

Degree Program Student Learning Report

Revised August 2017

Department of English & Humanities

BA in Liberal Arts **For 2020-2021 Academic Year**

PART 1

Degree Program Mission and Student Learning Outcomes

A. State the school, department, and degree program missions.

University Mission	School Mission	Department Mission	Degree Program Mission
Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities.	Central to the mission of the School of Arts and Sciences is the preparation of students to achieve professional and personal goals in their respective disciplines and to enable their success in dynamic local and global communities. Our strategy is to foster an academic setting of diverse curricula that inherently incorporates an environment of service and collegiality.	The mission of the Department of English and Humanities at Rogers State University is to support students in their pursuit of knowledge and to prepare them for participation in the increasingly globalized culture of the 21st century.	The Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts is an innovative, interdisciplinary degree that fosters students who think critically, creatively, and independently, and who have the skills to work in all types of situations and communicate with all types of people.

B. Align school purposes, department purposes, and program student learning outcomes with their appropriate University commitments.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking.	The School of Arts and Sciences offers innovative degrees, which focus upon developing skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, creativity, empirical and evidenced-based inquiry, experimental investigation and theoretical explanation of natural phenomena, and innovative technology	Foster the skills of critical and creative thinking, writing, communication, and research among our students.	1) Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills as well as the ability to think creatively and critically. 2) Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.	The School of Arts and Sciences educates its majors to think independently and have the knowledge, skills and vision to work in all types of situations and careers and communicate with all types of people.	Foster the values of scholarship, creativity, appreciation of diversity, and community service among our faculty, staff, and students.	3) Students will evidence an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on the human condition.
To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic programs and prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.	The School of Arts and Sciences offers general education courses of high quality and purpose that provide a foundation for lifelong learning.	Serve the University and the community by providing quality general education courses that prepare students for their roles as citizens and cultural participants.	
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs.	The School of Arts and Sciences fosters a community of scholars among the faculty and students of the institution.	Offer innovative programs and quality teaching within the classroom and through distance education.	4) Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.
To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs.		Facilitate the formation of groups of citizen-scholars consisting of faculty and students that meet outside the traditional classroom setting.	
To support and strengthen student, faculty, and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution.			
To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff, and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual and personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves.	The School of Arts and Sciences will offer and promote artistic, scientific, cultural, and public affairs events on the campus and in the region.		

PART 2

Revisit Proposed Changes Made in Previous Assessment Cycle

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

Proposed Change	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comments
None	NA	Before 2013-14, BA-LA students completed either a scholarly paper or a creative project. Starting 2013-14, all BA-LA students were required to complete a 25-35-page scholarly paper. The 2013-14 change to assessment measure 1C reflected the Capstone Committee's concern about the perennial weakness of too many of the creative projects. The Committee concluded that too many students chose the creative project believing that it would be easier to complete, only to discover that it was more difficult, which resulted in poorer performance results, thus undermining the purpose of the assessment measure. Also, the Committee found it problematic to assess consistently the two different types of projects in relation to one another. Thus, the 2013-14 change afforded the Committee a more uniform measure toward greater consistency in assessing students' performance and learning outcomes. For the most part, the Capstone Committee was satisfied with assessment measure 1C, but we also recognized that it was conceived more for those students who both aspire and are able to engage the liberal arts at a higher (or the highest, undergraduate) level, and who are considering or plan to continue their education in graduate school. Thus, in 2017-18 the Capstone Committee decided to allow students again to choose from two options for their Capstone projects: a 25-35-page scholarly paper [measure 1C] or a 7-10-page research paper with a visual triptych [measure 1E]. This 2017-18 change preserves a scholarly Option #1 (meas. 1C & 1D) for the abovementioned students, but it also re-introduces an Option #2 (meas. 1E & 1F) by which to assess the performance of students who intend to go directly into the workforce. 2020-21 is only the fourth year assessing these two options separately.

PART 3

Response to University Assessment Committee Peer Review

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

Peer Review Feedback	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comment
"Part 2: You have no proposed changes yet have a long comment. There is no need to keep commenting on a change that took place in 2013-14."	N	Preserving the comment about the historical changes preserves historical context for analyzing annual and historical results.
"Part 4: The conclusions are what you glean from the data, not a repeat of the data, nor an addition of data. Perhaps more narrative expounding on the skills and development of your students would be more appropriate."	Y	Because the narrative conclusions are already long and complex, repetition of data, and additional data analysis, are introduced where necessary to present direct evidence to support the narrative, especially when data tables (evidence) appear on separate pages. Furthermore, narrative conclusions about skills and development of students are already in the narrative expounding.
"General recommendation: Assessing two different types of projects seems counterintuitive to effective assessment. Consider only one type of project so that the data can be compared/contrasted properly."	N	The Capstone Committee is maintaining the two project options for the time being. Furthermore, the narrative conclusions do compare and contrast the data effectively.

PART 4

Evidence of Student Learning

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

A. Student Learning Outcome #1						
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)	
1A Students in the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) are required to create a <i>Capstone Project Proposal</i> . NOTE: HUM 4993 is taught fall semesters only.	At least 75% of the students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their <i>Capstone Project Proposal</i> . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	12 total students	9 of 12 total students = 75% met the performance standard.	Y	
			6 On-Ground 6 Online	5 of 6 On-Ground = 83.34% 4 of 6 Online = 66.67%		
			7 English = 5 OG + 2 OL 5 Global Humanities = 1 OG + 4 OL	5 of 7 English (4 OG + 1 OL) = 71.43% 4 of 5 Global Humanities (1 OG + 3 OL) = 80%		
			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale			
			SCORE	STUDENTS		%
			5	2		16.67%
			4.5	2		16.67%
			4	1		8.34%
			3.5	1		8.34%
			3	3		25%
2	2	16.67%				
1	1	8.34%				
Average Score of All Passing Scores = 3.94 Average Score of All Scores = 3.375						

