

Degree Program Student Learning Report (rev. 7/14)

Fall 2014 – Spring 2015

The Department of English & Humanities in the School of Liberal Arts

Liberal Arts, A.A.

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.

PART 1 (A & B)

Relationship of Degree Program Learning Outcomes to Departmental and University Missions

A. Clearly state the school, department and degree program missions.

| University Mission | School Mission | Department Mission | Degree Program Mission |
|---|--|--|---|
| Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities. | The mission of the School of Liberal Arts is to further the study and practice of the arts, humanities, and social sciences at Rogers State University, in the community, and in the region. | The mission of the Department of English and Humanities is to support students in their pursuit of knowledge and to prepare them for participation in the increasingly global culture of the 21st century. | A study of the Liberal Arts provides a strong, broad-based education in liberal arts, emphasizing concepts, experiences, and creations of people from pre-history to the present. The Associate in Arts in Liberal Arts is designed to provide students with a sound grounding in our cultural heritage in a two-year degree which meets the general education requirements for transfer to a four-year degree. |

B. Clearly state school purposes, department purposes and degree program student learning outcomes. Align student learning outcomes with their appropriate school and department purposes, and these outcomes and purposes with their appropriate university commitments.

| University Commitments | School Purposes | Department Purposes | Student Learning Outcomes |
|---|---|--|--|
| 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. | The School will offer innovative degrees which focus upon developing skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, and creativity. | The Department will foster the skills of critical and creative thinking, writing, communication, and research among our students. | Students will demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically. |
| 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. | The School will educate liberal arts majors to think critically, creatively, and independently and have the skills to work in all types of situations and communicate with all types of people. | The Department will foster the values of scholarship, creativity, appreciation of diversity, and community service among our faculty, staff, and students. | Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition. |
| To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic programs and prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society. | The School will offer general education courses of high quality and purpose that provide a foundation for life-long learning. | The Department will serve the University and the community by providing quality general education courses that prepare students for their roles as citizens and cultural participants. | Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition. |
| To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs. | The School will foster a community of scholars among the faculty and students of the institution. | The Department will offer innovative programs and quality teaching within the classroom and through distance education. | Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program. |
| 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. | | | |

| University Commitments | School Purposes | Department Purposes | Student Learning Outcomes |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 2

Discussion of Instructional Changes Resulting from 2013-2014 Degree Program Student Learning Report

List and discuss all instructional or assessment changes proposed in Part 5 of last year's Degree Program 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 |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| By consulting the 2013-14 AALA SLR, Part 2, one can see reported six instructional or assessment changes resulting from both the 2012-13 AALA SLR and independent deliberations among the Humanities I/II faculty. These changes continue to be evaluated by the Humanities I/II faculty and their results continue to be reported in this SLR, in Part 4 below. In light of these recent changes, the Humanities I/II faculty do not plan any further changes for the time being. | Y | The changes reported in Part 2 of the 2013-14 AALA SLR are only a year old. Due to the newness of these changes, the Humanities I/II faculty members need to continue to gather data into the future before we can speak definitively about the impact of these changes. For the time being, the impact of these changes is discussed within the context of the general Conclusions reported in Part 4, Section G below. |

PART 3

Discussion About the University Assessment Committee’s 2013-2014 Peer Review Report

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 |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>“Both reports [the AALA and the BALA SLRs] refer to less than 20 students, one of the smaller totals on campus, so putting the data into distribution tables should not be difficult since it can be easily tallied by hand. Other departments manage to construct tables, and they usually include much greater numbers of students” (Sic; brackets inserted).</p> | <p>N</p> | <p>The Department of English and Humanities appreciates the Peer Reviewers’ zeal for putting data into distribution tables. Such a presentation of data might paint a richer picture of student progress toward learning outcomes, but the Department believes that this aspiration would place an undue burden on the many faculty members who contribute to the already inefficient manual process of collecting, collating, and analyzing the aggregate of assessment data. The Department suggests that putting data into distribution tables is an unrealistic hope by the UAC--until the entire data collection and reporting process for SLRs becomes totally automated, so that each individual faculty member across all of the multiple sections that are reporting data can simply in-put his or her raw numbers and a sophisticated computer program will complete all of the calculations for all of the breakdowns for all of the sections. Perhaps then, faculty members could devote their assessment reporting energies to philosophical reflection on student learning, rather than to the mechanics of assessment.</p> |

PART 4

Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes

For all student learning outcomes (as listed in Part 1 B above), describe 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 relevant conclusions related to strengths and weaknesses of their performance.

