

Students


Benchmark

Percent of all students that scored a 2 or above (competency is passing or above) on PLOs 1-4 and 6.

More than half of participating students scored a 4-strong evidence of competency.


## Disproportionate Impact

There were no significant low performing groups.


Courses Involved ACC-1A, 1B, BUS-10, 18A, 20, CIS-1A,
 COM-12 and ECO-4, 7, 8.

AVERAGE NUMBER OF UNITS COMPLETED IN PROGRAM

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Administration and Information Systems PLO 1
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Categorize basic administrative terms, theories and principles. COURSES INVOLVED: BUS-10, BUS-20, and CIS-1A.

ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4-STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY

## BENCHMARK:

- At least 70\% of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above


## SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 200 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 21.78 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 3.36 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $86 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 28 | $14 \%$ |
| 1 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| 2 | 5 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 3 | 17 | $8.5 \%$ |
| 4 | 150 | $75 \%$ |

## YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1—Program Beginners: 0 units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: More than 0 units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL\# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $86.1 \%$ | 3.28 | 115 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $85.9 \%$ | 3.34 | 85 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was not significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=0.314, \mathrm{p}=.754$ )

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR <br> ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | TOTAL\# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 50.0\% | 18 |  |
|  | Asian | 94.7\% | 19 |  |
|  | Hispanic | 87.2\% | 94 | . 95 |
|  | White | 91.7\% | 60 | 1.00 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander |  |  |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 2 |  |
|  | Unknown | 85.7\% | 7 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 90.8\% | 109 | 1.00 |
|  | 25 and above | 80.2\% | 91 | . 88 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 83.0\% | 112 | . 92 |
|  | Male | 90.7\% | 86 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown | 50.0\% | 2 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Administration and Information Systems PLO 2
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Demonstrate basic understanding of economic systems; i.e., the manner in which goods are produced and distributed in a society and the means by which economic growth is achieved and sustained.
COURSES INVOLVED: ECO-4, ECO-7, and ECO-8.
ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4-STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
BENCHMARK:

- At least $70 \%$ of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 269 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 26.67 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 4.16 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $65.8 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 60 | $22.3 \%$ |
| 1 | 32 | $11.9 \%$ |
| 2 | 28 | $10.4 \%$ |
| 3 | 56 | $20.8 \%$ |
| 4 | 93 | $34.6 \%$ |

## YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: 3 or less units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: More than 3 units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL \# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $57.3 \%$ | 2.03 | 178 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $82.4 \%$ | 2.92 | 91 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=4.87, \mathrm{p}<.01$ )

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR <br> ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | TOTAL \# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 66.7\% | 9 |  |
|  | Asian | 65.2\% | 23 | . 95 |
|  | Hispanic | 65.9\% | 164 | . 96 |
|  | White | 68.7\% | 67 | 1.00 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander |  |  |  |
|  | Two or more | 50.0\% | 2 |  |
|  | Unknown | 25.0\% | 4 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 64.1\% | 237 | . 82 |
|  | 25 and above | 78.1\% | 32 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 67.1\% | 82 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 65.6\% | 186 | . 98 |
|  | Unknown | 0\% | 1 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Administration and Information Systems PLO 3
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Understand and apply fundamental management principles, such as profit/loss, balancing accounts, conflict resolution, effective customer relations and time management. COURSES INVOLVED: ACC-1A, BUS-18A, and COM-12.

ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4 - STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
BENCHMARK:

- At least 70\% of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 133 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 40.17 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 7.54 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $94.7 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 1 | 5 | $3.8 \%$ |
| 2 | 9 | $6.8 \%$ |
| 3 | 27 | $20.3 \%$ |
| 4 | 90 | $67.7 \%$ |

## YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: 6 or less units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: More than 6 units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL \# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $91.8 \%$ | 3.40 | 73 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $98.3 \%$ | 3.60 | 60 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was not significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=1.361, \mathrm{p}=.176$ )

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 ON PLO | TOTAL \# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 91.7\% | 12 |  |
|  | Asian | 100\% | 10 |  |
|  | Hispanic | 93.8\% | 80 | . 97 |
|  | White | 96.4\% | 28 | 1.00 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander |  |  |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 2 |  |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 1 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 93.2\% | 88 | . 95 |
|  | 25 and above | 97.8\% | 45 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 93.4\% | 76 | . 95 |
|  | Male | 98.2\% | 55 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown | 50.0\% | 2 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Administration and Information Systems PLO 4
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Perform functions such as preparation of memoranda, utilization of spreadsheets, adherence to schedules and responding effectively to changes in the work environment.
COURSES INVOLVED: ACC-1B, and CIS-1A.
ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4 - STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
BENCHMARK:

- At least 70\% of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 211 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 26.57 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 4.38 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $89.6 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 14 | $6.6 \%$ |
| 1 | 8 | $3.8 \%$ |
| 2 | 16 | $7.6 \%$ |
| 3 | 21 | $10 \%$ |
| 4 | 152 | $72 \%$ |

## YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: 0 units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: More than 0 units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL\# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $88.0 \%$ | 3.40 | 108 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $91.3 \%$ | 3.34 | 103 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was not significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=-0.355, \mathrm{p}=.723$ )

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 ON PLO | TOTAL \# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 78.6\% | 14 |  |
|  | Asian | 88.5\% | 26 | . 94 |
|  | Hispanic | 90.3\% | 113 | . 96 |
|  | White | 94.2\% | 52 | 1.00 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian | 100\% | 2 |  |
|  | Pacific Islander |  |  |  |
|  | Two or more |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | 50.0\% | 4 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 88.8\% | 125 | . 98 |
|  | 25 and above | 90.7\% | 86 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 91.6\% | 107 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 87.3\% | 102 | . 95 |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 2 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Administration and Information Systems PLO 6
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Locate, process, and utilize information effectively. COURSES INVOLVED: BUS-20.

ASSESSMENT METHOD: Based on the rubric below, rated each student in class on an artifact (test/quiz, project, assignment, etc.) that mapped to above PLO:

O- NO EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
1 - VERY LIMITED EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY, NOT PASSING
2 - EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY IS LIMITED, BUT PASSING
3 - ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY
4 - STRONG EVIDENCE OF COMPETENCY

## BENCHMARK:

- At least $70 \%$ of the advanced group in my program will score 2.0 or above


## SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Total number of students involved in PLO assessment: | 32 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 37.5 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 9.56 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $93.8 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 1 | 1 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 2 | 3 | $9.4 \%$ |
| 3 | 2 | $6.3 \%$ |
| 4 | 25 | $78.1 \%$ |

YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: 7 or less units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: More than 7 units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.

|  | \% AT OR ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | AVERAGE <br> PLO SCORE | TOTAL \# IN <br> GROUP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRP 1-PROGRAM BEGINNERS | $93.8 \%$ | 3.69 | 16 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $93.8 \%$ | 3.38 | 16 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was not significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=-0.867, \mathrm{p}=.393$ )

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

* If a group's average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than the other group, there was less than $5 \%$ probability that this occurred by chance. We are inferring that a significantly higher average PLO assessment score for a group indicates greater mastery of the PLO.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISAGGREGATED BY ETHNICITY, AGE, \& GENDER

|  |  | \% AT OR <br> ABOVE 2 <br> ON PLO | TOTAL \# IN GROUP | DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT (Not calculated if less than 20 students in group) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETHNICITY | African-American | 66.7\% | 3 |  |
|  | Asian | 100\% | 3 |  |
|  | Hispanic | 90.9\% | 11 |  |
|  | White | 100\% | 11 |  |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian | 100\% | 1 |  |
|  | Pacific Islander |  |  |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 1 |  |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 2 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 75.0\% | 8 |  |
|  | 25 and above | 100\% | 24 |  |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 95.5\% | 22 |  |
|  | Male | 90.0\% | 10 |  |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## Participants

Ashlee Johnson, Assessment Coordinator, Associate Professor, Engineering Tech
Greg Aycock, Dean Institutional Effectiveness
Caitlin Welch, Acting Research and Assessment Manager
Peter Boleman, Associate Professor, Economics
Rex Beck, Professor, Business Administration
John Coverdale, Associate Professor, Computer Information Systems

## Overview

AOE assessment is facilitated by the IE department in Fall 2019. 23 faculty participated in the assessment assignments for their courses, with a total of 10 courses and 30 sections assessed.

