

Degree Program Student Learning Report

Revised August 2017

Department of English & Humanities

BA in Liberal Arts

For 2019-2020 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 Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts is an innovative, interdisciplinary degree that fosters students who think critically, creatively, and independently, and who have the skills to work in all types of situations and communicate with all types of people.

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 competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills as well as the ability to think creatively and critically. 2) Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.

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.	3) Students will evidence an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on 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.	4) 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.		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
None	NA	Before 2013-14, BA-LA students completed either a scholarly paper or a creative project. Starting 2013-14, all BA-LA students were required to complete a 25-35-page scholarly paper. The 2013-14 change to assessment measure 1C reflected the Capstone Committee's concern about the perennial weakness of too many of the creative projects. The Committee concluded that too many students chose the creative project believing that it would be easier to complete, only to discover that it was more difficult, which resulted in poorer performance results, thus undermining the purpose of the assessment measure. Also, the Committee found it difficult to assess consistently the two different types of projects in relation to one another. Thus, the 2013-14 change afforded the Committee a more uniform measure toward greater consistency in assessing students' performance and learning outcomes. For the most part, the Capstone Committee was satisfied with assessment measure 1C, but we also recognized that it was conceived more for those students who both aspire and are able to engage the liberal arts at a higher (or the highest, undergraduate) level, and who are considering or plan to continue their education in graduate school. Thus, in 2017-18 the Capstone Committee decided to allow students again to choose from two options for their Capstone projects: a 25-35-page scholarly paper [measure 1C] or a 7-10-page research paper with a visual triptych [measure 1E]. This 2017-18 change preserves a scholarly Option #1 (meas. 1C & 1D) for the abovementioned students, but it also re-introduces an Option #2 (meas. 1E & 1F) by which to assess the performance of students who intend to go directly into the workforce. 2019-20 is only the third year assessing these two options separately.

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
BA-LA was not peer reviewed during AY 2019-2020.	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 competence in their 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 the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM-4993) are required to create a Capstone Project Proposal . Note that HUM-4993 is taught fall semesters only.	At least 75% of the students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM-4993) will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their Capstone Project Proposal . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM-4993) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	11 total students	6 of 11 total students = 54.55% met the performance standard.	N	
			7 On-Ground 4 Online	4 of 7 On-Ground = 57.14% 2 of 4 Online = 50%		
			10 English = 6 OG + 4 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OG	6 of 10 English (4 OG + 2 OL) = 60% 0 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 0%		
			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale			
			SCORE	STUDENTS		%
			5	2		18.18%
			3	4		36.36%
			2.5	1		9.09%
			2	2		18.18%
			1	2		18.18%
Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 3.67 Average Score of All Scores = 2.77						

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in their 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)	
1B Students in the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM-4993) are required to present their Capstone Project Proposal in a Presentation to the Capstone Committee. Note that HUM-4993 is taught fall semesters only.	At least 75% of the students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM-4993) will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their Capstone Project Proposal Presentation . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM-4993) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	11 total students	8 of 11 total students = 72.73% met the performance standard.	N	
			7 On-Ground 4 Online	4 of 7 On-Ground = 57.14% 4 of 4 Online = 100%		
			10 English = 6 OG + 4 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OG	8 of 10 English (4 OG + 4 OL) = 80% 0 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 0%		
			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale			
			SCORE	STUDENTS		%
			5	2		18.18%
			4	3		27.27%
			3.5	1		9.09%
			3	2		18.18%
			2	1		9.09%
1.5	1	9.09%				
1	1	9.09%				
				Average Score of All Passing Scores = 3.9375 Average Score of All Scores = 3.245		
1C Students in the <i>Capstone Project/ Portfolio</i> (HUM-4013) may choose to complete a	At least 75% of the students in the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM-4013) who choose Option #1	Data from all students who complete Option #1 in the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i>	6 total students	5 of 6 total students = 83.34% met the performance standard.	Y	
			6 On-Ground 0 Online	5 of 6 On-Ground = 83.34% No Online		

A. Student Learning Outcome #1						
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their 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)	
25-35-page Scholarly Paper = Option #1. (N.B., This measure changed 2013-14 and again 2017-18) Note that HUM-4013 is taught spring semesters only.	will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 25-35-page Scholarly Paper . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	(HUM-4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	5 English = 5 OG + 0 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OL	5 of 5 English (5 OG + 0 OL) = 100%		
				0 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 0%		
				Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale		
				SCORE STUDENTS %		
				5 2 33.34%		
				4.75 1 16.67%		
4.5 1 16.67%						
3.5 1 16.67%						
2.5 1 16.67%						
Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4.55 Average Score of All Scores = 4.21						
1D Students in the Capstone Project/ Portfolio (HUM-4013) who chose Option #1 (cf. AM 1C) are required to present their projects orally before the Capstone Committee and answer a series of questions related to their projects. (N.B., This measure	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) who chose Option #1 will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) in presenting their projects orally before the Capstone Committee. The score is determined by the	Data from all students who complete Option #1 in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration:	6 total students 6 On-Ground 0 Online 5 English = 5 OG + 0 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OL	5 of 6 total students = 83.34% met the performance standard.	Y	
				5 of 6 On-Ground = 83.34%		
				No Online		
				5 of 5 English (5 OG + 0 OL) = 100%		
				0 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 0%		
				Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale		
SCORE STUDENTS %						
5 4 66.67%						
4 1 16.67%						
2.5 1 16.67%						

