

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

Fall 2017 – Spring 2018

Department of English & Humanities

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

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

Relationship of Degree Program Learning Outcomes to Departmental and University Missions

RSU Mission	General Education 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	General Education at Rogers State University provides a broad foundation of intellectual skills, knowledge, and perspectives to enable students across the University to achieve professional and personal goals in a dynamic local or global society.
RSU Commitments	General Education 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Think critically and creatively.2) Acquire, analyze, and evaluate knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world.3) Use written, oral, and visual communication effectively.4) Develop an individual perspective on the human experience, and demonstrate an understanding of diverse perspectives and values.5) Demonstrate civic knowledge and engagement, ethical reasoning, and skills for lifelong learning.
To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.	
To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic programs and prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Think critically and creatively.2) Acquire, analyze, and evaluate knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world.3) Use written, oral, and visual communication effectively.4) Develop an individual perspective on the human experience, and demonstrate an understanding of diverse perspectives and values.5) Demonstrate civic knowledge and engagement, ethical reasoning, and skills for lifelong learning.

RSU Mission	General Education Mission
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits, and continuous improvement of programs.	
To provide university-wide student services, activities, and resources that complement academic programs.	
To support and strengthen student, faculty, and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution.	
To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff, and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual, and personal enrichment for the university and the communities it serves.	

PART 1

Discussion of Instructional Changes Resulting from 2016-2017 General Education Student Learning Report

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

Instructional or Assessment Changes	Changes Implemented (Y/N)	Impact of Changes on Degree Program Curriculum or Budget
No changes were proposed.	NA	No changes were proposed.

PART 2

Discussion of the University Assessment Committee's 2016-2017 Peer Review Report

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

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

PART 3

Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes

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

OUTCOME 1: THINK CRITICALLY AND CREATIVELY

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will summarize and evaluate an article . The summary assignment will require a minimum of two documented quotes. The evaluation assignment will require demonstration of critical thinking and observation.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on rubrics developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on summaries to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.	500 Total students assessed	411 of 500 students (82.2%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 399 of 485 (82.27%) <hr/> Online 12 of 15 (80%) <hr/> Blended No sections <hr/>	Students in all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective, which continues a successful trend. This is evidence that the Department of English and Humanities is meeting its General Education goals. Only one Online section reported results, which makes for a small sample.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will take a post-test that requires them to analyze written communication. These tests require students to demonstrate careful reading skills, comprehension skills and critical thinking skills, as well as knowledge about documentation requirements and guidelines.	At least 70% of students who take the exam will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on post-tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.	463 Total students assessed	336 of 463 students (72.57%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 322 of 445 (72.36%) <hr/> Online 14 of 18 (77.78%) <hr/> Blended No sections	Students in all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective. This is evidence that the Department of English and Humanities is meeting its General Education goals. Only one Online section reported results, which makes for a small sample. As this is a multiple choice test, identical for everyone taking it, this seems to be a particularly relevant result.	Y
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will summarize and evaluate an article . The summary assignment will require a minimum of two documented quotes. The evaluation	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and	474 Total students assessed	394 of 474 students (83.12%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 350 of 417 (83.93%) <hr/> Online 44 of 57 (77.19%) <hr/> Blended No sections	Students in the On-Ground classes met this performance standard, a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals. The Online sections of this course did much better than last academic year.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
	assignment will require demonstration of critical thinking and observation.		recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.				
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will take a post-test that requires them to analyze written communication. These tests require them to demonstrate careful reading skills, comprehension skills and critical thinking skills, as well as knowledge about documentation requirements and guidelines.	At least 70% of students who take the exam will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the coordinator.	417 Total students assessed	350 of 441 students (79.37%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 297 of 374 (79.41%) <hr/> Online 53 of 67 (79.1%) <hr/> Blended No sections <hr/>	Students in both delivery modes did very well on this performance standard, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																					
ENGL 2613 Introduction to Literature	Students will submit a creative project responding to some literary work, theme, or text demonstrating generally basic content knowledge of the humanities and in particular critical and creative thinking.	At least 70% of students who submit the creative project will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on papers to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.	9 Total students assessed	9 of 9 students (100%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground No sections <hr/> Online 9 of 9 (100%) <hr/> Blended No sections <hr/>	Students consistently perform particularly well on this component. As a course that aims to engage students in creative thinking, this is a particularly good sign.	Y																					
HUM 2113 Humanities I	Students will submit an essay in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to	At least 70% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT &	147 Total students Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>37</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>17</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>17</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table>	37	FT	OG	17	FT	OL	17	PT	B	113 of 147 total students (76.87%) met the performance standard. Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>28</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>75.7%</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>47.1%</td></tr><tr><td>17</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>100%</td></tr></table>	28	FT	OG	75.7%	8	FT	OL	47.1%	17	PT	B	100%	All sections of On-Ground (x 3) and Blended (x 1) students met or exceeded the performance standard, whether with FT or PT instructors. By contrast, only 1 of 3 Online sections (by a PT instructor) met the standard. The 2 low-performing Online sections were taught by a FT instructor, who also teaches Composition. Results suggest that either this FT instructor graded students' writing by a higher standard,	Y
37	FT	OG																										
17	FT	OL																										
17	PT	B																										
28	FT	OG	75.7%																									
8	FT	OL	47.1%																									
17	PT	B	100%																									