PowerPoint of summary of results for PLO 1 and an overall summary of PLOs 1-4 and 6 was presented (attached). PLO 5 was assessed in 2016. The data summary and Infographic were emailed to participating faculty in advance of the discussion.

## Discussion

- How is age determined? Based on traditional college-age 24 and below vs 25 and above.
- Faculty was not surprised to see that in PLO 1 older students and women had higher scores this has been noticed in the classroom.
- PLO 2 had a higher than normal percent of 0 scores. This could be because a 0 score were given to absent or student that did not complete the assessed assignment.
- Beginners have an exceptionally low percent of 2 or more, could be from the zeros that could have been scored in error.
- ECO has a reputation of a more difficult course by students than other BUS classes. Students that have more program units tend to do better than beginners. In economics females tend to perform better or score higher than males. Females also tend to be the lesser population in Economics
- Economics progressively gets more difficult over the progression of the course; a more difficult assignment could have been used to do the assessment because it was at the end of the semester.
- Suggestion to send out assignments earlier in the semester.
- PLO 3 the program beginners and the (almost) completers are awfully close in scores. Could be because the courses involved are varied.
- Accounting 1A has a reputation for being a difficult course, surprised by the high scores.
- ACC 1A students may have a hard time in the class, but our students do well on the final. The final is based on input from Cal state Fullerton. If the final was used for the assessment this could explain the high scores.
- PLO 4 is a high performing group. Interesting that ACC $2 B$ is included in this PLO and has such high scores because it is a more difficult course with a prerequisite. Only two of the 7 sections assessed for this PLO were ACC 2B.
- PLO 6 BUS is part of the certificate for the Business administration. Not included in the ADT. Only 2 sections participated in this PLO.
- Request for faculty to share the assessed assignments in the future for these assignments. Faculty would like to see the level of difficulty of the assignments used to be able to reflect on the data collected.
- The data for the PLOs there was no disproportionate impact, they are not showing DI in their learning but may still in their grades.
- Students are learning but this may not be reflected in grades.
- From the data it looks like students are learning as they progress through the AOE program.
- Not all faculty are aware of the AOEs, in general they are more familiar with the ADTs and Certificates in their discipline. No one officially owns the AOEs.
- AOEs account for the highest number of degrees we grant.
- In 2018-2019-102 students graduated with the AOE in Administration and Information Systems.
- In 2018- 2019-99 students graduated with the ADT in Business and 28 students graduated with the ADT in Accounting.
- Request for the data for PLO 2 broken down by course.
- PLO 2 for ECO could be because the assessments were more rigorous and more difficult to obtain a higher score due to the nature of the course. The assessments may be more difficult and this may account for the lower scores and $0 s$.
- Students enrolled in ECO 8 are more advanced.
- ECO 4 students are more in need off building skills, entry level students.
- Question: When will these PLOs be assessed again? We assess the PLOs once every 6 years. We are currently in a gap year. Earliest we will assess again is in Fall 2021. The IE department will be making a schedule this year for the AOE assessments.
- Question about AA students in PLO 4, DI was not large enough to calculate, could it be calculated? Generally, we do not calculate for groups smaller than 20, in this case the AA students DI is $83 \%$, which does not hit the $80 \%$ threshold. No DI found for AA students.
- PLO 4 is not a difficult to obtain. The assignments assessed may be easier than other assignments in the course due to the nature of the PLO.