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in their 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)															
changed 2017-18) Note that HUM-4013 is taught spring semesters only.	Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	[1] English; [2] Global Humanities.		Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 4.8 Average Score of All Scores = 4.42																
1E Students in the Capstone Project/ Portfolio (HUM-4013) may choose to complete a 7-10-page Research Paper = Option #2. (N.B., This measure changed 2013-14 and again 2017-18) Note that HUM-4013 is taught spring semesters only.	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) who choose Option #2 will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 7-10-page Research Paper . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students who complete Option #2 in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	5 total students	1 of 5 total students = 20% met the performance standard.	N															
			2 On-Ground 3 Online	0 of 2 On-Ground = 0% 1 of 3 Online = 33.34%																
			5 English = 2 OG + 3 OL 0 Global Humanities	1 of 5 English (0 OG + 1 OL) = 20% No Global Humanities																
				Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale																
				<table><tr><td>SCORE</td><td>STUDENTS</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>2.5</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>		SCORE	STUDENTS	%	4	1	20%	2.5	1	20%	2	2	40%	1	1	20%
			SCORE	STUDENTS		%														
4	1	20%																		
2.5	1	20%																		
2	2	40%																		
1	1	20%																		
	Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 4 Average Score of All Scores = 2.3																			
1F Students in the Capstone Project/ Portfolio (HUM-4013) who chose Option #2	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013)	Data from all students who complete Option #2 in the Capstone	5 total students	2 of 5 total students = 40% met the performance standard.	N															
			2 On-Ground 3 Online	0 of 2 On-Ground = 0% 2 of 3 Online = 66.67%																

A. Student Learning Outcome #1																					
SLO #1:	B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)															
	(cf. AM 1E) are required to present a visual triptych to the Capstone Committee and answer any questions related to their projects.	who chose Option #2 will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their visual triptych presented to the Capstone Committee.	Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	5 English = 2 OG + 3 OL 0 Global Humanities	2 of 5 English (0 OG + 2 OL) = 40% No Global Humanities																
	(N.B., This measure changed 2017-18)	The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale																
	Note that HUM-4013 is taught spring semesters only.				<table><tr><th>SCORE</th><th>STUDENTS</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr></table>	SCORE	STUDENTS	%	4	1	20%	3	1	20%	2	2	40%	1	1	20%	
SCORE	STUDENTS	%																			
4	1	20%																			
3	1	20%																			
2	2	40%																			
1	1	20%																			
Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 3.5 Average Score of All Scores = 2.4																					
H. Conclusions																					
SLO #1 results are complex, as they involve analyzing and interpreting data from six total assessment measures (AMs), which resolve into three pairs. Each pair aims to assess written <i>vis-à-vis</i> oral and visual communication skills, and critical and creative thinking, in parallel across fall and spring semesters. Thus, Pair 1 (fall sem.) = (1A) a <u>written</u> Capstone Project Proposal & (1B) an <u>oral</u> Capstone Project Proposal Presentation, both in <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM-4993); Pairs 2 and 3 (spring sem.) = Option #1: (1C) a <u>written</u> Scholarly Paper & (1D) an <u>oral</u> Capstone Presentation, or, Option #2: (1E) a <u>written</u> Research Paper & (1F) a <u>Visual Triptych</u> (incl. <u>oral</u> explanation), both in <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM-4013). Year-Over-Year distribution tables below present comparative and trend data for each of the six AMs. For AM 1A (see table below), 2019-20 overall performance results (54.55%) are the lowest in seven years, and 18.87% lower than the 7-YR average (73.42%). Nevertheless, the 2019-20 average passing score (3.67) is higher than 2018-19 (3.38), as well as 2014-15 (3.5), which had 100% overall performance results, and “3.67” is consistent with the 7-YR average (3.72). Moreover, while the AM 1A table suggests a three-year declining trend of overall performance results from 2017-18 (if not back to 2014-15), internal analysis of 2019-20 AM 1A overall performance results indicates that they are distorted by a/the significant difference in performance between Option #1 (AMs 1C & 1D) and Option #2 (AMs 1E & 1F) students. All 11 students completed the same fall 2019 written Project Proposal (1A), but 5 of these students completed Option #2 spring 2020, and only 1 (20%) scored higher than a “2.5” on his/her Proposal (1A)--this student scored a “3” --and their average score was “1.9.” Unfortunately, the low fall 2019 AM 1A performance of these 5 students anticipated their low performance spring 2020 in completing their																					

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1:	B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
----------------	--	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Option #2 projects: AM 1E performance rate 20%, with an average score of “2.3,” and AM 1F performance rate 40%, with an average score of “2.4” (see appropriate tables and narrative below). The better news is that 6 of 11 students completed Option #1 (AMs 1C & 1D) spring 2020, and 5 of these 6 (83.34%) met or exceeded the “3” performance standard, with an average score of “3.5.” In brief, if one isolates for AM 1A the 6 Option #1 spring 2020 students, they exceeded the 75% performance standard by 8.34%, and they anticipated their 83.34% performance rate for both AM 1C & AM 1D (their completed Project and their Presentation).

On the one hand, 83.34% spring 2020 Option #1 isolated AM 1A results, together with 83.34% overall performance results for AM 1C (the Pair 2 spring semester parallel to AM 1A), calm some concerns about the 54.55% AM 1A overall performance results, especially as 83.34% exceeds both the AM 1A 7-YR average (73.42%) and the AM 1C 7-YR average (81.67%) (see appropriate tables below). On the other hand, 20% spring 2020 Option #2 isolated AM 1A results are very troubling. In the final analysis, the Capstone Committee wants to see stronger student performance results overall for AM 1A, but the Committee also believes that at least part of the explanation for AM 1A overall low(er) results is simply a function of the provisional character of the measure, *i.e.*, a proposal. Thus, the Committee recognizes that many students have difficulty fully and clearly conceptualizing and articulating their preliminary ideas for a project before they delve into working to complete it, and that this character (problem) is inherent in the Capstone process--which also helps to clarify why completed projects historically score higher than do proposals.