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																																																								
	them. Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”		<i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>37</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>18</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table> <u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	37	FT	OG	18	FT	OL	10	PT	OG	11	PT	OL	Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>31</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>83.8%</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>66.7%</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>70%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>90.9%</td></tr></table> <u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	31	FT	OG	83.8%	12	FT	OL	66.7%	7	PT	OG	70%	10	PT	OL	90.9%	or that the other instructors were more (too?) generous in evaluating students’ writing (especially insofar as the 2 highest performing categories were taught by the same PT instructor). Does this indicate poorer instruction and/or weaker learning in FT sections? It seems more likely that PT instructors are more generous in their grading.																													
37	FT	OG																																																													
18	FT	OL																																																													
10	PT	OG																																																													
11	PT	OL																																																													
31	FT	OG	83.8%																																																												
12	FT	OL	66.7%																																																												
7	PT	OG	70%																																																												
10	PT	OL	90.9%																																																												
HUM 2223 Humanities II	Students will submit an essay in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them. Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”	At least 70% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT & <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	165 Total students Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>23</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>47</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>29</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table> <u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	23	FT	OG	16	FT	OL	16	PT	OG	10	PT	OL	13	PT	B	47	FT	OG	29	FT	OL	11	PT	OL	147 of 165 total students (89.1%) met the performance standard. Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>20</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>87%</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>75%</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>43</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>91.5%</td></tr><tr><td>22</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>75.9%</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	20	FT	OG	87%	12	FT	OL	75%	16	PT	OG	100%	10	PT	OL	100%	13	PT	B	100%	43	FT	OG	91.5%	22	FT	OL	75.9%	11	PT	OL	100%	Results significantly exceeded the performance standard for all variations of Instructor Status & Delivery Mode but for the two FT, OL sections, one of which exceeded the standard by only 5%, while the other by ~6%. Drawing conclusions about performance differences by Delivery Mode is difficult, since no Mode necessarily outperformed the others. Yet, if one considers results in terms of Instructor Status, students in FT sections averaged overall lower results (97 of 115 = 84.35%) vs. students in PT sections (50 of 50 = 100%). Does this reflect weaker instruction/less learning in FT sections? or just more generous grading in PT sections? Anecdotal evidence suggest the latter, not the former. Two of the FT instructors also teach Composition; FT instructors expect better essay-writing.	Y
23	FT	OG																																																													
16	FT	OL																																																													
16	PT	OG																																																													
10	PT	OL																																																													
13	PT	B																																																													
47	FT	OG																																																													
29	FT	OL																																																													
11	PT	OL																																																													
20	FT	OG	87%																																																												
12	FT	OL	75%																																																												
16	PT	OG	100%																																																												
10	PT	OL	100%																																																												
13	PT	B	100%																																																												
43	FT	OG	91.5%																																																												
22	FT	OL	75.9%																																																												
11	PT	OL	100%																																																												

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
HUM 3633 Comparative Religion	Students will complete two essay exams , demonstrating basic content knowledge of the relevant cultures. The two exams are in-class essay exams, one midway through the course and the other at the conclusion of the semester.	At least 70% of students who take the two essay exams will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who took both exams are included.	43 Total students assessed 2 of 2 sections of the course are included: 1 On-Ground (Fall 2017) + 1 Online (Spring 2018) Summer 2018 will be reported on the 2018-19 SLR.	38 of 43 students (88.37%) met the performance standard. Blended No sections On-Ground 23 of 23 (100%) Online 15 of 20 (75%) Summer 2018 will be reported on the 2018-19 SLR.	Note that for the first time a summer course is not included in the results, due to the change in reporting deadline (now at the end of spring 2018; thus, summer 2018 results will be reported on the 2018-19 SLR). The on-ground course excelled. Though it was an Honors section and those traditionally score higher, the result is still excellent. Online results are good, though six students failed to take one (or both) exams and are not included in the data. Results overall are positive—students are accomplishing the outcome.	Y
LANG 1113 Foundations of World Languages	Students will complete workbook assignments and dictionary assignments that require focus on changes in the English language, as well as investigation of etymologies.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignments will score 70% or higher.	Students from 2 of 2 sections are included in the sample. 1 On-Ground (Fall 2017) + 1 Online (Spring 2018)	29 Total students assessed On-Ground 8 Online 21	28 of 29 students (96.55%) met the performance standard. On-Ground 8 of 8 (100%) Online 20 of 21 (95.24%) Blended No sections	For 2017-18, the performance of On-Ground students (100%) was higher than that of Online students (95.24%) and both of these, in turn, are very similar to past performance. The numbers are so small, though, that the difference is negligible. Out of all the students who took the course <i>and completed the final</i> , only one student did not score a 70% or higher. Because of declining enrollment, only two total sections were taught for 2014-15, one On-Ground in the Fall, and one Online in the Spring. This continued into 2016-17, as well as 2017-18	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
LANG 1113 Foundations of World Languages	Students will complete a comprehensive mid-term examination of weeks 1-9. The mid-term examination will employ a variety of testing methods, including fill in the blank, true/false, multiple choice and short essay answers.	At least 70% of students who take the mid-term examination will average 70% or higher. Student knowledge required to pass the mid- term includes familiarity with the Latin and Greek foundations of language, a beginning understanding of the etymology of words, and efficient articulation of how/why language reflects culture.	Students from 2 of 2 sections are included in the sample. 1 On-Ground (Fall 2017) + 1 Online (Spring 2018)	30 Total students assessed On-Ground 8 Online 22	24 of 30 students (80%) met the performance standard. On-Ground 8 of 8 (100%) Online 16 of 22 (72.73%) Blended No sections	In formal exams, like the mid-term and the final (next assessment measure), On-Ground students seemed to perform better than Online students. Overall, though, both classes performed well on their mid-term tests and met the performance standard. Going forward, we want to continue to watch these results closely, as we believe that the mid-term exam serves as a learning experience that helps our students better prepare for the comprehensive final exam (next assessment measure); thus, the current results establish a quasi-baseline for evaluating overall learning in light of the final exam.	Y
LANG 1113 Foundations of World Languages	Students will complete a comprehensive final examination of weeks 1-15. The final examination	At least 70% of students who take the final examination will average 70% or higher. Student	Students from 2 of 2 sections are included in the sample. 1 On-Ground (Fall 2017) +	29 Total students assessed On-Ground 8	28 of 29 students (96.55%) met the performance standard. On-Ground 8 of 8 (100%)	2017-18 results: Outcomes for the two semesters were very similar. Despite there being no change in the test, both On-Ground and Online classes were very nearly equally successful. Compare with 2016-17 results: For the final, a marked difference can	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
	will employ a variety of testing methods, including fill in the blank, true/false, multiple choice and short essay answers.	knowledge required to pass the final includes all that was required for successful completion of the mid-term, as well as a deeper and more intense investigation and understanding of etymology and its role in determining the past and present use of words, and the subsequent impact on intrasocial communication.	1 Online (Spring 2018)	Online 21	Online 20 of 21 (95.24%) Blended No sections	be seen between the On-ground and Online classes. Due to the small sample size, it is difficult to determine any kind of trend. We will watch this number in the future to look for larger concerns.	

