

# Degree Program Student Learning Report

Revised August 2017

## Department of English & Humanities

### AA in Liberal Arts For 2021-2022 Academic Year

#### PART 1

#### Degree Program Mission and Student Learning Outcomes

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

University Mission	School Mission	Department Mission	Degree Program Mission
Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities.	Central to the mission of the School of Arts and Sciences is the preparation of students to achieve professional and personal goals in their respective disciplines and to enable their success in dynamic local and global communities. Our strategy is to foster an academic setting of diverse curricula that inherently incorporates an environment of service and collegiality.	The mission of the Department of English and Humanities at Rogers State University is to support students in their pursuit of knowledge and to prepare them for participation in the increasingly globalized culture of the 21st century.	The Associate in Arts in Liberal Arts is designed to provide students with a sound grounding in our cultural heritage in a two-year degree which meets the general education requirements for transfer to a four-year degree.

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

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking.	The School of Arts and Sciences offers innovative degrees, which focus upon developing skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, creativity, empirical and evidenced-based inquiry, experimental investigation and theoretical explanation of natural phenomena, and innovative technology	Foster the skills of critical and creative thinking, writing, communication, and research among our students.	#1. Demonstrate creative and critical thinking.

<b>University Commitments</b>	<b>School Purposes</b>	<b>Department Purposes</b>	<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>
To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.	The School of Arts and Sciences educates its majors to think independently and have the knowledge, skills and vision to work in all types of situations and careers and communicate with all types of people.	Foster the values of scholarship, creativity, appreciation of diversity, and community service among our faculty, staff, and students.	#2. Demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.
To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic programs and prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.	The School of Arts and Sciences offers general education courses of high quality and purpose that provide a foundation for lifelong learning.	Serve the University and the community by providing quality general education courses that prepare students for their roles as citizens and cultural participants.	
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs.	The School of Arts and Sciences fosters a community of scholars among the faculty and students of the institution.	Offer innovative programs and quality teaching within the classroom and through distance education.	#3. Express satisfaction with 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.

<b>Proposed Change</b>	<b>Implemented? (Y/N)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Revise, update SLO #1: "Students will demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically."	Y	New, revised SLO #1: "Demonstrate creative and critical thinking." New, revised SLO #1 is more direct and clearer, and more consistent with Bloom's taxonomy.
Revise, update SLO #2: "Students will demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition."	Y	New, revised SLO #2: "Demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition." New, revised SLO #2 is more direct and clearer, and more consistent with Bloom's taxonomy
Revise, update SLO #3: "Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree program."	Y	New, revised SLO #3: "Express satisfaction with the degree program." New, revised SLO #3 is more direct and clearer, and more consistent with Bloom's taxonomy.

**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.

<b>Peer Review Feedback</b>	<b>Implemented? (Y/N)</b>	<b>Comment</b>
The 2020-21, UAC Peer Review Report proposed <u>no</u> "Recommendations." For 2021-22, no UAC peer review occurred due to biennial cycle of review.	NA	NA

## PART 4

### Evidence of Student Learning

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

A. Student Learning Outcome #1						
SLO #1:	B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
	Demonstrate creative and critical thinking.					
<b>1A:</b> Students in <b>Humanities I</b> (HUM 2113) will complete an <b>in-class presentation</b> displaying oral and visual communication skills, as well as creative and critical thinking.  (Online students will submit a paper/project in lieu of the presentation.)	At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all AA-LA students who presented are included.  2021-22 is now the ninth year (cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that sample size and results report AA-LA students separately from all general education students.	2 total AA-LA students, from 9 total sections (only 1 section had any AA-LA students), analyzed according to:  <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B	1 of 2 total AA-LA students (50%) met the performance standard.	N	
<b>1B:</b> Students in <b>Humanities II</b> (HUM 2223) will complete an <b>in-class presentation</b> displaying oral and visual communication	At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.	Data from all AA-LA students who presented are included.  2021-22 is now the ninth year	3 total AA-LA students, from 10 total sections (3 sections had one AA-LA student), analyzed according to:  <i>Instructor Status</i> Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT <i>Delivery Mode</i> On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B	3 of 3 total AA-LA students (100%) met the performance standard.	Y	