A. Student Learning Outcome #1						
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)	
1B Students in the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) are required to present their Capstone Project Proposal in a Presentation to the Capstone Committee. NOTE: HUM 4993 is taught fall semesters only.	At least 75% of the students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their Capstone Project Proposal Presentation . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	12 total students	10 of 12 total students = 83.34% met the performance standard.	Y	
			6 On-Ground 6 Online	6 of 6 On-Ground = 100% 4 of 6 Online = 66.67%		
			7 English = 5 OG + 2 OL 5 Global Humanities = 1 OG + 4 OL	6 of 7 English (5 OG + 1 OL) = 85.71% 4 of 5 Global Humanities (1 OG + 3 OL) = 80%		
			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale			
			SCORE	STUDENTS		%
			5	5		41.67%
			4.5	1		8.34%
			4	1		8.34%
			3.5	2		16.67%
			3	1		8.34%
2.5	1	8.34%				
2	1	8.34%				
			Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4.35 Average Score of All Scores = 4			
1C Students in the <i>Capstone Project/ Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) may choose to	At least 75% of the students in the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013)	Data from all students who complete Option #1 in the <i>Capstone</i>	5 total students	5 of 5 total students = 100% met the performance standard.	Y	
			5 On-Ground 0 Online	5 of 5 On-Ground = 100% 0 Online		

A. Student Learning Outcome #1							
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.						
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)		
complete a 25-35-page Scholarly Paper = Option #1. NOTE: This measure changed 2013-14 and again 2017-18 NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	who choose Option #1 will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 25-35-page Scholarly Paper . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	4 English = 4 OG + 0 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OG	4 of 4 English (4 OG + 0 OL) = 100% 1 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 100%			
				Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale			
				SCORE		STUDENTS	%
				5		2	40%
				4		1	20%
3.5	1	20%					
3	1	20%					
Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 4.1 Average Score of All Scores = 4.1							
1D Students in the Capstone Project/ Portfolio (HUM 4013) who chose Option #1 (cf. AM 1C) are required to present their projects orally before the Capstone Committee and answer a series of questions related to their projects. NOTE: This measure changed 2017-18	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013) who chose Option #1 will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) in presenting their projects orally before the Capstone Committee. The score is determined by the Capstone Committee	Data from all students who complete Option #1 in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English;	5 total students 5 On-Ground 0 Online 4 English = 4 OG + 0 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OG	5 of 5 total students = 100% met the performance standard.	Y		
				5 of 5 On-Ground = 100% 0 Online			
				4 of 4 English (4 OG + 0 OL) = 100% 1 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 100%			
				Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale			
				SCORE		STUDENTS	%
5	2	40%					
4.5	1	20%					
4	2	40%					

A. Student Learning Outcome #1																
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.															
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)											
NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	[2] Global Humanities.		Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 4.5 Average Score of All Scores = 4.5												
1E Students in the Capstone Project/ Portfolio (HUM 4013) may choose to complete a 7-10-page Research Paper = Option #2.	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013) who choose Option #2 will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 7-10-page Research Paper .	Data from all students who complete Option #2 in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013) is included.	5 total students	2 of 5 total students = 40% met the performance standard.	N											
			1 On-Ground 4 Online	1 of 1 On-Ground = 100% 1 of 4 Online = 25%												
			2 English = 1 OG + 1 OL 3 Global Humanities = 3 OL	1 of 2 English (1 OG + 0 OL) = 50% 1 of 3 Global Humanities (1 OL) = 33.34%												
			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale													
			<table><tr><th>SCORE</th><th>STUDENTS</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>2.5</td><td>1</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>40%</td></tr></table> Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 4 Average Score of All Scores = 2.9				SCORE	STUDENTS	%	5	1	20%	3	1	20%	2.5
SCORE	STUDENTS	%														
5	1	20%														
3	1	20%														
2.5	1	20%														
2	2	40%														
NOTE: This measure – changed 2013-14 and again 2017-18 NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.																
1F Students in the Capstone Project/ Portfolio (HUM 4013) who chose Option #2 (cf. AM 1E) are required to present a	At least 75% of the students in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013) who chose Option #2 will score a “3” or	Data from all students who complete Option #2 in the Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM 4013)	5 total students	3 of 5 total students = 60% met the performance standard.	N											
			1 On-Ground 4 Online	1 of 1 On-Ground = 100% 2 of 4 Online = 50%												
			2 English = 1 OG + 1 OL	2 of 2 English (1 OG + 1 OL) = 100%												

