

## General Education Student Learning Report (rev. 7/15)

Fall 2014 – Spring 2015

# Department of English & Humanities

Effectively assessing a degree program should address a number of factors:

- 1) Valid student learning outcomes should be clearly articulated;
- 2) Valid assessment measures should be used, consistent with the standards of professional practice;
- 3) There should be evidence that assessment data are being used by faculty to make necessary instructional or assessment changes; and there should be evidence that instructional or assessment changes are being implemented to improve student learning.

### Relationship of Degree Program Learning Outcomes to Departmental and University Missions

<b>RSU Mission</b>	<b>General Education Mission</b>
Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities	General Education at Rogers State University provides a broad foundation of intellectual skills, knowledge, and perspectives to enable students across the University to achieve professional and personal goals in a dynamic local or global society.
<b>RSU Commitments</b>	<b>General Education Outcomes</b>
To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning, and critical and creative thinking.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Think critically and creatively.</li><li>2) Acquire, analyze, and evaluate knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world.</li><li>3) Use written, oral, and visual communication effectively.</li><li>4) Develop an individual perspective on the human experience, and demonstrate an understanding of diverse perspectives and values.</li><li>5) Demonstrate civic knowledge and engagement, ethical reasoning, and skills for lifelong learning.</li></ol>

RSU Mission	General Education Mission
To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.	
To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic programs and prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Think critically and creatively.</li> <li>2) Acquire, analyze, and evaluate knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world.</li> <li>3) Use written, oral, and visual communication effectively.</li> <li>4) Develop an individual perspective on the human experience, and demonstrate an understanding of diverse perspectives and values.</li> <li>5) Demonstrate civic knowledge and engagement, ethical reasoning, and skills for lifelong learning.</li> </ol>
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits, and continuous improvement of programs.	
To provide university-wide student services, activities, and resources that complement academic programs.	
To support and strengthen student, faculty, and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution.	
To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff, and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual, and personal enrichment for the university and the communities it serves.	

**PART 1**

**Discussion of Instructional Changes Resulting from 2013-2014 General Education Student Learning Report**

List and discuss all instructional or assessment changes proposed in Part 4 of last year's General Education Student Learning Report, whether implemented or not. Any other changes or assessment activities from last year, but not mentioned in last year's report, should be discussed here as well. Emphasis should be placed on student learning and considerations such as course improvements, the assessment process, and the budget. If no changes were planned or implemented, simply state "No changes were planned or implemented."

Instructional or Assessment Changes	Changes Implemented (Y/N)	Impact of Changes on Degree Program Curriculum or Budget
RE Outcome 1: "The English Faculty are considering updating the assessment tests for ENGL 1113 (Composition I) to more accurately test students on the kinds of common errors instructors see in their writing."	Y	The English/writing faculty made significant changes to assessment tests for both ENGL 1113 (Composition I) and ENGL 1213 (Composition II). This is our first semester using the new assessment tests, so no conclusions can be drawn.
RE Outcome 2: "The Humanities Faculty are considering eliminating the mid-term exam as an assessment measure for HUM 2113 (Humanities I) and HUM 2223 (Humanities II)."	Y	Both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223 use a <i>comprehensive</i> final exam for assessment. This measure assesses the semester-long outcome of student learning; thus, Humanities faculty deemed it unnecessary to assess and report results for a mid-term exam. Instructors are still free (and encouraged) to conduct a mid-term exam in order to foster semester-long student learning, so the aim and impact of this assessment change was to relieve instructors of the time burden involved in gathering, calculating, reporting, and evaluating non-semester-long data.

**PART 2**

**Discussion of the University Assessment Committee's 2013-2014 Peer Review Report**

[Complete this part only if the general education course(s) was among those that were peer reviewed last year.] The University Assessment Committee in its Degree Program Peer Review Report provided feedback and recommendations for improvement in assessment. List or accurately summarize all feedback and recommendations from the committee, and state whether they were implemented or will be implemented at a future date. If they were not or will not be implemented, please explain why. If no changes were recommended last year, simply state "No changes were recommended."

Feedback and Recommended Changes from the University Assessment Committee	Suggestions Implemented (Y/N)	Changes that Were or Will Be Implemented, or Rationale for Changes that Were Not Implemented
No changes were recommended.	NA	No changes were recommended.

### PART 3

#### Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes

The four General Education Outcomes are listed below. For each outcome, indicate the General Education courses being assessed, and provide a brief narrative of the assessment measures and performance standards used, as well as the sampling methods and sample sizes. For each measure, document the results of the activity measured and draw any relevant conclusions related to strengths and weaknesses of their performance. Finally, indicate whether the performance measure was met or not.