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| <p>1) Students will demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.</p> | <p>1a) Students in Humanities I (HUM 2113) will complete an in-class presentation 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> | <p>At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.</p> | <p>Data from all AALA students who presented are included.</p> | <p>15 Total AALA students across 18 total sections, distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown: <u>Fall 2014</u> 3 FT OG 1 FT OL 7 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 3 FT OG 1 FT OL 0 PT OG 0 PT B</p> | <p>15 of 15 total AALA students (100%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown: <u>Fall 2014</u> 3 FT OG (100%) 1 FT OL (100%) 7 PT OG (100%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 3 FT OG (100%) 1 FT OL (100%) NA NA</p> | <p>Results are very positive for all instructional and delivery modes, and they are identical with 2013-14 results, i.e., 100% of AALA students meeting the performance standard.</p> <p>However, this is only the second year now (cf. 2013-14 AALA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that the sample and results separate out AALA students specifically from all/other students taking Humanities I for general education.</p> <p>Moreover, even though the 2014-15 sample size (15 students) is double the 2013-14 sample size (7 students), the overall sample size is still rather small.</p> <p>Finally, although AALA students were universally successful in achieving the performance standard, at this course level (Gen Ed), we expect such performance from them.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> |

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | <u>Summer 2015</u> 0 FT OL 0 FT B | <u>Summer 2015</u> NA NA | | |
| | <p>1b) Students in Humanities II (HUM 2223) will complete an in-class presentation 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> | <p>At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.</p> | <p>Data from all AALA students who presented are included.</p> | <p>18 Total AALA students across 13 total sections, distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown:</p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 3 FT OG 1 FT OL 1 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 1 FT OG 6 PT OG 4 PT OL 2 PT B</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 0 FT OL</p> | <p>18 of 18 total AALA students (100%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown:</p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 3 FT OG (100%) 1 FT OL (100%) 1 PT OG (100%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 1 FT OG (100%) 6 PT OG (100%) 4 PT OL (100%) 2 PT B (100%)</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> NA</p> | <p>Results are very positive for all instructional and delivery modes, and they are higher than the 2013-14 results of 91.7% of AALA students meeting the performance standard.</p> <p>However, this is only the second year now (cf. 2013-14 AALA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that the sample and results separate out AALA students specifically from all/other students taking Humanities II for general education.</p> <p>Moreover, even though the 2014-15 sample size (18 students) is larger than the 2013-14 sample size (11 students), the overall sample size is still rather small.</p> <p>Finally, although AALA students were universally successful in achieving the performance standard, at this course level (Gen Ed), we expect such performance from them.</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------------------|
| <p>2) Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.</p> | <p>2a) Students in Humanities I (HUM 2113) will submit an essay in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.</p> <p><i>N.B.</i>, Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”</p> | <p>At least 70% of the students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.</p> | <p>Data from all AALA students who presented are included.</p> | <p>15 Total AALA students across 18 total sections, distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown:</p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 2 FT OG 2 FT OL 7 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 3 FT OG 1 FT OL 0 PT OG 0 PT B</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 0 FT OL 0 FT B</p> | <p>13 of 15 total AALA students (86.67%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown:</p> <p><u>Fall 2014</u> 1 FT OG (50%) 2 FT OL (100%) 7 PT OG (100%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 2 FT OG (66.67%) 1 FT OL (100%) NA NA</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> NA NA</p> | <p>Overall results are positive, with the notable exception of 2 of the 5 total students in the Fall & Spring sections taught by Full-Time, On-Ground (FT OG) Instructors.</p> <p>To compare, 2013-14 results were 100% for all delivery modes, though that sample was only 5 total students (4 OG, 1 B); also, 2013-14 results did distinguish delivery modes (OG, OL, B), but they did not distinguish Instructor status, as do 2014-15 results.</p> <p>The 2014-15 total larger sample size (15 students vs. 5) might help to explain the much weaker 2014-15 FT OG performance, but any results are statistically skewed by the small FT OG sample size of only 5 total students fall & spring.</p> <p>Moreover, because only 2014-15 results distinguish Instructor Status (FT vs PT), it is unclear whether this helps to explain the much weaker performance, such as FT OG Instructors having higher expectations for students’ writing abilities, especially as FT OL students (thought only 3 total) met the performance standard at 100%. Merits further study.</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------------------|