A. Student Learning Outcome #1						
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.					
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)	
visual triptych to the Capstone Committee and answer any questions related to their projects. NOTE: This measure changed 2017-18 NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	higher (on a five-point scale) on their visual triptych presented to the Capstone Committee.	is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	3 Global Humanities = 3 OL	1 of 3 Global Humanities (1 OL) = 33.34%		
				Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale		
				SCORE	STUDENTS	%
				5	1	20%
				4	1	20%
				3.5	1	20%
				2	1	20%
			1.5	1	20%	
				Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4.17 Average Score of All Scores = 3.3		
H. Conclusions						
SLO #1 results are complex, as they involve analyzing and interpreting data from six total assessment measures (AMs), which resolve into three pairs. Each pair aims to assess written vis-à-vis oral and visual communication skills, and critical and creative thinking, in parallel across fall and spring semesters. Thus, Pair 1 (fall sem.) = (1A) a written Capstone Project Proposal & (1B) an oral Capstone Project Proposal Presentation, both in Humanities Seminar (HUM-4993); Pairs 2 and 3 (spring sem.) = Option #1: (1C) a written Scholarly Paper & (1D) an oral Capstone Presentation, or, Option #2: (1E) a written Research Paper & (1F) a Visual Triptych (incl. oral explanation), both in Capstone Project/Portfolio (HUM-4013). Year-Over-Year distribution tables below present comparative and trend data for each of the six AMs. AM 1A 2020-21 overall performance results (75%) are the highest since (and equal to) 2015-16 results (see table below), reversing a declining trend over the previous three years (2017-18 to 2019-20) and surpassing the 8-YR average (73.63%). Likewise, both the average passing score (3.94) and the average of all scores (3.375) for 2020-21 are the highest since 2015-16, and each surpasses its 8-YR average. Moreover, internal analysis of AM 1A 2020-21 overall performance results indicates that they are downwardly distorted by a/the difference in successful performance between On-Ground students (5 of 6 = 83.34%, with an average score of 3.84) and Online students (4 of 6 = 66.67%, with an average score of 2.92). One OL student did score a “5,” but, excluding him, the other five OL students’ average score was 2.5. Furthermore, this OG versus OL performance disparity anticipates the disparity between Option #1 (cf. AMs 1C & 1D) and Option #2 (cf. AMs 1E & 1F) students (cf. appropriate tables & analysis below). For AM 1A, all twelve students completed the same fall 2020 written Project Proposal, but five of these students completed Option #2 spring 2021, with only three (60%) scoring “3” or higher on the Proposal (AM 1A). Of the five Option #2 students, four were OL students.						

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

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

Unfortunately, the low fall 2020 AM 1A performance of the five Option #2 students anticipated their low spring 2021 performance in completing their Option #2. AM 1E results: 2 of 5 = 40% (1 of 1 OG vs. 1 of 4 OL). AM 1F results: 3 of 5 = 60% (1 of 1 OG vs. 2 of 4 OL). For AM 1A, of the six OG students, the only one who did not meet the performance standard was an Option #2 student, while the five remaining OG students' results for Option #1 were 100% for both AM 1C & 1D. For AM 1A, of the six OL students, two did not continue to Capstone spring 2021 (one failed and must repeat the process 2021-22, the other--who scored a "5"--withdrew for family reasons), but of the four who did continue to Capstone, all four were Option #2, and their results were 1 of 4 = 25% for AM 1E and 2 of 4 = 50% for AM 1F.

In the final analysis, the Capstone Committee wants to see stronger student performance results overall for AM 1A, but the Committee observes that the specific issue involves OL students, and especially the combination of OL and Option #2 students (cf. appropriate tables & analysis below). The Committee believes that at least part of the explanation for AM 1A (written proposal) overall lower results *vis-à-vis* AM 1C (completed written paper) is simply a function of the preliminary, provisional character AM 1A, *i.e.*, it is a proposal. The Committee recognizes that some students have difficulty fully and clearly conceptualizing and articulating their preliminary ideas for a project before they delve into working to complete it, and that this difficulty is inherent in the Capstone process--which also helps to clarify why completed projects historically score higher than do proposals. This difficulty seems especially so for OL and Option #2 students and is discussed further below.

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

RUBRIC SCORE		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		8-YR	
5	2	16.67%	2	18.18%			1	10%	1	7.1%	3	25%		2	11.8%		11 of 91	12.09%	
	2	16.67%					1	10%	1	7.1%			1	11.1%		5 of 91	5.5%		
4	1	8.34%			1	16.67%	2	20%	3	21.4%	3	25%	3	33.3%	5	29.4%	18 of 91	19.78%	
3.5	1	8.34%			1	16.67%	2	20%	3	21.4%					2	11.8%	9 of 91	9.89%	
3	3	25%	4	36.36%	2	33.34%	1	10%	1	7.1%	3	25%	5	55.6%	5	29.4%	24 of 91	26.37%	
2.5			1	9.09%			1	10%									2 of 91	2.2%	
2	2	16.67%	2	18.18%	2	33.34%	1	10%	5	35.7%	1	8.3%		2	11.8%		15 of 91	16.48%	
1	1	8.34%	2	18.18%			1	10%			2	16.7%		1	5.9%		7 of 91	7.69%	
MET "3" STANDARD	9	75%	6	54.55%	4	66.67%	7	70%	9	64.3%	9	75%	9	100%	14	82.4%	67 of 91	73.63%	
AVE PASSING SCORE		3.94		3.67		3.38		3.93		3.89		4		3.5	3.7		3.75		
AVE OF ALL SCORES		3.375		2.77		2.92		3.3		3.21		3.33		3.5	3.35		3.22		