#### OUTCOME 1: Think critically and creatively.

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will <b>summarize and evaluate an article</b> . The summary assignment will require a minimum of two documented quotes. The evaluation assignment will require demonstration of critical thinking and observation.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on rubrics developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on summaries to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the	503 Total students assessed	417 of 503 students (82.9%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 339 of 401 (84.5%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 51 of 69 (73.9%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: 27 of 33 (81.8%) met the performance standard.	Students in all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective, which is an improvement in results from last academic year. This is evidence that the Department of English and Humanities is meeting its General Education goals. Traditional on-ground classes consistently score higher than their counterparts in other delivery modes, with the most marked differences reflected in the online classes. Much work has been done over the past few years within the online sections of First Year Writing by dedicated, full time faculty. The rise in online scores may well be a testimony to this; however, these sections are still less successful than their counterparts.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.				
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will take a <b>post-test</b> that requires them to analyze written communication. These tests require them to demonstrate careful reading skills, comprehension skills and critical thinking skills, as well as knowledge about documentation requirements and guidelines.	At least 70% of students who take the exam will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on post-tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared	504 Total students assessed	<p>436 of 504 students (86.5%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-ground: 346 of 406 (85.2%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Online: 59 of 65 (90.7%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: 31 of 33 (93.9%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>	<p>Students in all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective, which is an improvement in results from last academic year. This is evidence that the Department of English and Humanities is meeting its General Education goals.</p> <p>In this measure, students performed significantly better on this standardized assessment tests in the online and blended environments, which counter the results in other measures.</p> <p>As this is a multiple choice test, identical for everyone taking it, this seems to be a particularly relevant result.</p>	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.				
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will <b>summarize and evaluate an article</b> . The summary assignment will require a minimum of two documented quotes. The evaluation assignment will require demonstration of critical thinking and observation.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared	516 Total students assessed	441 of 516 students (85.4%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 403 of 460 (87.6%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 38 of 56 (67.8%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended sections were offered. <hr/>	Students in the on-ground classes met this performance standard a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals. The online classes fell short. The differences are marked. Though significant work has gone into online class restructuring, we still see areas of significant weakness when compared to the on-ground delivery mode.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.				
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will take a <b>post-test</b> that requires them to analyze written communication. These tests require them to demonstrate careful reading skills, comprehension skills and critical thinking skills, as well as knowledge about documentation requirements and guidelines.	At least 70% of students who take the exam will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared	536 Total students assessed	478 of 536 students (89.1%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 403 of 460 (87.6%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 38 of 56 (67.8%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended sections were offered.	A high percentage of students met the performance standard in the on-ground classes, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.  However, the online population failed to achieve this measurement. Again, the differences are marked.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.				
ENGL 2613 Introduction to Literature	Students will submit a <b>creative project</b> responding to some literary work, theme, or text demonstrating generally basic content knowledge of the humanities and in particular critical and creative thinking.	At least 70% of the students who submit the creative project will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on papers to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared	22 Total students assessed	22 of 22 students (100%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 12 of 12 (100%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 10 of 10 (100%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended sections were offered.	Students performed particularly well on this component.	Y



A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.				
HUM 2113 Humanities I	Students will submit an <b>essay</b> in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.  Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”	At least 70% of the students who submit the <b>essay</b> will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the <b>essay</b> are included.	250 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).  <b>Students per breakdown:</b>  <u>Fall 2014</u> 32 FT OG 41 FT OL 48 PT OG  <u>Spring 2015</u> 37 FT OG	201 of 250 total students (80.4%) met the performance standard.  <b>Students per breakdown:</b>  <u>Fall 2014</u> 25 FT OG (78.13%) 36 FT OL (87.8%) 35 PT OG (72.92%)  <u>Spring 2015</u> 26 FT OG (70.27%)	Results meet/exceed the PS for all variations of instructor & delivery, save the one summer 2015 blended section with a very small sample size (only 8 total students @ 62.5% meeting the PS).  Overall, OL students averaged higher results (89 of 102 = 87.25%) vs. OG students (92 of 123 = 74.8%); moreover, excluding the one PT OG section of only 6 students @ 100%, OG students drop to 86 of 117 = 73.5%.  Blended students were 20 of 25 = 80%, but these results are from only two sections, one of which reported 88.24% meeting the PS, while the other reported only 62.5% meeting the PS.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
				40 FT OL 6 PT OG 17 PT B  <u>Summer 2015</u> 21 FT OL 8 FT B	32 FT OL (80%) 6 PT OG (100%) 15 PT B (88.24%)  <u>Summer 2015</u> 21 FT OL (100%) 5 FT B (62.5%)	Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged slightly higher results (145 of 179 = 81%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (56 of 71 = 78.87%).	
HUM 2223 Humanities II	Students will submit an <b>essay</b> in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.  Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”	At least 70% of the students who submit the <b>essay</b> will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the <b>essay</b> are included.	166 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).  <b>Students per breakdown:</b>  <u>Fall 2014</u> 21 FT OG 28 FT OL 32 PT OG  <u>Spring 2015</u> 37 FT OG 7 PT OG 22 PT OL 11 PT B  <u>Summer 2015</u> 8 FT OL	144 of 166 total students (86.75%) met the performance standard.  <b>Students per breakdown:</b>  <u>Fall 2014</u> 16 FT OG (76.19%) 18 FT OL (64.29%) 31 PT OG (96.88%)  <u>Spring 2015</u> 34 FT OG (91.89%) 6 PT OG (85.71%) 22 PT OL (100%) 10 PT B (90.91%)  <u>Summer 2015</u> 7 FT OL (87.5%)	Results exceed, in most cases significantly, the PS for all variations of instructor & delivery save one fall 2014 OL section @ 64.29%.  Overall, OG students averaged higher results (87 of 97 = 89.7%) vs. OL students (47 of 58 = 81.03%); this is the reverse of the HUM I results immediately above. Moreover, excluding the one FT OL section of only 7 of 8 students @ 87.5%, OL students drop to 40 of 50 = 80%. Blended students were 10 of 11 = 90.91% with a small sample size.  Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged lower results (75 of 94 = 79.79%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (69 of 72 = 95.84%). However, note that the success rate for students taught by FT faculty remains consistent from HUM I to HUM II (81% & 79.79%), while the success rate for students taught by PT faculty	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
						increases significantly (78.87 vs. 95.84%).	
HUM 3633 Comparative Religion	Students will complete <b>two essay exams</b> , demonstrating basic content knowledge of the relevant cultures. The two exams are in-class essay exams, one midway through the course and the other at the conclusion of the semester.	At least 70% of the students who take the two essay exams will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who took both exams are included.  2 of 2 sections of the course are included: 1 on-ground + 1 online (summer).	30 Total students assessed	22 of 30 students (73.34%) met the performance standard.  On-ground: 12 of 12 (100%) met the performance standard.  Online: 10 of 18 (55.56%) met the performance standard.  Blended: No blended courses were taught.	2014-15 on-ground students exceeded the PS at an even higher (perfect) percentage (100%) than the 2013-14 on-ground results (97.6%), which were improved over the on-ground results for 2012-13 (90.9%) and 2011-12 (87%).  The 2014-15 online students were not successful (55.56%), and were even lower than usual; for example, 2013-14 online students were 68.2%, just missing the PS.  It is worth noting that these two online results are for summer sections. The eight-week format can be challenging for online students.	Y
LANG 1113 Foundations of World Languages	Students will complete <b>workbook assignments</b> and <b>dictionary assignments</b> that require focus on changes in the English language, as well as	At least 70% of students who submit the assignments will score 70% or higher.	Students from 2 of 2 sections are included in the sample.  On-ground: 14 (F2014)  Online: 24 (Sp2015)	38 Total students assessed	34 of 38 students (89.47%) met the performance standard.  On-ground: 13 of 14 (92.86%) met the performance standard.  Online: 21 of 24 (87.5%)	For 2013-14, the performance of on-ground students (89.66%) was slightly higher than that of online students (84.85%). 2014-15 results are very similar, though further improved.  Because of declining enrollment, only two total sections were taught for 2014-15, one on-ground in the Fall, and one online in the Spring. For 2013-14, four total sections	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	investigation of etymologies.				met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended courses were taught.	were taught, one apiece of on-ground and online both fall and spring.	
LANG 1113 Foundations of World Languages	Students will complete a <b>mid-term examination</b> that is comprehensive of instruction weeks 1-9. Mid-term examination will employ a variety of testing methods, including fill in the blank, true/false, multiple choice and short essay answers. Student knowledge required to pass the mid-term includes familiarity with the Latin and Greek foundations of	At least 70% of students who take the mid-term examination will average 70% or higher.	Students from 2 of 2 sections are included in the sample. <hr/> On-ground: 13 (F2014) <hr/> Online: 24 (Sp2015)	37 Total students assessed	24 of 37 students (64.86%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 10 of 13 (76.92%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 14 of 24 (58.34%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended courses were taught.	The comprehensive mid-term exam grades are typically lower than the comprehensive final exam grades, perhaps especially for online students.  Going forward this is a result we need to watch closely, but we believe that the mid-term exam serves as a learning experience that helps our students learn how to better prepare for a comprehensive final exam; thus, we do not think that the current results are a bad outcome.	N