**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #1**

SLO #1:	Demonstrate creative and critical thinking.																																										
<b>B. Assessment Measure</b>	<b>C. Performance Standard</b>	<b>D. Sampling Method</b>	<b>E. Sample Size (n)</b>	<b>F. Results</b>	<b>G. Standard Met (Y/N)</b>																																						
skills, as well as creative and critical thinking.  (Online students will submit a paper/project in lieu of the presentation.)		(cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 & 4) that sample size and results report AA-LA students separately from all general education students.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">AA-LA Students per Category</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">Summer 2021</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Fall 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>PT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>PT</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Spring 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>FT</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>OL</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AA-LA Students per Category		Summer 2021		NA	NA	Fall 2021		1	PT	1	PT	Spring 2022		1	FT		OL	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">AA-LA Students per Category</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">Summer 2021</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Fall 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 of 1</td> <td>PT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 of 1</td> <td>PT</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Spring 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 of 1</td> <td>FT</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>OL</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>OL</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AA-LA Students per Category		Summer 2021		NA	NA	Fall 2021		1 of 1	PT	1 of 1	PT	Spring 2022		1 of 1	FT		OL		OL	
AA-LA Students per Category																																											
Summer 2021																																											
NA	NA																																										
Fall 2021																																											
1	PT																																										
1	PT																																										
Spring 2022																																											
1	FT																																										
	OL																																										
AA-LA Students per Category																																											
Summer 2021																																											
NA	NA																																										
Fall 2021																																											
1 of 1	PT																																										
1 of 1	PT																																										
Spring 2022																																											
1 of 1	FT																																										
	OL																																										
	OL																																										

**H.**  
**Conclusions**

SLO #1 performance results are 80% (4 of 5) for 2021-22 if one aggregates both assessment measures (AMs 1A & 1B) for all assessed instructor statuses and delivery modes. In this respect, SLO #1 performance results do meet the performance standard.

NOTE: Instructor statuses and deliver modes not reported in sample size (column E.) and results (column F.) above indicates no AA-LA students in other sections. Due to perennial small sample sizes, one must review 2021-22 results in relation to previous years (cf. the two Tables below) to develop any meaningful conclusions.

AM 1A: Humanities I Presentation year-over-year comparison

YEAR	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	9-YR
RESULTS	1 of 2	2 of 2	2 of 2	6 of 7	3 of 3	4 of 5	9 of 9	15 of 15	7 of 7	49 of 52
PERCENTAGE	50%	100%	100%	85.71%	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	94.23%

AM 1A is embedded in HUM 2113 (Humanities I), a General Education course. As the performance standard is essentially a "C" grade, the Humanities faculty expect AA-LA students (as distinguished from all Gen Ed students, as reported in the Gen Ed SLR) to meet the performance standard.

As the table shows, 2021-22 performance results (50%) deviate from the eight-year trend of otherwise student success, with 100% performance results for 6 of 8 previous years: 2020-21, 2019-20, 2017-18, 2015-16, 2014-15, & 2013-14. In the 2 of 8 previous years (2018-19, 2016-17) when the performance results were under 100%, each year reflects only one student performing below the standard. 2021-22 results also had only one student performing below the standard, but the very small sample size (only 2 students), skews the results disproportionately low. In fact, over the past nine years, only 3 of 52 (5.77%) AA-LA students have not met the performance standard. This indicates perennial student (and degree) success.

**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #1**

**SLO #1:** Demonstrate creative and critical thinking.

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

AM 1B: Humanities II Presentation year-over-year comparison

YEAR	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	9-YR
RESULTS	3 of 3	5 of 5	4 of 4	7 of 7	5 of 5	3 of 3	5 of 6	18 of 18	11 of 12	61 of 63
PERCENTAGE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83.33%	100%	91.7%	96.83%

AM 1B is embedded in HUM 2223 (Humanities II), a General Education course. As the performance standard is essentially a “C” grade, the Humanities faculty expect AA-LA students (as distinguished from all Gen Ed students, as reported in the Gen Ed SLR) to meet the performance standard.