A. Student Learning Outcome #1																			
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.																		
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard			D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)			F. Results				G. Standard Met (Y/N)						
AM 1B 2020-21 overall performance results (83.34%) are ~10% higher than 2019-20 results, but consistent with the 8-YR average (82.42%), though surpassing it by ~1% (see table below). Like AM 1A 2020-21 results, AM 1B 2020-21 average passing score (4.35) is the highest since 2015-16 (4.38) and, thus, the second highest in eight years, also surpassing the 8-YR average (4.03). AM 1B 2020-21 average of all scores (4) is the highest in eight years, also surpassing the 8-YR average (3.61). Unfortunately, as with AM 1A 2020-21 results, internal analysis of AM 1B 2020-21 overall performance results indicates a disparity in successful performance between On-Ground students (6 of 6 = 100%, with an average score of 4.5) and Online students (4 of 6 = 66.67%, with an average score of 3.5).																			
AM 1B: Oral Presentation (Fall Semester) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Performance Results																			
RUBRIC SCORE	2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		8-YR		
5	5	41.67%	2	18.18%			3	30%	5	35.7%	5	41.7%	2	22.2%	1	5.9%	23 of 91	25.27%	
4.5	1	8.34%											2	22.2%	2	11.8%	5 of 91	5.49%	
4	1	8.34%	3	27.27%	4	66.67%	3	30%	1	7.1%	1	8.3%			6	35.3%	19 of 91	20.88%	
3.5	2	16.67%	1	9.09%			2	20%							4	23.5%	9 of 91	9.89%	
3	1	8.34%	2	18.18%	2	33.34%			6	42.9%	2	16.7%	5	55.6%	1	5.9%	19 of 91	20.88%	
2.5	1	8.34%															1 of 91	1.1%	
2	1	8.34%	1	9.09%			1	10%	2	14.3%	1	8.3%			2	11.8%	8 of 91	8.79%	
1.5			1	9.09%													1 of 91	1.1%	
1			1	9.09%			1	10%			3	25%			1	5.9%	6 of 91	6.59%	
		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		8-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	10	83.34%	8	72.73%	6	100%	8	80%	12	85.7%	8	66.7%	9	100%	14	82.4%	75 of 91	82.42%	
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.35		3.94		3.67		4.25		3.92		4.38		3.78		3.93		4.03		
AVE OF ALL SCORES	4		3.25		3.67		3.7		3.64		3.33		3.78		3.53		3.61		
If one compares year-over-year performance results for AM 1A & AM 1B (as Pair 1, per the introductory paragraph), 2020-21 results continue the now-five-year trend (since 2016-17) of BA-LA students performing ~10-30% better on AM 1B (Oral Presentation) than on AM 1A (Written Proposal), with AM 1B 8-YR average results (82.42%) surpassing AM 1A 8-YR average results (73.63%) by 8.79%. In fact, 2015-16 is the only year that AM 1B results did not surpass AM 1A results. Rather than rehearse further detailed data already presented in the AM 1A and AM 1B year-over-year distribution tables above, five sets of reflections below offer some analysis and interpretation to explain why BA-LA students annually perform better on AM 1B than on AM 1A.																			

A. Student Learning Outcome #1				
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.			
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results
G. Standard Met (Y/N)				
Five reflections on AM 1A <i>vis-à-vis</i> AM 1B. First, AM 1A is a written <i>proposal</i> for a project that students will complete in the spring semester (AM 1C or AM 1E). As expressed above in AM 1A conclusions, in developing their proposals (fall semester), students are still working to conceptualize clearly and to articulate cogently their preliminary ideas and research/scholarship plans. Second, the BA-LA degree emphasizes writing skills, whether students concentrate in English or in Humanities, and the Capstone Committee rightly has higher expectations for students' formal writing skills in developing their proposals than it does for their oral communication regarding their proposals. In brief, the Committee correctly holds students' writing to a higher standard and is properly stingy regarding assessment scores for AM 1A. Third, AM 1B involves students answering oral questions from the Committee; this process enables and encourages students to clarify features of their written proposal that are less than cogent. Thus, the Committee is heartened when students with problematic written proposals answer oral questions clearly and thoughtfully. In brief, higher performance scores on AM 1B often reflect the difference between the Committee's disappointment in students' writing and the Committee's reassurance when students provide oral clarification. Furthermore, part of the purpose of AM 1B, and especially of the Committee's oral questions, is to help students to clarify and articulate more cogently the ideas and features of their proposed project. In brief, the interactive and inherently pedagogical character of AM 1B results in higher scores. Fourth, this AM 1B interaction illuminates a factor in the written proposal process that clarifies some low(er) results for AM 1A, namely, too many students, in writing their proposal, do not interact enough with their faculty mentor--despite being instructed to do so! Unfortunately, this issue is perhaps most prevalent among and problematic regarding the weakest students, and perhaps especially Online students, who often least interact with and/or seek help from their faculty mentor. In brief, students who most need mentoring too often least seek and/or accept it. Fifth, some students are simply more natural speakers than they are scholarly writers--though the interactive character of AM 1B surely assists students in more successfully discussing their proposals. Now to analyze students' spring 2021 performance on two pairs of measures designed to parallel AMs 1A & 1B, overall results involve a stark disparity between students who completed Option #1 (AMs 1C & 1D) and students who completed Option #2 (AMs 1E & 1F). As expressed above in AM 1A conclusions, analyzing and interpreting the disparity in results between Option #1 students and Option #2 students involves performance disparities between On-Ground and Online students. AM 1C (Option #1 written) 2020-21 overall performance results (100%) match the previous high percentage of 2018-19 (100%) and surpass the 8-YR average (83.08%) by 16.92% (see table below). Moreover, AM 1C 2020-21 average passing score (4.1), although slightly lower than the 2019-20 score (4.55), is, nevertheless, the second highest over eight years and surpasses the 8-YR average (3.89). In brief, Option #1 students have performed consistently well over eight years. Note, again, that AM 1C, the spring semester Capstone Scholarly Paper, constitutes the completed counterpart to AM 1A, the fall semester written Project Proposal. If one compares the year-over-year table of AM 1C performance results to the year-over-year table of AM 1A performance results, one observes AM 1C annually consistently higher overall performance results (excepting 2014-15) and average passing scores than AM 1A performance results. AM 1C higher performance results suggest the positive outcome of students' learning (improved writing skills and creative and critical thinking) from fall to spring semesters through the process of their completing their fall-proposed Capstone project. The one caveat to comparing and/or contrasting AM 1A and AM 1C as fall-to-spring parallel assessment measures is the separating of all AM 1A sample students into two cohorts: Option #1 (AM 1C) and Option #2 (AM 1E). As discussed in the AM 1A conclusions above, and as indicated more clearly in the AM 1E results below, Option #2 (especially Online) students do (have) not necessarily show(n) improvement from fall-to-spring.				