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	language, a beginning understanding of the etymology of words, and efficient articulation of how/why language reflects culture.						
LANG 1113 Foundations of World Languages	Students will take a <b>final examination</b> that is comprehensive of instruction weeks 1-15. The final examination will employ a variety of testing methods, including fill in the blank, true/false, multiple choice and short essay answers. Student knowledge required to pass the final exam will	At least 70% of students who take the final examination will average 70% or higher.	Students from 2 of 2 sections are included in the sample. <hr/> On-ground: 13 (F2014) <hr/> Online: 23 (Sp2015) <hr/>	36 Total students assessed	27 of 36 students (75%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 10 of 13 (76.92%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 17 of 23 (73.91%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended courses were taught. <hr/>	Evaluating the lower mid-term exam results in light of the higher final exam results brings us to the conclusion that taking the comprehensive mid-term exam helped to prepare the students for the comprehensive final. This finding has been consistent for several years. The final exam covers both the Latin and Greek sections, but the mid-term only tests the Latin section, so the final is more rigorous, yet the students meet the performance standard.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	include all that was required for successful completion of the mid-term, as well as a deeper and more intense investigation and understanding of etymology and its role in determining the past and present use of words, and the subsequent impact on intrasocial communication.						

**OUTCOME 2: Acquire, analyze, and evaluate knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world.**

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
HUM 2113 Humanities I	Students will take a <b>comprehensive final exam</b> on content knowledge of the humanities.	At least 70% of the students who take the <b>exam</b> will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who took the <b>exam</b> are included.	<p>252 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) &amp; Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <hr/> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 35 FT OG 37 FT OL 42 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 39 FT OG 40 FT OL 7 PT OG 23 PT B</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 19 FT OL 10 FT B</p>	<p>208 of 252 total students (82.54%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 28 FT OG (80%) 25 FT OL (67.57%) 36 PT OG (85.71%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 31 FT OG (79.49%) 37 FT OL (92.5%) 5 PT OG (71.43%) 23 PT B (100%)</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 17 FT OL (89.47%) 6 FT B (60%)</p>	<p>Results meet/exceed the PS for all variations of instructor &amp; delivery with two exceptions: one fall 2014 OL section (67.75%) &amp; one summer 2015 blended section with a small sample size (only 10 total students @ 60% meeting the PS).</p> <p>Overall, OL students averaged slightly higher results (79 of 96 = 82.29%) vs. OG students (100 of 123 = 81.3%); however, excluding the one PT OG section of only 5 of 7 students @ 71.43%, OG students rise to 95 of 116 = 81.9%.</p> <p>Blended students were 29 of 33 = 87.88%, but these results are from only two sections, one of which reported 100% meeting the PS, while the other reported only 60% meeting the PS.</p> <p>Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged somewhat lower results (144 of 180 = 80%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (64 of 72 = 88.9%), but PT faculty taught only 28.57% of all total students.</p>	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
HUM 2223 Humanities II	Students will take a <b>comprehensive final exam</b> on content knowledge of the humanities.	At least 70% of the students who take the <b>exam</b> will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who took the <b>exam</b> are included.	201 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).  <b>Students per breakdown:</b>  <u>Fall 2014</u> 28 FT OG 30 FT OL 41 PT OG  <u>Spring 2015</u> 38 FT OG 25 PT OG 21 PT OL 11 PT B  <u>Summer 2015</u> 7 FT OL	171 of 201 total students (85.07%) met the performance standard.  <b>Students per breakdown:</b>  <u>Fall 2014</u> 24 FT OG (85.71%) 23 FT OL (76.67%) 39 PT OG (95.12%)  <u>Spring 2015</u> 37 FT OG (97.37%) 23 PT OG (92%) 11 PT OL (52.38%) 10 PT B (90.91%)  <u>Summer 2015</u> 4 FT OL (57.14%)	Results meet or significantly exceed the PS for all variations of instructor & delivery with two exceptions: one spring 2015 OL section (52.38%) & one summer 2015 OL section with a very small sample size (only 7 total students @ 57.14% meeting the PS).  Overall, OG students averaged much higher results (123 of 132 = 93.18%) vs. OL students (38 of 58 = 65.52%), especially due to the low results for the two OL sections cited above; even excluding the one OL section of only 4 of 7 students @ 57.14%, OL students still rise only to 34 of 51 = 66.7%. Blended students were 10 of 11 = 90.91%.  Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged slightly higher results (88 of 103 = 85.4%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (83 of 98 = 84.7%).	Y
PHIL 1113 Introduction to Philosophy	Students will take a <b>comprehensive final exam</b> , evaluating their retention and understanding of	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who take the exam will score 85% or higher.	Data from all students who took the exam are included in the sample.	80 Total students assessed	<u>Standard #1:</u> 42 of 80 students (52.5%) met the performance standard.	Students performed well on the final exam. Quizzes given during the semester were a contributing factor.	Y Both standards were met.



A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	the problems and history of philosophy, broadly construed.	<hr/> <hr/> <u>Standard #2:</u> At least 85% of students who take the exam will score 70% or higher.	4 sections: 2 on-ground, + 2 online. <hr/> No blended sections were taught.		<hr/> On-ground: 21 of 39 (53.8%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 21 of 41 (51.2%) met the performance standard. <hr/> <u>Standard #2:</u> 70 of 80 students (87.5%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 33 of 39 (84.6%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 37 of 41 (90.2%) met the performance standard.		
PHIL 1313 Values and Ethics	Students will take a <b>comprehensive final exam</b> , evaluating their	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who take the exam will	Data from all students who took the exam are included in	38 Total students assessed	<u>Standard #1:</u> 20 of 38 students (52.6%) met the performance standard.	Students performed well on the final exam. Quizzes given during the semester were a contributing factor.	Y Both standards were met.

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	retention and understanding of the problems and history of ethics.	score 85% or higher. _____ _____ Standard #2: At least 85% of students who take the exam will score 70% or higher.	the sample.  2 sections, on-ground. _____ No online or blended sections. _____		Standard #2: 33 of 38 students (86.8%) met the performance standard.		

