

Degree Program Student Learning Report

Revised August 2017

Department of English & Humanities

AA in Liberal Arts **For 2018-2019 Academic Year**

PART 1

Degree Program Mission and Student Learning Outcomes

A. 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.	Central to the mission of the School of Arts and Sciences is the preparation of students to achieve professional and personal goals in their respective disciplines and to enable their success in dynamic local and global communities. Our strategy is to foster an academic setting of diverse curricula that inherently incorporates an environment of service and collegiality.	The mission of the Department of English and Humanities at Rogers State University is to support students in their pursuit of knowledge and to prepare them for participation in the increasingly globalized culture of the 21st century.	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. Align school purposes, department purposes, and program student learning outcomes 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 of Arts and Sciences offers innovative degrees, which focus upon developing skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, creativity, empirical and evidenced-based inquiry, experimental investigation and theoretical explanation of natural phenomena, and innovative technology	Foster the skills of critical and creative thinking, writing, communication, and research among our students.	1) Students will demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
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 of Arts and Sciences educates its majors to think independently and have the knowledge, skills and vision to work in all types of situations and careers and communicate with all types of people.	Foster the values of scholarship, creativity, appreciation of diversity, and community service among our faculty, staff, and students.	2) 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 of Arts and Sciences offers general education courses of high quality and purpose that provide a foundation for lifelong learning.	Serve the University and the community by providing quality general education courses that prepare students for their roles as citizens and cultural participants.	
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs.	The School of Arts and Sciences fosters a community of scholars among the faculty and students of the institution.	Offer innovative programs and quality teaching within the classroom and through distance education.	3) Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree program.
To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs.		Facilitate the formation of groups of citizen-scholars consisting of faculty and students that meet outside the traditional classroom setting.	
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.	The School of Arts and Sciences will offer and promote artistic, scientific, cultural, and public affairs events on the campus and in the region.		

PART 2

Revisit Proposed Changes Made in Previous Assessment Cycle

Revisit each instructional/assessment change proposed in Part 5 of the degree program SLR for the preceding year. Indicate whether the proposed change was implemented and comment accordingly. Any changes the department implemented for this academic year, but which were not specifically proposed in the preceding report, should also be reported and discussed here. Please note if no changes were either proposed or implemented or this academic year.

Proposed Change	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comments
No specific changes were proposed in Part 5 of the 2017-18 SLR. Please consult the 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Part 2; there, one can see reported <u>six</u> instructional or assessment changes resulting from both the 2012-13 AA-LA SLR and independent deliberations among the Humanities faculty. The Humanities faculty are continuing to evaluate these changes, and their results are reported in this SLR, Part 4, below. Due to perennial small sample sizes, which make Conclusions difficult to draw, the Humanities faculty members do not plan any further changes for the time being.	NA	The changes reported in the 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Part 2, are now six years old; nevertheless, the annual sample sizes remain rather small. Thus, Humanities faculty members continue to gather and to analyze available data about the impact of these changes, but the perennial small sample sizes limit conclusive Conclusions. For the time being, the impact of the 2013-14 changes is discussed within the context of the general Conclusions reported in Part 4, Section H below.

PART 3

Response to University Assessment Committee Peer Review

The University Assessment Committee provides written feedback on departmental assessment plans through a regular peer review process. This faculty-led oversight is integral to RSU's commitment to the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness. UAC recommendations are not compulsory and departments may implement them at their discretion. Nevertheless, respond below to each UAC recommendations from last year's peer review report. Indicate whether the recommendation was implemented and comment accordingly. Please indicate either if the UAC had no recommendations or if the program was not subject to review in the previous cycle.

Peer Review Feedback	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comment
The 2018-19 UAC Peer Review Report proposed no "Recommendations."	NA	NA

PART 4
Evidence of Student Learning

Evidence and analyze student progress for each of the student learning outcomes (same as listed in Part I B above) for the degree program. See the *Appendix* for a detailed description of each component. Note: The table below is for the first program learning outcome. Copy the table and insert it below for each additional outcome. SLO numbers should be updated accordingly.

