 5 | |
| Mode | | 5 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.450 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 39 | |
| % of 6s | | 38.5% | |
| % of 5s | | 33.34% | |
| % of 4s | | 5% | |
| % of 3s | | 7.7% | |
| % of 2s | | 15.4% | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| 2b. Interprets works of human expression within cultural context | Direct: 5 online discussion board questions; 5 internet research projects ; 12 critiques of public performances; | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.77  (79.5%) | | 77.3 % of students met or exceeded expectations.  The results of analysis reveal that the students have exceeded the expectations but can be improved with focus on this PSLO within course assignments. Also more diversity in artifact collection is recommended for improvement. | | ENG 2312 British Literature added a required “relevancy response” to each exam over each literature reading assignment.  (Support 4. Instructions for exams)  Additional courses are included in the request for artifacts to be used in the rating process.  (Support 5. Memo requesting faculty to submit artifact examples) | |
| Median | | 5 | |
| Mode | | 5 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.152 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 22 | |
| % of 6s | | 31.8% | |
| % of 5s | | 36% | |
| % of 4s | | 9% | |
| % of 3s | | 22.7% | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | Direct: 8 online discussion board questions; 13 exam questions with test maps; 5 rubric evaluations of monolog project; 3 essays; 5 critiques of public performances | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.82  (80.3%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is the highest demonstrated skill in PSLO #2 showing that the students are aware of their own culture in relation to others but it is recommended that course enhancement activities will improve their ability to express this awareness. | ENG 2312 British Literature added a required “relevancy response” to each exam over each literature reading assignment.  (Support 4. Instructions for exams)  Additional courses are included in the request for artifacts to be used in the rating process.  (Support 5. Memo requesting faculty to submit artifact examples) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.290 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 34 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 38% |
| % of 4s | 12% |
| % of 3s | 3% |
| % of 2s | 12% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3a. Identifies problem, argument, or issue to determine extent of information needed | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 10 final exam questions with test map; 1 persuasive speech outline; 3 kinesiology lab reports; 2 comprehensive research outlines | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.35  (72.5%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One of the weakest in PSLO # 3 even though the students met the success criterion. It is recommended that specific course improvements be made to enhance the student ability to identify problems, arguments, or issues. | 1. ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.)    2. GOV 2301 added Online Class Project to investigate and analyze local government issues.  (Support 7. Instruction sheet) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.137 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 15% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3b. Differentiates the facts from opinion as relates to situation | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 10 final exam question with test maps; 1 persuasive speech outline; 1 kinesiology lab report; 4 comprehensive research outlines | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  The students demonstrated they can identify the difference between fact and opinion but can improve in this ability with the enhanced assignment focus on critical thinking skills overall in course assignment. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.322 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 2 chapter discussions; 5 final exam questions with test map; 5 internet research projects; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive speech outline; 1 kinesiology lab report | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.35  (89.2%) | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is the highest skill area in the critical thinking PSLO #3. It is recommended that the course enhancement assignment will improve the student ability to construct possible solutions or prediction of consequences. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.04 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 65% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Direct: 4 online discussion board postings; 2 chapter discussion essays; 10 exams with test maps; 4 monolog projects with project map. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.2%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One of the weakest in PSLO # 3 even though the students met the success criterion. It is recommended that specific course improvements be made to enhance the student ability to use logical, sound reason to justify conclusion. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.356 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 30% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Direct: 11 online discussion board postings; 5 online chapter assignments; 10 exam questions with test map; 5 internet research projects; 1 bibliography; 4 rubric evaluations of PowerPoint presentations; 1 online review question | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.59  (93.2%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students demonstrate a high level of technological literacy in using computers to respond to online assignments and find information needed for research projects or presentations. It is recommended that courses utilize current technology in their course assignments or incorporate new assignments using technological elements.  Texas High Education Coordinating Board requires by law that all syllabi are on the home page of the institution’s website for student access to class information. | 1. GOV 2301 added Online Class Project to investigate and analyze local government issues.  (Support 7. Instruction sheet)  2. GOV 2301 & GOV 2302 added “Find Your Ideology” computer exercise for on campus students to use technology.  (Support 8. Instructions sheet)  3. ENG 1301 and ENG 1302 required all work to be created on the computer.  (Support 9. Syllabus)  4. IT uploaded all faculty syllabi for Fall 2010 on the home page of the college’s web site.  (Support 10. Snapshot of web page) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.956 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 75.7% |
| % of 5s | 19% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Direct: 14 online assignments; 17 online discussion board assignments; 10 exam questions with test map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.51  (91.8%) | 95.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Artifacts showed that students accurately can formatting essays, discussion board questions and display knowledge about organizing information with tools of technology, but a more diverse collection of artifacts would enhance the assessment process. | ART 2349 Digital Art is a computer graphics class offered in 2010 for the first time.  (Support 11. Syllabus and Calendar) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.779 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 41 |
| % of 6s | 63% |
| % of 5s | 29% |
| % of 4s | 2% |
| % of 3s | 4.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4c. Presents information using the appropriate tool or device | Direct: 20 online discussion board assignments; 8 online assignments; 3 exam questions with test map; 2 internet projects; 4 rubric evaluations of PowerPoint presentations; 1 online review | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.87  (97.8%) | 97.34% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students exceeded expectations but to enhance this skill students have to stay current with the ever changing technology. Assignments in courses need to fully utilize the abilities of current technological tools or devices. | 1. Academic Dean encouraged faculty to enhance assignments by using technology, particularly the WebCT features on the campus system in course assignments where appropriate.  (Support 12. Memo to faculty, Jan. 10, 2010) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.529 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 38 |
| % of 6s | 92% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 2.6% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program.**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program. | Indirect: Graduation data only.  2006: 71  2007: 80  2008: 67  2009: 68 |  |  |  | Enrollment fluxuates with local economy and hurricane events but the recommendation is to focus on retention techniques at the course level. | ENG 1301, 1302, 2321, 2326 incorporated a sign in sheet for each class period to reduce tardiness and absenteeism.  (Support 13. Syllabus)  GOV 2301, 2302,  Soc. 1201,  Phil 1301  introduced the policy of disqualifying any extra credit to students who exceed the 3 hour unexcused absence limit.  (Support 14. Syllabus) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Associate of Arts Created by: Gongre/Stafford/Dupuis/Askew/Huval/Sorrells Date: 1/26/2011**

**PSLO 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals or groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 1. a. Demonstrates thesis clarity | Thesis and purpose are clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are fairly clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are vague to audience; only loosely relates to communication task |  |  |
| 1. b. Organizes information | Fully & creatively supports thesis & purpose with effective transitions & sequencing of ideas | Organizational elements support thesis & purpose but could improve transitions & sequencing of ideas | Signs of logical organization but may have abrupt shifts & less than effective flow of ideas |  |  |
| 1. c. Uses support | Substantial, logical & specific development of ideas; details are relevant, original, credible and correctly documented when appropriate | Solid but less than original reasoning with some appropriate details or examples and limited documentation if relevant | Obvious support that may be too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to thesis, or repetitive with little or no relevant documentation |  |  |
| 1. d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Style of presentation is appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is fairly appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is underdeveloped for specific audience and loosely matches communication task |  |  |

**PSLO 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 2. a. Identifies cultural characteristics (including beliefs, values, perspectives and/or practices) | Identifies multiple cultural characteristics | Identifies at least two  cultural characteristics | Identifies one cultural characteristic |  |  |
| 2. b. Interprets works of human expression  within cultural context | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with specific details that reveals insights to understanding the value of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with generalizations that include some details showing an awareness of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with description and limited details in a ethnocentric way |  |  |
| 2. c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others | Illuminates with multiple specific details the understanding between self and others | Articulates with some details the understanding between self and others | Shows limited understanding between self and others |  |  |

**PSLO 3. Uses critical thinking skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 3. a. identifies problem, argument, or issue (to determine extent of information needed) | Key concepts and terms are identified and extensive information is used | Identifies concepts related to the situation to develop some details of information | Unable to formulate clearly what is needed to examine the situation and uses limited details |  |  |
| 3.b. Differentiates the facts from opinions as relates to situation | Multiple and diverse sources of information are used to distinguish between facts and opinions | Some facts and opinion are clearly distinguished but not consistently | Separation between fact and opinion is unclear and minimally related to situation |  |  |
| 3. c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Generates new , creative, interesting ideas as solutions or consequences; makes appropriate connections between ideas | Provides some connected ideas and a reasonable solution or consequence | Ideas are limited and the connection between ideas is vague and solution is obvious or not conclusive |  |  |
| 3. d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Able to integrate information from a variety of sources to draw appropriate conclusion; articulates the use of a recognizable reasoning pattern for the justification of conclusion | Can integrate information from sources and draws a conclusion by using a reasoning pattern | Shows limited ability to integrate information from sources and draws a weak conclusion by using a reasoning pattern incorrectly |  |  |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| 4. a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully implements use of technological tool or device for assigned task | Appropriate tool or device is used with some errors or multiple attempts | Displays difficulty in identifying or using appropriate technology tool or device |  |  |
| 4. b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Demonstrates exemplary skills in layout or format of information | Shows some skill in layout or format of information | Shows limited understanding in layout or format of information |  |  |
| 4. c. Presents information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully completes project utilizing a word processing program, and or other necessary software, with a variety of resources if needed | Displays some skill in presenting information effectively with technological tools or device but may have errors or multiple attempts | Limited use of appropriate technology tool or device to complete task |  |  |