**OUTCOME 3: Use written, oral, and visual communication effectively.**

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will write a <b>short, researched essay/body section of an essay</b> , using one or more forms of standard documentation, such as MLA, APA, etc.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, using a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on essays to the writing faculty	496 Total students assessed	388 of 496 students (78.2%) met the performance standard. _____ On-ground: 315 of 402 (78.3%) met the performance standard. _____	Students in all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals. The online sections of this course did markedly better than in previous years, which is a particularly welcome trend, and one that may indeed be a result of the tremendous work done by lead online faculty in these courses, which for years have been weaker	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			<p>coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.</p>		<p>Online: 43 of 60 (71.6%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: 30 of 34 (88.2%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>	<p>than their on-ground peers. Research remains one of the most challenging tasks for First Year writers across delivery platforms.</p> <p>Students in the blended courses did exceptionally well. This remains a fraction of the population, but does point to the success of this model if used appropriately. Only a larger sample size would offer definite conclusions.</p>	
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will take a <b>grammar post-test</b> , featuring close to 100 questions. Grammar issues reflected in the post-test address the grammar challenges that most often	At least 70% of students who take the exam will score 70% or higher, based on a national rubric.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on post-tests to the writing	502 Total students assessed	<p>474 of 502 students (94.4%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-ground: 382 of 406 (94%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>	<p>Students across all delivery modes did exceptionally well on this performance standard for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.</p> <p>This is one of the strongest set of results we have had in recent memory. It is hard to draw conclusions, but several options are possible. Instructors are doing more work with grammar</p>	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	appear in college students' writing.		faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.		<p>Online: 62 of 64 (96.8%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: 30 of 32 (93.7%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>	instruction than in the past with positive outcomes. Perhaps this cohort of students is simply better than their counterparts in previous years. Or the grammar test does not examine today's students on the types of errors they actually make in their writing. The English faculty suspect this, and that is why we revised the assessment tests. We are in the inaugural year of using these revised tests, so not conclusions may be drawn at this point.	
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will write a well-developed, well-supported <b>400-1000 word expository essay</b> , using a writing process, including pre-writing, planning, organizing,	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, using a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on essays to the	540 Total students assessed	<p>447 of 540 students (82.7%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-ground: 356 of 441 (80.7%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>	<p>Students across all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.</p> <p>Interestingly, the online and blended groups did much better than their on-ground counterparts.</p>	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	drafting, revising and editing. A successfully structured formal essay will contain a coherent thesis statement and a minimal amount of grammatical and mechanical errors.		writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.		<p>Online: 59 of 67 (88%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: 32 of 32 (100%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>		
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will take one <b>timed Comp I essay test</b> (50 minutes, minimum and maximum). Essay test questions/ subjects will require students to demonstrate	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on post-tests to	516 Total students assessed	<p>445 of 516 students (86.2%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-ground: 358 of 417 (85.8%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>	Students across delivery modes did very well on this performance standard for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	skill with essay structure, coherence, and clarity of thought.		the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.		<p>Online: 58 of 67 (86.5%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: 29 of 32 (90.6%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>		
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will write a well-developed, well-supported <b>answer to an essay question</b> . A successfully structured formal essay will contain a	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on	547 Total students assessed	<p>488 of 547 students (89.2%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-ground: 432 of 486 (88.8%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/>	Students across delivery modes did very well on this performance standard for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	coherent topic sentence, support, and few grammatical and mechanical errors.	Faculty.	essay tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.		<p>Online: 56 of 61 (91.8%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: No blended sections were offered.</p> <hr/>		
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will write a <b>researched essay</b> , using one or more forms of standard documentation, such as MLA, APA, etc.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported	539 Total students assessed	<p>449 of 539 students (83.3%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-ground: 400 of 481 (83.1%) met the performance standard.</p>	Students across all delivery modes met this performance measure. Notably, students' ability with research and documentation increased from Comp I, which as it should be.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
		the English Faculty.	results to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.		<hr/> Online: 49 of 58 (84.4%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended sections were offered. <hr/>		
HUM 2113 Humanities I	Students will complete an <b>in-class presentation</b> displaying oral and visual communication skills, as well as creative and critical thinking.	At least 70% of the students who <b>present</b> will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who <b>presented</b> are included.	247 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).	243 of 247 total students (98.38%) met the performance standard.	This is the third year of using this new, common assessment measure (promised in 2011-12 to promote consistency).  Results significantly exceed the PS for all variations of instructor & delivery, with the lowest results being 95.65%.  Overall, OG students averaged	Y