OUTCOME 2: ACQUIRE, ANALYZE, & EVALUATE KNOWLEDGE OF HUMAN CULTURES & THE PHYSICAL & NATURAL WORLD

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																																																																
HUM 2113 Humanities I	Students will take a comprehensive final exam on content knowledge of the humanities.	At least 70% of students who take the final exam will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who took the final exam are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT & <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	165 Total students Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>42</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>19</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>19</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>44</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>18</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table> Summer 2018 To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	42	FT	OG	19	FT	OL	19	PT	B	44	FT	OG	18	FT	OL	10	PT	OG	13	PT	OL	135 of 165 total students (81.82%) met the performance standard. Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>34</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>81%</td></tr><tr><td>15</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>79%</td></tr><tr><td>19</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>41</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>93.2%</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>88.9%</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>10%</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>69.2%</td></tr></table> Summer 2018 To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	34	FT	OG	81%	15	FT	OL	79%	19	PT	B	100%	41	FT	OG	93.2%	16	FT	OL	88.9%	1	PT	OG	10%	9	PT	OL	69.2%	Results meet or exceed the performance standard for all variations of Instructor Status & Delivery Mode but for 2 PT sections, 1 OG & 1 OL. Instructor Status Aggregated Results <table><tr><td>FT</td><td>106 of 123</td><td>86.18%</td></tr><tr><td>PT</td><td>29 of 42</td><td>69%</td></tr></table> Delivery Mode Aggregated Results <table><tr><td>OG</td><td>76 of 96</td><td>79.17%</td></tr><tr><td>OL</td><td>40 of 50</td><td>80%</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>19 of 19</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> Students taught by FT Instructors averaged higher results vs. students taught by PT Instructors, yet OG students performed the lowest of the 3 Modes, even though the largest cohort of students (75 of 86 = 87.2%) were FT, OG. Conclusion 1: OG results are skewed lower by the 1 PT, OG section results of 10%. Conclusion 2: OG Modes is the strongest for student learning; B results are skewed by 1 section taught by a PT Instructor.	FT	106 of 123	86.18%	PT	29 of 42	69%	OG	76 of 96	79.17%	OL	40 of 50	80%	B	19 of 19	100%	Y
42	FT	OG																																																																					
19	FT	OL																																																																					
19	PT	B																																																																					
44	FT	OG																																																																					
18	FT	OL																																																																					
10	PT	OG																																																																					
13	PT	OL																																																																					
34	FT	OG	81%																																																																				
15	FT	OL	79%																																																																				
19	PT	B	100%																																																																				
41	FT	OG	93.2%																																																																				
16	FT	OL	88.9%																																																																				
1	PT	OG	10%																																																																				
9	PT	OL	69.2%																																																																				
FT	106 of 123	86.18%																																																																					
PT	29 of 42	69%																																																																					
OG	76 of 96	79.17%																																																																					
OL	40 of 50	80%																																																																					
B	19 of 19	100%																																																																					
HUM 2223 Humanities II	Students will take a comprehensive final exam on content knowledge of the humanities.	At least 70% of students who take the final exam will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who took the final exam are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT	172 Total students Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>27</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr></table>	27	FT	OG	138 of 172 total students (80.23%) met the performance standard. Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>25</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>92.6%</td></tr></table>	25	FT	OG	92.6%	Results meet or exceed the performance standard for all variations of Instructor Status & Delivery Mode but for 2 PT sections, 1 OG & 1 OL. Investigation of these 2 lowest results found that both sections were taught by the same adjunct instructor, who did not quiz students regularly	Y																																																									
27	FT	OG																																																																					
25	FT	OG	92.6%																																																																				