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

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

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

RUBRIC SCORE	2020-21		2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15		2013-14		8-YR
5	2	40%	2	33.34%		2	15.4%	1	11.1%	4	28.6%	11 of 65
4.75			1	16.67%								1 of 65
4.5			1	16.67%	1	25%	3	33.3%				7 of 65
4	1	20%			1	20%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	2	11 of 65
3.75					1	20%						1 of 65
3.5	1	20%	1	16.67%	2	50%	1	11.1%				8 of 65
3	1	20%			1	25%	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	6	15 of 65
2.5			1	16.67%			1	11.1%				3 of 65
2									4	44.4%	1	5 of 65
1.5							2	15.4%				2 of 65
1										1	7.1%	1 of 65
	2020-21		2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15		2013-14		8-YR
MET "3" STANDARD	5	100%	5	83.34%	4	100%	8	88.9%	5	55.6%	12	54 of 65
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.1		4.55		3.63		3.75		3.8		3.83	
AVE OF ALL SCORES	4.1		4.21		3.63		3.61		3		3.5	

AM 1D (Option #1 oral) 2020-21 overall performance results (100%) match the previous high percentage of 2018-19 & 2015-16 (100%) and surpass the 8-YR average (81.54%) by 18.46% (see table below). Moreover, AM 1D 2020-21 average passing score (4.5), although slightly lower than the 2019-20 score (4.8), is, nevertheless, the second highest over eight years and surpasses the 8-YR average (4.245). Certainly, across 2018-2021, Option #1 students have performed consistently well.

Of significant importance regarding AM 1C *vis-à-vis* AM 1D, their respective overall performance results across 2018-2021 are equivalent to one another. This equivalent relationship between students' written skills (AM 1C) and students' oral skills (AM 1D) is a positive contrast to the unequal relationship of AM 1A (written proposal) *vis-à-vis* AM 1B (oral presentation), where AM 1B 8-YR average results (82.42%) surpass AM 1A 8-YR average results (73.63%) by 8.79%. In brief, as with

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.

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

comparing AM 1C higher results over AM 1A, AM 1C & AM 1D equal results again suggests that students' writing and creative and critical thinking improves with their completing their spring-semester Capstone Scholarly Paper (AM 1C) from their fall-semester Proposal (AM 1A).

AM 1D: Oral Presentation (Spring Semester; Option #1) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Performance Results

RUBRIC SCORE	2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		8-YR	
5	2	40%	4	66.67%	1	25%	1	20%	2	15.4%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%	5	35.7%	21 of 65	32.31%
	1	20%			1	25%	1	20%	3	23.1%							6 of 65	9.23%
4	2	40%	1	16.67%	2	50%			2	15.4%			1	11.1%	1	7.1%	9 of 65	13.85%
3.5									1	7.7%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%			3 of 65	4.62%
3							1	20%	1	7.7%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	7	50%	14 of 65	21.54%
2.5		1	16.67%						2	15.4%							3 of 65	4.62%
2							2	40%	2	15.4%			3	33.3%	1	7.1%	8 of 65	12.31%
1													1	11.1%			1 of 65	1.54%
	2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		8-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	5	100%	5	83.34%	4	100%	3	60%	9	69.2%	9	100%	5	55.6%	13	92.9	53 of 65	81.54%
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.5		4.8		4.38		4.17		4.22		3.94		4.1		3.85		4.245	
AVE OF ALL SCORES	4.5		4.42		4.38		3.3		3.62		3.94		3.06		3.71		3.87	

Moving from analyzing results for Option #1 to Option #2, note that AM 1E & AM 1F constitute the spring semester Option #2 parallel assessment pair (cf. Part 2, above) to AM 1A & AM 1B (cf. results above). Option #2 sample sizes remain relatively small, and only four years' data (15 total students) is available for year-over-year comparisons, but trend performance results are consistently weak (see table below). For 2020-21, 5 of 12 original students completed Option #2 spring 2021. Note that 1 of these 5 Option #2 students changed her project from Option #1 fall to spring. This student's change from Option #1 to Option #2 is noteworthy for two reasons. First, this student was by far the strongest Option #2 student, and one of the strongest students overall--she scored a "5" on both AM 1E and AM 1F. Second, this student was an Online-only student throughout her RSU coursework. The consequence of having this student in the Option #2 dataset, then, somewhat artificially improves the still very poor performance results for AM 1E = 40% and AM 1F = 60%. If one sequesters from the datasets this single high-performing Option #2 (and Online) student, the already-low AM 1E results decline to only 25%, while the already-low AM 1F results decline to 50%. In brief, had this student remained Option #1, Option #2 (AM 1E & AM 1F) results would be even worse than they are for 2020-21 (see table below).

A.
Student Learning Outcome #1

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

The performance of this single high-performing Online-only Option #2 student contrasts sharply with the 3 of 4 other Option #2 students who were Online students--none of whom (0%) met the AM 1E performance standard, though 1 of the 3 (33.34%) did meet the AM 1F performance standard. Furthermore, if one tracks all five Option #2 students across the parallel measures of AM 1A & AM 1E and AM 1B & AM 1F, their performance results were very weak: AM 1A (written proposal) = 3 of 5 (60%) vs. AM 1E (written project) = 2 of 5 (40%); AM 1B (oral presentation) = 4 of 5 (80%) vs. AM 1F (oral & triptych) = 3 of 5 (60%). Notice that whereas Option #1 students improved from AM 1A to AM 1C and from AM 1B to AM 1D, Option #2 students declined, as 3 of the 4 Option #2 Online students performed worse on AM 1E & AM 1F than they did on AM 1A & AM 1B. Nevertheless, the Capstone Committee believes that it is premature to abandon Option #2 and its measures; instead, the Committee wishes to collect more results data and continue to deliberate to try to clarify why a certain set of students perform below a level of competence.