A. Student Learning Outcome #1							
SLO #1: Students will demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.							
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)			F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
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. (Online students will submit a paper/project in lieu of the presentation.)	At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all AA-LA students who presented are included. 2018-19 is now the sixth year (cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that sample size and results report AA-LA students separately from all general education students.	7 total AA-LA students, from 10 total sections (4 sections had no AA-LA students), analyzed according to: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B			6 of 7 total AA-LA students (85.71%) met the performance standard.	Y
			AA-LA Students per Category				
			Summer 2018				
			1	FT	OL		
			Fall 2018				
			1	FT	OL		
			Spring 2019				
			2	FT	OG		
			1	FT	OL		
			1	PT	OG		
			1	PT	B		
			AA-LA Students per Category				
			Summer 2018				
1 of 1	FT	OL	100%				
Fall 2018							
0 of 1	FT	OL	0%				
Spring 2019							
2 of 2	FT	OG	100%				
1 of 1	FT	OL	100%				
1 of 1	PT	OG	100%				
1 of 1	PT	B	100%				
1b) Students in Humanities II (HUM 2223) will complete an	At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all AA-LA students who presented are included.	7 total AA-LA students, from 10 total sections (4 section had no AA-LA students), analyzed according to:			7 of 7 total AA-LA students (100%) met the performance standard.	Y

A. Student Learning Outcome #1													
SLO #1: Students will demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.													
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)			F. Results				G. Standard Met (Y/N)			
in-class presentation displaying oral and visual communication skills, as well as creative and critical thinking. (Online students will submit a paper/project in lieu of the presentation.)		2018-19 is now the sixth year (cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that sample size and results report AA-LA students separately from all general education students.	Instructor Status Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT Delivery Mode On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B AA-LA Students per Category			AA-LA Students per Category							
			Summer 2018			Summer 2018							
			No Sections Taught			No Sections Taught							
			Fall 2018			Fall 2018							
			2	FT	OL	2 of 2	FT	OL	100%				
			1	PT	OG	1 of 1	PT	OG	100%				
			Spring 2019			Spring 2019							
			1	FT	OG	1 of 1	FT	OG	100%				
			2	FT	OL	2 of 2	FT	OL	100%				
			1	PT	B	1 of 1	PT	B	100%				
			H. Conclusions										
			Results are 100% performance for both assessment measures (AMs) for all instructor statuses and delivery modes assessed--except for 1 student fall 2018 (FT, OL). Nevertheless, one must review the results in light of the very small sample sizes (cf. the two Tables below). NOTE: instructor statuses and deliver modes not reported indicates no AA-LA students in those other sections.										
AM 1a) Humanities I Presentation year-over-year comparison													
YEAR	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	Six-Year Totals						
RESULTS	6 of 7	3 of 3	4 of 5	9 of 9	15 of 15	7 of 7	44 of 46						
PERCENTAGE	85.71%	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	95.65%						
2018-19 results are 14.83% lower than the 100% results for 2017-18, 2015-16, 2014-15, & 2013-14. Nevertheless, this 14.83% decline amounts to only 1 student missing the performance standard (cf. 2016-17 results). Even though the 2018-19 sample size is double that of 2017-18, drawing meaningful conclusions from perennial small sample sizes remains difficult. As the performance standard is essentially a “C” grade, one should expect AA-LA students (as distinguished from all General Education students) to meet the standard. In fact, over the past six years, only 2 AA-LA students have not met the performance standard.													

A. Student Learning Outcome #1							
SLO #1: Students will demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.							
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)		F. Results		G. Standard Met (Y/N)
AM 1b) Humanities II Presentation year-over-year comparison							
YEAR	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	Six-Year Totals
RESULTS	7 of 7	5 of 5	3 of 3	5 of 6	18 of 18	11 of 12	49 of 51
PERCENTAGE	100%	100%	100%	83.33%	100%	91.7%	96.08%
2018-19 results match 2017-18, 2016-17, & 2014-15 results @ 100%. As with AM 1a), however, robust conclusions seem impossible due to the very low sample size(s). As with AM 1a), one should expect AA-LA students to meet the standard; in fact, over the past six years, only 2 AA-LA students have not met the standard.							
For SLO #1, the two AMs (each an in-class Presentation) parallel one another across two different (though sequential) courses: AM 1a) = Humanities I; AM 1b) = Humanities II (<i>n.b.</i> , though the two courses are chronological in sequence, students may take Humanities II before they take Humanities I). Why noteworthy? Insofar as the same students are being assessed as they complete both courses, their performance across the two courses remains consistent. In the final analysis, AA-LA students have been highly successful in achieving the performance standard for both AMs for the past six consecutive years (per the Tables above). Even so, as this assessment occurs at the General Education course level, we would (do) expect self-selected Liberal Arts students to perform well.							