AM 1A: Written Proposal (Fall Semester) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Scores

SCORE	2019-20		2018-19	2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		7-YR		
5	2	18.18%		1	10%	1	7.1%	3	25%			2	11.8%	9 of 79	11.39%	
4.5				1	10%	1	7.1%			1	11.1%			3 of 79	3.8%	
4			1	16.67%	2	20%	3	21.4%	3	25%	3	33.3%	5	29.4%	17 of 79	21.52%
3.5			1	16.67%	2	20%	3	21.4%					2	11.8%	8 of 79	10.13%
3	4	36.36%	2	33.34%	1	10%	1	7.1%	3	25%	5	55.6%	5	29.4%	21 of 79	25.58%
2.5	1	9.09%			1	10%								2 of 79	2.53%	
2	2	18.18%	2	33.34%	1	10%	5	35.7%	1	8.3%			2	11.8%	13 of 79	16.46%
1	2	18.18%			1	10%			2	16.7%			1	5.9%	6 of 79	7.59%
	2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		7-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	6	54.55%	4	66.67%	7	70%	9	64.3%	9	75%	9	100%	14	82.4%	58 of 79	73.42%
AVE PASSING SCORE	3.67		3.38		3.93		3.89		4		3.5		3.7		3.72	
AVE OF ALL SCORES	2.77		2.92		3.3		3.21		3.33		3.5		3.35		3.2	

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in their 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)

For AM 1B (see table below), 2019-20 overall performance results (72.73%) are the lowest in four years (2017-2020), the second lowest in seven years, surpassing only 2015-16 (66.7%), and 9.55% lower than the 7-YR average (82.28%). Nevertheless, the 2019-20 average passing score (3.94) is higher than 2018-19 (3.67) and 2014-15 (3.78), and consistent with 2016-17 (3.92), 2013-14 (3.93), and the 7-YR average (3.98). Moreover, the 2019-20 total number of students (8) who met or exceeded the “3” performance standard is consistent with three previous years (2017-18, 2015-16, 2014-15) and is surpassed only by two years with larger sample sizes (2016-17, 2013-14); also, the total number of students (3) who fell below the performance standard is consistent with the total number (between 2 and 4) from the four other years when students fell below the standard (2017-18, 2016-17, 2015-16, 2013-14). In brief, 2019-20 AM 1B results are historically consistent.

AM 1B: Oral Presentation (Fall Semester) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students’ Scores

SCORE	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	7-YR
5	2 18.18%		3 30%	5 35.7%	5 41.7%	2 22.2%	1 5.9%	18 of 79 22.78%
4.5						2 22.2%	2 11.8%	4 of 79 5.06%
4	3 27.27%	4 66.67%	3 30%	1 7.1%	1 8.3%		6 35.3%	18 of 79 22.78%
3.5	1 9.09%		2 20%				4 23.5%	7 of 79 8.86%
3	2 18.18%	2 33.34%		6 42.9%	2 16.7%	5 55.6%	1 5.9%	18 of 79 22.78%
2.5								0%
2	1 9.09%		1 10%	2 14.3%	1 8.3%		2 11.8%	7 of 79 8.86%
1.5	1 9.09%							1 of 79 1.27%
1	1 9.09%		1 10%		3 25%		1 5.9%	6 of 79 7.59%
	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	7-YR
MET “3” STANDARD	8 72.73%	6 100%	8 80%	12 85.7%	8 66.7%	9 100%	14 82.4%	65 of 79 82.28%
AVE PASSING SCORE	3.94	3.67	4.25	3.92	4.38	3.78	3.93	3.98
AVE OF ALL SCORES	3.25	3.67	3.7	3.64	3.33	3.78	3.53	3.56

If one compares year-over-year table results for AM 1A & AM 1B (as Pair 1, per the introductory paragraph), 2019-20 results continue the now-four-year (since 2016-17) trend of BA-LA students performing ~10-20% better on AM 1B (Oral Presentation) than on AM 1A (Written Proposal), with AM 1B 7-YR average results (82.28%) surpassing AM 1A 7-YR average results (73.42%) by 8.86%. Rather than rehearse detailed data already presented in the AM 1A and AM 1 B year-over-year distribution tables above, four sets of narrative reflections below offer some analysis and interpretation.

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1:	B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.					

Narrative reflections on AM 1A *vis-à-vis* AM 1B. First, AM 1A is a written *proposal* for a project to be completed in the spring semester (AM 1C or AM 1E). As expressed above in the narrative conclusions for AM 1A, in developing their proposals (fall semester), students are still working to conceptualize clearly and to articulate cogently their preliminary ideas and research/scholarship plans. Second, the BA-LA degree emphasizes writing skills, whether the students concentrate in English or in Humanities, and the Capstone Committee rightly has higher expectations for students' writing skills in developing their proposals than it does for their oral communication regarding their proposals; in brief, the Committee correctly holds students' writing to a higher standard and is properly stingy regarding assessment scores for AM 1A. Third, AM 1B involves students answering oral questions from the Committee; this process enables and encourages students to clarify features of their written proposal (AM 1A) that are less than cogent. Thus, the Committee is heartened when students with problematic written proposals can answer oral questions clearly and thoughtfully; in brief, higher performance scores on AM 1B often reflect the difference between the Committee's disappointment in students' writing (AM 1A) and the Committee's reassurance when students provide oral clarification. Furthermore, part of the purpose of AM 1B, and especially of the Committee's oral questions, is to help students to clarify and articulate more cogently the ideas and features of their proposed project; in brief, the interactive and inherently pedagogical character of AM 1B results in higher scores. At the same time, this oral interaction illuminates a factor in the written proposal process that helps to clarify some low(er) results for AM 1A, namely, too many students, in writing their proposals, do not interact enough with their faculty mentors, and, unfortunately, the weakest students often least interact with and/or seek help from their faculty mentor; in brief, students who most need mentoring too often least seek and/or accept it. Fourth, some students are simply better speakers than they are writers (though the interactive character of AM 1B surely contributes to this).

Turning now to students' spring 2020 performance on two pairs of measures designed to parallel AMs 1A & 1B, overall results involve a stark disparity between students who complete Option #1 (AMs 1C & 1D) versus those who complete Option #2 (AMs 1E & 1F). Analyzing and interpreting results for AMs 1D & 1F (oral presentations) are further complicated by the Covid-19 campus shut-down, which necessitated conducting traditional in-person presentations via ZOOM.