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

AM 1E: Option #2 Written Paper

AM1F: Option #2 Visual Triptych

RUBRIC SCORE	2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16	
	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%
5	1	20%										
4.5												
4			1	20%								
3.5												
3	1	20%			2	66.67%						
2.5	1	20%	1	20%	1	50%						
2	2	40%	2	40%	1	50%	1	33.34%				
1.5												
1			1	20%								
	2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16	
MET "3" STANDARD	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	2	66.67%	5 of 15	33.34%	7 of 15	46.67%
AVE PASSING SCORE	4	4	4	4	NA	NA	3	3	3.67	3.67	4.17	4.22
AVE OF ALL SCORES	2.9	2.3	2.25	2.25	2.67	2.67	2.53	2.53	2.4	2.4	2	2.93

The most probable explanation for the poor performance of Option #2 students (AM 1E & AM 1F) is simply that it reflects the students' own limits in their skills and program learning as measured by the rigor of the Capstone process and the high standards of the Capstone Committee. The Committee observes anecdotally that

A. Student Learning Outcome #1																
SLO #1:	Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.															
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard		D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)		F. Results			G. Standard Met (Y/N)							
historically, pre-Capstone weaker students (more/most) choose Option #2. A second, and convergent, explanation involves Online versus On-Ground students. For spring 2021, 4 of the 5 students who completed Option #2 did so Online, with weak results (see table below). Note that for 2020-21 AM 1A & AM 1B, two additional Online students are included, but neither continued spring 2021: one because he failed, and one, although he earned a "5," withdrew for family reasons. Of the six total Online students who began fall 2020, only four completed their Capstone spring 2021, and only one performed well (as discussed above). These two successes exemplify the exceptions, as the Committee continues to observe the historically weaker performance across all measures of Online versus On-Ground students.																
ONLINE (including DIRECTED STUDY) STUDENT RESULTS: HOW MANY HAVE MET THE "3" (on 5-point scale) PERFORMANCE STANDARD YEAR-OVER-YEAR?																
Measures	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	8-YR				
1A = Fall	4 of 6	66.67%	2 of 4	50%	0 of 2	0%	0 of 1	0%	2 of 2	100%	1 of 3	33.3%	9 of 19	47.37%		
1B = Fall	4 of 6	66.67%	4 of 4	100%	1 of 2	50%	1 of 1	100%	0 of 1	0%	2 of 2	100%	1 of 3	33.3%	13 of 19	68.42%
1C = Spring	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 of 1	100%	0	NA	1 of 2	50%	1 of 1	100%	3 of 4	75%
1D = Spring	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 of 1	0%	NA	NA	1 of 2	50%	1 of 1	100%	2 of 4	50%
1E = Spring	1 of 4	25%	1 of 3	33.34%	0 of 1	0%	0 of 1	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 of 8	25%
1F = Spring	2 of 4	50%	2 of 3	66.67%	1 of 1	100%	1 of 1	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5 of 8	62.5%
Officially, RSU students may complete the BA-LA Degree entirely Online. Historically, the number of students annually seeking to complete the Capstone process Online has been too small for an Online-only section of either the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) or the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013)--though 2020-21 we did offer both. In previous years, when Online students (historically 1 to 3) could not or would not pursue the Capstone process On-Ground, course instructors conducted uncompensated (!) Directed Studies Online, but they were dissatisfied with the experience and results. The Capstone Committee strongly believes, supported by assessment evidence, that all students need, and greatly benefit from, the structure of and support in taking both HUM 4993 and HUM 4013 with classmates On-Ground; thus, the Committee urges normally-online-students to pursue the Capstone process On-Ground. Despite the evidenced benefits for all students of an On-Ground Capstone experience, Online students cite their family obligations, work-schedule conflicts, and travel-distance or out-of-state constraints as prohibitive. The Committee acknowledges Online students' difficulties and will continue to work to accommodate them toward completing their BA-LA degree.																
In the final analysis, the Capstone process is meant to be the culmination of students' degree coursework and the final demonstration of their programmatic learning; thus, the Capstone Committee expects students' Capstone work to surpass the quality that otherwise satisfies competence (a "3" score) or demonstrates excellence (a "5" score) in program-required and program-elective courses. In brief, the Committee wants to see all BA-LA students not just pass through the Capstone process, but to perform at the highest possible level, and, thus, expects Capstone students to elevate their work to a higher level than exhibited in their prior degree coursework. For degree program assessment purposes, then, maintaining rigorous standards preserves and presents a clearer and clarifying (even if stark) picture of the levels and range of students' written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as their critical and creative thinking abilities (SLO #1).																

A.
Student Learning Outcome #2

SLO #2: Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.							
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)		
Students in the <i>Capstone Project/ Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) are required to complete a 12–15-page Reflective Essay . NOTE: This measure changed 2015-16. NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	At least 75% of the students in the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) will score a “3” or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 12-15-page Reflective Essay . The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	10 total students	8 of 10 total students = 80% met the performance standard.	Y		
			6 On-Ground 4 Online	6 of 6 On-Ground = 100% 2 of 4 Online = 50%			
			6 English = 5 OG + 1 OL 4 Global	5 of 6 English (5 OG + 0 OL) = 83.34% 3 of 4 Global Humanities (1 OG + 2 OL) = 75%			
			Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale				
			SCORE	STUDENTS	%		
			5	3	30%		
			4.5	2	20%		
			4	1	10%		
			3.5	1	10%		
			3	1	10%		
			2.5	1	10%		
			2	1	10%		
			Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4.31 Average Score of All Scores = 3.9				