A. Student Learning Outcome #2					
SLO #2: Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
2a) Students in Humanities I (HUM 2113) will submit an essay in which they	At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all AA-LA students who submitted are included. 2018-19 is now the	6 total AA-LA students, from 10 total sections (5 sections had no AA-LA students), analyzed according to:	3 of 6 total AA-LA students (50%) met the performance standard.	N

A. Student Learning Outcome #2							
SLO #2: Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.							
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)			F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them. N.B., Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”		sixth year (cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that sample size and results report AA-LA students separately from all general education students.	<i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B				
			AA-LA Students per Category			AA-LA Students per Category	
			Summer 2018			Summer 2018	
			1	FT	OL	0 of 1	FT OL 0%
			Fall 2018			Fall 2018	
			1	FT	OL	0 of 1	FT OL 0%
			Spring 2019			Spring 2019	
			2	FT	OG	2 of 2	FT OG 100%
			1	FT	OL	0 of 1	FT OL 0%
			1	PT	OG	1 of 1	PT OG 100%
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. N.B., Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”	At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all AA-LA students who submitted are included. 2018-19 is now the sixth year (cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that sample and results report AA-LA students separately from all general education students.	6 total AA-LA students, from 10 total sections (5 section had no AA-LA students), analyzed according to: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B			5 of 6 total AA-LA students (83.34%) met the performance standard.	
			AA-LA Students per Category			AA-LA Students per Category	
			Summer 2018			Summer 2018	
			No Sections Taught			No Sections Taught	
			Fall 2018			Fall 2018	
			2	FT	OL	1 of 2	FT OL 50%
			1	PT	OG	1 of 1	PT OG 100%

A.
Student Learning Outcome #2

SLO #2: Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)			F. Results				G. Standard Met (Y/N)
			Spring 2019			Spring 2019				
			1	FT	OG	1 of 1	FT	OG	100%	
			2	FT	OL	2 of 2	FT	OL	100%	

H.
Conclusions

Results are positive for assessment measure (AM) 2b but not for AM 2a. Nevertheless, one must review the results in light of the very small sample sizes (cf. the two Tables below). NOTE: instructor statuses and deliver modes not reported indicates no AA-LA students in those other sections.

AM 2a) Humanities I Essay year-over-year comparison

YEAR	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	Six-Year Totals
RESULTS	3 of 6	2 of 3	3 of 5	7 of 9	13 of 15	5 of 5	33 of 43
PERCENTAGE	50%	66.67%	60%	77.78%	86.67%	100%	76.74%

2018-19 results decline 16.67% from 2017-18 results and are the lowest results in the past six years. Nevertheless, the very small sample sizes skew negatively the results percentages and produce an exaggerated lower percentage difference in relation to the performance standard. In terms of raw numbers, from 2014-15 to 2017-18 (4 years), 1 or 2 students have missed the performance standard each year; in this respect, 2018-19 raw numbers (3 students missing the performance standard) are consistent with the past four years. Still, six-year performance results for AM 2a) are very average and exceed the performance standard by only 6.74%. 2015-16 to 2018-19 (4 years) total results are 15 of 23 = 65.22% (4.78% below the performance standard). In brief, AA-LA students in Humanities I appear to be weak essay writers (for further reflection, please consult remarks at bottom).

AM 2b) Humanities II Essay year-over-year comparison

YEAR	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	Six-Year Totals
RESULTS	5 of 6	4 of 4	3 of 3	5 of 6	13 of 13	10 of 12	40 of 44
PERCENTAGE	83.34%	100%	100%	83.34%	100%	83.34%	90.91%

2018-19 results match 2015-16 & 2013-14 results = 16.66% lower than 2017-18, 2016-17, & 2014-15 results @ 100%. Nevertheless, drawing robust conclusions is difficult due to the very small sample sizes. In terms of raw numbers, the 16.66% lower performances amount to only 1-2 students in those years. As the performance standard is essentially a "C" grade, one should expect AA-LA students (as distinguished from all General Education students) to meet the standard.

