## NORCO

## COLLEGE

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT SUMMARY
AOE- HUMANITIES, PHILOSOPHY \& ARTS FALL 2019


Benchmark

Scored 2 or above

## Percent of all students that scored a 2

 or above (met minimum level of competency or above) on PLO 1-4.Students with more units completed in the program scored significantly higher on the PLOs.


## Disproportionate Impact

There were no significant low performing groups.

Courses Involved ART-1,6, FRE-1, HUM-4,8,10,16, PHI-10,19 and SPA- 1,2,3.


AVERAGE NUMBER OF UNITS COMPLETED IN PROGRAM :

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

## PROGRAM: AOE Humanities, Philosophy and Arts PLO 1

PLO(S) ASSESSED: Interpret key philosophical, religious and literary texts, as well as creative works, in historical and cultural contexts and express that interpretation persuasively in oral and/or written form. COURSES INVOLVED: ART-1, ART-6, SPA-3, PHI-10, PHI-19, and HUM-10.

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: | 368 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 23.04 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 6.24 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $\mathbf{7 9 . 9 \%}$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 46 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 1 | 28 | $7.6 \%$ |
| 2 | 57 | $15.5 \%$ |
| 3 | 84 | $22.8 \%$ |
| 4 | 153 | $41.6 \%$ |

## 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 | $77.2 \%$ | 2.61 | 189 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $82.7 \%$ | 2.87 | 179 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was not significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=1.780, \mathrm{p}=.076$ )

## 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 | 76.5\% | 17 |  |
|  | Asian | 87.5\% | 40 | 1.00 |
|  | Hispanic | 78.7\% | 230 | . 90 |
|  | White | 78.6\% | 70 | . 90 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander | 100\% | 2 |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 6 |  |
|  | Unknown | 66.7\% | 3 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 82.4\% | 312 | 1.00 |
|  | 25 and above | 66.1\% | 56 | . 80 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 81.1\% | 190 | 1.00 |
|  | Male* | 78.5\% | 172 | . 97 |
|  | Unknown | 83.3\% | 6 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Humanities, Philosophy and Arts PLO 2
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Analyze the role and use of language, rhetoric and/or the arts in informing and contextualizing human experience.
COURSES INVOLVED: ART-1, ART- 6, FRE-1, SPA-3, PHI-10, PHI-19, HUM-8, and HUM-10.
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: | 461 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 26.50 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 6.45 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $90.5 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 26 | $5.6 \%$ |
| 1 | 18 | $3.9 \%$ |
| 2 | 60 | $13 \%$ |
| 3 | 120 | $26 \%$ |
| 4 | 237 | $51.4 \%$ |

## 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 | $88.2 \%$ | 3.02 | 237 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $92.9 \%$ | 3.26 | 224 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=2.349, \mathrm{p}<.05$ )

## 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 | 94.1\% | 17 |  |
|  | Asian | 93.6\% | 47 | . 99 |
|  | Hispanic | 88.5\% | 304 | . 93 |
|  | White | 94.8\% | 77 | 1.00 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian | 100\% | 1 |  |
|  | Pacific Islander | 100\% | 3 |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 8 |  |
|  | Unknown | 75.0\% | 4 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 90.1\% | 363 | . 98 |
|  | 25 and above | 91.8\% | 98 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 93.4\% | 257 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 86.8\% | 197 | . 93 |
|  | Unknown | 85.7\% | 7 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Humanities, Philosophy and Arts PLO 3
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Analyze the role and use of the arts (literature, music, theatre, dance, and the fine arts) as a reflection of the culture in which it appears.
COURSES INVOLVED: ART-1, ART- 6, SPA-3, PHI-10, PHI-19, HUM-4, and HUM-16.
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: | 369 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 19.94 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 5.57 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $83.2 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 35 | $9.5 \%$ |
| 1 | 27 | $7.3 \%$ |
| 2 | 71 | $19.2 \%$ |
| 3 | 101 | $27.4 \%$ |
| 4 | 135 | $36.6 \%$ |

## 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 | $79.6 \%$ | 2.58 | 216 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $88.2 \%$ | 2.97 | 153 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=2.992, \mathrm{p}<.05$ )

## 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 | 73.3\% | 15 |  |
|  | Asian | 80.5\% | 41 | . 90 |
|  | Hispanic | 82.2\% | 236 | . 92 |
|  | White | 89.1\% | 64 | 1.00 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian |  |  |  |
|  | Pacific Islander | 100\% | 2 |  |
|  | Two or more | 85.7\% | 7 |  |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 4 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 83.0\% | 323 | . 98 |
|  | 25 and above | 84.8\% | 46 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 85.9\% | 177 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 81.0\% | 184 | . 94 |
|  | Unknown | 75.0\% | 8 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## PLO ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

PROGRAM: AOE Humanities, Philosophy and Arts PLO 4
PLO(S) ASSESSED: Evaluate the role of individual human agency in history. COURSES INVOLVED: ART-1, FRE-1, SPA-1, SPA-2, and SPA-3.