**PSLO 5.** Transfers to a baccalaureate program

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Lack of Evidence** | **Rating** |
| a. Exhibits student contact hours completed at LSC-PA |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Number of AA majors who graduate |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. Number of AA graduates who request transcripts sent to other colleges or universities |  |  |  |  |  |
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**Associate of Arts in Teaching 2010**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Educational Program: Associate of Arts in Teaching** | | |
| **Degree/Certificate Award: AAT degree** | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Students will improve ability to identify characteristics of diverse populations within an education setting.  **PSLO 6: Analyzes learning communities.**  6a. Identifies characteristics of diverse populations within an education setting. | Faculty are keeping copies of all students’ work which is a more representative sampling of examples used in rating assessments. Instructions for Observation Journal entries clearly emphasize what characteristics of diverse population within an education setting were to be included in the analysis since only 40% of students met or exceeded expectations. | New instruction sheets were given to students in EDUC 1301 & EDUC 2301 to clarify expectations of what characteristics of diverse population within an education setting were to be included in the analysis.  Support 1. Instructions for Observation Journals Spring 2011 |
| **PSLO 6: Analyzes learning communities.**  6b. Identifies diverse teaching styles. | Faculty are keeping copies of all students’ work which is a more representative sampling of examples used in rating assessments. Instructions for Observation Journal entries clearly emphasize what characteristics of diverse teaching styles were to be included in the analysis since 60% of students met or exceeded expectations. | New instruction sheets were given to students in EDUC 1301 & EDUC 2301 to clarify expectations of what characteristics of diverse teaching styles were to be included in the analysis.  Support 1.r Instructions for Observation Journals Spring 2011 |
| **PSLO 6: Analyzes learning communities.**  6c. Presents information about learning communities in appropriate mode of expression. | Faculty are keeping copies of all students’ work which is a more representative sampling of examples used in rating assessments. Instructions for Observation Journal entries clearly emphasize how the information should be presented to be in the appropriate mode of expression since 70% of students met or exceeded expectations | New instruction sheets were given to students in EDUC 1301 & EDUC 2301 to clarify expectations of appropriate presentation of Observation Journals.  Support 1. Instructions for Observation Journals Spring 2011 |

The Associate of Arts in Teaching degree curriculum is a new program designed for students who plan to pursue a baccalaureate degree in education. The degree plan provides a Core Curriculum that will transfer to any state-supported college or university in Texas. It includes additional course requirements in the subject area. Specializations are available in Teaching, art, drama, music and physical education.

Students in the Associate of Arts in Teaching program enjoyed a remarkable level of success in this round of program assessment, especially in the PSLOs and subPSLOs that measured general education knowledge. The education-specific subPSLO did not enjoy such strong success, and one subPSLO, “Identifies characteristics of diverse populations within an education setting” did not meet the college’s success criteria.

Artifacts for assessment of the AAT degree were gathered from across the disciplines contributing to the degree. Artifacts were gathered from traditional delivery, hybrid, computer-assisted, and online classes. Indirect evidence includes graduation data. Graduation data was used as an indirect measure of success.

To counter student difficulties identifying characteristics of learning communities and their diverse populations, and diverse teaching styles, new instruction sheets were given to students in EDUC 1301 & EDUC 2301 to clarify expectations of what characteristics of diverse population within an education setting are.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Name of Program: Associate of Arts in Teaching Assessment Coordinator: Stafford Date: 2010**

**PSLO 1: Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals and groups.**

| ***subPSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1a. Demonstrates thesis clarity. | | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 case studies; 4 letters to elected officials; 3 research documents; 12 PowerPoint presentations, scored by rubrics; 5 online philosophy test questions  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.45  (74.1%) | | 82% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | | 5 | |
| Mode | | 4 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.121 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 33 | |
| % of 6s | | 24% | |
| % of 5s | | 27% | |
| % of 4s | | 30% | |
| % of 3s | | 15% | |
| % of 2s | | 3% | |
| # Disputed | | 2 | |
| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| 1b. Organizes information | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 psychology reports; 5 case studies; 6 poster presentations; 4 history presentations scored with rubric; 5 online philosophy questions; 5 letters to elected officials; 4 art presentations  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.49  (74.8%) | | 82.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) | |
| Median | | 5 | |
| Mode | | 4 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.19 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 39 | |
| % of 6s | | 23% | |
| % of 5s | | 28% | |
| % of 4s | | 30% | |
| % of 3s | | 10% | |
| % of 2s | | 7.7% | |
| # Disputed | | 1 | |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1c. Uses support | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 letters to elected officials; 4 presentations scored by rubric; 6 online philosophy questions; 5 case studies; 5 poster presentations scored by rubric; 5 history reports.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.70  (78.3%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.10 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 33 |
| % of 6s | 27% |
| % of 5s | 33% |
| % of 4s | 24% |
| % of 3s | 12% |
| % of 2s | 3% |
| # Disputed | 3 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Direct: 5 letters to elected officials; 4 art projects scored by rubric; 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 1 research project; 5 case studies; 6 online philosophy test questions; 5 research projects in hybrid class; 5 poster presentations scored by rubric.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.12  (85.8%) | 94.1% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Highest skill level exhibited by the artifacts collected in 2010. The improvement in textbook material in the English 1301 may contribute to these scores. Recommended to further enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.946 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 34 |
| % of 6s | 44% |
| % of 5s | 29% |
| % of 4s | 20.6% |
| % of 3s | 5.9% |
| # Disputed | 3 |

**PSLO 2: Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities.**

| ***subPSLO*** | | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | | ***Success Criterion*** | | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2a. Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices) | | | Direct: 5 composition research papers; 3 sociology test questions with test map; 10 online discussion board questions; 5 video reports; 1 literature post-test; 5 final exam essays; 5 diversity projects; 1 original poem; 10 critiques of public performances  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | | Mean | | 4.37  (72.8%) | | 63.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This score is lower than 2009 scores in this sub criterion and is still the lowest of PSLO 2. Recommended that course assignments have clearer instructions to improve identification of cultural characteristics or additional assignments that are looking for multiple examples of cultural characteristics. | | | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2.  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions) | | |
| Median | | 5 | |
| Mode | | 5 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.262 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 35 | |
| % of 6s | | 22.9% | |
| % of 5s | | 28.6% | |
| % of 4s | | 17% | |
| % of 3s | | 25.7% | |
| % of 2s | | 11% | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | |
| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | | ***Success Criterion*** | | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| 2b. Interprets works of human expression within cultural context | Direct: 4 online philosophy questions; 1 literature post-test; 5 discussion board questions on acts of protest; 5 library projects; 3 sociology test questions; 5 literature final exam questions; 5 historical reports scored with rubric; 5 poster projects scored with rubric.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | | Mean | | | 4.21  (70.17%) | | | | | 86% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Higher score than 2009 and it is recommended that course activities continue to improve the students’ opportunities to interpret works of human expression within cultural contexts. | | | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions) |
| Median | | | 4 | | | | |
| Mode | | | 4 | | | | |
| Standard Deviation | | | 1.293 | | | | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | | 33 | | | | |
| % of 6s | | | 18% | | | | |
| % of 5s | | | 24% | | | | |
| % of 4s | | | 33% | | | | |
| % of 3s | | | 9% | | | | |
| % of 2s | | | 15% | | | | |
| # Disputed | | | 0 | | | | |
| ***subPSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | | ***Success Criterion*** | | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| 2c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | | Direct: 4 composition research papers; 5 video reports; 5 final exam essays; 5 sociology test questions with map; 5 online discussion board questions about dominant culture; 5 online philosophy questions; 3 letters to elected officials; 1 literature post test.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | | Mean | | | | 4.375  (73.9%) | | 81.5% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Very similar score from 2009 and it is recommended that course activities continue to improve the students’ opportunities to show awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | | | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions) | |
| Median | | | | 5 | |
| Mode | | | | 5 | |
| Standard Deviation | | | | 1.211 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | | | 32 | |
| % of 6s | | | | 15.6% | |
| % of 5s | | | | 37.5% | |
| % of 4s | | | | 28% | |
| % of 3s | | | | 6% | |
| % of 2s | | | | 12.5% | |
| # Disputed | | | | 1 | |

**PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3a. Identifies problem, argument, or issue to determine extent of information needed | Direct: 2 pretest/post-test essays on citizenship; 5 response essays to smoking and lung cancer; 1 set of online philosophy discussions; 2 online discussion board responses on social deviance; 2 mileage calculation worksheets; 4 literature essays; 2 online discussion board questions about breast feeding and breast cancer; 7 student essays; 2 literature character analyses; 6 composition research papers;  5 drama self-evaluations;  Indirect:  Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5  (83.3%) | 94.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  A significant increase in scores from 2009 indicating that the activities added to courses had an impact in results. Also a wide variety of artifacts were assessed which added to the increased results. It is recommended that additional course activities enhance student critical thinking skills. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student essay exams PHIL 1301)  3. GOV 2302 expanded the Class Project scope of analysis to include State and National legislature issues.  (Support 5. Instruction Sheet GOV 2302) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.848 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 34 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 23.5% |
| % of 3s | 5.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3b. Differentiates the facts from opinion as relates to situation | Direct: 1 pretest/post-test on citizenship; 5 responses on social deviance; 4 responses on smoking and breast cancer; 2 responses on origins of life; 3 character analyses; 12 research papers; 1 final exam essay.  Indirect: 5 learning self-assessments;  Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.44  (74%) | 82% of students met or exceeded expectations.  A slight increase in scores from 2009 but can add more specific course enhancing activities to demonstrate student abilities to differentiate between facts and opinions. | 1. In SPCH 1315 Public Speaking: student analytical outlines now identify if the verbal supportive materials used in the speech are facts or opinions.  (Support 6. Speech 1315 Outline Instruction- Sample Outlines)  2. Using new textbook in SPCH 1315 which emphasizes differences in fact and opinion particularly sections on propaganda, misinformation, and disinformation.  (Support 7. New Textbook SPCH 1315 Table of Contents Ch. 8, 9, 10, & 11) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.22 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 27 |
| % of 6s | 18.5% |
| % of 5s | 37% |
| % of 4s | 25.9% |
| % of 3s | 7% |
| % of 2s | 11% |
| # Disputed | 4 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Direct: 15 online responses to smoking and lung cancer, breast cancer, reverence for life, social deviance, protagonists and self; conclusion paragraphs/sections of 11 research essays.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.52  (75.5%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Not as high as the 2009 scores but still in the acceptable range. It is recommended that course assignments specifically ask for students to construct possible solutions or prediction of consequences to improve their critical thinking skills. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student Essay exarms PHIL 1301 ) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.985 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 25 |
| % of 6s | 16% |
| % of 5s | 40% |
| % of 4s | 24% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Direct: 2 pretest/post-tests on citizenship; 3 mileage reports; 7 online responses to jobs, meaning of life, social deviance; conclusion paragraphs/sections of 4 research essays; 3 psychology exam questions with test map; 4 nutrition exam questions.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.74  (79%) | 74.6% of students met or exceeded expectations.  The scores are very similar to the 2009 scores showing that students need further practice at justifying their conclusions. It is recommended that course assignments specifically ask for students to explain why they have constructed their possible solutions or consequences. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2.  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student Essay Exams PHIL 1301) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.287 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 23 |
| % of 6s | 34.8% |
| % of 5s | 34.8% |
| % of 4s | 4% |
| % of 3s | 21.7% |
| % of 2s | 3.7% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

**PSLO 4: Demonstrates technology literacy**

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Direct: 5 library projects; 5 online discussion board discussions; 9 PowerPoint projects scored with rubrics; 4 internet research projects for biology;16 graphic arts design projects.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 87.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. New textbook in SPCH 1315 emphasized Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. New Textbook SPCH 1315 Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Source 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.894 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 39 |
| % of 6s | 17.9% |
| % of 5s | 56% |
| % of 4s | 12.8% |
| % of 3s | 12.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Direct: 3 case studies; 5 online discussion board projects; 3 internet research projects for biology; 16 graphic design projects scored by rubrics; 1 letter to elected official; 3 library research projects; 2 psychology essays;  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.51  (75.2%) | 89.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. New textbook in SPCH 1315 emphasized Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. New Textbook SPCH 131r5 Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Source 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.901 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 10.8% |
| % of 5s | 43% |
| % of 4s | 35% |
| % of 3s | 8% |
| % of 2s | 2.7% |
| # Disputed | 2 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4c. Presents information using the appropriate tool or device | Direct: 4 PowerPoint projects scored with rubrics; 1 internet information search for biology; 2 composition research papers; 6 online discussion board discussions on food pyramid; 2 case studies; 22 graphic arts design projects.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.19  (86.5%) | 87.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online essay that specifically required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. New textbook in SPCH 1315 emphasized Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. New Textbook SPCH 1315 Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Source 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.844 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 43% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 18.9% |
| % of 3s | 12.7% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program.**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program. | Indirect: Graduation data only.  2006: 0  2007: 0  2008: 4  2009: 4  2010: 3 |  | Mean |  | The program is still relatively new and the economic depression in the area influenced the number of graduates in the academic programs. | Moved the sections of EDUC 1301 and EDUC 2301 to Tuesday – Thursday class periods for longer class time and at prime times of 9:30 and 11:00 to make the courses attractive to student schedules.  (Support 10. Course Schedules Fall 2010 & Spring 2011) |
| Median |  |
| Mode |  |
| Standard Deviation |  |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* |  |
| % of 6s |  |
| % of 5s |  |
| % of 4s |  |
| % of 3s |  |
| % of 2s |  |
| % of 1s |  |
| % of 0s |  |
| # Disputed |  |

**PSLO 6: Analyzes learning communities.**

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a. Identifies characteristics of diverse populations within an education setting. | Direct: 18 classroom observation reports; 2 principles of teaching reports.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.2  (53.3%) | 40% of students met or exceeded expectations.  The success criterion of 50% or more will score a total mean score of 2 or higher was not met.  Recommended that the assignment clarify in the instructions what cultural characteristics can be included in the description of students in the classroom observation journal reports. Gender was included in some, but not all and ethnicity, age, or other cultural characters should be specified. | Educ. Courses enhanced instructions by adding specific examples of what constitutes cultural characteristics in class discussion of project preparation.  (Support 11. EDUC 1301 & 2301 Journal Observation Instructions) |
| Median | 3 |
| Mode | 3 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.105 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 5s | 10% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 40% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| % of 1s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6b. Identifies diverse teaching styles. | Direct: 18 classroom observation reports; 2 principles of teaching reports.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.8  (63.3%) | 60% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is a satisfactory level but can be improved through classroom activity enhancements. | Educ. Courses enhanced instructions by adding specific examples of what constitutes diverse teaching styles in class discussion of project preparation.  (Support 11. EDUC 1301 & 2301 Journal Observation Instructions) |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 2 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.542 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 15% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| % of 2s | 35% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***subPSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6c. Presents information about learning communities in appropriate mode of expression. | Direct: 18 classroom observation reports; 2 principles of teaching reports.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.75  (79.2%) | 70% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is the highest score in PSLO 6 and reflects that student’s follow the instructions for creating projects fairly well but can improve by course enhancing activities. | EDUC Courses enhanced instructions by adding specific presentation expectations in class discussion of project preparation and on the revised instruction sheet.  (Support 11. EDUC 1301 & 2301 Journal Observation Instructions) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.482 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |
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**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Associate of Arts in Teaching Created by: Gongre/Stafford/Dupuis/Askew/ Huval/Sorrells Date: 1/26/2011**

**PSLO 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals or groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. a. Demonstrates thesis clarity | Thesis and purpose are clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are fairly clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are vague to audience; only loosely relates to communication task |  |  |
| 1. b. Organizes information | Fully & creatively supports thesis & purpose with effective transitions & sequencing of ideas | Organizational elements support thesis & purpose but could improve transitions & sequencing of ideas | Signs of logical organization but may have abrupt shifts & less than effective flow of ideas |  |  |
| 1. c. Uses support | Substantial, logical & specific development of ideas; details are relevant, original, credible and correctly documented when appropriate | Solid but less than original reasoning with some appropriate details or examples and limited documentation if relevant | Obvious support that may be too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to thesis, or repetitive with little or no relevant documentation |  |  |
| 1. d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Style of presentation is appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is fairly appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is underdeveloped for specific audience and loosely matches communication task |  |  |

**PSLO 2.**  Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 2. a. Identifies cultural characteristics (including beliefs, values, perspectives and/or practices) | Identifies multiple cultural characteristics | Identifies at least two  cultural characteristics | Identifies one cultural characteristic |  |  |
| 2. b. Interprets works of human expression  within cultural context | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with specific details that reveals insights to understanding the value of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with generalizations that include some details showing an awareness of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with description and limited details in a ethnocentric way |  |  |
| 2. c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others | Illuminates with multiple specific details the understanding between self and others | Articulates with some details the understanding between self and others | Shows limited understanding between self and others |  |  |

**PSLO 3. Uses critical thinking skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 3. a. identifies problem, argument, or issue (to determine extent of information needed) | Key concepts and terms are identified and extensive information is used | Identifies concepts related to the situation to develop some details of information | Unable to formulate clearly what is needed to examine the situation and uses limited details |  |  |
| 3.b. Differentiates the facts from opinions as relates to situation | Multiple and diverse sources of information are used to distinguish between facts and opinions | Some facts and opinion are clearly distinguished but not consistently | Separation between fact and opinion is unclear and minimally related to situation |  |  |
| 3. c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Generates new, creative, interesting ideas as solutions or consequences; makes appropriate connections between ideas | Provides some connected ideas and a reasonable solution or consequence | Ideas are limited and the connection between ideas is vague and solution is obvious or not conclusive |  |  |
| 3. d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Able to integrate information from a variety of sources to draw appropriate conclusion; articulates the use of a recognizable reasoning pattern for the justification of conclusion | Can integrate information from sources and draws a conclusion by using a reasoning pattern | Shows limited ability to integrate information from sources and draws a weak conclusion by using a reasoning pattern incorrectly |  |  |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 4. a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully implements use of technological tool or device for assigned task | Appropriate tool or device is used with some errors or multiple attempts | Displays difficulty in identifying or using appropriate technology tool or device |  |  |
| 4. b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Demonstrates exemplary skills in layout or format of information | Shows some skill in layout or format of information | Shows limited understanding in layout or format of information |  |  |
| 4. c. Presents information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully completes project utilizing a word processing program, and or other necessary software, with a variety of resources if needed | Displays some skill in presenting information effectively with technological tools or device but may have errors or multiple attempts | Limited use of appropriate technology tool or device to complete task |  |  |

**PSLO 5. Transfers to a baccalaureate program**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| a. Exhibits student contact hours completed at LSC-PA |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Number of AA majors who graduate |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. Number of AA graduates who request transcripts sent to other colleges or universities |  |  |  |  |  |