A. Student Learning Outcome #2																		
SLO #2:	Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.																	
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard				D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)		F. Results				G. Standard Met (Y/N)					
H. Conclusions																		
As with SLO #1 AMs 1A & 1B, all ten spring 2021 students completed the same Reflective Essay, and SLO #2 2020-21 overall performance results (80%) surpass 2019-20 results by 25.45% and return to a more historic norm, essentially equal to the 8-YR average (82.5%). Likewise, both the average passing score (4.31) and the average of all scores (3.9) for 2020-21 are consistent with historical results, and each surpasses its 8-YR average (see table below). Nevertheless, internal analysis of SLO #2 2020-21 overall performance results indicates a downward difference in successful performance between On-Ground students (6 of 6 = 100%, with an average score of 4.42) and Online students (2 of 4 = 50%, with an average score of 3.13), as well as Option #1 students (5 of 5 = 100%, with an average score of 4.4) and Option #2 students (3 of 5 = 60%, with an average score of 3.4). The overlap between Option #2 and Online students is most telling. Of the five Option #2 students, only one was On-Ground (she scored a “4.5”), and of the four total spring 2021 Online students (all Option #2), one did score a “5,” but, excluding her, the other three Online students’ average score was 2.5. In the final analysis, SLO #2 performance results reflect and reinforce the On-Ground versus Online, and Option #1 (cf. AMs 1C & 1D) versus Option #2 (cf. AMs 1E & 1F), performance disparities analyzed above.																		
AM 2: Reflective Essay = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students’ Performance Results																		
RUBRIC SCORE	2020-21	2020-21	2019-20	2019-20	2018-19	2018-19	2017-18	2017-18	2016-17	2016-17	2015-16	2015-16	2014-15	2014-15	2013-14	2013-14	8-YR	
5	3	30%	4	36.36%	1	16.67%	1	12.5%	6	46.15%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	5	35.7%	25 of 80	31.25%
4.5	2	20%	2	18.18%			1	12.5%									5 of 80	6.25%
4	1	10%			3	50%	3	37.5%	3	23.1%	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	3	21.43%	17 of 80	21.25%
3.5	1	10%					3	37.5%	1	7.7%							5 of 80	6.25%
3	1	10%			2	33.34%			1	7.7%	2	22.2%	4	44.4%	4	28.57%	14 of 80	17.5%
2.5	1	10%	1	9.1%					2	15.38%							4 of 80	5%
2	1	10%	3	27.27%							1	11.1%	2	22.2%	1	7.14%	8 of 80	10%
1			1	9.1%											1	7.14%	2 of 80	2.5%
	2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		8-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	8	80%	6	54.55%	6	100%	8	100%	11	84.62%	8	88.87%	7	77.78%	12	85.7%	66 of 80	82.5%
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.31		4.83		3.83		4		4.41		4.25		3.57		4.08		4.16	
AVE OF ALL SCORES	3.9		3.5		3.83		4		4.11		4		3.22		3.71		3.78	

A. Student Learning Outcome #3						
SLO #3: Students will evidence an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on the human condition.						
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)	
Students in Comparative Religion (HUM 3633) are required to complete a Reflective Essay , asking them to compare and contrast their own religious background to that of another religious tradition.	At least 80% of the students in Comparative Religion (HUM 3633) will score 70% or higher on their Reflective Essay .	All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors. The course Instructor reports the performance of BA-LA students separately from the general education student population.	8 total students	7 of 8 total students = 87.5% met the performance standard.	Y	
			4 Online; Summer 2020	3 of 4 Online = 75%; Summer 2020		
			4 Online; Fall 2020	4 of 4 Online = 100%; Fall 2020		
			No Spring 2021 sections & No Blended sections taught 2020-21			
H. Conclusions						
SLO #3 results are very positive and indicate solid student success. BA-LA program majors have been tracked separately for the past ten years. Program majors have been more successful than non-BA-LA students over the past eight years, although the small sample sizes of BA-LA students relative to the larger student population (cf. General Education SLR) makes direct comparisons between BA-LA and non-BA-LA students problematic. Faculty will continue to track results.						

A. Student Learning Outcome #4					
SLO #4:	Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.				
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
Students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BA-LA) degree will complete the Graduating Senior Survey as a part of their graduation application process. In the Survey , students will rate their degree of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in response to a series of categories/questions.	At least 80% of the students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BA-LA) degree will rate overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the degree program.	Students who complete the Graduating Senior Survey at the time they apply for graduation.	0 total students All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors. Results are taken from the 2020-2021 Graduating Senior Survey , disaggregated by degree program, as provided by Mary A. Millikin, Ph.D., Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Office for Accountability and Academics. NOTE: According to Dr. Millikin, no graduates in the BA in Liberal Arts completed a survey for 2020-2021 academic year.	0 of 0 total students (No Data) rated overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the BA-LA degree in each of the five selected program-specific categories.	Y
				1. "Quality of Instruction in Major"	
				Very Satisfied	ND
				Somewhat Satisfied	ND
				2. "Preparation for Advanced Classes in Major"	
				Very Satisfied	ND
				Somewhat Satisfied	ND
				3. "Availability of Faculty for Academic Help"	
				Very Satisfied	ND
				Somewhat Satisfied	ND
				4. "Overall Major Experience"	
				Very Satisfied	ND
				Somewhat Satisfied	ND
				5. "Overall Department Experience"	
				Very Satisfied	ND
				Somewhat Satisfied	ND
				6. "Overall RSU Experience" [Comparison/Control]	
				Very Satisfied	ND
				Somewhat Satisfied	ND