| | <p>2b) Students in Humanities II (HUM 2223) will submit an essay in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.</p> <p><i>N.B.</i>, Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”</p> | <p>At least 70% of the students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.</p> | <p>Data from all AALA students who submitted are included.</p> | <p>13 Total AALA students across 13 total sections, distinguished by Instructor Status: Full-Time (FT) vs. Part-Time (PT) & Delivery Mode: On-ground (OG), Online (OL), Blended (B).</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown: <u>Fall 2014</u> 3 FT OG 1 FT OL 1 PT OG</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 1 FT OG 2 PT OG 4 PT OL 1 PT B</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> 0 FT OL</p> | <p>13 of 13 total AALA students (100%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>AALA Students per breakdown: <u>Fall 2014</u> 3 FT OG (100%) 1 FT OL (100%) 1 PT OG (100%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2015</u> 1 FT OG (100%) 2 PT OG (100%) 4 PT OL (100%) 1 PT B (100%)</p> <p><u>Summer 2015</u> NA</p> | <p>Results are very positive for all instructional and delivery modes, and they are higher than the 2013-14 results of 83.3% of AALA students meeting the standard.</p> <p>It might be worth noting that HUM II students achieved this measure at 100%, vs. the mixed results for HUM I students for the same measure (cf. 2a above). Perhaps HUM II students benefitted from the HUM I parallel assignment?</p> <p>However, this is only the second year now (cf. 2013-14 AALA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that the sample and results separate out AALA students specifically from all/other students taking Humanities I or II for general education.</p> <p>Moreover, even though the 2014-15 sample size (13 students) is larger than the 2013-14 sample size (10 students), the overall sample size is still rather small.</p> <p>Finally, although AALA students were universally successful in achieving the performance standard, at this course level (Gen Ed), we expect such performance from them.</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>3) Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AALA) degree program.</p> | <p>Students graduating with an Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AALA) degree will complete the School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey as a part of their graduation application process.</p> | <p>At least 80% of students graduating with an Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AALA) degree will express overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the degree.</p> | <p>Students must complete the School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey at the time they apply for graduation.</p> <p>Graduation applications are not considered complete and will not be forwarded unless the completed survey is attached to the application.</p> <p>All students in the sample are AALA program majors.</p> | <p>22 Total students</p> <p>Results are taken from the 2014-2015 SLA Graduating Student Survey, disaggregated by degree program, as completed by the Office for Accountability and Academics.</p> <p>For comparison, the 2014-15 sample size of 22 Total students is more than double the 2013-14 sample size of 10 Total students.</p> | <p>17 to 19 of 22 total students (77.3% to 86.4% = 81.8% Ave) expressed overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the AALA degree. The level of overall satisfaction is even higher (89.5%-95%) if one factors out non-responses</p> <hr/> <p>Students rated their level of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in response to five categories/questions as indicated below.</p> <hr/> <p>1. <u>“Quality of Instruction in Major”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 13 (65%)</p> <p>“somewhat satisfied” = 6 (30%)</p> <p>“somewhat dissatisfied” = 1 (5%)</p> | <p>Results overall are highly positive and consistent with the past few years.</p> <p>A notable difference between 2014-15 results and 2013-14 results is that for 2013-14 students, not one (0%) rated their level of satisfaction below either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” (100% overall satisfied), whereas for 2014-15 students, roughly 5% rated some level of dissatisfaction in each of the five categories, and up to 10% rated some level of dissatisfaction in three of the five categories.</p> <p>However, even with the 2014-15 sample size (22 students) being more than double the 2013-14 sample size (10 students), the total number of 2014-15 dissatisfied students is only 1 or 2 in each category. Thus, while 2014-15 is technically statistically lower than 2013-14, the actual number of total satisfied students is much higher.</p> <p>In the end, AALA students seem to be highly satisfied overall with the educational experience afforded by their AALA degree.</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>No Response = 2</p> <hr/> <p>2. <u>“Preparation for Advanced Classes in Major”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 12 (57.1%)</p> <p>“somewhat satisfied” = 7 (33.3%)</p> <p>“somewhat dissatisfied” = 1 (4.8%)</p> <p>“very dissatisfied” = 1 (4.8%)</p> <p>No Response = 1</p> <hr/> <p>3. <u>“Overall Major Experience”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 12 (60%)</p> <p>“somewhat satisfied” = 6 (30%)</p> | | |