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																																																																
			vs. Part-Time = PT & <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	<table><tr><td>17</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>14</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table> <div>Spring 2018</div> <table><tr><td>49</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>27</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table> <div>Summer 2018</div> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	17	FT	OL	16	PT	OG	10	PT	OL	14	PT	B	49	FT	OG	27	FT	OL	12	PT	OL	<table><tr><td>14</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>82.4%</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>37.5%</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>60%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>71.4%</td></tr></table> <div>Spring 2018</div> <table><tr><td>46</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>93.9%</td></tr><tr><td>22</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>81.5%</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>75%</td></tr></table> <div>Summer 2018</div> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	14	FT	OL	82.4%	6	PT	OG	37.5%	6	PT	OL	60%	10	PT	B	71.4%	46	FT	OG	93.9%	22	FT	OL	81.5%	9	PT	OL	75%	throughout the semester and did not conduct a mid-term exam; thus, the final exam was these students' only testing of their content knowledge. This confirms the need to quiz students regularly and to have a mid-term exam to help students to develop their learning (including learning from their mistakes) as they advance weekly toward the final exam. <div>Instructor Status Aggregated Results</div> <table><tr><td>FT</td><td>107 of 120</td><td>89.17%</td></tr><tr><td>PT</td><td>31 of 52</td><td>59.62%</td></tr></table> <div>Delivery Mode Aggregated Results</div> <table><tr><td>OG</td><td>77 of 92</td><td>83.7%</td></tr><tr><td>OL</td><td>51 of 66</td><td>77.27%</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>10 of 14</td><td>71.4%</td></tr></table> Conclusions: students taught by FT Instructors and/or in OG sections yield the greatest student learning results. Also, note that FT Instructors taught well over twice as many students.	FT	107 of 120	89.17%	PT	31 of 52	59.62%	OG	77 of 92	83.7%	OL	51 of 66	77.27%	B	10 of 14	71.4%	
17	FT	OL																																																																					
16	PT	OG																																																																					
10	PT	OL																																																																					
14	PT	B																																																																					
49	FT	OG																																																																					
27	FT	OL																																																																					
12	PT	OL																																																																					
14	FT	OL	82.4%																																																																				
6	PT	OG	37.5%																																																																				
6	PT	OL	60%																																																																				
10	PT	B	71.4%																																																																				
46	FT	OG	93.9%																																																																				
22	FT	OL	81.5%																																																																				
9	PT	OL	75%																																																																				
FT	107 of 120	89.17%																																																																					
PT	31 of 52	59.62%																																																																					
OG	77 of 92	83.7%																																																																					
OL	51 of 66	77.27%																																																																					
B	10 of 14	71.4%																																																																					
PHIL 1113 Introduction to Philosophy	Students will take a comprehensive final exam , evaluating their retention and understanding of the problems and history of philosophy,	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who take the final exam will score 85% or higher. <hr/> <hr/>	Data from all students who took the final exam are included.	97 Total students assessed <hr/> 6 sections: 4 On-Ground + 2 Online <hr/> No Blended sections. <hr/>	<u>Standard #1:</u> 77 of 97 students (79.38%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 51 of 63 (81%) <hr/> Online 26 of 34 (76.47%) <hr/>	Students performed well on the final exam. Class participation given during the semester was a contributing factor.	Standard #1 Y <hr/> Standard #2 Y																																																																

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
	broadly construed.	<u>Standard #2:</u> At least 85% of students who take the final exam will score 70% or higher.			<u>Standard #2:</u> 86 of 97 students (88.66%) met the performance standard. On-ground 57 of 63 (90.48%) Online 29 of 34 (85.29%)		
PHIL 1313 Values and Ethics	Students will take a comprehensive final exam , evaluating their retention and understanding of the problems and history of ethics.	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who take the final exam will score 85% or higher. <u>Standard #2:</u> At least 85% of students who take the final exam will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who took the final exam are included.	39 Total students assessed 2 On-Ground sections No Online or Blended sections	<u>Standard #1:</u> 29 of 39 students (74.36%) met the performance standard. <u>Standard #2:</u> 34 of 39 students (87.18%) met the performance standard.	Students performed well on the final exam. Class participation given during the semester was a contributing factor.	Standard #1 Y Standard #2 Y