As the table shows, 2021-22 performance results (100%) continue the now nine-year trend of student success, with 100% performance results for 6 of 8 previous years--2020-21, 2019-20, 2018-19, 2017-18, 2016-17, & 2014-15--and now six years consecutively! In the 2 of 8 previous years (2015-16, 2013-14) when the performance results were under 100%, each year reflects only one student performing below the standard. In fact, over the past nine years, only 2 of 62 (3.23%) AA-LA students have not met the performance standard. This indicates perennial student (and degree) success.

NOTE: For SLO #1, the two AMs (each an in-class Presentation) parallel one another across two different courses: AM 1A = Humanities I; AM 1B = Humanities II. Although the two courses are sequential in their numbering/sequence and their historical-chronological content, because they are General Education courses, neither has a prerequisite, and students (whether Gen Ed or AA-LA) may take Humanities II before they take Humanities I. This is noteworthy for two reasons.

First, because both Humanities I and Humanities II are General Education courses, some AA-LA students might take one or the other or even both courses before these students declare officially for the AA-LA degree. In brief, the sample sizes reported do not necessarily reflect the number of AA-LA students active to graduation. This is perhaps especially so for Humanities I (AM 1A), and this perhaps explains why Humanities II (AM 1B) sample sizes are usually larger than those from Humanities I. Humanities faculty speculate that some Gen Ed students who succeed in Humanities I might, due to their success, subsequently declare officially for the AA-LA degree and continue onto Humanities II.

Second, insofar as the same AA-LA students are being assessed as they complete both courses, their performance results (*i.e.*, demonstration of skills and learning) across the two courses remains highly consistently successful, and perhaps even improves from Humanities I (AM 1A) to Humanities II (AM 1B).

In the final analysis, AA-LA students have been highly successful in meeting or surpassing the performance standard for both AMs for the past nine years (per the Tables above). Even so, as this assessment occurs at the General Education course level, we would (do) expect self-selected Liberal Arts students to perform well.

**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #2**

**SLO #2:** Demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.

<b>B. Assessment Measure</b>	<b>C. Performance Standard</b>	<b>D. Sampling Method</b>	<b>E. Sample Size (n)</b>	<b>F. Results</b>	<b>G. Standard Met (Y/N)</b>																																													
<p><b>2A:</b> Students in <b>Humanities I</b> (HUM 2113) will submit an <b>essay</b>, in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.</p> <p>NOTE: Individual instructors may use more specific prompts for “diverse forces.”</p>	<p>At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.</p>	<p>Data from all AA-LA students who submitted are included.</p> <p>2021-22 is now the ninth year (cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 &amp; 4) that sample size and results report AA-LA students separately from all general education students.</p>	<p>2 total AA-LA students, from 9 total sections (only 1 section had any AA-LA students), analyzed according to:</p> <p><i>Instructor Status</i></p> <p>Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT</p> <p><i>Delivery Mode</i></p> <p>On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="769 663 992 1213"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">AA-LA Students per Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Summer 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Fall 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Spring 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>FT</td> <td>OG</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AA-LA Students per Category			Summer 2021			NA	NA	NA	Fall 2021			NA	NA	NA	Spring 2022			2	FT	OG	<p>0 of 2 total AA-LA students (0%) met the performance standard.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="769 201 992 663"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">AA-LA Students per Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Summer 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Fall 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Spring 2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 of 2</td> <td>FT</td> <td>OG</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AA-LA Students per Category			Summer 2021			NA	NA	NA	Fall 2021			NA	NA	NA	Spring 2022			0 of 2	FT	OG			0%	<p>N</p>
AA-LA Students per Category																																																		
Summer 2021																																																		
NA	NA	NA																																																
Fall 2021																																																		
NA	NA	NA																																																
Spring 2022																																																		
2	FT	OG																																																
AA-LA Students per Category																																																		
Summer 2021																																																		
NA	NA	NA																																																
Fall 2021																																																		
NA	NA	NA																																																
Spring 2022																																																		
0 of 2	FT	OG																																																
		0%																																																
<p><b>2B:</b> Students in <b>Humanities II</b> (HUM 2223) will submit an <b>essay</b>, in which they evidence an understanding of the diverse forces that shape the humanities and our responses to them.</p> <p>NOTE: Individual</p>	<p>At least 70% of the students who present will score 70% or higher.</p>	<p>Data from all AA-LA students who submitted are included.</p> <p>2021-22 is now the ninth year (cf. 2013-14 AA-LA SLR, Parts 2 &amp; 4) that sample and results report AA-LA students separately from all</p>	<p>3 total AA-LA students, from 10 total sections (3 sections had one AA-LA student), analyzed according to:</p> <p><i>Instructor Status</i></p> <p>Full-Time = FT vs. Part-Time = PT</p> <p><i>Delivery Mode</i></p> <p>On-Ground = OG; Online = OL; Blended = B</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1354 663 1503 1213"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">AA-LA Students per Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Summer 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Fall 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>PT</td> <td>OG</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AA-LA Students per Category			Summer 2021			NA	NA	NA	Fall 2021			1	PT	OG	<p>2 of 3 total AA-LA students (66.67%) met the performance standard.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1354 201 1503 663"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">AA-LA Students per Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Summer 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Fall 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 of 1</td> <td>PT</td> <td>OG</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AA-LA Students per Category			Summer 2021			NA	NA	NA	Fall 2021			1 of 1	PT	OG			100%	<p>N</p>												
AA-LA Students per Category																																																		
Summer 2021																																																		
NA	NA	NA																																																
Fall 2021																																																		
1	PT	OG																																																
AA-LA Students per Category																																																		
Summer 2021																																																		
NA	NA	NA																																																
Fall 2021																																																		
1 of 1	PT	OG																																																
		100%																																																