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: | 293 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Average number of total units completed: | 29.76 |
| Average number of units completed in program: | 7.07 |
| Percent of all students at 2.0 or above on PLO Assessment: | $96.9 \%$ |


| PLO Score | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 3 | $1 \%$ |
| 1 | 6 | $2 \%$ |
| 2 | 33 | $11.3 \%$ |
| 3 | 81 | $27.6 \%$ |
| 4 | 170 | $58 \%$ |

YOUR PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED INTO 2 GROUPS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS

- GROUP 1-Program Beginners: 5 or less units completed in the program at the beginning of the fall semester.
- GROUP 2-Program (almost) Completers: More than 5 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 | $95.5 \%$ | 3.29 | 154 |
| GRP 2-PROGRAM (almost) COMPLETERS | $98.6 \%$ | 3.52 | 139 |

Group 2 average PLO assessment score was significantly higher than Group 1. ( $\mathrm{t}=2.370, \mathrm{p}<.05$ )

## 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 | 100\% | 14 |  |
|  | Asian | 100\% | 20 | 1.00 |
|  | Hispanic | 95.5\% | 199 | . 96 |
|  | White | 100\% | 48 | 1.00 |
|  | Filipino |  |  |  |
|  | American Indian | 100\% | 1 |  |
|  | Pacific Islander | 100\% | 2 |  |
|  | Two or more | 100\% | 6 |  |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 3 |  |
| AGE | 24 and below | 96.3\% | 219 | . 98 |
|  | 25 and above | 98.6\% | 74 | 1.00 |
|  | Unknown |  |  |  |
| GENDER | Female | 97.3\% | 187 | 1.00 |
|  | Male | 96.2\% | 104 | . 99 |
|  | Unknown | 100\% | 2 |  |

*Disproportionately impacted group

## Participants

Greg Aycock, Dean Institutional Effectiveness
Michael Bobo, Assistant Professor, Humanities
Areceli Covarrubias, Assistant Professor, Spanish
Barbara May, Adjunct Professor, Art
Dominique Hitchcock, Professor, Spanish and French
Quinton Bemiller, Associate Professor, Art

## Overview

AOE assessment is facilitated by the IE department in Fall 2019. 13 faculty participated in the assessment assignments for their courses, with a total of 12 courses and 40 sections assessed.

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

## Discussion

- Question: Are Honors courses included in the data for this AOE? No honors courses were assessed in this AOE.
- Request to not include honors courses because Honors includes a different population of students that tend to be more advanced and have a better grasp on the college experience.
- Would be interesting to do a separate assessment of the whole Honors program.
- The 25 and above group in PLO 1 was right at the $80 \%$ index almost considered disproportionately impacted.
- World Religions is popular for General Ed, the older student population realize that the religion they have been raised with is not perfect it becomes challenging for them. It has been noticed that this can affect their performance. "I think the older student population. They are excited about learning about religion, but then when they start to realize that the tradition that they've been raised in isn't perfect. It's challenging."
- Are the students that choose to take this class more likely more open minded? It is a mixed group.
- How does this compare to the age group across the whole campus? It has been observed in the classroom that older students that persist tend to do better. It is also not the norm on campus that younger students score better usually it is the older students that score higher.
- Older students can have more responsibilities. Making connections on campus can help students succeed.
- Older students tend to do better, especially with persistence.
- This is the only PLO of the AOE-HUM that students 25 and older did not score higher than the students 24 and younger.
- Who are these students? Are they Humanities, Philosophy and Arts major students? Would be interesting if we knew their majors.
- Suggestion that PLO 1 may be a harder PLO to obtain.
- Assumption is that the students should have acquired the PLOs if they have 6 or so courses in the program.
- If you added English this would be like a Schools of Arts and Humanities and Programmeta major.
- Suggestion that with a more intentional assessment, numbers may be better.
- Timing of this assessment is concerning, these are students that are near the end of the courses.
- Because of this most of the students that were struggling could have already dropped the courses. This is not a perfect group.
- Students with more units completed in the program scored significantly higher on the PLOs.
- When will we do this again? We will be making an AOE schedule with in the 6-year cycle.
- Are these PLOs representing what students should be learning or are they lacking? On a certain level the AOEs are a Hodge podge, is it a rare student who would choose this AOE, or any AOE on purpose?
- There is currently no ADT in Humanities. Do the Cal Sates have bachelor's degrees in Humanities? There are a few scattered throughout the state, but it is difficult.
- Do you have an interest in having a local AA in Humanities? This AOE seems to represent our Humanities students. Would have to work with the district to obtain a local ADT.
- Do we have a way to see if students that declare an ADT earlier do better for transfer than students that don't? Are students that declare an ADT earlier more successful?
- What are transfer rates for these AOE's and ADT's?
- Our highest graduation rates are in the AOEs. The ADTs are on an upswing.
- Suggestion to look at students by major. Prior to Guided Pathways a 'major' was seen as invalid. This is the time that we can be using majors to pull success data.
- PLO1- require written communication. English 1A and 1B are no longer a prerequisite. If we cannot make English 1A a pre-requisite student may have a harder time obtaining this PLO.
- Suggestion that once every student has a trailhead and they are following it, English and math would be completed early on, in the first year. Unfortunately, we won't see the effects of the trailheads for 4-5 years.
- Suggestion to see if students that are completing English and Math in the first year more successful overall?