A. Student Learning Outcome #2					
SLO #2: Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
<p>For SLO #2, the two AMs (each an Essay) parallel one another across two different (though sequential) courses: AM 2a) = Humanities I; AM 2b) = Humanities II (<i>n.b.</i>, though the two courses are chronological in sequence, students may take Humanities II before they take Humanities I). Why noteworthy?</p> <p>First, AM 2a) six-yr. results = 76.74%, while AM 2b) six-yr. results = 90.91%, which = 14.17% higher performance; insofar as the same students are being assessed as they move from Humanities I to Humanities II, this might suggest substantial student learning improvement from course to course on the same, parallel assignment.</p> <p>Second, the potentially most meaningful point of comparison is actually between the AMs themselves for SLO #1 and SLO #2. For SLO #1, both AMs assess primarily oral and visual presentation skills, whereas for SLO #2, both AMs assess specifically writing skills. SLO #1 six-yr. results: 1a) 95.65%; 1b) 96.08%. SLO #2 six-yr. results: 2a) 76.74%; 2b) 90.91%. Conclusion? AA-LA students exhibit stronger oral and visual presentation skills than they do writing skills? Or is it that faculty expectations are higher and, thus, grade evaluations are lower, for AA-LA writing skills? The latter seems more likely, anecdotally, insofar as two of the FT Humanities I/II instructors also teach Comp I/II. In the final analysis, students always need to improve their writing skills, but sample sizes are too small to reach meaningful conclusions on this matter.</p>					

A. Student Learning Outcome #3					
SLO #3: Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree program.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
Students graduating with an Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree will complete the Graduating Senior	At least 80% of the students graduating with an Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree will rate overall satisfaction	Students must complete the Graduating Senior Survey at the time they apply for	1 total student. All students in the sample are AA-LA program majors.	1 of 1 total students (100%) rated overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the AA-LA degree in four selected sample degree categories	Y

A. Student Learning Outcome #3																							
SLO #3: Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree program.																							
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard			D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)			F. Results					G. Standard Met (Y/N)										
Survey as a part of their graduation application process. In the Survey, students will rate their degree of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in response to a series of categories/questions.	with the educational experience afforded by the degree.			graduation. Graduation applications are not considered complete unless the Survey is completed.	Results are taken from the 2018-2019 Graduating Senior Survey, disaggregated by degree program, as completed by the Office for Accountability and Academics.			1. Quality of Instruction in Major															
								Very Satisfied	1	100%	2. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help												
								Very Satisfied	1	100%	3. Overall Major Experience												
								Very Satisfied	1	100%	4. Overall Department Experience												
								Very Satisfied	1	100%	5. Overall RSU Experience [Comparison/Control]												
								Very Satisfied	1	100%													
								H. Conclusions															
								Only 1 student completed the 2018-19 Graduating Senior Survey; thus, meaningful conclusions are elusive, if not impossible. In the absence of greater data, one should consult the six-year, year-over-year table, below. In 2017-18, one or two students rated “somewhat dissatisfied” in two of the four selected sample degree categories, resembling 2014-15 results, in which one or two students rated some degree of dissatisfaction in each of the categories specific to their Major, Degree, or Dept. experience. 2018-19 results, then, resemble 2016-17, 2015-16, and 2013-14 results, in which <u>not one</u> student (0%) rated any degree of dissatisfaction. Nevertheless, sample sizes have been shrinking every year since 2014-15, so any rating of satisfaction (or any dissatisfaction) will be exaggerated. If one considers raw numbers (see the table below), the total number of overall satisfied students has remained consistent over the past six years. In brief, over the past six years, only 2 to 4 (3.57% to 7.14%) graduating students (of a combined 56 total) have expressed any degree of dissatisfaction with the AA-LA degree program.															
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION KEY: VS = “Very Satisfied”; SS = “Somewhat Satisfied”; TOT = Total Overall Degree of Satisfaction																							
CATEGORY			2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14										
1. Quality of Instruction in Major			VS	1	100%	VS	3	60%	VS	3	37.5%	VS	8	80%	Data Not Reported								
			SS			SS	1	20%	SS	5	62.5%	SS	2	20%									
			TOT	1	100%	TOT	4	80%	TOT	8	100%	TOT	10	100%									