**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #2**

**SLO #2:** Demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.

<b>B. Assessment Measure</b>	<b>C. Performance Standard</b>	<b>D. Sampling Method</b>	<b>E. Sample Size (n)</b>			<b>F. Results</b>			<b>G. Standard Met (Y/N)</b>
instructors may use more specific prompts for "diverse forces."		general education students.	1	PT	OL	1 of 1	PT	OL	100%
			Spring 2022			Spring 2022			
			1	FT	OL	0 of 1	FT	OL	0%

**H.**  
**Conclusions**

SLO #2 performance results are only 40% (2 of 5) for 2021-22 if one aggregates both assessment measures (AMs 2A & 2B) for all assessed instructor statuses and delivery modes. In this respect, SLO #2 performance results are very disappointing in not meeting the performance standard.

NOTE: Instructor statuses and deliver modes not reported in sample size (column E.) and results (column F.) above indicates no AA-LA students in other sections. Due to perennial small sample sizes, one must review 2021-22 results in relation to previous years (cf. the two Tables below) to develop any meaningful conclusions.

AM 2A: Humanities I Essay year-over-year comparison

YEAR	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	9-YR
RESULTS	0 of 2	2 of 2	ND	3 of 6	2 of 3	3 of 5	7 of 9	13 of 15	5 of 5	35 of 47
PERCENTAGE	0%	100%	ND	50%	66.67%	60%	77.78%	86.67%	100%	74.47%

As the table shows, 2021-22 performance results (0%) are the lowest by far in nine years. Nevertheless, the small sample size, as well as those in the preceding five years (including 2019-20, wherein no AA-LA students were reported), skew the results percentages and produce exaggerated lower and higher results percentage differences in relation to the 70% performance standard. Thus, while the 2021-22 0% performance results are very negative, the small sample size remains too small to draw a meaningful conclusion of complete failure. As fewer students complete the AA-LA degree since 2015-16, annual results are problematic to analyze.

AM 2B: Humanities II Essay year-over-year comparison

YEAR	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	9-YR
RESULTS	2 of 3	3 of 5	3 of 4	5 of 6	4 of 4	3 of 3	5 of 6	13 of 13	10 of 12	48 of 56
PERCENTAGE	66.67%	60%	75%	83.34%	100%	100%	83.34%	100%	83.34%	85.71%

As the table shows, 2021-22 performance results (66.67%) improved 6.67% from 2020-21 results--reversing slightly a three-year consecutive decline from 100% in 2017-18 & 2016-17--but they are still 33.33% lower than the 100% results of 2017-18, 2016-17, & 2014-15 and the second lowest over nine years. Nevertheless,



**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #2**

**SLO #2:** Demonstrate humanistic awareness and an appreciation for the diversity of perspectives as regards the human condition.