For AM 1C (Option #1 written) (see table below), 2019-20 overall performance results (83.34%) are 16.66% lower than 2018-19 (100%), but they surpass the 7-YR average (81.67%) and are consistent with four other of the previous six years: 2017-18 (80%); 2016-17 (84.6%); 2015-16 (88.9%); 2013-14 (85.7%). Moreover, the 2019-20 average passing score (4.55) is the highest by far in seven years and surpasses the 7-YR average (3.86) by .69 points. Similarly, for AM 1D (Option #1 oral) (see table below), 2019-20 overall performance results (83.34%) are 16.66% lower than 2018-19 (100%), but they surpass the 7-YR average (80%) and are much higher (by 14.14% to 27.74%) than three of five earlier years: 2017-18 (60%); 2016-17 (69.2%); 2014-15 (55.6%). Moreover, the 2019-20 average passing score (4.8) is the highest by far in seven years and surpasses the 7-YR average (4.21) by .59 points.

Of significant importance regarding AM 1C *vis-à-vis* AM 1D, their respective 2019-20 overall performance results are (more) equivalent to one another: both 83.34%, and both surpassing their respective 7-YR average (per above). This (more) equivalent relationship between students' written skills (AM 1C) and students' oral skills (AM 1D) is a positive contrast to the unequal relationship between AM 1A *vis-à-vis* AM 1B, their fall semester parallel measures: AM 1B (oral presentation) 7-YR average (82.28%) represents historically consistently higher performances than indicated by AM 1A (written proposal) 7-YR average (72.42%). In brief, AM 1C higher results suggest that students' writing and creative and critical thinking improves with the completion of their Capstone Scholarly Paper (1C) from their proposal (1A).

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1:	B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.					

AM 1C: Scholarly Paper (Spring Semester; Option #1) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Scores

SCORE	2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		7-YR		
5	2	33.34%					2	15.4%			1	11.1%	4	28.6%	9 of 60	15%	
4.75	1	16.67%													1 of 60	1.67%	
4.5	1	16.67%	1	25%			2	15.4%	3	33.3%					7 of 60	11.67%	
4					1	20%	4	30.8%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	2	14.3%	10 of 60	16.67%	
3.75					1	20%									1 of 60	1.67%	
3.5	1	16.67%	2	50%	2	40%	1	7.7%	1	11.1%					7 of 60	11.67%	
3			1	25%			2	15.4%	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	6	42.9%	14 of 60	23.34%	
2.5	1	16.67%			1	20%			1	11.1%					3 of 60	5%	
2											4	44.4%	1	7.1%	5 of 60	8.34%	
1.5							2	15.4%							2 of 60	3.34%	
1													1	7.1%	1 of 60	1.67%	
		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		7-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	5	83.34%	4	100%	4	80%	11	84.6%	8	88.9%	5	55.6%	12	85.7%	49 of 60	81.67%	
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.55		3.63		3.44		4.05		3.75		3.8		3.83		3.86		
AVE OF ALL SCORES	4.21		3.63		3.25		3.65		3.61		3		3.5		3.55		

Again, note that AM 1C, the spring semester Capstone Scholarly Paper, constitutes the completed counterpart to AM 1A, the fall semester written Project Proposal. Historically consistently higher overall performance results and average passing scores for AM 1C over AM 1A suggests the positive outcome of student learning (improved writing skills and creative and critical thinking) from fall to spring semesters through the process of completing the Capstone project. The one caveat regarding comparing and/or contrasting AM 1A and AM 1C as fall-to-spring parallel assessment measures is the separation of all AM 1A sample students into Option #1 (AM 1c) versus Option #2 (AM 1E) sample students. As explained in the AM 1A narrative above, and as indicated more clearly in the AM 1E results below, Option #2 students do (have) not necessarily show(n) improvement.

A. Student Learning Outcome #1																		
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their 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 1D 2019-20 results and year-over-year table results were discussed above, in conjunction with AM 1C 2019-20 results and table, but a special note regarding AM 1D is needed due to the Covid-19 campus shutdown spring 2020.																		
AM 1D: Oral Presentation (Spring Semester; Option #1) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Scores																		
SCORE	2019-20		2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	7-YR									
5	4	66.67%	1	25%	1	20%	2	15.4%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%	5	35.7%	19 of 60	31.67%		
4.5			1	25%	1	20%	3	23.1%							5 of 60	8.34%		
4	1	16.67%	2	50%			2	15.4%			1	11.1%	1	7.1%	7 of 60	11.67%		
3.5							1	7.7%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%				3 of 60	5%	
3					1	20%	1	7.7%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	7	50%	14 of 60	23.34%		
2.5	1	16.67%						2	15.4%							3 of 60	5%	
2						2	40%	2	15.4%			3	33.3%	1	7.1%	8 of 60	13.34%	
1												1	11.1%				1 of 60	1.67%
		2019-20		2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	7-YR								
MET "3" STANDARD	5	83.34%	4	100%	3	60%	9	69.2%	9	100%	5	55.6%	13	92.9	48 of 60	80%		
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.8		4.38	4.17	4.22	3.94	4.1	3.85	4.21									
AVE OF ALL SCORES	4.42		4.38	3.3	3.62	3.94	3.06	3.71	3.78									
Note that AM 1D, students' oral presentation to the Capstone Committee of their completed written project (AM 1C), traditionally occurs in person in the Baird Hall Performance Studio. Due to Covid-19, however, for spring 2020, this measure was conducted via ZOOM (online video conferencing). On a positive note, however, despite the necessity to conduct AM 1D via an alternative, "distance learning" method, Option #1 students' 2019-20 performance was (still) very strong (5 of 6 = 83.34% performance results), registering the highest average passing score (4.8) in seven years and surpassing the 7-YR average score (4.21) by .59 points. Capstone Committee discussion regarding Option #1 students' performance speculated two possible explanations. First, that 2019-20 Option #1 students were a strong cohort (cf. AM 1C results) and, thus, were minimally affected by using ZOOM. Second, that these students actually felt more comfortable (relaxed and confident) presenting from the familiar confines of their homes instead of in the formal setting of the Performance Studio and the intimidating presence of the assembled Committee.																		