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>“somewhat dissatisfied” = 1 (5%)</p> <p>“very dissatisfied” = 1 (5%)</p> <p>No Response = 2</p> <hr/> <p>4. <u>“Overall Department Experience”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 10 (52.6%)</p> <p>“somewhat satisfied” = 8 (42.1%)</p> <p>“very dissatisfied” = 1 (5.3%)</p> <p>No Response = 3</p> <hr/> <p>5. <u>“Overall RSU Experience”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 9 (47.4%)</p> <p>“somewhat satisfied” = 8 (42.1%)</p> | | |

| A. Student Learning Outcomes | B. Assessment Measures | C. Performance Standards | D. Sampling Methods | E. Sample Size (N) | F. Results | G. Conclusions | H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|----------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | | | "somewhat dissatisfied" = 1 (5.3%) "very dissatisfied" = 1 (5.3%) No Response = 3 | | |

PART 5

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 4 (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."

| Student Learning Outcomes | Instructional or Assessment Changes | Rationale for Changes | Impact of Planned Changes on Student Learning and Other Considerations. |
|--|--|--|---|
| No changes are planned. Consult remarks in Part 2 above. | No changes are planned. Consult remarks in Part 2 above. | No changes are planned. Consult remarks in Part 2 above. | No changes are planned. Consult remarks in Part 2 above. |

PART 6

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 |
|-------------|
| |

PART 7 (A & B)

Assessment Measures and Faculty Participation

A. Assessment Measures:

- 1) How many different assessment measures were used? 5
- 2) List the direct measures (see rubric): [1] Humanities I (HUM 2113) Presentation; [2] Humanities II (HUM 2223) Presentation; [3] Humanities I (HUM 2113) "Diverse Forces" Essay; [4] Humanities II (HUM 2223) "Diverse Forces" Essay*
- 3) List the indirect measures (see rubric): [5] School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey

*Note that all presentations and essays are direct to the extent to which the developed grading rubric was implemented. Otherwise they remain indirect.

B.

1) Provide the names and signatures of all faculty members who contributed to this report and indicate their respective roles:

| Faculty Members | Roles in the Assessment Process (e.g., collect data, analyze data, prepare report, review report, etc.) | Signatures |
|--------------------------|--|------------|
| 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; reported and evaluated data from the School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey. Prepared this report and approved final draft. | |
| Sara Beam | Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Holly Clay-Buck | Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| J. Renée Cox | Contributed data for HUM 2223. Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Emily Dial-Driver | Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Sally Emmons | Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| James Ford | Contributed data for HUM 2113; reviewed, edited, and approved final draft. | |
| Francis A. Grabowski III | Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Laura Gray | Assessment Committee member; reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Gioia Kerlin | Assessment Committee member; reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Diana Lurz | Contributed data for both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223. Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Mary M Mackie | Department Head; reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Frances Morris | Assessment Committee member; reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Scott Reed | Contributed data for both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223. Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Cecilia Townsend | Reviewed and approved final draft. | |
| Brenda Tuberville | Reviewed and approved final draft. | |

2) Reviewed by:

| Titles | Names | Signatures | Date |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|------|
| Department Head | Mary M Mackie | | |
| Dean | Frank Elwell | | |