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

the small sample size, as well as those going back to 2015-16, skew the results percentages and produce exaggerated lower and higher results percentage differences in relation to the 70% performance standard. In raw numbers, as the table shows, for 2021-22 (like 2019-20, 2018-19, 2015-16), only 1 student did not meet the standard, but, unlike its counterpart years, which all surpassed the standard, 2021-22 results percentage falls short of 70% by 3.33%. Over now nine years, only 8 of 56 (14.29%) AA-LA students have not met the AM 2B performance standard.

NOTE: For SLO #2, the two AMs (each an Essay) parallel one another across two different courses: AM 2A = Humanities I; AM 2B = Humanities II. Although the two courses are sequential in their numbering/sequence and their historical-chronological content, because they are General Education courses, neither has a prerequisite, and students (whether Gen Ed or AA-LA) may take Humanities II before they take Humanities I. This is noteworthy for four reasons.

First, because both Humanities I and Humanities II are General Education courses, some AA-LA students might take one or the other or even both courses before these students declare officially for the AA-LA degree. In brief, the sample sizes reported do not necessarily reflect the number of AA-LA students active to graduation. This is perhaps especially so for Humanities I (AMs 1A & 2A), and this perhaps explains why Humanities II (AMs 1B & 2B) sample sizes are usually larger than those from Humanities I, insofar as some successful Humanities I students afterward declare officially for the AA-LA and then proceed to Humanities II.

Second, as the tables show, AM 2B 9-YR results (85.71%) are 11.24% higher than AM 2A 9-YR results (74.47%). Insofar as the same AA-LA students are being assessed as they complete Humanities I (AM 2A) and then Humanities II (AM 2B), AM 2B 9-YR performance results of 11.24% higher performance perhaps suggest improved student learning from Humanities I to Humanities II on the same, parallel assignment.

Third, both SLO #2 AMs assess specifically writing skills, whereas both SLO #1 AMs assess oral and visual communication skills. As the tables show, for SLO #1, AM 1A 9-YR performance results are 94.23%, while AM 1B 9-YR performance results are 96.83%. By contrast, for SLO #2, AM 2A 9-YR results are 74.47%, while AM 2B 9-YR results are 85.71%. At first glance, then, AA-LA students appear to demonstrate substantially stronger oral and visual communication skills (AMs 1A & 1B) than writing skills (AMs 2A & 2B)—but, if AM 2B performance results hold, students do seem to improve their writing skills from Humanities I to Humanities II.

Fourth, Humanities faculty observe anecdotally that ALL students need to improve their writing skills—though neither Humanities I nor Humanities II are writing instruction courses. The question is, then, are students’ oral and visual communication skills (AMs 1A & 1B) just naturally stronger, or are faculty expectations for writing skills (AMs 2A & 2B) specifically higher and, thus, their grade evaluations are lower? The latter conclusion seems more likely, and not just because two of the FT Humanities I/II instructors also teach Composition I/II. In the final analysis, these conclusions remain speculative, as the combination of (1) too small overall sample sizes and (2) the inability to track specific, identical students makes direct analysis and more meaningful conclusions problematic between AM 2A and AM 2B and likely impossible between AMs 1A & 1B vis-à-vis AMs 2A & 2B in trying to explain the differences of students’ performance results.

