

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

Fall 2014 – Spring 2015

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

Liberal Arts, B.A.

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

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

PART 1 (A & B)

Relationship of Degree Program Learning Outcomes to Departmental and University Missions

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

University Mission	School Mission	Department Mission	Degree Program Mission
Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities.	The mission of the School of Liberal Arts is to further the study and practice of the arts, humanities, and social sciences at Rogers State University, in the community, and in the region.	The mission of the Department of English and Humanities is to support students in their pursuit of knowledge and to prepare them for participation in the increasingly global culture of the 21st century.	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.** Clearly state school purposes, department purposes and degree program student learning outcomes. Align student learning outcomes with their appropriate school and department purposes, and these outcomes and purposes with their appropriate university commitments.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking.	The School will offer innovative degrees which focus upon developing skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, and creativity.	The Department will foster the skills of critical and creative thinking, writing, communication, and research among our students.	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.
			Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.
To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.	The School will educate liberal arts majors to think critically, creatively, and independently and have the skills to work in all types of situations and communicate with all types of people.	The Department will foster the values of scholarship, creativity, appreciation of diversity, and community service among our faculty, staff, and students.	Students will 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 will offer general education courses of high quality and purpose that provide a foundation for life-long learning.	The Department will serve the University and the community by providing quality general education courses that prepare students for their roles as citizens and cultural participants.	
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs.	The School will foster a community of scholars among the faculty and students of the institution.	The Department will offer innovative programs and quality teaching within the classroom and through distance education.	Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.
To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs.			
To support and strengthen student, faculty and administrative			

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
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 2

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

List and discuss all instructional or assessment changes proposed in Part 5 of last year's Degree Program Student Learning Report, whether implemented or not. Any other changes or assessment activities from last year, but not mentioned in last year's report, should be discussed here as well. Emphasis should be placed on student learning and considerations such as course improvements, the assessment process, and the budget. If no changes were planned or implemented, simply state "No changes were planned or implemented."

Instructional or Assessment Changes	Changes Implemented (Y/N)	Impact of Changes on Degree Program Curriculum or Budget
"The Capstone Committee (ten EH faculty) is reviewing the requirements and expectations for the Capstone project. No decisions have been made yet, but further changes are being evaluated."	Y	The EH Capstone Committee has introduced several major changes in recent years. These include requiring scholarly/non-creative projects from all students, requiring a creative element of all students, and providing students with an official Guide booklet (please consult Part 5 below). Due to the ongoing nature of these changes, the Department needs to continue to gather data into the future before we can speak definitively about the impact of these changes.

PART 3

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

The University Assessment Committee in its Degree Program Peer Review Report provided feedback and recommendations for improvement in assessment. List or accurately summarize all feedback and recommendations from the committee, and state whether they were implemented or will be implemented at a future date. If they were not or will not be implemented, please explain why. If no changes were recommended last year, simply state "No changes were recommended."

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

PART 4

Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes

For all student learning outcomes (as listed in Part 1 B above), describe the assessment measures and performance standards used, as well as the sampling methods and sample sizes. For each measure, document the results of the activity measured and draw relevant conclusions related to strengths and weaknesses of their performance.

A. Student Learning Outcomes	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Performance Results	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
1) Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.	1a) Students in the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993) are required to create a Capstone Project Proposal .	At least 75% of the students completing the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993) will score a “3” or higher (using a five point scale) on their Capstone Project Proposal . The grade is determined by the BALA Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993) is included. All students in the sample are BALA program majors.	9 Total students <u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u> 7 On-Ground 2 Directed Study Online <u>Breakdown by Option:</u> 7 English (5 OG + 2 DSO) 2 Global Humanities (2 OG)	9 of 9 Total students (100%) met the performance standard. <u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u> 7 of 7 (100%) On-Ground 2 of 2 (100%) Directed Study Online <u>Breakdown by Option:</u> 7 of 7 (100%) English (5 OG+ 2 DSO) 2 of 2 (100%) Global Humanities (2 OG)	Y
	1b) Students in the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993) are required to	At least 75% of the students completing the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993)	Data from all students completing the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993)	9 Total students <u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u>	9 of 9 Total students (100%) met the performance standard. <u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u>	Y