OUTCOME 3: USE WRITTEN, ORAL, AND VISUAL COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVELY

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will write a short, researched essay/body section of an essay , using one or more forms of standard documentation, such as MLA, APA, etc.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, using a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on essays to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.	501 Total students assessed	<p>406 of 501 students (81%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-Ground 392 of 484 (81%)</p> <hr/> <p>Online 14 of 17 (82.35%)</p> <hr/> <p>Blended No sections</p> <hr/>	Students across all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals. This is the first time in several years that both delivery modes met the benchmark.	Y
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will write a well-developed, well-supported 400-1000 word expository essay , using a	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, using a rubric developed by	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on essays to the writing	525 Total students assessed	<p>420 of 525 students (80%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-Ground 401 of 505 (79.41%)</p> <hr/> <p>Online 19 of 20 (95%)</p> <hr/>	<p>Students across all delivery modes met the performance standard for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.</p> <p>Students in the Online class did significantly better than their On-Ground counterparts. However,</p>	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
	writing process, including pre-writing, planning, organizing, drafting, revising and editing.	the English Faculty. A successfully structured formal essay will contain a coherent thesis statement and a minimal amount of grammatical and mechanical errors.	faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.		Blended No sections	as only one class is represented in the Online category, it is impossible to draw significant conclusions.	
ENGL 1113 Composition I	Students will take one timed Comp I essay test (50 minutes, minimum and maximum).	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher. Essay test questions/ subjects will require students to demonstrate skill with essay structure, coherence, and clarity of	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on post-tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee,	524 Total students assessed	426 of 524 students (81.3%) met the performance standard. On-Ground 408 of 506 (80.63%) Online 18 of 18 (100%) Blended No sections	Students in the On-Ground classes met this objective, while their Online counterparts did even better. Students across delivery modes did very well on this assessment measure for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
		thought.	consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.				
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will write a well-developed, well-supported answer to an essay question .	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty. A successfully structured formal essay will contain a coherent topic sentence, support, and few grammatical and mechanical errors.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on essay tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.	477 Total students assessed	415 of 477 students (87%) met the performance standard. On-Ground 361 of 410 (88%) Online 54 of 67 (80.6%) Blended No sections	Students across delivery modes did very well on this assessment measure for this objective, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																																	
ENGL 1213 Composition II	Students will write a researched essay , using one or more forms of standard documentation, such as MLA, APA, etc.	At least 70% of students who submit the assignment will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported results to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the coordinator.	477 Total students assessed	<div>388 of 477 students (81.34%) met the performance standard.</div> <div>On-Ground 337 of 410 (82.2%)</div> <div>Online 51 of 67 (76.12%)</div> <div>Blended No sections</div>	Students across all delivery modes met this performance standard.	Y																																	
HUM 2113 Humanities I	Students will complete an in-class presentation displaying oral and visual communication skills, as well as creative and critical thinking. (Online	At least 70% of students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who presented are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT &	155 Total students Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>43</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>14</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>21</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table>	43	FT	OG	14	FT	OL	21	PT	B	151 of 155 total students (97.42%) met the performance standard. Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>43</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>14</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>18</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>85.7%</td></tr></table>	43	FT	OG	100%	14	FT	OL	100%	18	PT	B	85.7%	Results significantly exceed the performance standard for all variations of Instructor Status & Delivery Mode. Instructor Status Aggregated Results <table><tr><td>FT</td><td>113 of 114</td><td>99.12%</td></tr><tr><td>PT</td><td>38 of 41</td><td>92.68%</td></tr></table> Delivery Mode Aggregated Results <table><tr><td>OG</td><td>93 of 94</td><td>98.94%</td></tr><tr><td>OL</td><td>40 of 40</td><td>100%</td></tr></table>	FT	113 of 114	99.12%	PT	38 of 41	92.68%	OG	93 of 94	98.94%	OL	40 of 40	100%	Y
43	FT	OG																																						
14	FT	OL																																						
21	PT	B																																						
43	FT	OG	100%																																					
14	FT	OL	100%																																					
18	PT	B	85.7%																																					
FT	113 of 114	99.12%																																						
PT	38 of 41	92.68%																																						
OG	93 of 94	98.94%																																						
OL	40 of 40	100%																																						

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																																																																							
	students will submit a paper/project in lieu of the presentation.)		Delivery Mode On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>41</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table> Summer 2018 To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	41	FT	OG	16	FT	OL	10	PT	OG	10	PT	OL	Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>40</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>97.6%</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> Summer 2018 To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	40	FT	OG	97.6%	16	FT	OL	100%	10	PT	OG	100%	10	PT	OL	100%	<table><tr><td>B</td><td>18 of 21</td><td>85.7%</td></tr></table> Overall, students taught by FT Instructors averaged higher results vs. students taught by PT Instructors, though both results are very strong. Note that FT Instructors taught 73.55% of all students. While OG students averaged slightly lower results vs. OL students, both of these Delivery Modes exceeded the B section (x 1). This seems significant in that the OG students sample (94) greatly exceeded the OL & B students sample combined (61).	B	18 of 21	85.7%																																									
41	FT	OG																																																																												
16	FT	OL																																																																												
10	PT	OG																																																																												
10	PT	OL																																																																												
40	FT	OG	97.6%																																																																											
16	FT	OL	100%																																																																											
10	PT	OG	100%																																																																											
10	PT	OL	100%																																																																											
B	18 of 21	85.7%																																																																												
HUM 2223 Humanities II	Students 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 students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who presented are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT & <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	167 Total students Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>27</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>15</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>14</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>49</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>25</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table>	27	FT	OG	15	FT	OL	16	PT	OG	10	PT	OL	14	PT	B	49	FT	OG	25	FT	OL	11	PT	OL	159 of 167 total students (95.2%) met the performance standard. Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>24</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>88.9%</td></tr><tr><td>14</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>93.33%</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>85.7%</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>48</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>94.74%</td></tr><tr><td>24</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>96%</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr></table>	24	FT	OG	88.9%	14	FT	OL	93.33%	16	PT	OG	100%	10	PT	OL	100%	12	PT	B	85.7%	48	FT	OG	94.74%	24	FT	OL	96%	11	PT	OL	100%	Results significantly exceed the performance standard for all variations of Instructor Status & Delivery Mode. Instructor Status Aggregated Results <table><tr><td>FT</td><td>110 of 116</td><td>94.83%</td></tr><tr><td>PT</td><td>49 of 51</td><td>96.1%</td></tr></table> Delivery Mode Aggregated Results <table><tr><td>OG</td><td>88 of 92</td><td>95.65%</td></tr><tr><td>OL</td><td>59 OF 61</td><td>96.72%</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>12 OF 14</td><td>85.7%</td></tr></table> Although students taught by FT Instructors averaged slightly lower results vs. students taught by PT Instructors, FT Instructors taught 69.46% of all students, which yields a more accurate sample result.	FT	110 of 116	94.83%	PT	49 of 51	96.1%	OG	88 of 92	95.65%	OL	59 OF 61	96.72%	B	12 OF 14	85.7%	Y
27	FT	OG																																																																												
15	FT	OL																																																																												
16	PT	OG																																																																												
10	PT	OL																																																																												
14	PT	B																																																																												
49	FT	OG																																																																												
25	FT	OL																																																																												
11	PT	OL																																																																												
24	FT	OG	88.9%																																																																											
14	FT	OL	93.33%																																																																											
16	PT	OG	100%																																																																											
10	PT	OL	100%																																																																											
12	PT	B	85.7%																																																																											
48	FT	OG	94.74%																																																																											
24	FT	OL	96%																																																																											
11	PT	OL	100%																																																																											
FT	110 of 116	94.83%																																																																												
PT	49 of 51	96.1%																																																																												
OG	88 of 92	95.65%																																																																												
OL	59 OF 61	96.72%																																																																												
B	12 OF 14	85.7%																																																																												