A. Student Learning Outcome #4																		
SLO #4:	Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.																	
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results				G. Standard Met (Y/N)										
H. Conclusions																		
For 2020-21, no students completed the Graduating Senior Survey; thus, conclusions are impossible. In the absence of new data, consult the 8-YR table below.																		
SLO #4 results are historically very positive, as they show consistent levels of very high overall student satisfaction with the BA-LA program over the previous seven years (as evidenced in the table below). For example, only one 2019-20 BA-LA student did not express total overall satisfaction (either “Very Satisfied” or “Somewhat Satisfied”) and only in one of the five selected program-specific categories.																		
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION KEY: VS = “Very Satisfied”; SS = “Somewhat Satisfied”; TOT = Total Overall Degree of Satisfaction																		
CATEGORY	KEY	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	8-YR								
1. Quality of Instruction in Major	VS	ND	5	71.4%	2	66.7%	7	77.8%	11	84.6%	13	100%	8	80%	Data Not Collected	46	83.64%	
	SS	ND	2	28.6%	1	33.3%	2	22.2%	2	15.4%	NA	0%	0	0%		7	12.73%	
	TOT	ND	7	100%	3	100%	9	100%	13	100%	13	100%	8	80%		53	96.37%	
2. Preparation for Advanced Classes in Major	VS	ND	5	71.4%	1	33.3%	7	77.8%	5	38.5%	11	84.6%	8	80%	Data Not Collected	37	67.27%	
	SS	ND	1	14.3%	2	66.7%	1	11.1%	7	53.9%	2	15.4%	0	0%		13	23.64%	
	TOT	ND	6	85.7%	3	100%	8	88.9%	12	92.4%	13	100%	8	80%		50	90.91%	
3. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help	VS	ND	6	85.7%	1	33.3%	7	77.8%	11	84.6%	Data Not Collected			25	78.13%			
	SS	ND	1	14.3%	1	33.3%	1	11.1%	2	15.4%				5	15.63%			
	TOT	ND	7	100%	2	66.7%	8	88.9%	13	100%				30	93.75%			
4. Overall Major Experience	VS	ND	6	85.7%	2	66.7%	7	77.8%	8	61.5%	12	92.3%	7	70%	11	84.6%	53	77.94%
	SS	ND	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	22.2%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%	1	10%	2	15.4%	12	17.65%
	TOT	ND	7	100%	2	66.7%	9	100%	13	100%	13	100%	8	80%	13	100%	65	95.59%
5. Overall Department Experience	VS	ND	5	71.4%	2	66.7%	6	66.7%	8	61.5%	11	84.6%	7	70%	12	92.3%	51	75%
	SS	ND	2	28.6%	0	0%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	2	15.4%	1	10%	1	7.7%	14	20.59
	TOT	ND	7	100%	2	66.7%	9	100%	13	100%	13	100%	8	80%	13	100%	65	95.59%
6. Overall RSU Experience [Control]	VS	ND	5	71.4%	1	33.3%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	9	69.2%	7	70%	11	84.6%	41	60.29%
	SS	ND	2	28.6%	1	33.3%	5	55.6%	6	46.2%	4	30.8%	1	10%	2	15.4%	21	30.88%
	TOT	ND	7	100%	2	66.7%	8	88.9%	11	84.7%	13	100%	8	80%	13	100%	62	91.17%

A. Student Learning Outcome #4				
SLO #4:	Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.			
B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results
Over the previous seven years, 68 students have completed the survey. Only 6 (8.82%) have expressed <u>any</u> degree of dissatisfaction with the BA-LA program. Given the very high degree of expressed overall satisfaction year-after-year, the department believes that the few expressions of dissatisfaction (roughly 1 student per year) are isolated students and actually indicate the academic rigor and overall strength of the BA-LA program with respect to student learning. This assessment is supported by the very few times historically that any student has submitted any written comments in completing the survey. These ostensibly negative comments have been students complaining about having too much reading and too much writing involved in their English or Humanities coursework--as though English and Humanities students should be reading and writing less than they do. To contextualize better the very positive results of student satisfaction with the BA-LA program, note that over the previous seven years, BA-LA students have expressed an average of ~5% higher total satisfaction with the "Quality of Instruction in Major" (QIM), their "Overall Major Experience" (OME), and their "Overall Department Experience" (ODE) than they have expressed regarding their "Overall RSU Experience" (ORE). At the level of the highest standard, <i>i.e.</i>, "Very Satisfied," the BA-LA 8-YR results surpass the ORE 8-YR results by significant percentages: QIM = 23.35% higher; OME = 17.65% higher; ODE = 14.71% higher. By this highest standard, BA-LA students have been more "Very Satisfied" with their BA-LA experience than they have been with their "Overall RSU Experience." In the final analysis, one may conclude that BA-LA students are highly satisfied with the educational experience afforded by the degree program.				
G. Standard Met (Y/N)				

PART 5 Proposed Instructional or Assessment Changes

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

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

PART 6

Summary of Assessment Measures

- A. How many different assessment measures were used? = 9
- B. List the direct measures (see appendix): [1] Capstone Proposal; [2] Proposal Presentation; [3] Scholarly Paper; [4] Oral Presentation; [5] Research Paper; [6] Visual Triptych; [7] Reflective Paper; [8] Comparative Religion Essay
- C. List the indirect measures (see appendix): [9] School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey

PART 7

Faculty Participation and Signatures

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

Faculty Name	Assessment Role	Signature
Matthew Oberrieder	Department Assessment Coordinator, University Assessment Committee representative, and Capstone Committee member. Collected, confirmed, and evaluated all data for HUM 4013 and HUM 4993. Reported and evaluated data from the Graduating Senior Survey. Prepared Student Learning Report and approved final draft.	
Emily Dial-Driver	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Sally Emmons	Capstone Committee Chair. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
James Ford	Director of Academic Enrichment; Capstone Committee member. Contributed and evaluated data for HUM 3633. Reviewed, edited, and approved final draft.	
Laura Gray	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Mary M Mackie	Department Head; Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	<i>Mary Mackie</i>
Scott Reed	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	

- B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	Mary M Mackie	<i>Mary M Mackie</i>	6-7-2021
Dean	Keith W Martin	<i>Keith W. Martin</i>	6/8/21