A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	(Online students will submit a paper/project in lieu of the presentation.)			<p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 35 FT OG 34 FT OL 46 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 37 FT OG 41 FT OL 7 PT OG 19 PT B</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 20 FT OL 8 FT B</p>	<p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 34 FT OG (97.14%) 34 FT OL (100%) 44 PT OG (95.65%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 36 FT OG (97.3%) 41 FT OL (100%) 7 PT OG (100%) 19 PT B (100%)</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 20 FT OL (100%) 8 FT B (100%)</p>	<p>slightly lower results (121 of 125 = 96.8%) vs. OL students (95 of 95 = 100%), but both delivery modes had extremely high results. Blended students were 27 of 27 = 100% across two sections.</p> <p>Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged slightly higher results (173 of 175 = 98.86%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (70 of 72 = 97.22%).</p>	
HUM 2223 Humanities II	<p>Students will complete an <b>in-class presentation</b> displaying oral and visual communication skills, as well as creative and critical thinking.</p> <p>(Online students will submit a paper/project in lieu of the presentation.)</p>	At least 70% of the students who <b>present</b> will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who <b>presented</b> are included.	<p>196 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) &amp; Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 27 FT OG</p>	<p>185 of 196 total students (94.39%) met the performance standard.</p> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 23 FT OG (85.19%)</p>	<p>This is the second year of using this new, common assessment measure (changed from an essay in 2012-13 to parallel HUM 2113).</p> <p>Results significantly exceed the PS for all variations of instructor &amp; delivery, with the lowest results being 81.82%.</p> <p>Overall, OG students averaged slightly lower results (116 of 125 = 92.8%) vs. OL students (60 of 60 = 100%), but both delivery modes had extremely high results.</p> <p>Blended students were 9 of 11 =</p>	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
				31 FT OL 39 PT OG  <u>Spring 2015</u> 35 FT OG 24 PT OG 20 PT OL 11 PT B  <u>Summer 2015</u> 9 FT OL	31 FT OL (100%) 37 PT OG (94.87%)  <u>Spring 2015</u> 33 FT OG (94.29%) 23 PT OG (95.83%) 20 PT OL (100%) 9 PT B (81.82%)  <u>Summer 2015</u> 9 FT OL (100%)	81.82% (the lowest performance), but for only one small section.  Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged slightly lower results (96 of 102 = 94.11%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (89 of 94 = 94.68%), but this very slight difference is not statistically significant.	
HUM 3633 Comparative Religion	Students will complete and present a <b>comprehensive project</b> , which includes a five-to-seven page paper and various supporting materials. For these projects, students attended a service of an unfamiliar tradition, created a new religion, or interviewed members of various religious backgrounds.	At least 70% of the students who submit the project will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who completed the assignment are included. <hr/> 2 of 2 sections of the course are included: 1 on-ground + 1 online (summer).	30 Total students assessed	28 of 30 students (93.3%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 12 of 12 (100%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 16 of 18 (88.89%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended courses were taught.	Students were highly successful.  This is an assignment that many students particularly enjoy, and so one to which they devote a great deal of effort. Success rates have been at or above 90% the past several years (e.g., 93.8% in 2013-14; 92.3% in 2011-12).  Online results are somewhat lower, though still quite successful. That trend has also been true the past several years.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
PHIL 1113 Introduction to Philosophy	Students will write an <b>essay</b> in which they are asked to explore diverse ethical systems and problems taken from a variety of historical periods: ancient, medieval, and modern.  All essays were scored using a rubric.	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who submit the essay will score 85% or higher.  <u>Standard #2:</u> At least 85% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included in the sample.  3 sections: 1 on-ground, + 2 online.  No blended sections were taught.	80 Total students assessed	<u>Standard #1:</u> 40 of 80 students (50%) met the performance standard.  On-ground: 20 of 39 (51.2%) met the performance standard.  Online: 20 of 41 (49.2%) met the performance standard.  <u>Standard #2:</u> 70 of 80 students (87.5%) met the performance standard.  On-ground: 33 of 39 (84.6%) met the performance standard.  Online: 35 of 41 (85.3%) met the performance	Students from year to year continue to perform well on the rubric-graded essay. As a direct measure, the essay has proven an effective tool for measuring not only General Education outcomes, but also course objectives, which include comprehending the concepts and arguments utilized by philosophers and articulating and appraising possible solutions to core philosophical problems.	Y Both standards were met.