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in their 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 1E & AM 1F constitute the spring semester Option #2 parallel assessment pair (introduced 2017-18; cf. Part 2, above) to AM 1A & AM 1B (cf. results and tables above). Option #2 sample sizes are relatively small, and only three years' data is available for year-over-year comparisons, but trend performance results are consistently weak (see table below). For 2019-20, 5 of 11 total students (the largest cohort thus far) completed Option #2 spring 2020, but their performance results (the rate at which they met or exceeded the performance standard) was very weak across all measures: only 1 (20%) for AM 1A (written proposal) and 3 (60%) for AM 1B (oral presentation) paralleled by only 1 (20%) for AM 1E and 2 (40%) for AM 1F. Although 2019-20 AM 1F (as with AM 1D, AM 1F was conducted via ZOOM) overall performance results (40%) were double the percentage of AM 1E results (20%), they were still less than half the percentage of AMs 1C & 1D results (83.34%).

Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Scores (Spring Semester, Option #2)

SCORE	AM 1E: Option #2 Written Paper					AM 1F: Option #2 Visual Triptych				
	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	3-YR		2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	3-YR	
5								2	66.67%	2 of 10 20%
4.5										
4	1	20%		1 of 10 10%		1	20%			1 of 10 10%
3.5										
3			2	66.67%	2 of 10 20%	1	20%			1 of 10 10%
2.5	1	20%	1	50%						
2	2	40%	1	50%	1	33.34%	2	40%	2	100%
1	1	20%			4 of 10 40%	1	20%	1	33.34%	5 of 10 50%
					1 of 10 10%					1 of 10 10%
	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	3-YR		2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	3-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	1	20%	2	66.67%	3 of 10 30%	2	40%	0	0%	2
AVE PASSING SCORE	4	NA	3	3.5		3.5	NA	5		4.25
AVE OF ALL SCORES	2.3	2.25	2.67	2.41		2.4	2	4		2.8

Nevertheless, the Capstone Committee believes that it is premature to abandon Option #2 and its measures; instead, the Committee wishes to collect more results data and continue to deliberate to try to clarify why a certain set of students perform below a level of competence (*i.e.*, do not meet the performance standard). One possible explanation for the poor performance of Option #2 students on AM 1E & AM 1F is simply that this represents the students' own limits in their abilities and program learning in the face of the rigor of the Capstone process and the high standards of the Capstone Committee. The Capstone process is meant to be the

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in their 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)

culmination of students' degree coursework and the final demonstration of their programmatic learning; thus, the Capstone Committee expects students' Capstone work (written, oral, and visual) to surpass the quality that otherwise satisfies competence (a "3" standard) or demonstrates excellence (a "5" score) in program-required and program-elective courses. In brief, the Committee wants to see all BA-LA students not just pass through the Capstone process, but to perform at the highest possible level, and, thus, expects Capstone students' work to advance to a higher level than exhibited in their prior degree coursework. For degree program assessment purposes, then, maintaining rigorous standards presents and preserves a clearer and clarifying (even if stark) picture of the levels and range of students' written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as their critical and creative thinking abilities (SLO #1).

As a second (and convergent) possible explanation, of the 5 students who completed Option #2 spring 2020, 3 did so Online; the number who met or exceeded the performance standard: AM 1A = 1 (33.34%); AM 1B = 3 (100%); AM 1E = 1 (33.34%); AM 1F = 2 (66.67%). One normally-online-student completed Option #1 and did well across all measures (but she took the Capstone course On-Ground), while a second normally-online-student did well on AMs 1E & 1F (Option #2). Despite these two successes, the Capstone Committee continues to observe the recurrent weaker performance across all measures of Online versus On-Ground students.

ONLINE (including DIRECTED STUDY) STUDENT RESULTS: HOW MANY HAVE MET THE "3" (on 5-point scale) PERFORMANCE STANDARD YEAR-OVER-YEAR?

Measures	2019-20		2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	7-YR
1A = Fall	2 of 4	50%	NA	0 of 2	0%	0 of 1	0%	1 of 3	33.3%
1B = Fall	4 of 4	100%	NA	1 of 2	50%	1 of 1	100%	1 of 3	33.3%
1C = Spring	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 of 1	100%	1 of 1	100%
1D = Spring	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 of 1	0	1 of 2	1 of 1	50%
1E = Spring	1 of 3	33.34%	NA	0 of 1	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA
1F = Spring	2 of 3	66.67%	NA	1 of 1	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA

Officially, RSU students may complete the BA-LA Degree entirely online, yet the number of students annually seeking to complete the Capstone process entirely online has been too small historically for an online-only section of either the *Humanities Seminar* (HUM-4993) or the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM-4013). In previous years, when normally-online-students (historically 1 to 3) could not or would not undertake the Capstone process on-ground, course instructors conducted uncompensated (!) Directed Studies online. Over these past two Academic Years, course instructors have experimented with both blended and low-enrolled online sections to try to accommodate normally-online-students, but they have been dissatisfied with the experience and results. The Capstone Committee strongly believes, supported by assessment evidence, that all students greatly benefit from, and, thus, need the structure and support of, taking both HUM-4993 and HUM-4013 with a sufficient number of classmates in an on-ground setting; thus, the Committee urges normally-online-students to undertake the Capstone process on-ground. Despite the benefits for students of this preference, the Committee concedes the family obligations, work-schedule conflicts, and travel-distance or out-of-state constraints on normally-online-students and, thus, will continue to work to accommodate these students toward the completion of their BA-LA degree.