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
				<u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	<u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	OG and OL students averaged nearly identical, near-perfect results (even with OG sample size 50% larger), and both of these Delivery Modes exceeded the single B section. Note that the OG students sample (92) significantly exceeded the OL & B students sample combined (75).	
HUM 3633 Comparative Religion	Students will complete and present a comprehensive project , which includes a five-to-seven page paper and various supporting materials. For these projects, students attended a service of an unfamiliar tradition, created a new religion, or interviewed members of various religious backgrounds.	At least 70% of students who submit the project will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who completed the project are included.	46 Total students assessed 2 of 2 sections of the course are included: 1 On-Ground (Fall 2017) + 1 Online (Spring 2018) Summer 2018 students will be reported on the 2018-19 SLR.	43 of 46 students (93.48%) met the performance standard. Blended No sections On-Ground 23 of 23 (100%) Online 20 of 23 (87%)	Traditionally, On-Ground course sections have had higher performance results than Online sections (2016-17 was an exception to this pattern), and that is true again this year. This is an assignment that many students particularly enjoy, and so one to which they devote a great deal of effort. Success rates have been at or above 90% the past several years (e.g., 100% in 2016-17; 93.3% in 2014-15; 93.8% in 2013-14; 92.3% in 2011-12). 2017-18 results are a bit below online, though still strong. Worth noting that three students failed to submit any project at all (and so failed the course). This is why there are 46 students for this measure (SLO #3) vs. 43 students for the SLO #1 measure. That said, the overall standard is met. Students accomplished the outcome quite well.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
PHIL 1113 Introduction to Philosophy	Students will write an essay in which they are asked to explore diverse ethical systems and problems taken from a variety of historical periods: ancient, medieval, and modern.	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who submit the essay will score 85% or higher. <hr/> <u>Standard #2:</u> At least 85% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher. <hr/> All essays were scored using a rubric.	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included in the sample.	97 Total students assessed <hr/> 6 sections: 4 On-Ground + 2 Online <hr/> No Blended sections were taught.	<u>Standard #1:</u> 76 of 97 students (78.35%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 50 of 63 (79.37%) <hr/> Online 26 of 34 (76.47%) <hr/> <u>Standard #2:</u> 87 of 97 students (89.69%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 57 of 63 (90.48%) <hr/> Online 30 of 34 (88.23%)	Students from year to year continue to perform well on the rubric-graded essay. As a direct measure, the essay has proven an effective tool for measuring not only General Education outcomes, but also course objectives, which include comprehending the concepts and arguments utilized by philosophers and articulating and appraising possible solutions to core philosophical problems.	Standard #1 Y <hr/> Standard #2 Y
PHIL 1313 Values and Ethics	Students will write an essay in which they are asked to explore diverse ethical systems and problems taken from a variety of historical periods:	<u>Standard #1:</u> At least 50% of students who submit the essay will score 85% or higher. <hr/> <hr/>	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included in the sample.	39 Total students assessed <hr/> 2 On-Ground sections <hr/> No Online or Blended sections were taught.	<u>Standard #1:</u> 28 of 39 students (71.8%) met the performance standard. <hr/> <u>Standard #2:</u> 34 of 39 students (87.18%) met the performance standard.	Students performed well on the essay assignment. Class participation given during the semester was a contributing factor.	Standard #1 Y <hr/> Standard #2 Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
	ancient, medieval, and modern.	<u>Standard #2:</u> At least 85% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher. <hr/> <hr/> All essays were scored using a rubric					
SPAN 1113 Beginning Spanish I	Students will take a final examination that focuses on written and oral communication in Spanish. On this exam, students will be tested on their knowledge of the Spanish language and understanding of Hispanic cultures.	At least 70% of students who take the final exam will score 70% or higher.	All students in SPAN 1113 (On-Ground & Online) who complete the class (i.e., those who do not drop, stop attending, or fail to take the final exam) are counted.	150 Total students assessed over fall 2017 & spring 2018 <hr/> On-Ground 110 Students <hr/> Online 40 Students <hr/> Blended No sections	121 of 150 students (80.67%) met the performance standard. <hr/> On-Ground 94 of 110 (85.45%) <hr/> Online 27 of 40 (67.5%) <hr/> Blended No sections	Counting all students enrolled in SPAN1113 (On-Ground & Online), 80.67% of students met or exceeded the 70% performance standard on a timed exam that tested the technical mechanics of self-expression and communication in the Spanish language, as well as testing aspects of awareness of Hispanic cultures. Since the 2014-2015 SLR, the overall number of students who have met the performance standard has varied from 69.8% in AY 2014-2015, to 82.5% in AY 2015-2016, to 81% in AY 2016- 2017, and then to 80.7% in AY 2017- 2018. On-Ground students have seen an increase from 70.2% (AY 2014- 2015), to 82.6% (AY 2015-2016), to 83.2% (AY 2016-2017), and to 85.5% (AY 2017-2018). This increase in On- Ground student performance may be	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
						<p>due to factors that include student preparedness for college-level classes, previous experience with high school Spanish, and instructor involvement.</p> <p>Online student performance in SPAN 1113, however, has ranged from 67.7% (AY 2014-2015), to 82.6% (AY 2015-2016), to 76.9% (AY 2016-2017), and then dipped to 67.5% in AY 2017-2018. The dramatic increase in student performance from AY 2014-2015 through AY 2015-2016 was most likely due to the fact that many Online students had had previous experience with Spanish, either at the high school level, or in real-life situations. The following year (AY 2016-2017) still showed an increase in student performance over AY 2014-2015, but AY 2017-2018 saw an approximately 10% decrease in student performance on the final exam. This decrease in Online student performance could have been due to lack of effort on the students' part, lack of familiarity with the online learning/testing environment, lack of preparation for university level work, and inexperience with Jenzabar online testing.</p>	