A. Student Learning Outcome #3																		
SLO #3: Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree program.																		
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard			D. Sampling Method			E. Sample Size (n)				F. Results						G. Standard Met (Y/N)	
2. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help	VS	1	100%	VS	3	60%	VS	5	62.5%	Data Not Reported			Data Not Reported			Data Not Reported		
	SS			SS			SS	2	25%									
	TOT	1	100%	TOT	3	60%	TOT	7	87.5%									
3. Overall Major Experience	VS	1	100%	VS	3	60%	VS	3	37.5%	VS	7	70%	VS	12	60%	VS	7	70%
	SS			SS	2	40%	SS	5	62.5%	SS	3	30%	SS	6	30%	SS	3	30%
	TOT	1	100%	TOT	5	100%	TOT	8	100%	TOT	10	100%	TOT	18	90%	TOT	10	100%
4. Overall Department Experience	VS	1	100%	VS	3	60%	VS	2	25%	VS	7	70%	VS	10	50%	VS	5	50%
	SS			SS	2	40%	SS	4	50%	SS	3	30%	SS	8	40%	SS	5	50%
	TOT	1	100%	TOT	5	100%	TOT	6	75%	TOT	10	100%	TOT	18	90%	TOT	10	100%
5. Overall RSU Experience [control]	VS	1	100%	VS	3	60%	VS	3	37.5%	VS	6	60%	VS	9	45%	VS	5	50%
	SS			SS	1	20%	SS	3	37.5%	SS	4	40%	SS	8	40%	SS	5	50%
	TOT	1	100%	TOT	4	80%	TOT	6	75%	TOT	10	100%	TOT	17	85%	TOT	10	100%
To try to contextualize better the very positive results of student satisfaction with the AA-LA degree, one can (should) compare students’ overall satisfaction in both Category 3. “Overall Major Experience” and Category 4. “Overall Department Experience” in relation to the comparison/control Category 5. “Overall RSU Experience.” AA-LA students’ overall satisfaction with both their “Overall Major Experience” and their “Overall Department Experience” annually matches or exceeds that of their “Overall RSU Experience.”																		

PART 5

Proposed Instructional or Assessment Changes

Learning outcomes assessment can generate actionable evidence of student performance that can be used to improve student success and institutional effectiveness. Knowledge of student strengths and weakness gained through assessment can inform faculty efforts to improve course instruction and program curriculum. Below discuss potential changes the department is considering which are aimed at improving student learning or the assessment process. Indicate which student learning outcome(s) will be affected and provide a rationale for each proposed change. These proposals will be revisited in next assessment cycle.

Proposed Change	Applicable Learning Outcomes	Rationale and Impact
No changes are planned.	NA	2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Part 2, reports <u>six</u> instructional or assessment changes. These changes are now six years old, yet the annual sample sizes remain rather small; thus, the Humanities faculty continue to gather and to analyze data about these changes (as reported in Part 4, above), but we do not believe there is any need for further changes at this time.

PART 6

Summary of Assessment Measures

- A. How many different assessment measures were used? = 5
- B. List the direct measures (see appendix):
- [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
- C. List the indirect measures (see appendix):
- [5] School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey

PART 7
Faculty Participation and Signatures

A. Provide the names and signatures of all full time and adjunct faculty who contributed to this report.

Faculty Name	Assessment Role	Signature
Matthew Oberrieder	University Assessment Committee member and Department Assessment Coordinator. Contributed individual data for HUM 2113 and HUM 2223. Collected, calculated, analyzed, reported, and evaluated all data for both HUM 2113 and HUM 2223. Reported and evaluated data from the Graduating Senior Survey. Prepared Student Learning Report and approved final draft.	
Renée Cox	Contributed data for HUM 2113 & HUM 2223. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Scott Reed	Contributed data for HUM 2113 & HUM 2223. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Nancy Gill	Adjunct Instructor. Contributed data for HUM 2113 & HUM 2223.	
Charlies Richards	Adjunct Instructor. Contributed data for HUM 2113 & HUM 2223.	