A. Student Learning Outcome #2																			
SLO #2: Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.																			
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)														
Students in the Capstone Project/ Portfolio (HUM-4013) are required to complete a 12–15-page Reflective Essay . (This measure changed 2015-16). Note that HUM-4013 is taught spring semesters only.	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 12-15-page Reflective Essay . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	11 total students	6 of 11 total students = 54.55% met the performance standard.	N														
			8 On-Ground 3 Online	5 of 8 On-Ground = 62.5% 1 of 3 Online = 33.34%															
			10 English = 7 OG + 3 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OG	6 of 10 English (5 OG + 1 OL) = 60% 0 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 0%															
			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale																
			<table><tr><th>SCORE</th><th>STUDENTS</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>36.36%</td></tr><tr><td>4.5</td><td>2</td><td>18.18%</td></tr><tr><td>2.5</td><td>1</td><td>9.1%</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>27.27%</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>9.1%</td></tr></table> Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4.83 Average Score of All Scores = 3.5			SCORE	STUDENTS	%	5	4	36.36%	4.5	2	18.18%	2.5	1	9.1%	2	3
SCORE	STUDENTS	%																	
5	4	36.36%																	
4.5	2	18.18%																	
2.5	1	9.1%																	
2	3	27.27%																	
1	1	9.1%																	
H. Conclusions																			
For AM 2 (see table below), 2019-20 overall performance results (54.55%) are the lowest by far in seven years and are 28.31% lower than the 7-YR average (82.86%). Nevertheless, the 2019-20 average passing score (4.83) is the highest by far in seven years and surpasses the 7-YR average passing score (4.14) by .69 points. What explains this incongruity? As with 2019-20 AM 1A results and conclusions (see above), internal analysis of 2019-20 AM 2 results indicates that they are distorted by a/the significant difference in performance between Option #1 (AMs 1C & 1D) and Option #2 (AMs 1E & 1F) students.																			

A. Student Learning Outcome #2																
SLO #2:	Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.															
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard		D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)		F. Results		G. Standard Met (Y/N)							
As with AM 1A, 11 students completed the same spring 2020 Reflective Essay (AM 2), but 5 of these students completed Option #2 spring 2020, and only 1 (20%) scored higher than a "2.5" on his/her Reflective--this student scored a "4.5"--and the average score of the other 4 Option #2 students was "1.875." Unfortunately, 4 of the 5 Option #2 students were poor performers across all three spring 2020 measures (1E, 1F, & 2), with only 1 (20%) exceeding the "3" performance standard on all three measures (cf. results and tables for AMs 1E & 1F). In brief, the 4 weakest 2019-20 students were consistently weak across all three spring 2020 measures.																
AM 2: Reflective Essay = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Scores																
SCORE	2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2013-14	7-YR				
5	4	36.36%	1	16.67%	1	12.5%	6	46.15%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	5	35.7%	22 of 70	31.43%
4.5	2	18.18%			1	12.5%									3 of 70	4.29%
4			3	50%	3	37.5%	3	23.1%	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	3	21.43%	16 of 70	22.86%
3.5					3	37.5%	1	7.7%							4 of 70	5.71%
3			2	33.34%			1	7.7%	2	22.2%	4	44.4%	4	28.57%	13 of 70	18.57%
2.5	1	9.1%					2	15.38%							3 of 70	4.29%
2	3	27.27%							1	11.1%	2	22.2%	1	7.14%	7 of 70	10%
1	1	9.1%											1	7.14%	2 of 70	2.68%
	2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		7-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	6	54.55%	6	100%	8	100%	11	84.62%	8	88.87%	7	77.78%	12	85.7%	58 of 70	82.86%
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.83		3.83		4		4.41		4.25		3.57		4.08		4.14	
AVE OF ALL SCORES	3.5		3.83		4		4.11		4		3.22		3.71		3.77	
The better news is that of the 6 of 11 students who completed Option #1 (AMs 1C & 1D) spring 2020, 5 of these 6 (83.34%) exceeded the "3" performance standard for AM 2, with an average score of "4.9" (on 5-point scale). In brief, if one isolates for AM 2 the 6 Option #1 spring 2020 students, they exceeded the 75% performance standard by 8.34% (and 5 of them at 100%), and they equaled their 83.34% performance rate for both AM 1C & AM 1D (their completed Project and their Presentation). Moreover, if one reviews the 7-YR total number of students who have fallen short of the AM 2 performance standard, it is only 12 of 70 total students (17.14%), and 5 (= nearly half) of these 12 (41.67%) in 2019-20. In the final analysis, the Capstone Committee concludes that 2019-20 is an uncharacteristic year, anomalous with the otherwise consistent successful performance of BA-LA students on AM 2.																

A. Student Learning Outcome #3					
SLO #3:	Students will evidence an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on the human condition.				
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
Students in Comparative Religion (HUM-3633) are required to complete a Reflective Essay , asking them to compare and contrast their own religious background to that of another religious tradition.	At least 80% of the students in Comparative Religion (HUM-3633) will score 70% or higher on their Reflective Essay .	All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors. The course Instructor reports the performance of BA-LA students separately from the general education student population.	11 total students	10 of 11 total students = 90.91% met the performance standard.	Y
			6 Online; Summer 2019	5 of 6 Online = 83.34%; Summer 2019	
			5 On-Ground; Fall 2019	5 of 5 On-Ground = 100%; Fall 2019	
			No Spring 2020 sections & no Blended sections taught 2019-20	Note: Fall 2019 On-Ground section was Honors students only.	
H. Conclusions					
SLO #3 results are very positive and indicate solid student success. BA-LA program majors have been tracked separately for the past nine years. Program majors have been more successful than non-BA-LA students over the past seven years, although the small sample sizes of BA-LA students relative to the larger student population (cf. General Education SLR) makes direct comparisons between BA-LA and non-BA-LA students problematic. Faculty will continue to track results.					