	present their Capstone Project Proposal in a Presentation to the BALA Capstone Committee.	will score a “3” or higher (using a five point scale) on their Capstone Project Proposal Presentation . The grade is determined by the BALA Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	is included. All students in the sample are BALA program majors.	7 On-Ground 2 Directed Study Online <u>Breakdown by Option:</u> 7 English (5 OG + 2 DSO) 2 Global Humanities (2 OG)	7 of 7 (100%) On-Ground 2 of 2 (100%) Directed Study Online <u>Breakdown by Option:</u> 7 of 7 (100%) English (5 OG + 2 DSO) 2 of 2 (100%) Global Humanities (2 OG)	
	1c) Students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) are required to complete a 25-35 page scholarly Paper/Project (This measure changed in 2013-14).	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) will score a “3” or higher (using a five point scale) on their 25-35 page scholarly Paper/Project . The grade is determined by the BALA 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 BALA program majors.	9 Total students <u>Breakdown On-Ground vs. Online:</u> 7 On-Ground 2 Directed Study Online <u>Breakdown by Option:</u> 7 English (5 OG + 2 DSO) 2 Global Humanities (2 OG)	5 of 9 Total students (55.6%) met the performance standard. <u>Breakdown On-Ground vs. Online:</u> 4 of 7 (57.14%) On-Ground 1 of 2 (50%) Directed Study Online <u>Breakdown by Option:</u> 4 of 7 (57.14%) English (3 OG = 60%+ 1 DSO = 50%) 1 of 2 (50%) Global Humanities (1 OG = 50%)	N

	<p>1d) Students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) are required to present their projects orally before the BALA Capstone Committee and answer a series of questions related to their projects.</p>	<p>At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) will score a “3” or higher (using a five point scale) in presenting their projects orally before the BALA Capstone Committee.</p> <p>The grade is determined by the BALA Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.</p>	<p>Data from all students completing the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) is included.</p> <p>All students in the sample are BALA program majors.</p>	<p>9 Total students</p> <hr/> <p><u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u></p> <p>7 On-Ground</p> <p>2 Directed Study Online</p> <hr/> <p><u>Breakdown by Option:</u></p> <p>7 English (5 OG + 2 DSO)</p> <p>2 Global Humanities (2 OG)</p> <hr/>	<p>5 of 9 Total students (55.6%) met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u></p> <p>4 of 7 (57.14%) On-Ground</p> <p>1 of 2 (50%) Directed Study Online</p> <hr/> <p><u>Breakdown by Option:</u></p> <p>5 of 7 (71.43%) English (4 OG = 80% + 1 DSO = 50%)</p> <p>0 of 2 (0%) Global Humanities (0 OG = 0%)</p> <hr/>	N
--	--	---	---	---	--	---

G. Conclusions

Results overall for SLO #1 are mixed. Assessment of SLO #1 resolves into two pairs of parallel measures, conducted [1] fall and [2] spring, respectively: [1] (1a) a written Capstone Project Proposal and (1b) an oral Capstone Project Proposal Presentation, both in *Humanities Seminar* (HUM-4993) fall semester, and [2] (1c) a written Capstone Project and (1d) an oral Capstone Project Presentation, both in *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM-4013) spring semester. Fall semester results are highly positive: 100% of students met the performance standard for both the written and the oral assessment measure. Spring semester results are highly disappointing: only 55.6% of these same students met the performance standard for both the written and the oral assessment measure. The department attributes this performance decline from fall to spring to two main conspiring and compounding factors.

In 2012-13, the Capstone Committee still allowed creative (vs. strictly scholarly) Capstone Projects. Analyzing assessment results, the Committee concluded that strictly creative projects tended to exhibit (and perhaps, in the weaker students, inadvertently encouraged) weaker student work. If one consults the 2012-13 BALA Degree Program SLR, Part 4, one sees that: only 5 of 10 (50%) written proposals (!) for strictly creative projects [cf. 1a, column G.] and only 3 of 10 (30%) creative project presentations (vs. 10 of 13 = 76.9% of scholarly project presentations) [cf. 1c, columns F. & G., as well as 1d, column F.] met the performance standard in 2012-13.

Thus, for 2013-14, the Committee modified the Capstone Project requirement--and, thus, both the written Proposal and the oral Presentation requirements (and, thus, the Assessment Measures)--to eliminate creative projects (and, thus, creative proposals). This modification, with its requirement of a 25-35 page scholarly Paper/Project (cf. column B., 1c), resulted in more successful Capstone Project Proposals (column B., 1a) and Presentations (column B., 1b), as well as more successful Capstone Papers (column B., 1c) and Presentations (cf. column B., 1d).

This 2013-14 improvement continued in 2014-15 for Capstone Proposals (1a) and Capstone Presentations (1b), as this report reflects (cf. 1a and 1b, column F.). At the same time, however, for the actual Capstone Papers/Projects (1c) and Presentations (1d), these same students declined in their performance (cf. 1c and 1d, column F.) Part of the explanation for this decline in performance from fall to spring is simply the emergence of the limitations of students' abilities in the difference in the academic demands involved in their writing and presenting a Proposal for a project (in the fall) versus their efforts actually to complete this proposed Project (in the spring). In brief, the students who do not meet the performance standards in the spring are showing the limits or peak of their abilities.