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
					standard.		
PHIL 1313 Values and Ethics	Students will write an <b>essay</b> in which they are asked to explore diverse ethical systems and problems taken from a variety of historical periods: ancient, medieval, and modern.  All essays were scored using a rubric.	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who submit the essay will score 85% or higher.  <u>Standard #2:</u> At least 85% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included in the sample.  2 sections, on-ground.  No online or blended sections were taught.	38 Total students assessed	<u>Standard #1:</u> 19 of 38 students (50%) met the performance standard.  <u>Standard #2:</u> 33 of 38 students (86.8%) met the performance standard.	Students performed well on the essay assignment. It would have been great had Standard #2 been met, but two students were found guilty of plagiarism and, as a result, received failing grades.	Y Both standards were met.
SPAN 1113 Beginning Spanish I	Students will take a <b>final examination</b> that focuses on written and oral communication in Spanish. On this exam, students will be tested on their knowledge of the Spanish language and understanding of Hispanic	At least 70% of students who take the final exam will score 70% or higher.	All students in SPAN 1113 (online and on ground) who complete the class (those who do not drop, stop attending, or fail to take the final exam) are counted.	202 Total students assessed.  This includes fall 2014, spring 2015, and summer 2015 semesters.	141 of 202 students (69.8%) met the performance standard.  On-ground: 97 of 138 (70.2%) met the performance standard.  Online: 44 of 65 (67.7%) met the performance	A fair percentage (69.8%) of students met or exceeded the 70% performance standard on a timed exam that tested the technical mechanics of self-expression and communication in the Spanish language, as well as testing aspects of awareness of Hispanic cultures. The percentage of students in the previous academic year (2013-2014) who met the performance standard was higher overall (77.6% including on-ground classes at 76.2% as well as online at 80.7%) than the current year	N (strictly-speaking) With a final percentage of 69.8%, we came very close to meeting the performance standard, but did not fully achieve it. We were only low by .2%.

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	cultures.				<p>standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: No blended courses were taught.</p> <hr/>	<p>under review (2014-2015), but the performance of the current year's students in the online classes was more closely aligned with that of the on-ground students during this assessment period. Last year showed a significant discrepancy between online achievement (80.7% at or above the benchmark) and on-ground (76.2%). In general terms, the online students during the current assessment period fared almost as well in SPAN1113 as did the on-ground students. We believe that last year's higher percentage of online achievement was due to students' prior experience with Spanish, and a higher level of general overall knowledge of the language. This year, we have seen a return to the norm in the online classrooms, and a reduced performance in some of the on-ground sections. Spanish faculty will be meeting to discuss factors that may have influenced lowered on-ground student success, which might include late/missing assignments, poor study habits, lack of preparedness, and possible negative influence on the part of instructors.</p>	

**OUTCOME 4: Develop an individual perspective on the human experience, and demonstrate an understanding of diverse perspectives and values.**

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
ENGL 2613 Introduction to Literature	Students will take a <b>final examination</b> , in which they are expected to demonstrate, in particular, content knowledge of literature and, more generally, basic content knowledge of the humanities.	At least 70% of the students who take the exam will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the	22 Total students assessed	<p>21 of 22 students (95.4%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-ground: 12 of 12 (100%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Online: 9 of 10 (90%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>Blended: No blended courses were offered.</p> <hr/>	Students across delivery modes did extremely well on this measurement. This is a particularly positive trend, as students struggled in the past, especially in the online section, to meet this standard.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			assessment coordinator.				
ENGL 2613 Introduction to Literature	Students will write one <b>literary analysis/ research paper</b> , in which they are expected to demonstrate, in particular, content knowledge of literature and, more generally, basic content knowledge of the humanities.	At least 70% of the students who submit the literary analysis/ research paper will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on papers to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment	22 Total students assessed	21 of 22 students (95.4%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-ground: 11 of 12 (91.6%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Online: 10 of 10 (100) met the performance standard. <hr/> Blended: No blended courses were taught.	Students across delivery modes did extremely well on this measurement. This is a particularly positive trend, as students struggled in the past to meet this standard.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
			coordinator.				
HUM 2113 Humanities I	<p>Students will submit an <b>essay</b> in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.</p> <p>Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”</p>	At least 70% of the students who submit the <b>essay</b> will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the <b>essay</b> are included.	<p>250 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) &amp; Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <hr/> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 32 FT OG 41 FT OL 48 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 37 FT OG 40 FT OL 6 PT OG 17 PT B</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 21 FT OL 8 FT B</p>	<p>201 of 250 total students (80.4%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 25 FT OG (78.13%) 36 FT OL (87.8%) 35 PT OG (72.92%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 26 FT OG (70.27%) 32 FT OL (80%) 6 PT OG (100%) 15 PT B (88.24%)</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 21 FT OL (100%) 5 FT B (62.5%)</p>	<p>Results meet/exceed the PS for all variations of instructor &amp; delivery, save the one summer 2015 blended section with a very small sample size (only 8 total students @ 62.5% meeting the PS).</p> <p>Overall, OL students averaged higher results (89 of 102 = 87.25%) vs. OG students (92 of 123 = 74.8%); moreover, excluding the 1 PT OG section of only 6 students @ 100%, OG students drop to 86 of 117 = 73.5%.</p> <p>Blended students were 20 of 25 = 80%, but these results are from only two sections, one of which reported 88.24% meeting the PS, while the other reported only 62.5% meeting the PS.</p> <p>Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged slightly higher results (145 of 179 = 81%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (56 of 71 = 78.87%).</p>	Y
HUM 2223 Humanities II	Students will submit an <b>essay</b> in which they	At least 70% of the students who submit the	Data from all students who submitted the <b>essay</b> are	166 Total students distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT)	144 of 166 total students (86.75%) met the performance	Results exceed, in most cases significantly, the PS for all variations of instructor & delivery save one fall 2014 OL section @ 64.29%.	Y