OUTCOME 4: DEVELOP AN INDIVIDUAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE HUMAN EXPERIENCE, & DEMONSTRATES AN UNDERSTANDING OF DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES & VALUES

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)
ENGL 2613 Introduction to Literature	Students will take a final examination , in which they are expected to demonstrate, in particular, content knowledge of literature and, more generally, basic content knowledge of the humanities.	At least 70% of students who take the final exam will score 70% or higher, based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on tests to the writing faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.	10 Total students assessed	<p>7 of 10 students (70%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-Ground No sections</p> <hr/> <p>Online 7 of 10 (70%)</p> <hr/> <p>Blended No sections</p> <hr/>	Students met the standard for this measure, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.	Y
ENGL 2613 Introduction to Literature	Students will write one literary analysis/ research paper , in which they are expected to	At least 70% of students who submit the literary analysis/ research paper will score 70% or higher,	Data from all students completing the course were taken into account. Individual faculty members reported grades on papers to the writing	8 Total students assessed	<p>7 of 8 students (87.5%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>On-Ground No sections</p> <hr/> <p>Online 7 of 8 (87.5%)</p>	Students met the standard for this measure, which is a positive sign that the department is achieving its General Education goals.	Y

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																																																	
	demonstrate, in particular, content knowledge of literature and, more generally, basic content knowledge of the humanities.	based on a rubric developed by the English Faculty.	faculty coordinator. Collated results were examined and recorded by the writing faculty coordinator and shared with the writing faculty committee, consisting of all full-time English Faculty. All data and results were reported to the assessment coordinator.		<div>Blended</div> <div>No sections</div>																																																			
HUM 2113 Humanities I	Students will submit an essay in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them. Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for	At least 70% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT & <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	147 Total students <div>Students per category:</div> <div>Fall 2017</div> <table><tr><td>37</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>17</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>17</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table> <div>Spring 2018</div> <table><tr><td>37</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>18</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table>	37	FT	OG	17	FT	OL	17	PT	B	37	FT	OG	18	FT	OL	10	PT	OG	11	PT	OL	113 of 147 total students (76.87%) met the performance standard. <div>Students per category:</div> <div>Fall 2017</div> <table><tr><td>28</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>75.7%</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>47.1%</td></tr><tr><td>17</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <div>Spring 2018</div> <table><tr><td>31</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>83.8%</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>66.7%</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>70%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>90.9%</td></tr></table>	28	FT	OG	75.7%	8	FT	OL	47.1%	17	PT	B	100%	31	FT	OG	83.8%	12	FT	OL	66.7%	7	PT	OG	70%	10	PT	OL	90.9%	All sections of On-Ground (x 3) and Blended (x 1) students met or exceeded the performance standard, whether with FT or PT instructors. By contrast, only 1 of 3 Online sections (by a PT instructor) met the standard. The 2 low-performing Online sections were taught by a FT instructor, who also teaches Composition. Results suggest that either this FT instructor graded students' writing by a higher standard, or that the other instructors were more (too?) generous in evaluating students' writing (especially insofar as the 2 highest performing categories were taught by the same PT instructor). Does this indicate poorer instruction	Y
37	FT	OG																																																						
17	FT	OL																																																						
17	PT	B																																																						
37	FT	OG																																																						
18	FT	OL																																																						
10	PT	OG																																																						
11	PT	OL																																																						
28	FT	OG	75.7%																																																					
8	FT	OL	47.1%																																																					
17	PT	B	100%																																																					
31	FT	OG	83.8%																																																					
12	FT	OL	66.7%																																																					
7	PT	OG	70%																																																					
10	PT	OL	90.9%																																																					