Another factor in the fall/spring decline is the difference between on-ground and online students. Due to too small of a cohort of online students, the Dept. could not offer an online section of the *Humanities Seminar* (HUM-4993); instead, 2 students took this course as a Directed Study online. In the fall, both of these students met the performance standards for the two assessment measures, and this includes their both delivering their proposal presentations (1b) online/virtually via Skype. Their performance is an improvement over 2013-14, where only 1 of 3 (33%) of Directed Study Online students met the performance standard. Nevertheless, in the spring, only 1 of 2 (50%) of these 2014-15 directed study students met the performance standard for her actual Capstone Paper (1c) and Capstone Paper Presentation (1d).

The BALA Capstone Committee believes that all students greatly benefit from and, thus, need the structure and support of taking both the *Humanities Seminar* (HUM-4993) and the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM-4013) with a sufficient number of classmates in an on-ground setting. Thus, the Committee discourages students from requesting to take either of these courses as a Directed Study Online. Nevertheless, for some students, especially those who have completed most of their previous coursework online due to work and family obligations, the department works to accommodate these students toward the completion of their degree, but we seek to use directed study online only in exigent circumstances.

A. Student Learning Outcomes	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Performance Results	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
2) Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.	2a) Students in the Humanities Seminar (HUM 4993) are required to turn in a Reflective Essay draft	At least 75% of the students completing the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993) will score a "3" or higher (using a five point scale)	Data from all students completing the Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993) is included. All students in the	9 Total students <u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u> 7 On-Ground 2 Directed Study Online	This measure was not assessed in 2014-15 due to a change in the Assessment Coordinator and a miscommunication between the Assessment Coordinator and the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) instructor. This issue has been corrected for	N

	based on a portfolio of work from previous courses.	on their Reflective Essay draft . The grade is determined by the BALA Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	sample are BALA program majors.	<hr/> Breakdown by Option: 7 English (5 OG + 2 DSO) 2 Global Humanities (2 OG)	2015-16	
	2b) Students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013) are required to complete a 12–15 page Reflective Essay .	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013) will score a “3” or higher (using a five point scale) on their 12-15 page Reflective Essay . The grade is determined by the BALA 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 BALA program majors.	9 Total students <hr/> Breakdown On-Ground vs. Online: 7 On-Ground 2 Directed Study Online <hr/> Breakdown by Option: 7 English (5 OG + 2 DSO) 2 Global Humanities (2 OG)	7 of 9 Total students (77.8%) met the performance standard. <hr/> Breakdown On-Ground vs. Online: 6 of 7 (85.71%) On-Ground 1 of 2 (50%) Directed Study Online <hr/> Breakdown by Option: 6 of 7 (85.71%) English (5 OG = 100% + 1 DSO = 50%) 1 of 2 (50%) Global Humanities (1 OG = 50%)	Y
G. Conclusions						
Assessment measure 2a) was assessed in 2011-12 & 2013-14, but not in 2012-13 or 2014-15, due to changes in Capstone assessment practices, the Assessment Coordinator, and a miscommunication between the Assessment Coordinator and the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) instructor. This issue has been corrected for 2015-16 and 2015-16 data will be reported for assessment measure 2a) next year (2016-17).						

For assessment measure 2b), results overall are positive, even if not as high as the department would like for them to be. The obvious weakness in performance results emerges again in the case of directed study online students (in this case, the DSO student was also a Global Humanities option). The department strongly believes that it is in the best interest of student learning that all BALA students complete the entire Capstone process on-ground.

A. Student Learning Outcomes	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Performance Results	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
3) Students will evidence an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on the human condition.	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 BALA program majors.	12 Total students <u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u> 7 On-Ground Spring 2015 5 Online Summer 2015	11 of 12 Total students (91.7%) met the performance standard. <u>Breakdown</u> <u>On-Ground vs. Online:</u> 7 of 7 (100%) On-Ground Spring 2015 4 of 5 (80%) Online Summer 2015	Y

**G.
Conclusions**

Results for SLO #3 are very positive and indicate student success. BALA program majors have been tracked separately the past four years. Program majors have been more successful than non-BALA students the past three years, although small sample sizes make direct comparisons problematic. Faculty will continue to track results.