**PSLO 6. Analyzes learning communities.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 6a. Identifies characteristic of diverse populations within an educational setting |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6b. Identifies diverse teaching styles |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6c. Presents information about learning communities (strategies) in appropriate mode of expression |  |  |  |  |  |
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**Associate of Arts in Teaching 2009**

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Associate of Arts in Teaching Program Assessment Coordinator: Stafford Date: FALL 2009**

**PSLO: 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals and groups.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1a. Demonstrates thesis clarity. | Direct: 5 written paragraphs; 2 written essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 4 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 3 monolog reports with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (81%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.a and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify thesis clarity in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which identified thesis clarity to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.089 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 30% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1b. Organizes information | Direct: 5 written paragraphs; 2 written essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 4 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 3 monolog reports with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.95  (82.5%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.b and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify the organization of information in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which demonstrated clearer organization techniques to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.191 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1c. Uses support | Direct: 5 chapter question short paragraphs; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 3 rubric evaluations of project; 4 comprehensive research outlines; 5 dramatic critiques of a public performance | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.2  (86.67%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show this to be the most developed of abilities in PSLO #1 and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify the use of support in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which identified support materials used successfully to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.951 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Direct: 5 chapter question short paragraphs; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 5 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 2 monolog projects with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (80.8%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.d and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to evaluate delivery elements in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which are used to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.137 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2a. Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices) | Direct: 7 online discussion board responses; 18 exam questions with test maps; 1 internet research project; 3 essays on interpersonal communication; 10 critiques of public performances | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.72  (72.9%) | 76.9% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Analysis reveals this is the weakest of skills in the PSLO #2 and it is recommended that additional assignments or supplemental material be added to course work to improve student ability to identify cultural characteristics. Also noted that instructor instructions could be clearer in asking for this type of information. | The discussion board questions for online and on campus classes became a required element in the following courses and the questions pertained to specific cultural issues in which cultural characteristics were identified.  Courses:  SOC 1301  PHIL 1301  GOV 2301 and  GOV 2301  (Support 3. Syllabi from the above courses) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.450 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 39 |
| % of 6s | 38.5% |
| % of 5s | 33.34% |
| % of 4s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 7.7% |
| % of 2s | 15.4% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2b. Interprets works of human expression within cultural context | | Direct: 5 online discussion board questions; 5 internet research projects ; 12 critiques of public performances; | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.77  (79.5%) | | 77.3 % of students met or exceeded expectations.  The results of analysis reveal that the students have exceeded the expectations but can be improved with focus on this PSLO within course assignments. Also more diversity in artifact collection is recommended for improvement. | | ENG 2312 British Literature added a required “relevancy response” to each exam over each literature reading assignment.  (Support 4. Instructions for exams)  Additional courses are included in the request for artifacts to be used in the rating process.  (Support 5. Memo requesting faculty to submit artifact examples) |
| Median | | 5 | |
| Mode | | 5 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.152 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 22 | |
| % of 6s | | 31.8% | |
| % of 5s | | 36% | |
| % of 4s | | 9% | |
| % of 3s | | 22.7% | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| 2c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | Direct: 8 online discussion board questions; 13 exam questions with test maps; 5 rubric evaluations of monolog project; 3 essays; 5 critiques of public performances | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.82  (80.3%) | | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is the highest demonstrated skill in PSLO #2 showing that the students are aware of their own culture in relation to others but it is recommended that course enhancement activities will improve their ability to express this awareness. | | ENG 2312 British Literature added a required “relevancy response” to each exam over each literature reading assignment.  (Support 4. Instructions for exams)  Additional courses are included in the request for artifacts to be used in the rating process.  (Support 5. Memo requesting faculty to submit artifact examples) | |
| Median | | 5 | |
| Mode | | 5 | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.290 | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 34 | |
| % of 6s | | 35% | |
| % of 5s | | 38% | |
| % of 4s | | 12% | |
| % of 3s | | 3% | |
| % of 2s | | 12% | |
| # Disputed | | 0 | |

**PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3a. Identifies problem, argument, or issue to determine extent of information needed | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 10 final exam questions with test map; 1 persuasive speech outline; 3 kinesiology lab reports; 2 comprehensive research outlines | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.35  (72.5%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One of the weakest in PSLO # 3 even though the students met the success criterion. It is recommended that specific course improvements be made to enhance the student ability to identify problems, arguments, or issues. | 1. ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.)  2. GOV 2301 added Online Class Project to investigate and analyze local government issues.  (Support 7. Instruction sheet) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.137 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 15% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3b. Differentiates the facts from opinion as relates to situation | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 10 final exam question with test maps; 1 persuasive speech outline; 1 kinesiology lab report; 4 comprehensive research outlines | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  The students demonstrated they can identify the difference between fact and opinion but can improve in this ability with the enhanced assignment focus on critical thinking skills overall in course assignment. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.322 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 2 chapter discussions; 5 final exam questions with test map; 5 internet research projects; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive speech outline; 1 kinesiology lab report | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.35  (89.2%) | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is the highest skill area in the critical thinking PSLO #3. It is recommended that the course enhancement assignment will improve the student ability to construct possible solutions or prediction of consequences. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.04 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 65% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Direct: 4 online discussion board postings; 2 chapter discussion essays; 10 exams with test maps; 4 monolog projects with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.2%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One of the weakest in PSLO # 3 even though the students met the success criterion. It is recommended that specific course improvements be made to enhance the student ability to use logical, sound reason to justify conclusion. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.356 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 30% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Direct: 11 online discussion board postings; 5 online chapter assignments; 10 exam questions with test map; 5 internet research projects; 1 bibliography; 4 rubric evaluations of PowerPoint presentations; 1 online review question | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.59  (93.2%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students demonstrate a high level of technological literacy in using computers to respond to online assignments and find information needed for research projects or presentations. It is recommended that courses utilize current technology in their course assignments or incorporate new assignments using technological elements.  Texas High Education Coordinating Board requires by law that all syllabi are on the home page of the institution’s website for student access to class information. | 1. GOV 2301 added Online Class Project to investigate and analyze local government issues.  (Support 7. Instruction sheet)  2. GOV 2301 & GOV 2302 added “Find Your Ideology” computer exercise for on campus students to use technology.  (Support 8. Instructions sheet)  3. ENG 1301 and ENG 1302 required all work to be created on the computer.  (Support 9. Syllabus)  4. IT uploaded all faculty syllabi for Fall 2010 on the home page of the college’s web site.  (Support 10. Snapshot of web page) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.956 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 75.7% |
| % of 5s | 19% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Direct: 14 online assignments; 17 online discussion board assignments; 10 exam questions with test map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.51  (91.8%) | 95.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Artifacts showed that students accurately can formatting essays, discussion board questions and display knowledge about organizing information with tools of technology, but a more diverse collection of artifacts would enhance the assessment process. | ART 2349 Digital Art is a computer graphics class offered in 2010 for the first time.  (Support 11. Syllabus and Calendar) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.779 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 41 |
| % of 6s | 63% |
| % of 5s | 29% |
| % of 4s | 2% |
| % of 3s | 4.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4c. Presents information using the appropriate tool or device | Direct: 20 online discussion board assignments; 8 online assignments; 3 exam questions with test map; 2 internet projects; 4 rubric evaluations of PowerPoint presentations; 1 online review | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.87  (97.8%) | 97.34% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students exceeded expectations but to enhance this skill students have to stay current with the ever changing technology. Assignments in courses need to fully utilize the abilities of current technological tools or devices. | 1. Academic Dean encouraged faculty to enhance assignments by using technology, particularly the WebCT features on the campus system in course assignments where appropriate.  (Support 12. Memo to faculty, Jan. 10, 2010) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.529 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 38 |
| % of 6s | 92% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 2.6% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program.**

|  | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program. | Indirect: Graduation data only.  2006: 0  2007: 0  2008: 4  2009: 4 |  |  |  | The AAT is fairly new and has maintained the number of graduates. The recommendation is to promote within the Education classes to declare the major. Also it is recommended that the AAT has its own PSLO 6 emphasizing particular student learning outcomes for this program beyond the 4 PSLO for the AA degree. | Subcommittee of EDUC 1301 and EDUC 2301 instructors formed to develop PSLO 6 (analyzing learning communities) and created the analytical rubric to assess 2010 artifacts.  (Support 13. Email calling meeting and minutes of meeting) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Program: Associate of Arts in Teaching Created by: Gongre/Stafford/Dupuis/Askew/ Huval/Sorrells Date: 1/26/2011**

**PSLO 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals or groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. a. Demonstrates thesis clarity | Thesis and purpose are clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are fairly clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are vague to audience; only loosely relates to communication task |  |  |
| 1. b. Organizes information | Fully & creatively supports thesis & purpose with effective transitions & sequencing of ideas | Organizational elements support thesis & purpose but could improve transitions & sequencing of ideas | Signs of logical organization but may have abrupt shifts & less than effective flow of ideas |  |  |
| 1. c. Uses support | Substantial, logical & specific development of ideas; details are relevant, original, credible and correctly documented when appropriate | Solid but less than original reasoning with some appropriate details or examples and limited documentation if relevant | Obvious support that may be too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to thesis, or repetitive with little or no relevant documentation |  |  |
| 1. d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Style of presentation is appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is fairly appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is underdeveloped for specific audience and loosely matches communication task |  |  |