A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
	<p>evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.</p> <p>Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”</p>	<b>essay</b> will score 70% or higher.	included.	<p>vs. Part-Time (PT) &amp; Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <hr/> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 21 FT OG 28 FT OL 32 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 37 FT OG 7 PT OG 22 PT OL 11 PT B</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 8 FT OL</p>	<p>standard.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Students per breakdown:</b></p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 16 FT OG (76.19%) 18 FT OL (64.29%) 31 PT OG (96.88%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 34 FT OG (91.89%) 6 PT OG (85.71%) 22 PT OL (100%) 10 PT B (90.91%)</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 7 FT OL (87.5%)</p>	<p>Overall, OG students averaged higher results (87 of 97 = 89.7%) vs. OL students (47 of 58 = 81.03%); this is the reverse of the HUM I results immediately above. Moreover, excluding the one FT OL section of only 7 of 8 students @ 87.5%, OL students drop to 40 of 50 = 80%. Blended students were 10 of 11 = 90.91% with a small sample size.</p> <p>Overall, students taught by FT faculty averaged lower results (75 of 94 = 79.79%) vs. students taught by PT faculty (69 of 72 = 95.84%). However, note that the success rate for students taught by FT faculty remains consistent from HUM I to HUM II (81% &amp; 79.79%), while the success rate for students taught by PT faculty increases significantly (78.87 vs. 95.84%).</p>	

**OUTCOME 5: Demonstrate civic knowledge and engagement, ethical reasoning, and skills for lifelong learning.**

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)

**PART 4**

**Proposed Instructional Changes Based on Conclusions Drawn from Evidence Presented Above**

State any proposed instructional or assessment changes to be implemented for the next academic year. They should be based on conclusions reported in Part 3 (above) or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum, degree plan, assessment process, or budget. If no changes are planned, simply state “No changes are planned.”

General Education Outcomes	Instructional or Assessment Changes	Rationale for Changes	Impact of Planned Changes on Student Learning and Other Considerations.
No changes are planned.	No changes are planned.	Due to recent instructional or assessment changes across several departmental general education courses, faculty members believe that we should wait to assess these changes more fully before introducing any additional changes.	No changes are planned.

**PART 5**

**Shared Pedagogical Insight that Improves Student Learning or Classroom Engagement**

(OPTIONAL) If your department or a faculty member has developed a method or technique of teaching that seems especially effective in improving student learning or student engagement in the classroom, please provide a brief description below. More detail can be communicated during the face to face peer review session.

Description
A comment from the English/writing faculty: “In all, our results point to improvements to performances of students in the online classes in general. Further, students in all courses are doing better in the areas of research and documentation. The Writing Faculty honed in on these areas in the past years, so it seems to be a positive trend. We will continue to monitor these numbers in the coming years before we draw conclusions.”

**PART 6 (A & B)**

**Documentation of Faculty Participation and Review**

**A.** Provide the names and signatures of all faculty members who contributed to this report and indicate their respective roles.

<b>Faculty Members</b>	<b>Roles in the Assessment Process</b> (e.g., collect data, analyze data, prepare report, review report, etc.)	<b>Signatures</b>
Matthew Oberrieder	Assessment Coordinator. Contributed individual data for both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223; calculated, analyzed, reported, and evaluated all data for both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223; oversaw all aspects of HUM 2113 and HUM 2223 assessment process. Prepared all submitted data for all courses, and completed non-data/narrative portions of the report. Approved final draft.	
Sara Beam	Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Holly Clay-Buck	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Renée Cox	Contributed data for HUM 2223; helped to process data for HUM 2113 and HUM 2223. Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Emily Dial-Driver	Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113, ENGL 1213, and ENGL 2613. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Sally Emmons	Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
James Ford	Assessment Committee member. Contributed and evaluated data for HUM 3633. Reviewed, edited, and approved final draft.	
Francis A Grabowski III	Contributed and evaluated data for PHIL 1113 and PHIL 1313. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Laura Gray	Assessment Committee member. Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113, ENGL 1213, and ENGL 2613; oversaw all aspects of ENGL assessment process. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Gioia Kerlin	Assessment Committee member. Collected, contributed, and evaluated data for SPAN 1113. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Diana Lurz	Contributed data for both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223. Contributed and evaluated data for LANG 1113. Reviewed and approved final draft.	

Mary M Mackie	Department Head. Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Frances Morris	Assessment Committee member. Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213. Contributed and evaluated data for LANG 1113. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Scott Reed	Contributed data for both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223. Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113 and ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Cecilia Townsend	Contributed and evaluated data for SPAN 1113. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Brenda Tuberville	Reviewed and approved final draft.	