A. Course	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Results	G. Conclusions	H. Standards Met (Y/N)																																																								
	“diverse forces.”			<u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	<u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	and/or weaker learning in FT sections? It seems more likely that PT instructors are more generous in their grading.																																																									
HUM 2223 Humanities II	Students will submit an essay in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them. Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”	At least 70% of students who submit the essay will score 70% or higher.	Data from all students who submitted the essay are included. Categorized by: <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT & <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG, Online = OL, Blended = B.	165 Total students Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>23</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>47</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td></tr><tr><td>29</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td></tr></table> <u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	23	FT	OG	16	FT	OL	16	PT	OG	10	PT	OL	13	PT	B	47	FT	OG	29	FT	OL	11	PT	OL	147 of 165 total students (89.1%) met the performance standard. Students per category: Fall 2017 <table><tr><td>20</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>87%</td></tr><tr><td>12</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>75%</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>PT</td><td>OG</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>PT</td><td>B</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> Spring 2018 <table><tr><td>43</td><td>FT</td><td>OG</td><td>91.5%</td></tr><tr><td>22</td><td>FT</td><td>OL</td><td>75.9%</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>PT</td><td>OL</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <u>Summer 2018</u> To be reported on 2018-19 SLR.	20	FT	OG	87%	12	FT	OL	75%	16	PT	OG	100%	10	PT	OL	100%	13	PT	B	100%	43	FT	OG	91.5%	22	FT	OL	75.9%	11	PT	OL	100%	Results significantly exceeded the performance standard for all variations of Instructor Status & Delivery Mode but for the two FT, OL sections, one of which exceeded the standard by only 5%, while the other by ~6%. Drawing conclusions about performance differences by Delivery Mode is difficult, since no Mode necessarily out-performed the others. Yet, if one considers results in terms of Instructor Status, students in FT sections averaged overall lower results (97 of 115 = 84.35%) vs. students in PT sections (50 of 50 = 100%). Does this reflect weaker instruction/less learning in FT sections? or just more generous grading in PT sections? Anecdotal evidence suggest the latter, not the former. Two of the FT instructors also teach Composition; FT instructors expect better essay-writing.	Y
23	FT	OG																																																													
16	FT	OL																																																													
16	PT	OG																																																													
10	PT	OL																																																													
13	PT	B																																																													
47	FT	OG																																																													
29	FT	OL																																																													
11	PT	OL																																																													
20	FT	OG	87%																																																												
12	FT	OL	75%																																																												
16	PT	OG	100%																																																												
10	PT	OL	100%																																																												
13	PT	B	100%																																																												
43	FT	OG	91.5%																																																												
22	FT	OL	75.9%																																																												
11	PT	OL	100%																																																												

OUTCOME 5: DEMONSTRATE CIVIC KNOWLEDGE & ENGAGEMENT, ETHICAL REASONING, & SKILLS FOR LIFELONG LEARNING

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

PART 4

Proposed Instructional Changes Based on Conclusions Drawn from Evidence Presented Above

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

General Education Outcomes	Instructional or Assessment Changes	Rationale for Changes	Impact of Planned Changes on Student Learning and Other Considerations.
OUTCOME 3: Use written, oral, and visual communication effectively.	Require an online, proctored, timed midterm exam for all online SPAN 1113 sections.	It is possible that the decrease in online student performance in SPAN 1113 could be partially due to unfamiliarity with online testing, and the need to memorize vocabulary, verbs conjugations, and other grammatical structures in such a way as to recall them without any supporting materials. The midterm exam in SPAN 1113 for spring 2018 was not proctored on campus, and this semester is when the deepest drop in student performance on the subsequent final exam was noted. Students not only need practice with the Spanish language, but also with the process of taking exams online. Practice taking an online, proctored, timed midterm exam will give students experience with the Jenzabar testing environment, and familiarity with the process of taking online tests.	By requiring students to take an online, proctored, timed midterm exam, they will gain experience and familiarity with online testing, and will realize the necessity of memorization to the process of second language acquisition. It is hoped that by requiring this proctored exam, students will be better prepared for the final exam.

PART 5

Shared Pedagogical Insight that Improves Student Learning or Classroom Engagement

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

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

PART 6 (A & B)
Documentation of Faculty Participation and Review

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

Faculty Members	Roles in the Assessment Process (e.g., collect data, analyze data, prepare report, review report, etc.)	Signatures
Matthew Oberrieder	Assessment Coordinator. Contributed individual data for both HUM 2113 & HUM 2223; calculated, analyzed, reported, and evaluated all data for both HUM 2113 & HUM 2223; oversaw all aspects of HUM 2113 & HUM 2223 assessment process. Reviewed and proofed/corrected all submitted data for all courses; completed the report.	
SethAnn Beaird	Contributed data for both ENGL 1113 & ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Holly Clay-Buck	Contributed data for both ENGL 1113 & ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Renée Cox	Contributed data for both HUM 2113 & HUM 2223. Contributed data for both ENGL 1113 & ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Anne Dennis	Contributed data for both ENGL 1113 & ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Emily Dial-Driver	Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113, ENGL 1213, & ENGL 2613. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Sally Emmons	Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113 & ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
James Ford	Contributed and evaluated data for HUM 3633. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Francis A Grabowski III	Contributed and evaluated data for PHIL 1113 & PHIL 1313. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Laura Gray	Contributed and evaluated data for ENGL 1113, ENGL 1213, & ENGL 2613; oversaw all collection and analysis of ENGL assessment process. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Gioia Kerlin	Collected, contributed, and evaluated data for SPAN 1113. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Mary M Mackie	Department Head. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Jennifer McGovern	Writing Center Director. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Scott Reed	Contributed data for both HUM 2113 & HUM 2223. Contributed data for both ENGL 1113 & ENGL 1213. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Cecilia Townsend	Contributed data for SPAN 1113. Reviewed and approved final draft.	

B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Names	Signatures	Date
Department Head	Mary M Mackie		
Dean	Keith W Martin		

RUBRIC FOR GENERAL EDUCATION STUDENT LEARNING REPORT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exemplary	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
All conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the	Most conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the	Some conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the	No conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results or related to the

strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	strengths and weaknesses in student performance.
--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXPLANATION & EXAMPLES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT EVIDENCE

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

Examples include:

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

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

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

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