**PSLO 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 2. a. Identifies cultural characteristics (including beliefs, values, perspectives and/or practices) | Identifies multiple cultural characteristics | Identifies at least two  cultural characteristics | Identifies one cultural characteristic |  |  |
| 2. b. Interprets works of human expression  within cultural context | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with specific details that reveals insights to understanding the value of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with generalizations that include some details showing an awareness of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with description and limited details in a ethnocentric way |  |  |
| 2. c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others | Illuminates with multiple specific details the understanding between self and others | Articulates with some details the understanding between self and others | Shows limited understanding between self and others |  |  |

**PSLO 3. Uses critical thinking skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 3. a. identifies problem, argument, or issue (to determine extent of information needed) | Key concepts and terms are identified and extensive information is used | Identifies concepts related to the situation to develop some details of information | Unable to formulate clearly what is needed to examine the situation and uses limited details |  |  |
| 3.b. Differentiates the facts from opinions as relates to situation | Multiple and diverse sources of information are used to distinguish between facts and opinions | Some facts and opinion are clearly distinguished but not consistently | Separation between fact and opinion is unclear and minimally related to situation |  |  |
| 3. c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Generates new , creative, interesting ideas as solutions or consequences; makes appropriate connections between ideas | Provides some connected ideas and a reasonable solution or consequence | Ideas are limited and the connection between ideas is vague and solution is obvious or not conclusive |  |  |
| 3. d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Able to integrate information from a variety of sources to draw appropriate conclusion; articulates the use of a recognizable reasoning pattern for the justification of conclusion | Can integrate information from sources and draws a conclusion by using a reasoning pattern | Shows limited ability to integrate information from sources and draws a weak conclusion by using a reasoning pattern incorrectly |  |  |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 4. a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully implements use of technological tool or device for assigned task | Appropriate tool or device is used with some errors or multiple attempts | Displays difficulty in identifying or using appropriate technology tool or device |  |  |
| 4. b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Demonstrates exemplary skills in layout or format of information | Shows some skill in layout or format of information | Shows limited understanding in layout or format of information |  |  |
| 4. c. Presents information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully completes project utilizing a word processing program, and or other necessary software, with a variety of resources if needed | Displays some skill in presenting information effectively with technological tools or device but may have errors or multiple attempts | Limited use of appropriate technology tool or device to complete task |  |  |

**PSLO 5. Transfers to a baccalaureate program**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| a. Exhibits student contact hours completed at LSC-PA |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Number of AA majors who graduate |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. Number of AA graduates who request transcripts sent to other colleges or universities |  |  |  |  |  |

**PSLO 6. Analyzes learning communities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 6a. Identifies characteristic of diverse populations within an educational setting |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6b. Identifies diverse teaching styles |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6c. Presents information about learning communities (strategies) in appropriate mode of expression |  |  |  |  |  |
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**Associate of Science**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lamar State College-Port Arthur**  **2009-2011 Educational Programs Assessment Summary** | | |
| Educational Program: Associate of Science in Academic Studies | | |
| Degree/Certificate Award: AS degree | | |
| **Assessment Summary** | | |
| **Key Assessment Program SLO’s** | **Results and Analysis** | **Implementation & Evidence**  **of Improvement** |
| Problem with decreasing number of graduates in the AS program.  **PSLO 5: Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program.** | With the decline of graduates dropping to zero Dr. Stretcher brought before the Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee meeting on Feb 16, 2011 the recommendation of the deletion of the AS in Academic Studies from the Catalog. | The Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee unanimously approved the recommendation to delete the Associate of Science in Academic Studies as of 2011-2012 Catalog. Further recommendation was made to include the “PSLO 6 Applies mathematical and scientific principles” to the Associate of Arts degree because students can select math and science as any of the 15 hours of academic electives to complete the degree.  (Support 1. Agenda Notes from ASCC meeting Feb. 16, 2011) |

The Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee unanimously approved the recommendation to delete the Associate of Science in Academic Studies as of 2011-2012 *Catalog*. Further recommendation was made to move the “PSLO 6: Applies mathematical and scientific principles” to the Associate of Arts degree because students can select math and science as any of the 15 hours of academic electives to complete the degree.

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Associate of Science Program Assessment Coordinator: Stafford Date: 2010**

**PSLO 1: Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals and groups.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1a. Demonstrates thesis clarity. | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 case studies; 4 letters to elected officials; 3 research documents; 12 PowerPoint presentations, scored by rubrics; 5 online philosophy test questions  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.1%) | 82% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.121 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 33 |
| % of 6s | 24% |
| % of 5s | 27% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 3% |
| # Disputed | 2 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1b. Organizes information | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 psychology reports; 5 case studies; 6 poster presentations; 4 history presentations scored with rubric; 5 online philosophy questions; 5 letters to elected officials; 4 art presentations  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.49  (74.8%) | 82.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.19 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 39 |
| % of 6s | 23% |
| % of 5s | 28% |
| % of 4s | 30% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 7.7% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1c. Uses support | Direct: 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 5 letters to elected officials; 4 presentations scored by rubric; 6 online philosophy questions; 5 case studies; 5 poster presentations scored by rubric; 5 history reports.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.70  (78.3%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Results of analysis shows that students are maintaining similar ratings of skill level as found in 2009. Recommended to enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.10 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 33 |
| % of 6s | 27% |
| % of 5s | 33% |
| % of 4s | 24% |
| % of 3s | 12% |
| % of 2s | 3% |
| # Disputed | 3 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Direct: 5 letters to elected officials; 4 art projects scored by rubric; 5 final exam essays; 1 post-test essay; 1 research project; 5 case studies; 6 online philosophy test questions; 5 research projects in hybrid class; 5 poster presentations scored by rubric.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.12  (85.8%) | 94.1% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Highest skill level exhibited by the artifacts collected in 2010. The improvement in textbook material in the English 1301 may contribute to these scores. Recommended to further enhance students’ ability to communicate through clearer assessment tools at the course level. | 1. ENG 1301 faculty constructed a grading rubric for essays to enhance consistency in assessing student essays.  (Support 1. English Essay Rubric)  2. SPCH 1315 Public Speaking holistic rubric was converted to an analytical rubric which was given to students to prepare them for the rubric rating process of speeches.  (Support 2. New Analytical Rubric SPCH 1315) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.946 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 34 |
| % of 6s | 44% |
| % of 5s | 29% |
| % of 4s | 20.6% |
| % of 3s | 5.9% |
| # Disputed | 3 |

**PSLO 2: Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2a. Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices) | Direct: 5 composition research papers; 3 sociology test questions with test map; 10 online discussion board questions; 5 video reports; 1 literature post-test; 5 final exam essays; 5 diversity projects; 1 original poem; 10 critiques of public performances;  Indirect:  Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.37  (72.8%) | 63.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This score is lower than 2009 scores in this sub criterion and is still the lowest of PSLO 2. Recommended that course assignments have clearer instructions to improve identification of cultural characteristics or additional assignments that are looking for multiple examples of cultural characteristics. | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.262 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 35 |
| % of 6s | 22.9% |
| % of 5s | 28.6% |
| % of 4s | 17% |
| % of 3s | 25.7% |
| % of 2s | 11% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2b. Interprets works of human expression within cultural context | Direct: 4 online philosophy questions; 1 literature post-test; 5 discussion board questions on acts of protest; 5 library projects; 3 sociology test questions; 5 literature final exam questions; 5 historical reports scored with rubric; 5 poster projects scored with rubric.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.21  (70.17%) | 86% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Higher score than 2009 and it is recommended that course activities continue to improve the students’ opportunities to interpret works of human expression within cultural contexts. | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions) |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 4 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.293 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 33 |
| % of 6s | 18% |
| % of 5s | 24% |
| % of 4s | 33% |
| % of 3s | 9% |
| % of 2s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | Direct: 4 composition research papers; 5 video reports; 5 final exam essays; 5 sociology test questions with map; 5 online discussion board questions about dominant culture; 5 online philosophy questions; 3 letters to elected officials; 1 literature post test.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.375  (73.9%) | 81.5% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Very similar score from 2009 and it is recommended that course activities continue to improve the students’ opportunities to show awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.211 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 32 |
| % of 6s | 15.6% |
| % of 5s | 37.5% |
| % of 4s | 28% |
| % of 3s | 6% |
| % of 2s | 12.5% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

**PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3a. Identifies problem, argument, or issue to determine extent of information needed | Direct: 2 pretest/post-test essays on citizenship; 5 response essays to smoking and lung cancer; 1 set of online philosophy discussions; 2 online discussion board responses on social deviance; 2 mileage calculation worksheets; 4 literature essays; 2 online discussion board questions about breast feeding and breast cancer; 7 student essays; 2 literature character analyses; 6 composition research papers; 5 drama self-evaluations;  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5  (83.3%) | 94.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  A significant increase in scores from 2009 indicating that the activities added to courses had an impact in results. Also a wide variety of artifacts were assessed which added to the increased results. It is recommended that additional course activities enhance student critical thinking skills. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3r. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student essay exams PHIL 1301)  3. GOV 2302 expanded the Class Project scope of analysis to include State and National legislature issues.  (Support 5. Instruction Sheet GOV 2302) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.848 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 34 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 23.5% |
| % of 3s | 5.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3b. Differentiates the facts from opinion as relates to situation | Direct: 1 pretest/post-test on citizenship; 5 responses on social deviance; 4 responses on smoking and breast cancer; 2 responses on origins of life; 3 character analyses; 12 research papers; 1 final exam essay; 5 learning self-assessments.  Indirect: narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.44  (74%) | 82% of students met or exceeded expectations.  A slight increase in scores from 2009 but can add more specific course enhancing activities to demonstrate student abilities to differentiate between facts and opinions. | 1. In SPCH 1315 Public Speaking: student analytical outlines now identify if the verbal supportive materials used in the speech are facts or opinions.  (Support 6. Speech 1315 Outline Instruction- Sample Outlines)  2. Using new textbook in SPCH 1315 which emphasizes differences in fact and opinion particularly sections on propaganda, misinformation, and disinformation.  (Support 7. New Textbook SPCH 1315 Table of Contents Ch. 8, 9, 10, & 11) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.22 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 27 |
| % of 6s | 18.5% |
| % of 5s | 37% |
| % of 4s | 25.9% |
| % of 3s | 7% |
| % of 2s | 11% |
| # Disputed | 4 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Direct: 15 online responses to smoking and lung cancer, breast cancer, reverence for life, social deviance, protagonists and self; conclusion paragraphs/sections of 11 research essays.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.52  (75.5%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Not as high as the 2009 scores but still in the acceptable range. It is recommended that course assignments specifically ask for students to construct possible solutions or prediction of consequences to improve their critical thinking skills. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student Essay exams PHIL 1301 ) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.985 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 25 |
| % of 6s | 16% |
| % of 5s | 40% |
| % of 4s | 24% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Direct: 2 pretest/post-tests on citizenship; 3 mileage reports; 7 online responses to jobs, meaning of life, social deviance; conclusion paragraphs/sections of 4 research essays; 3 psychology exam questions with test map; 4 nutrition exam questions.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.74  (79%) | 74.6% of students met or exceeded expectations.  The scores are very similar to the 2009 scores showing that students need further practice at justifying their conclusions. It is recommended that course assignments specifically ask for students to explain why they have constructed their possible solutions or consequences. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically addresses the issues of PSLO 2 .  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. Added online essay using critical thinking skills for all sections of PHIL 1301 on campus sections and online sections.  (Support 4. Student Essay Exams PHIL 1301 ) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5, 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.287 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 23 |
| % of 6s | 34.8% |
| % of 5s | 34.8% |
| % of 4s | 4% |
| % of 3s | 21.7% |
| % of 2s | 3.7% |
| # Disputed | 1 |

**PSLO 4: Demonstrates technology literacy**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Direct: 5 library projects; 5 online discussion board discussions; 9 PowerPoint projects scored with rubrics; 4 internet research projects for biology; 16 graphic arts design projects.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 87.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that specifically required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (Support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. New textbook in SPCH 1315 emphasized Internet Research in Ch. 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. New Textbook SPCH 1315 Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Support 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.894 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 39 |
| % of 6s | 17.9% |
| % of 5s | 56% |
| % of 4s | 12.8% |
| % of 3s | 12.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Direct: 3 case studies; 5 online discussion board projects; 3 internet research projects for biology; 16 graphic design projects scored by rubrics; 1 letter to elected official; 3 library research projects; 2 psychology essays;  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.51  (75.2%) | 89.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (support 3. ENG 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. New textbook in SPCH 1315 emphasized Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. New Textbook SPCH 1315 Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Support 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.901 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 10.8% |
| % of 5s | 43% |
| % of 4s | 35% |
| % of 3s | 8% |
| % of 2s | 2.7% |
| # Disputed | 2 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4c. Presents information using the appropriate tool or device | Direct: 4 PowerPoint projects scored with rubrics; 1 internet information search for biology; 2 composition research papers; 6 online discussion board discussions on food pyramid; 2 case studies; 22 graphic arts design projects.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.19  (86.5%) | 87.3% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Slightly lower results than the 2009 scores but it is the result of some confusion from raters on the graphic arts design projects because they were out of their field of expertise and not familiar with the technology needed to create the projects. Recommended to have additional Faculty Development training on rating examples of technology and include assignments in courses to enhance this PSLO. | 1. ENG 2326 Literature implemented an online Essay that required students to submit essay through campus email system.  (Support 3. Eng. 2326 On line Essay Instructions)  2. New textbook in SPCH 1315 emphasized Internet Research in Chapter 10 and 3 chapters on presentational aids using technological tools or devices.  (Support 8. New Textbook SPCH 1315 Table of Contents Ch. 10, 20, 21, & 22)  3. Faculty Development sessions about artifacts and rating them effectively.  (Support 9. Handouts from Faculty Development meetings) |

**PSLO 5: Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program.**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program. | Indirect: Graduation data only.  2006: 6  2007: 7  2008: 6  2009: 7  2010: 0 |  |  |  | With the decline of graduates dropping to zero Dr. Stretcher brought before the Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee meeting on Feb 16, 2011 the recommendation of the deletion of the AS in Academic Studies from the Catalog. | The Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee unanimously approved the recommendation to delete the Associate of Science in Academic Studies as of 2011-2012 Catalog. Further recommendation was made to include the “PSLO 6: Applies mathematical and scientific principles” to the Associate of Arts degree because students can select math and science as any of the 15 hours of academic electives to complete the degree.  (Support 10. Agenda Notes from ASCC meeting Feb. 16, 2011) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**PSLO: 6. Applies mathematical and scientific principles.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a. Identifies mathematical or scientific principles needed to complete task. | Direct: 1 GPA calculation; 4 chemistry mole calculations; 3 mileage payment calculations; 5 balancing of chemistry equations; 3 colitis case studies; 5 elasticity worksheets; 4 statistics exams; 5 nutrition exams.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.93  (82.1%) | | | 79% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This score has increased 6.6% over the 2009 score which shows the results of the implemented use of computer assisted lab online for homework assignments in classes on campus in MATH 1314 College Algebra, MATH 1332 College Mathematics, and MATH 2312 Precalculus. The expanded use of this lab is recommended to further enhance math skills. | | online computer assisted instruction for homework using MyMathLab is now being used in MATH 1350 Fundamentals of Mathematics I and MATH 1325 Elements of Analysis for Business Applications  (Support 11. Syllabi from MATH 1350 & 1325 classes) |
| Median | | 6 | | |
| Mode | | 6 | | |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.51 | | |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 28 | | |
| % of 6s | | 57% | | |
| % of 5s | | 14% | | |
| % of 4s | | 7% | | |
| % of 3s | | 7% | | |
| % of 2s | | 14% | | |
| # Disputed | | 2 | | |
| ***sub-PSLO*** | | ***Assessment Methods*** | | ***Success Criterion*** | | ***Results of Assessment*** | | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** | |
| 6b. Uses mathematical or scientific principles to complete task. | | Direct: 1 GPA calculation; 4 chemistry mole calculations; 3 mileage repayment calculations; 10 balancing of chemical equations; 4 statistics exams; 5 elasticity worksheets; 5 nutrition exams.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | | Mean | | 4.56  (76%) | 72.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This score is very similar to the 2009 and the expanded use of this lab in additional MATH courses is recommended to enhance math skills. | | online computer assisted instruction for homework using MyMathLab is now being used in MATH 1350 Fundamentals of Mathematics I and MATH 1325 Elements of Analysis for Business Applications  (Support 11. Syllabi from MATH 1350 & 1325 classes) | |
| Median | | 5 |
| Mode | | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | | 1.605 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | | 32 |
| % of 6s | | 46.9% |
| % of 5s | | 9% |
| % of 4s | | 15.6% |
| % of 3s | | 9% |
| % of 2s | | 18.8% |
| # Disputed | | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6c. Applies problem-solving skills in mathematical or scientific principles to complete task. | Direct: 1 GPA calculation; 3 mileage repayment calculations; 4 chemistry mole calculations; 5 balancing of chemical equations; 4 statistics exams; 5 elasticity worksheets; 5 nutrition exams.  Indirect: Narrative description of program goals and achievements. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.70  (78%) | 74.5% of students met or exceeded expectations.  A significant increase of 15.6% over the 2009 scores indicates the success of the MyMathLab for improving student application of math skills. Recommend the expansion of the use of this online tool in other MATH courses. | online computer assisted instruction for homework using MyMathLab is now being used in MATH 1350 Fundamentals of Mathematics I and MATH 1325 Elements of Analysis for Business Applications  (Support 11. Syllabi from MATH 1350 & 1325 classes) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.589 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 27 |
| % of 6s | 48% |
| % of 5s | 18.5% |
| % of 4s | 7% |
| % of 3s | 7% |
| % of 2s | 18.5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |
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**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Name of Program: Associate of Science Created by: Stafford Date: 2/15/11**

**PSLO 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals or groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. a. Demonstrates thesis clarity | Thesis and purpose are clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are fairly clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are vague to audience; only loosely relates to communication task |  |  |
| 1. b. Organizes information | Fully & creatively supports thesis & purpose with effective transitions & sequencing of ideas | Organizational elements support thesis & purpose but could improve transitions & sequencing of ideas | Signs of logical organization but may have abrupt shifts & less than effective flow of ideas |  |  |
| 1. c. Uses support | Substantial, logical & specific development of ideas; details are relevant, original, credible and correctly documented when appropriate | Solid but less than original reasoning with some appropriate details or examples and limited documentation if relevant | Obvious support that may be too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to thesis, or repetitive with little or no relevant documentation |  |  |
| 1. d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Style of presentation is appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is fairly appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is underdeveloped for specific audience and loosely matches communication task |  |  |