**B. Reviewed by:**

<b>Titles</b>	<b>Names</b>	<b>Signatures</b>	<b>Date</b>
Department Head	Mary M Mackie		
Dean	Frank Elwell		

## RUBRIC FOR GENERAL EDUCATION STUDENT LEARNING REPORT

1) How well did the department incorporate instructional or assessment changes based on results and conclusions from last year's General Education Student Learning Report or from other assessment activities?

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
All planned changes were listed, whether they were implemented or not, and their impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed thoroughly.	Most planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed.	Some planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not clearly discussed.	No planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not discussed.

2) Did the department include peer review feedback and provide rationale for implementing or not implementing suggestions?

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
All reviewer feedback was listed, and for each suggestion a clear rationale was given for its being implemented or not.	Most reviewer feedback was listed, and for most suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not.	Some reviewer feedback was listed, and for some suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not.	Feedback from reviewers was not included.

3) A. Are the course titles and numbers listed?

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
All of the courses (titles and numbers) offered by the department are listed.	Most of the courses (titles and numbers) offered by the department are listed.	Some of the courses (titles and numbers) offered by the department are listed..	None of the courses (titles and numbers) offered by the department are listed.

B. Are the assessment measures appropriate for the General Education outcomes?

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
All assessment measures are appropriate to the General Education outcomes.	Most assessment measures are appropriate to the General Education outcomes.	Some assessment measures are appropriate to the General Education outcomes.	None of the assessment measures are appropriate to the General Education outcomes.

**C. Do the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance?**

<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Undeveloped</b>
All performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance.	Most performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance.	Some of the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance.	No performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance.

**D. Is the sampling method appropriate for all assessment measures?**

<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Undeveloped</b>
The sampling methodology is appropriate for all assessment measures.	The sampling methodology is appropriate for most assessment measures.	The sampling methodology is appropriate for some assessment measures.	The sampling methodology is appropriate for none of the assessment measures.

**E. Is the sample size listed for each assessment measure?**

<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Undeveloped</b>
Sample size was listed for all assessment measures.	Sample size was listed for most assessment measures.	Sample size was listed for some assessment measures.	Sample size was not listed for any assessment measures.

**F. How well do the data provide a clear and meaningful overview of the results?**

<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Undeveloped</b>
For all General Education outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance.	For most General Education outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance.	For some General Education outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance.	For none of the General Education outcomes were the results clear, was more than a single year's results included, or was meaningful information given that reveals an overview of student performance.

**G. Are the conclusions reasonably drawn and significantly related to General Education outcomes?**

<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Established</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Undeveloped</b>
------------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------------

All conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	Most conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	Some conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	No conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results or related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.
---	--	--	---

**H. Does the report indicate whether the performance standards were met?**

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Stated for all performance standards.	Stated for most performance standards.	Stated for some performance standards.	Not stated for any performance standard.

**4) How well supported is the rationale for making assessment or instructional changes? The justification can be based on conclusions reported in Section 3 or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and whether they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as the department's curriculum, General Education Student Learning Report, or budget.**

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
All planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is well grounded and convincingly explained.	Most planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is mostly well grounded and convincingly explained.	Some planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is lacking or is not convincingly explained.	No planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. There is no rationale.

**5) Is one or more teaching technique listed?**

The Peer Review Report will make note whether any techniques were included in the General Education Student Learning Report.

**6) Does the list of faculty participants indicate how many full time faculty who teach in the program participated, their signatures, and their contributions to the report?**

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
The faculty role is clearly identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the	The faculty role is identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the process.	The faculty roles are not identified. Few faculty participated.	The faculty roles are not identified. Faculty participation is not sufficiently described to make a

process. The roles are varied.

The roles are not varied.

determination about who participated.

---

## EXPLANATION & EXAMPLES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT EVIDENCE

**DIRECT EVIDENCE of student learning is tangible, visible, self-explanatory evidence of exactly what students have and haven't learned.**

**Examples include:**

- 1) Ratings of student skills by their field experience supervisors.
- 2) Scores and pass rates on licensure/certification exams or other published tests (e.g. Major Field Tests) that assess key learning outcomes.
- 3) Capstone experiences such as research projects, presentations, oral defenses, exhibitions, or performances that are scored using a rubric.
- 4) Written work or performances scored using a rubric.
- 5) Portfolios of student work.
- 6) Scores on locally-designed tests such as final examinations in key courses, qualifying examinations, and comprehensive examinations that are accompanied by test blueprints describing what the tests assess.
- 7) Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples.
- 8) Employer ratings of the skills of recent graduates.
- 9) Summaries and analyses of electronic class discussion threads.
- 10) Student reflections on their values, attitudes, and beliefs, if developing those are intended outcomes of the program.

**INDIRECT EVIDENCE provides signs that students are probably learning, but the evidence of exactly what they are learning is less clear and less convincing. Examples include:**

- 1) Course grades.
- 2) Assignment grades, if not accompanied by a rubric or scoring guide.
- 3) For four year programs, admission rates into graduate programs and graduation rates from those programs.
- 4) For two year programs, admission rates into four-year institutions and graduation rates from those programs.
- 5) Placement rates of graduates into appropriate career positions and starting salaries.
- 6) Alumni perceptions of their career responsibilities and satisfaction.
- 7) Student ratings of their knowledge and skills and reflections on what they have learning over the course of the program.
- 8) Those questions on end-of-course student evaluations forms that ask about the course rather than the instructor.
- 9) Student/alumni satisfaction with their learning, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups
- 10) Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni.

Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*. Anker Publishing Company: Bolton, MA