A. Student Learning Outcomes	B. Assessment Measures	C. Performance Standards	D. Sampling Methods	E. Sample Size (N)	F. Performance Results	H. Performance Standards Met (Y/N)
4) Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BALA) degree program.	Students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BALA) degree will complete the School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey as a part of their graduation application process.	At least 80% of students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BALA) degree will express overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the degree.	<p>Students must complete the School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey at the time they apply for graduation.</p> <p>Applications for graduation are not considered complete and will not be forwarded unless the completed Survey is attached to the application.</p> <p>All students in the sample are BALA program majors.</p>	<p>10 Total students.</p> <p>Results are taken from the 2014-2015 SLA Graduating Student Survey, disaggregated by degree program, as completed by the Office for Accountability and Academics.</p>	<p>8 of 10 total students (80%) expressed overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the BALA degree.</p> <hr/> <p>Students rated their level of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in response to a series of categories/questions as indicated below.</p> <hr/> <p><u>“Quality of Instruction in Major”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 8 (80%)</p> <p>“somewhat dissatisfied” = 2 (20%)</p> <hr/> <p><u>“Preparation for Advanced Classes in Major”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 8 (80%)</p> <p>“somewhat dissatisfied” = 1 (10%)</p> <p>“very dissatisfied” = 1 (10%)</p> <hr/> <p><u>“Overall Major Experience”</u></p> <p>“very satisfied” = 7 (70%)</p> <p>“somewhat satisfied” = 1 (10%)</p> <p>“somewhat dissatisfied” = 1 (10%)</p> <p>“very dissatisfied” = 1 (10%)</p> <hr/>	Y

					<u>"Overall Department Experience"</u> "very satisfied" = 7 (70%) "somewhat satisfied" = 1 (10%) "somewhat dissatisfied" = 2 (20%) <hr/> <u>"Overall RSU Experience"</u> "very satisfied" = 7 (70%) "somewhat satisfied" = 1 (10%) "somewhat dissatisfied" = 2 (20%)	
G. Conclusions						
<p>Results overall for SLO #4 are positive and consistent with the past few years.</p> <p>In every category assessed, a high majority of BALA student expressed overall satisfaction with the degree program, the department, & RSU. One may conclude that BALA students are satisfied with the educational experience afforded by their degree.</p> <p>Of the 10 total students who completed the survey, two (the same two) did repeatedly express dissatisfaction. The main complaints regarding the degree were the large amount of reading and writing, as well as the rigor of the Capstone Process. The department is satisfied that these expressions of dissatisfaction actually indicate the academic strength of our degree program.</p>						

PART 5

Proposed Instructional Changes Based on Conclusions Drawn from Evidence Presented Above

State any proposed instructional or assessment changes to be implemented for the next academic year. They should be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 (above) or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum, degree plan, assessment process, or budget. If no changes are planned, simply state “No changes are planned.”

Student Learning Outcomes	Instructional or Assessment Changes	Rationale for Changes	Impact of Planned Changes on Student Learning and Other Considerations.
<p>SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.</p> <p>SLO #2: Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.</p>	<p>For 2015-16, the EH Capstone Committee developed for, and distributed to, rising seniors (at the end of May 2015) a small packet of information regarding the overall Capstone process. This packet included a welcome letter and a Guide booklet that details the expectations for, and requirements of, the features of the Capstone process, in order to better guide students through the Capstone process. This same Guide also is posted on the “Online Resources” page of the Writing Center website.</p> <p>In conjunction with the Stratton Taylor Library, the Writing Center Director (who is a BALA faculty and Capstone Committee member) has developed a University-wide Capstone Support Group. The Group will meet throughout the academic year to bring together students and faculty members University-wide to share practices and insights regarding the Capstone process, as well as to provide mutual support.</p> <p>The Capstone Committee (11 of 16 BALA faculty) continues to review the requirements and expectations for the Capstone project. No decisions have been made yet, but further changes are being evaluated.</p>	<p>The Capstone Committee is concerned about the number of students who fail to complete the Capstone process, or who require more than one attempt. The Committee wants to be certain that the expectations are reasonable for all BALA students. Furthermore, students who struggle with the Capstone process have stated that they are unclear about its workings. In providing students with a printed Guide booklet in advance of the Capstone process, we expect the result to be higher quality, or at least greater consistency in (i.e., less disparity between the strongest and the weakest), the students’ proposals and projects, as well as less frustration for both students and faculty.</p>	<p>Student learning is our primary goal. Some students do well until their final year, but then struggle significantly in the Capstone process. Some students do well in the proposal stage, but then struggle to complete their proposed project. Recent changes have improved this gap, but it remains a concern, as evidenced by the Directed Study results this year, and the online results the past three years.</p>

PART 6

Shared Pedagogical Insight that Improves Student Learning or Classroom Engagement

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

Description

PART 7 (A & B)

Assessment Measures and Faculty Participation

A. Assessment Measures:

- 1) How many different assessment measures were used? 8
- 2) List the direct measures (see rubric): [1] Capstone Proposal; [2] Capstone Proposal Presentation; [3] Capstone Paper/Project; [4] Capstone Paper/Project Presentation; [5] Reflective Paper Proposal; [6] Reflective Paper; [7] Comparative Religion Essay
- 3) List the indirect measures (see rubric): [8] School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey

B.