**PSLO 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 2. a. Identifies cultural characteristics (including beliefs, values, perspectives and/or practices) | Identifies multiple cultural characteristics | Identifies at least two  cultural characteristics | Identifies one cultural characteristic |  |  |
| 2. b. Interprets works of human expression  within cultural context | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with specific details that reveals insights to understanding the value of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with generalizations that include some details showing an awareness of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with description and limited details in a ethnocentric way |  |  |
| 2. c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others | Illuminates with multiple specific details the understanding between self and others | Articulates with some details the understanding between self and others | Shows limited understanding between self and others |  |  |

**PSLO 3. Uses critical thinking skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 3. a. identifies problem, argument, or issue (to determine extent of information needed) | Key concepts and terms are identified and extensive information is used | Identifies concepts related to the situation to develop some details of information | Unable to formulate clearly what is needed to examine the situation and uses limited details |  |  |
| 3.b. Differentiates the facts from opinions as relates to situation | Multiple and diverse sources of information are used to distinguish between facts and opinions | Some facts and opinion are clearly distinguished but not consistently | Separation between fact and opinion is unclear and minimally related to situation |  |  |
| 3. c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Generates new , creative, interesting ideas as solutions or consequences; makes appropriate connections between ideas | Provides some connected ideas and a reasonable solution or consequence | Ideas are limited and the connection between ideas is vague and solution is obvious or not conclusive |  |  |
| 3. d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Able to integrate information from a variety of sources to draw appropriate conclusion; articulates the use of a recognizable reasoning pattern for the justification of conclusion | Can integrate information from sources and draws a conclusion by using a reasoning pattern | Shows limited ability to integrate information from sources and draws a weak conclusion by using a reasoning pattern incorrectly |  |  |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 4. a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully implements use of technological tool or device for assigned task | Appropriate tool or device is used with some errors or multiple attempts | Displays difficulty in identifying or using appropriate technology tool or device |  |  |
| 4. b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Demonstrates exemplary skills in layout or format of information | Shows some skill in layout or format of information | Shows limited understanding in layout or format of information |  |  |
| 4. c. Presents information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully completes project utilizing a word processing program, and or other necessary software, with a variety of resources if needed | Displays some skill in presenting information effectively with technological tools or device but may have errors or multiple attempts | Limited use of appropriate technology tool or device to complete task |  |  |

**PSLO 5. Transfers to a baccalaureate program**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 5.a. Exhibits student contact hours completed at LSC-PA | Completed AA degree, including the core curriculum. | Completed the core curriculum (48 SCH) | Completed 30 SCH or fewer |  |  |
| 5.b. Number of AS majors at LSC-PA who graduate | 40% | 30% | 20% |  |  |
| 5.c. Number of AS graduates that request transcripts sent to other universities | 40% | 30% | 20% |  |  |
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**Associate of Science 2009**

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report**

**Program: Associate of Science Program Assessment Coordinator: Stafford Date: FALL 2009**

**PSLO: 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals and groups.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1a. Demonstrates thesis clarity. | Direct: 5 written paragraphs; 2 written essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 4 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 3 monolog reports with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (81%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.a and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify thesis clarity in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which identified thesis clarity to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.089 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 30% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1b. Organizes information | Direct: 5 written paragraphs; 2 written essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 4 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 3 monolog reports with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.95  (82.5%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.b and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify the organization of information in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which demonstrated clearer organization techniques to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.191 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1c. Uses support | Direct: 5 chapter question short paragraphs; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 3 rubric evaluations of project; 4 comprehensive research outlines; 5 dramatic critiques of a public performance | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.2  (86.67%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show this to be the most developed of abilities in PSLO #1 and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to identify the use of support in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which identified support materials used successfully to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.951 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 50% |
| % of 5s | 25% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Direct: 5 chapter question short paragraphs; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive outline; 5 rubric evaluations of project; 5 research outlines; 2 monolog projects with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.85  (80.8%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students show satisfactory abilities in PSLO #1.d and the recommendation is to improve this skill area by course enhancement assignments. | Spring 2010:  1. Implemented new holistic rubric rating form used in all SPCH 1315 Public Speaking sections to evaluate delivery elements in persuasive or debate speeches.  (Support 1. rubric form)  2. ENG 1301 chose a new textbook with more student essay examples which are used to assist students in creating their own essays.  (Support 2. new textbook title page & table of contents) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.137 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 40% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2a. Identifies cultural characteristics (beliefs, values, perspectives, or practices) | Direct: 7 online discussion board responses; 18 exam questions with test maps; 1 internet research project; 3 essays on interpersonal communication; 10 critiques of public performances | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.72  (72.9%) | 76.9% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Analysis reveals this is the weakest of skills in the PSLO #2 and it is recommended that additional assignments or supplemental material be added to course work to improve student ability to identify cultural characteristics. Also noted that instructor instructions could be clearer in asking for this type of information. | The discussion board questions for online and on campus classes became a required element in the following courses and the questions pertained to specific cultural issues in which cultural characteristics were identified.  Courses:  SOC 1301  PHIL 1301  GOV 2301 and  GOV 2301  (Support 3. Syllabi from the above courses) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.450 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 39 |
| % of 6s | 38.5% |
| % of 5s | 33.34% |
| % of 4s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 7.7% |
| % of 2s | 15.4% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2b. Interprets works of human expression within cultural context | Direct: 5 online discussion board questions; 5 internet research projects ; 12 critiques of public performances; | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.77  (79.5%) | 77.3 % of students met or exceeded expectations.  The results of analysis reveal that the students have exceeded the expectations but can be improved with focus on this PSLO within course assignments. Also more diversity in artifact collection is recommended for improvement. | ENG 2312 British Literature added a required “relevancy response” to each exam over each literature reading assignment.  (Support 4. Instructions for exams)  Additional courses are included in the request for artifacts to be used in the rating process.  (Support 5. Memo requesting faculty to submit artifact examples) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.152 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 22 |
| % of 6s | 31.8% |
| % of 5s | 36% |
| % of 4s | 9% |
| % of 3s | 22.7% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others. | Direct: 8 online discussion board questions; 13 exam questions with test maps; 5 rubric evaluations of monolog project; 3 essays; 5 critiques of public performances. | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.82  (80.3%) | 85% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is the highest demonstrated skill in PSLO #2 showing that the students are aware of their own culture in relation to others but it is recommended that course enhancement activities will improve their ability to express this awareness. | ENG 2312 British Literature added a required “relevancy response” to each exam over each literature reading assignment.  (Support 4. Instructions for exams)  Additional courses are included in the request for artifacts to be used in the rating process.  (Support 5. Memo requesting faculty to submit artifact examples) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.290 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 34 |
| % of 6s | 35% |
| % of 5s | 38% |
| % of 4s | 12% |
| % of 3s | 3% |
| % of 2s | 12% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO 3: Uses critical thinking skills.**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3a. Identifies problem, argument, or issue to determine extent of information needed | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 10 final exam questions with test map; 1 persuasive speech outline; 3 kinesiology lab reports; 2 comprehensive research outlines | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.35  (72.5%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One of the weakest in PSLO # 3 even though the students met the success criterion. It is recommended that specific course improvements be made to enhance the student ability to identify problems, arguments, or issues. | 1. ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.)  2. GOV 2301 added Online Class Project to investigate and analyze local government issues.  (Support 7. Instruction sheet) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.137 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 15% |
| % of 5s | 35% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 20% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3b. Differentiates the facts from opinion as relates to situation | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 10 final exam question with test maps; 1 persuasive speech outline; 1 kinesiology lab report; 4 comprehensive research outlines | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.8  (80%) | 80% of students met or exceeded expectations.  The students demonstrated they can identify the difference between fact and opinion but can improve in this ability with the enhanced assignment focus on critical thinking skills overall in course assignment. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.322 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 45% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 20% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Direct: 4 online discussion postings; 2 chapter discussions; 5 final exam questions with test map; 5 internet research projects; 2 essays; 1 comprehensive speech outline; 1 kinesiology lab report | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.35  (89.2%) | 90% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is the highest skill area in the critical thinking PSLO #3. It is recommended that the course enhancement assignment will improve the student ability to construct possible solutions or prediction of consequences. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.04 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 65% |
| % of 5s | 15% |
| % of 4s | 10% |
| % of 3s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Direct: 4 online discussion board postings; 2 chapter discussion essays; 10 exams with test maps; 4 monolog projects with project map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.45  (74.2%) | 75% of students met or exceeded expectations.  One of the weakest in PSLO # 3 even though the students met the success criterion. It is recommended that specific course improvements be made to enhance the student ability to use logical, sound reason to justify conclusion. | ENG 1301 included a new assignment called “I Search” research paper with topics that specifically require each of the sub criterions of critical thinking skills indentified in PSLO 3.  (Support 6. “I Search” paper instruction page from two different sections.) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.356 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 20 |
| % of 6s | 30% |
| % of 5s | 20% |
| % of 4s | 25% |
| % of 3s | 15% |
| % of 2s | 10% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Direct: 11 online discussion board postings; 5 online chapter assignments; 10 exam questions with test map; 5 internet research projects; 1 bibliography; 4 rubric evaluations of PowerPoint presentations; 1 online review question | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.59  (93.2%) | 95% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students demonstrate a high level of technological literacy in using computers to respond to online assignments and find information needed for research projects or presentations. It is recommended that courses utilize current technology in their course assignments or incorporate new assignments using technological elements.  Texas High Education Coordinating Board requires by law that all syllabi are on the home page of the institution’s website for student access to class information. | 1. GOV 2301 added Online Class Project to investigate and analyze local government issues.  (Support 7. Instruction sheet)  2. GOV 2301 & GOV 2302 added “Find Your Ideology” computer exercise for on campus students to use technology.  (Support 8. Instructions sheet)  3. ENG 1301 and ENG 1302 required all work to be created on the computer.  (Support 9. Syllabus)  4. IT uploaded all faculty syllabi for Fall 2010 on the home page of the college’s web site.  (Support 10. Snapshot of web page) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.956 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 37 |
| % of 6s | 75.7% |
| % of 5s | 19% |
| % of 2s | 5% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***ub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Direct: 14 online assignments; 17 online discussion board assignments; 10 exam questions with test map | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.51  (91.8%) | 95.2% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Artifacts showed that students accurately can formatting essays, discussion board questions and display knowledge about organizing information with tools of technology, but a more diverse collection of artifacts would enhance the assessment process. | ART 2349 Digital Art is a computer graphics class offered in 2010 for the first time.  (Support 11. Syllabus and Calendar) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.779 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 41 |
| % of 6s | 63% |
| % of 5s | 29% |
| % of 4s | 2% |
| % of 3s | 4.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4c. Presents information using the appropriate tool or device | Direct: 20 online discussion board assignments; 8 online assignments; 3 exam questions with test map; 2 internet projects; 4 rubric evaluations of PowerPoint presentations; 1 online review | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 5.87  (97.8%) | 97.34% of students met or exceeded expectations.  Students exceeded expectations but to enhance this skill students have to stay current with the ever changing technology. Assignments in courses need to fully utilize the abilities of current technological tools or devices. | 1. Academic Dean encouraged faculty to enhance assignments by using technology, particularly the WebCT features on the campus system in course assignments where appropriate.  (Support 12. Memo to faculty, Jan. 10, 2010) |
| Median | 6 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.529 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 38 |
| % of 6s | 92% |
| % of 5s | 5% |
| % of 3s | 2.6% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