A.
Student Learning Outcome #4

SLO #4: Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the 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 a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BA-LA) degree will complete the Graduating Senior 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.	At least 80% of the students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BA-LA) degree will express overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the degree program.	Students must complete the Graduating Senior Survey at the time they apply for graduation. Applications for graduation are not considered complete unless the Survey is completed.	7 total students All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors. Results are taken from the 2019-2020 Graduating Senior Survey , disaggregated by degree program, as provided by Mary A. Millikin, Ph.D., Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Office for Accountability and Academics.	7 of 7 total students (100%) expressed overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the BA-LA degree in four of the five program-specific categories. In one of these five categories, 6 of 7 students (85.71%) expressed overall satisfaction.	Y
				1. "Quality of Instruction in Major"	
				Very Satisfied	5
				Somewhat Satisfied	2
					71.4%
					28.6%
				2. "Preparation for Advanced Classes in Major"	
				Very Satisfied	5
				Somewhat Satisfied	1
				Somewhat Dissatisfied	1
					71.4%
					14.3%
					14.3%
				3. "Availability of Faculty for Academic Help"	
				Very Satisfied	6
				Somewhat Satisfied	1
					85.7%
					14.3%
				4. "Overall Major Experience"	
				Very Satisfied	6
					85.7%
					14.3%
				5. "Overall Department Experience"	
				Very Satisfied	5
				Somewhat Satisfied	2
					71.4%
					28.6%
				6. "Overall RSU Experience" [Comparison/Control]	

A. Student Learning Outcome #4																	
SLO #4:	Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.																
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results		G. Standard Met (Y/N)											
				Very Satisfied	5	71.4%											
				Somewhat Satisfied	2	28.6%											
H. Conclusions																	
SLO #4 results 2019-20 are very positive and continue a consistent trend of very high overall student satisfaction levels with the BA-LA program over the past seven years (as evidenced in the table below). Only one 2019-20 BA-LA student did not express total overall satisfaction (either “Very Satisfied” or “Somewhat Satisfied”) and only in one of the five program-specific categories.																	
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION KEY: VS = “Very Satisfied”; SS = “Somewhat Satisfied”; TOT = Total Overall Degree of Satisfaction																	
CATEGORY	KEY	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	7-YR								
1. Quality of Instruction in Major	VS	5	71.4%	2	66.7%	7	77.8%	11	84.6%	13	100%	8	80%	Data Not Collected	46	83.64%	
	SS	2	28.6%	1	33.3%	2	22.2%	2	15.4%	NA	0%	0	0%	7	12.73%		
	TOT	7	100%	3	100%	9	100%	13	100%	13	100%	8	80%	53	96.37%		
2. Preparation for Advanced Classes in Major	VS	5	71.4%	1	33.3%	7	77.8%	5	38.5%	11	84.6%	8	80%	Data Not Collected	37	67.27%	
	SS	1	14.3%	2	66.7%	1	11.1%	7	53.9%	2	15.4%	0	0%	13	23.64%		
	TOT	6	85.7%	3	100%	8	88.9%	12	92.4%	13	100%	8	80%	50	90.91%		
3. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help	VS	6	85.7%	1	33.3%	7	77.8%	11	84.6%	Data Not Collected		Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	25	78.13%		
	SS	1	14.3%	1	33.3%	1	11.1%	2	15.4%	Data Not Collected		Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	5	15.63%		
	TOT	7	100%	2	66.7%	8	88.9%	13	100%	Data Not Collected		Data Not Collected	Data Not Collected	30	93.75%		
4. Overall Major Experience	VS	6	85.7%	2	66.7%	7	77.8%	8	61.5%	12	92.3%	7	70%	11	84.6%	53	77.94%
	SS	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	22.2%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%	1	10%	2	15.4%	12	17.65%
	TOT	7	100%	2	66.7%	9	100%	13	100%	13	100%	8	80%	13	100%	65	95.59%
5. Overall Department Experience	VS	5	71.4%	2	66.7%	6	66.7%	8	61.5%	11	84.6%	7	70%	12	92.3%	51	75%
	SS	2	28.6%	0	0%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	2	15.4%	1	10%	1	7.7%	14	20.59
	TOT	7	100%	2	66.7%	9	100%	13	100%	13	100%	8	80%	13	100%	65	95.59%
6. Overall RSU Experience [Comparison/Control]	VS	5	71.4%	1	33.3%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	9	69.2%	7	70%	11	84.6%	41	60.29%
	SS	2	28.6%	1	33.3%	5	55.6%	6	46.2%	4	30.8%	1	10%	2	15.4%	21	30.88%
	TOT	7	100%	2	66.7%	8	88.9%	11	84.7%	13	100%	8	80%	13	100%	62	91.17%

PART 6

Summary of Assessment Measures

- A. How many different assessment measures were used? = 9
- B. List the direct measures (see appendix): [1] Capstone Proposal; [2] Proposal Presentation; [3] Scholarly Paper; [4] Oral Presentation; [5] Research Paper; [6] Visual Triptych; [7] Reflective Paper; [8] Comparative Religion Essay
- C. List the indirect measures (see appendix): [9] 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	Department Assessment Coordinator, University Assessment Committee representative, and Capstone Committee member. Collected, confirmed, and evaluated all data for HUM-4013 and HUM-4993. Reported and evaluated data from the Graduating Senior Survey. Prepared Student Learning Report and approved final draft.	
Emily Dial-Driver	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Sally Emmons	Capstone Committee Chair. Reviewed and approved final draft.	EMAIL ATTACHED
James Ford	Director of Academic Enrichment; Capstone Committee member. Contributed and evaluated data for HUM-3633. Reviewed, edited, and approved final draft.	
Laura Gray	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Mary M Mackie	Department Head; Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	Mary mackie
Scott Reed	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	EMAIL ATTACHED

- B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	Mary M Mackie	Mary mackie	6-1-2020
Dean	Keith W Martin	Keith W Martin	6/2/2020