B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	Mary M Mackie		
Dean	Keith W Martin		

Appendix

Student Learning Outcome

Student learning outcomes are the observable or measurable results that are expected of a student following a learning experience. Learning outcomes may address knowledge, skills, attitudes, or values that provide evidence that learning has occurred. They can apply to a specific course, a program of study, or an institution. Outcomes should be worded in language that clearly implies a measurable behavior or quality of student work. Outcomes should also include Bloom's action verbs appropriate to the skill level of learning expected of students.

Examples:

Students will be able to apply principles of evidence-based medicine to determine clinical diagnoses and implement acceptable treatment modalities.

Students will be able to articulate cultural and socioeconomic differences and the significance of these differences for instructional planning.

Assessment Measure

An assessment measure is a tool or instrument used to gather evidence of student progress toward an established learning outcome. Every program learning outcome should have at least one appropriate assessment measure. Learning outcomes are frequently complex, however, and may require multiple measures to accurately assess student performance. Assessment plans should try to incorporate a combination of direct and indirect assessment measures. Direct provide concrete evidence of whether a student has command of a specific subject or content area, can perform a certain task, exhibits a particular skill, demonstrates a certain quality in their work, or holds a particular value. Because direct measures tap into actual student learning, it is often viewed as the preferred measure type. Indirect measures assess opinions or thoughts about the extent of a student's knowledge, skills, or attitudes. They reveal characteristics associated with learning, but they only imply that learning has occurred. Both types of measures can provide useful insight into student learning and experiences in a program. Each also has unique advantages and disadvantages in terms of the type of data and information it can provide. Examples of common direct and indirect measures are listed below.

Direct Measures

- Comprehensive exams
- Class assignments
- Juried review of performances and exhibitions
- Internship or clinical evaluations
- Portfolio evaluation
- Pre/post exams
- Third-party exams such as field tests, certification exams, or licensure exams
- Senior thesis or capstone projects

Indirect Measures

- Graduate exit interviews
- Focus group responses
- Job placement statistics
- Graduate school placement statistics
- Graduation and retention rates
- Student and alumni surveys that assess perceptions of the program
- Employer surveys that assess perceptions of graduates
- Honors and awards earned by students and alumni.

Performance Standard

A performance standard is a clearly-defined benchmark that establishes the minimally-acceptable level of performance expected of students for a particular measure.

Examples:

At least 70% of students will score 70% or higher on a comprehensive final exam.

At least 75% of students will earn score a “Proficient” or higher rating on the Communicate Effectively rubric.

Sampling Method

Sampling method describes the methodology used for selecting the students that were assessed for a given measure. In some cases, such as most course-embedded measures, it is possible to assess all active enrolled students. In other cases, however, it is not feasible to measure the population of all potential students. In these cases, it is important that a well-designed sampling scheme be used to ensure the sample of students measured is an unbiased representation of the overall population. Where multiple instructors teach a particular course, care should be taken to assess students across all instructors, including adjuncts.

Examples:

All students enrolled in BIOL 4801 Biology Research Methods II

All majors graduating in the 2016-17 academic year.

Sample Size

Sample size is the number of students from which evidence of student learning was obtained for a given assessment measure.

Results

Results are an analytical summary of the findings arising from the assessment of student performance for a particular assessment measure. Typical presentation includes descriptive statistics (mean, median, range) and score frequency distributions.

Standard Met?

This is a simple yes/no response that indicates whether the observed level of student performance for a particular measure meets or exceeds the established standard. An N/A may be used where circumstances prevented the department from accurately assessing a measure.

Conclusion

The conclusion is a reflective summary and determination of the assessment results obtained for a specific learning outcome. Questions to consider in this section include the following:

- Does the assessment evidence indicate the learning outcome is being satisfactorily met?
- Where multiple measures are used for a single outcome, do the results present a consistent or contradictory pattern?
- What are the most valuable insights gained from the assessment results?
- What strengths and weaknesses in student learning do the results indicate?
- What implications are there for enhancing teaching and learning?
- How can the assessment process be improved?