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

Faculty Members	Roles in the Assessment Process (e.g., collect data, analyze data, prepare report, review report, etc.)	Signatures
Matthew Oberrieder	Assessment Coordinator. Collected, confirmed, and evaluated data for HUM-4013 and HUM-4993. Reported and evaluated data from the School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey. Prepared report and approved final draft.	
Sara Beam	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Holly Clay-Buck	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Renée Cox	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Emily Dial-Driver	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Sally Emmons	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
James Ford	Contributed and evaluated data for HUM-3633, HUM-4013, and HUM-4993. Reviewed, edited, and approved final draft.	
Francis Grabowski	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Laura Gray	Assessment Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Gioia Kerlin	Assessment Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Diana Lurz	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Mary M Mackie	Department Head. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Frances Morris	Assessment Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Scott Reed	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Cecilia Townsend	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Brenda Tuberville	Reviewed and approved final draft.	

2) Reviewed by:

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

RUBRIC FOR STUDENT LEARNING STUDENT LEARNING REPORT

1) A. Are the school, department and program missions clearly stated?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
The program, department, and school missions are clearly stated.	The program, department, and school missions are stated, yet exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief).	The program, department, and school missions are incomplete and exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief).	The program, department, and school missions are not stated.

B. Are student learning outcomes and department purposes aligned with university commitments and school purposes?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
Student learning outcomes and department purposes are aligned with university commitments and school purposes.	Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate some alignment with university commitments and school purposes.	Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate limited alignment with university commitment and school purposes.	Student learning outcomes and department purposes do not demonstrate alignment with university commitment and school purposes.

2) How well did the department incorporate instructional or assessment changes from last year's report or from other assessment activities?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = 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.

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

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
All reviewer feedback was listed, and for each suggestion a clear rationale was given for its being	Most reviewer feedback was listed, and for most suggestions a rationale was given for their being	Some reviewer feedback was listed, and for some suggestions a rationale was given for their being	Feedback from reviewers was not included.

implemented or not.	implemented or not.	implemented or not.	
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	--

4) A. Are the student learning outcomes listed and measurable?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
All student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy).	Most student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy).	Some student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy).	Student learning outcomes are either not listed or not measurable.

B. Are the assessment measures appropriate for the student learning outcomes?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
All assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes.	Most assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes.	Some assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes.	None of the assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes.

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

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = 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?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = 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?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
Sample size was listed for all	Sample size was listed for most	Sample size was listed for some	Sample size was not listed for any

assessment measures.	assessment measures.	assessment measures.	assessment measures.
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

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

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
For all student learning 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 student learning 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 student learning 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 student learning outcomes were the results clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance.

G. Are the conclusions reasonably drawn and significantly related to student learning outcomes?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
All conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	Most conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	Some conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.	No conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results or related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance.

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

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
Stated for all performance standards.	Stated for most performance standards.	Stated for some performance standards.	Not stated for any performance standard.

- 5) How well supported is the rationale for making assessment or instructional changes? The justification can be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 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.**

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
All planned changes are specifically focused on student	Most planned changes are specifically focused on student	Some planned changes are specifically focused on student	No planned changes are specifically focused on student

learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is well grounded and convincingly explained.	learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is mostly well grounded and convincingly explained.	learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is lacking or is not convincingly explained.	learning and based on the conclusions. There is no rationale.
---	--	---	---

6) Did the faculty include at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom?

Yes	No		
The faculty has included at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom.	The faculty has not included any teaching techniques they believe improve student learning or student engagement in the classroom.		

7) A. How well did the faculty vary the assessment measures?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = Undeveloped
Assessment measures vary and include multiple direct measures and at least one indirect measure. The number of measures is consistent with those listed.	Assessment measures vary, but they are all direct. The number of measures is consistent with those listed.	Assessment measures do not vary or are all indirect. There is some inconsistency in the number of measures recorded and the total listed.	Assessment measures are not all listed or are listed in the wrong category. The total number of measures is not consistent with those listed.

B. Does the list of faculty participants clearly describe their role in the assessment process?

4 = Exemplary	3 = Established	2 = Developing	1 = 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