**PSLO: 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program.**

| ***PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Completes degree which is transferable to a baccalaureate program. | Indirect: Graduation data only.  2006: 6  2007: 7  2008: 6  2009: 7  Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board |  |  |  | In comparison to the AA program the AS is declining and has been extremely low for 4 years. | The administration and faculty investigated the possibility of eliminating the program.  (Support 13. Meeting notes from Academic Dean of Oct. 5, 2010) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**PSLO: 6. Applies mathematical and scientific principles**

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6a. Identifies mathematical or scientific principles needed to complete task. | Direct: 16 online assignment questions; 5 exam questions with test map; 6 test questions; 2 lab reports | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.69  (78.2%) | 72.4% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is a satisfactory level, but can improve with skill development through course enhancements. | After successful use of online computer assisted instruction in online MATH 1314 College Algebra, have now implemented use of computer assisted lab online for homework assignments in classes on campus in MATH 1314 College Algebra, MATH 1332 College Mathematics, and MATH 2312 Precalculus. (Support 14. Course syllabi) |
| Median | 5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.491 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 29 |
| % of 6s | 41.4% |
| % of 5s | 27.6% |
| % of 4s | 3.4% |
| % of 3s | 13.8% |
| % of 2s | 13.8% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6b. Uses mathematical or scientific principles needed to complete task | Direct: 15 online chapter assignments; 5 exam questions with test map; 6 exam questions; 2 lab reports | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 4.39  (73.2%) | 72% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This is a satisfactory level, but can improve with skill development through course enhancements. | After successful use of online computer assisted instruction in online MATH 1314 College Algebra, have now implemented use of computer assisted lab online for homework assignments in classes on campus in MATH 1314 College Algebra, MATH 1332 College Mathematics and MATH 2312 Precalculus. (Support 14. Course syllabi) |
| Median | 4.5 |
| Mode | 6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.449 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 28 |
| % of 6s | 32% |
| % of 5s | 18% |
| % of 4s | 21% |
| % of 3s | 14% |
| % of 2s | 14% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

| ***sub-PSLO*** | ***Assessment Methods*** | ***Success Criterion*** | ***Results of Assessment*** | | ***Interpretation of Findings*** | ***Use of Results for Improvement*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6c. Applies problem solving skills in mathematical or scientific principles needed to complete task. | Direct: 16 online assignment questions; 5 exam questions with test map; 6 test questions; 2 lab reports | 50% will score a total mean score of 2 or higher from two raters, each of whom rates using the following scale:  3 – Accomplished  2 – Competent  1 – Developing  0 – Not Observed  Rater scores are added, for a maximum sum of 6. | Mean | 3.86  (64.3%) | 58.9% of students met or exceeded expectations.  This has met the minimal level, but is the focus of improvement though skill development through course enhancements. | After successful use of online computer assisted instruction in online MATH 1314 College Algebra, have now implemented use of computer assisted lab online for homework assignments in classes on campus in MATH 1314 College Algebra, and MATH 2312 Precalculus. (Support 14. Course syllabi) |
| Median | 4 |
| Mode | 5 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.246 |
| # of artifacts  *(not disputes)* | 29 |
| % of 6s | 6.9% |
| % of 5s | 31% |
| % of 4s | 20.7% |
| % of 3s | 24.1% |
| % of 2s | 17% |
| # Disputed | 0 |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)

**LSC-PA Academic Program Student Learning Outcomes Rubric**

**Name of Program: Associate of Science Created by: Stafford Date: 2/15/11**

**PSLO 1. Communicates with appropriate modes of expression to individuals or groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 1. a. Demonstrates thesis clarity | Thesis and purpose are clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are fairly clear to audience; matches communication task | Thesis and purpose are vague to audience; only loosely relates to communication task |  |  |
| 1. b. Organizes information | Fully & creatively supports thesis & purpose with effective transitions & sequencing of ideas | Organizational elements support thesis & purpose but could improve transitions & sequencing of ideas | Signs of logical organization but may have abrupt shifts & less than effective flow of ideas |  |  |
| 1. c. Uses support | Substantial, logical & specific development of ideas; details are relevant, original, credible and correctly documented when appropriate | Solid but less than original reasoning with some appropriate details or examples and limited documentation if relevant | Obvious support that may be too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to thesis, or repetitive with little or no relevant documentation |  |  |
| 1. d. Presents ideas in appropriate mode of expression | Style of presentation is appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is fairly appropriate for specific audience and matches communication task | Style of presentation is underdeveloped for specific audience and loosely matches communication task |  |  |

**PSLO 2. Demonstrates awareness of cultural differences and similarities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 2. a. Identifies cultural characteristics (including beliefs, values, perspectives and/or practices) | Identifies multiple cultural characteristics | Identifies at least two  cultural characteristics | Identifies one cultural characteristic |  |  |
| 2. b. Interprets works of human expression  within cultural context | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with specific details that reveals insights to understanding the value of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with generalizations that include some details showing an awareness of cultural differences | Interprets works of human expression within cultural context with description and limited details in a ethnocentric way |  |  |
| 2. c. Shows awareness of one’s own culture in relation to others | Illuminates with multiple specific details the understanding between self and others | Articulates with some details the understanding between self and others | Shows limited understanding between self and others |  |  |

**PSLO 3. Uses critical thinking skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 3. a. identifies problem, argument, or issue (to determine extent of information needed) | Key concepts and terms are identified and extensive information is used | Identifies concepts related to the situation to develop some details of information | Unable to formulate clearly what is needed to examine the situation and uses limited details |  |  |
| 3.b. Differentiates the facts from opinions as relates to situation | Multiple and diverse sources of information are used to distinguish between facts and opinions | Some facts and opinion are clearly distinguished but not consistently | Separation between fact and opinion is unclear and minimally related to situation |  |  |
| 3. c. Constructs possible solutions or prediction of consequences | Generates new , creative, interesting ideas as solutions or consequences; makes appropriate connections between ideas | Provides some connected ideas and a reasonable solution or consequence | Ideas are limited and the connection between ideas is vague and solution is obvious or not conclusive |  |  |
| 3. d. Uses logical, sound reasoning to justify conclusion | Able to integrate information from a variety of sources to draw appropriate conclusion; articulates the use of a recognizable reasoning pattern for the justification of conclusion | Can integrate information from sources and draws a conclusion by using a reasoning pattern | Shows limited ability to integrate information from sources and draws a weak conclusion by using a reasoning pattern incorrectly |  |  |

**PSLO 4. Demonstrates technology literacy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***PSLO*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 4. a. Locates needed information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully implements use of technological tool or device for assigned task | Appropriate tool or device is used with some errors or multiple attempts | Displays difficulty in identifying or using appropriate technology tool or device |  |  |
| 4. b. Displays organizational skills with the use of technology | Demonstrates exemplary skills in layout or format of information | Shows some skill in layout or format of information | Shows limited understanding in layout or format of information |  |  |
| 4. c. Presents information using the appropriate technological tool or device | Successfully completes project utilizing a word processing program, and or other necessary software, with a variety of resources if needed | Displays some skill in presenting information effectively with technological tools or device but may have errors or multiple attempts | Limited use of appropriate technology tool or device to complete task |  |  |

**PSLO 5. Transfers to a baccalaureate program**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Competent (2)** | **Developing (1)** | **Not Observed (0)** | **Rating** |
| 5.a. Exhibits student contact hours completed at LSC-PA | Completed AA degree, including the core curriculum. | Completed the core curriculum (48 SCH) | Completed 30 SCH or fewer |  |  |
| 5.b. Number of AS majors at LSC-PA who graduate | 40% | 30% | 20% |  |  |
| 5.c. Number of AS graduates that request transcripts sent to other universities | 40% | 30% | 20% |  |  |

[**~Back to Top~**](#Top)