A. Student Learning Outcome #4				
SLO #4:	Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.			
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results
Over the past seven years, 68 students have completed the survey; only 6 (8.82%) have expressed <u>any</u> degree of dissatisfaction with the BA-LA program. In light of the very high degree of expressed overall satisfaction year-after-year, the department believes that the few expressions of dissatisfaction (roughly 1 student/year) are isolated incidents and actually indicate the academic rigor and overall strength of the BA-LA program with respect to student learning. To contextualize better the very positive results of student satisfaction with the BA-LA program, note that over the past seven years, BA-LA students have expressed an average of ~5% higher total satisfaction with the "Quality of Instruction in Major" (QIM) and their "Overall Major Experience" (OME) and "Overall Department Experience" (ODE) than they have expressed regarding their "Overall RSU Experience" (ORE). At the level of the highest standard, <i>i.e.</i>, "Very Satisfied," the BA-LA 7-YR results surpass the ORE 7-YR results by significant percentages: QIM = 23.35% higher; OME = 17.65% higher; ODE = 14.71% higher. By this highest standard, BA-LA students have been more "Very Satisfied" with their BA-LA experience than they have been with their "Overall RSU Experience." In the final analysis, one may conclude that BA-LA students are highly satisfied with the educational experience afforded by their degree.				
G. Standard Met (Y/N)				

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
None	SLO #1 & #2	A significant change occurred in 2017-18 (cf. Part 2 above). The Capstone Committee continues to deliberate about this change and awaits additional data before introducing additional changes.

Matthew Oberrieder

From: Sally Emmons
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 11:38 AM
To: Matthew Oberrieder; Scott Reed; Laura Gray; Emily Dial-Driver; Renee Cox; Gioia Kerlin; James Ford
Subject: Re: 2019-20 BA-LA SLR

I approve.

On May 27, 2020, at 1:34 PM, Sally Emmons <semmons@rsu.edu> wrote:

That's what I thought. 😊

On page 22 you need to remove Gioia's name because she stepped off the Capstone Committee this year. I'm not sure what to do about Renee--she was on hiatus this year because of Sam's accident.

S

From: Matthew Oberrieder <moberrieder@rsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 1:21 PM
To: Sally Emmons <semmons@rsu.edu>; Scott Reed <sreed@rsu.edu>; Laura Gray <lgray@rsu.edu>; Emily Dial-Driver <EDial-Driver@rsu.edu>; Renee Cox <reneecox@rsu.edu>; Gioia Kerlin <gkerlin@rsu.edu>; James Ford <jford@rsu.edu>
Subject: RE: 2019-20 BA-LA SLR

For rhetorical effect!

Dr. Matthew Oberrieder
Associate Professor of Humanities
Dept. of English and Humanities
Baird Hall 215L
Rogers State University
1701 W. Will Rogers Blvd.
Claremore, OK 74017
(918) 343-7743

From: Sally Emmons <semmons@rsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 1:19 PM
To: Matthew Oberrieder <moberrieder@rsu.edu>; Scott Reed <sreed@rsu.edu>; Laura Gray <lgray@rsu.edu>; Emily Dial-Driver <EDial-Driver@rsu.edu>; Renee Cox <reneecox@rsu.edu>; Gioia Kerlin <gkerlin@rsu.edu>; James Ford <jford@rsu.edu>
Subject: Re: 2019-20 BA-LA SLR

Matt,

On page 15 of the report do you intend to have the exclamation point in parenthesis for rhetorical effect, or is this a typo?

Sally

"course instructors conducted uncompensated (!) Directed Studies online."

From: Matthew Oberrieder <moberrieder@rsu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 12:14 PM

To: Scott Reed <sreed@rsu.edu>; Sally Emmons <semmons@rsu.edu>; Laura Gray <lgray@rsu.edu>; Emily Dial-Driver <EDial-Driver@rsu.edu>; Renee Cox <reneecox@rsu.edu>; Gioia Kerlin <gkerlin@rsu.edu>; James Ford <jford@rsu.edu>

Subject: 2019-20 BA-LA SLR

Capstone Committee Colleagues:

Please find attached the 2019-20 BA-LA SLR completed draft for your review. Most of the report addresses the Capstone process, which is why you are receiving it.

If you find it acceptable, please reply directly to this email with your "electronic signature" indicating your approval. Please reply before this Friday (5/29) morning.

If you detect some serious issue(s) with the report (or easily correctable typos, misspellings), please "reply all" with your specific suggestion(s) for change for the Committee to consider/approve. If you have (a) suggestion(s) for change, please be specific about where and what. Please reply before this Friday (5/29) morning.

Thank you.

Dr. Matthew Oberrieder
Associate Professor of Humanities
Dept. of English and Humanities
Baird Hall 215L
Rogers State University
1701 W. Will Rogers Blvd.
Claremore, OK 74017
(918) 343-7743

Matthew Oberrieder

From: Scott Reed
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 11:59 AM
To: Matthew Oberrieder; Sally Emmons; Laura Gray; Emily Dial-Driver; Renee Cox; Gioia Kerlin; James Ford
Subject: Re: 2019-20 BA-LA SLR

That is a lot of work. I approve, Matt.

Scott Robert Reed
Assistant Professor
English and Humanities
Rogers State University
BH 215K
918-343-7588

From: Matthew Oberrieder <moberrieder@rsu.edu>
Date: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 at 12:14 PM
To: Scott Reed <sreed@rsu.edu>, Sally Emmons <semmons@rsu.edu>, Laura Gray <lgray@rsu.edu>, Emily Dial-Driver <EDial-Driver@rsu.edu>, Renee Cox <reneecox@rsu.edu>, Gioia Kerlin <gkerlin@rsu.edu>, James Ford <jford@rsu.edu>
Subject: 2019-20 BA-LA SLR

Capstone Committee Colleagues:

Please find attached the 2019-20 BA-LA SLR completed draft for your review. Most of the report addresses the Capstone process, which is why you are receiving it.

If you find it acceptable, please reply directly to this email with your "electronic signature" indicating your approval. Please reply before this Friday (5/29) morning.

If you detect some serious issue(s) with the report (or easily correctable typos, misspellings), please "reply all" with your specific suggestion(s) for change for the Committee to consider/approve. If you have (a) suggestion(s) for change, please be specific about where and what. Please reply before this Friday (5/29) morning.

Thank you.

Dr. Matthew Oberrieder
Associate Professor of Humanities
Dept. of English and Humanities
Baird Hall 215L
Rogers State University
1701 W. Will Rogers Blvd.
Claremore, OK 74017
(918) 343-7743