**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #3**

SLO #3:	Express satisfaction with the degree program.																								
<b>B. Assessment Measure</b>	<b>C. Performance Standard</b>	<b>D. Sampling Method</b>	<b>E. Sample Size (n)</b>	<b>F. Results</b>	G. Standard Met (Y/N)																				
<p>Students graduating with an Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree will complete the <b>Graduating Senior Survey</b> as a part of their graduation application process.</p> <p>In the <b>Survey</b>, students will rate their degree of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in response to a series of categories/questions.</p>	<p>At least 80% of the students graduating with an Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts (AA-LA) degree will rate overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the degree program.</p>	<p>Students who complete the <b>Graduating Senior Survey</b> at the time they apply for graduation.</p>	<p>0 total students.</p> <p>All students in the sample are AA-LA program majors.</p> <p>Results are taken from the <b>2021-2022 Graduating Senior Survey</b>, disaggregated by degree program, as provided by Mary A. Millikin, Ph.D., Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Office for Accountability and Academics.</p>	<p>0 of 0 total students (NA) rated overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the AA-LA degree in each of the four selected program-specific categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="649 210 738 808"> <tr> <td><b>1. Quality of Instruction in Major</b></td> <td>Very Satisfied</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="803 210 852 808"> <tr> <td><b>2. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help</b></td> <td>Somewhat Satisfied</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="917 210 966 808"> <tr> <td><b>3. Overall Major Experience</b></td> <td>Somewhat Satisfied</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1031 210 1079 808"> <tr> <td><b>4. Overall Department Experience</b></td> <td>Somewhat Satisfied</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1144 210 1193 808"> <tr> <td><b>5. Overall RSU Experience [Comparison/Control]</b></td> <td>Somewhat Satisfied</td> <td>NA</td> <td>NA</td> </tr> </table>	<b>1. Quality of Instruction in Major</b>	Very Satisfied	NA	NA	<b>2. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA	<b>3. Overall Major Experience</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA	<b>4. Overall Department Experience</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA	<b>5. Overall RSU Experience [Comparison/Control]</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA	NA
<b>1. Quality of Instruction in Major</b>	Very Satisfied	NA	NA																						
<b>2. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA																						
<b>3. Overall Major Experience</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA																						
<b>4. Overall Department Experience</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA																						
<b>5. Overall RSU Experience [Comparison/Control]</b>	Somewhat Satisfied	NA	NA																						

**H.**  
**Conclusions**

NOTE: For 2021-22, no students completed the Survey, as reported by Dr. Millikin. Due to the absence of any new data, please review conclusions from 2020-21.

Over now an eight-year span, AA-LA students have expressed 100% total satisfaction (either “Very Satisfied” or “Somewhat Satisfied”) in all the selected program-specific categories for 4 of 8 years: 2020-21, 2018-19, 2015-16, and 2013-14. Only in 3 of 8 years--2017-18, 2016-17, and 2014-15 (NOTE: For 2019-20 no students completed the Survey)--did only one or two student(s) rate “somewhat dissatisfied” in two or three of the four selected program-specific categories. In these minor “somewhat dissatisfied” cases, however, small sample sizes skew negatively the results percentages and produce exaggerated lower percentage differences in

**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #3**

**SLO #3:** Express satisfaction with the degree program.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard		D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)		F. Results			G. Standard Met (Y/N)						
	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	1	100%	ND	1	100%	3	60%	3	37.5%	8	80%	13	65%	29 of 45	64.45%
	SS			ND			1	20%	5	62.5%	2	20%	6	30%	14 of 45	31.11%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>43 of 45</b>	<b>95.56%</b>
2. Availability of Faculty for Academic Help	VS			ND	1	100%	3	60%	5	62.5%		Data Not Collected		Data Not Collected	9 of 15	60%
	SS	1	100%	ND			2	25%				Data Not Collected		Data Not Collected	3 of 15	20%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>87.5%</b>					<b>12 of 15</b>	<b>80%</b>
3. Overall Major Experience	VS			ND	1	100%	3	60%	3	37.5%	7	70%	12	60%	33 of 55	60%
	SS	1	100%	ND			2	40%	5	62.5%	3	30%	6	30%	20 of 55	36.36%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>53 of 55</b>	<b>96.36%</b>
4. Overall Department Experience	VS			ND	1	100%	3	60%	2	25%	7	70%	10	50%	28 of 55	50.91%
	SS	1	100%	ND			2	40%	4	50%	3	30%	8	40%	22 of 55	41.82%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>51 of 55</b>	<b>92.73%</b>
5. Overall RSU Experience [control]	VS			ND	1	100%	3	60%	3	37.5%	6	60%	9	45%	27 of 55	49.09%
	SS	1	100%	ND			1	20%	3	37.5%	4	40%	8	40%	22 of 55	40%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>49 of 55</b>	<b>89.09%</b>

relation to meeting or surpassing the 80% performance standard. In brief, the data show that AA-LA students are highly satisfied with the educational experience afforded by the degree program.

To contextualize better the very positive results of AA-LA students' overall satisfaction with the AA-LA degree, compare the 8-YR totals for Category 3. "Overall Major Experience" & Category 4. "Overall Department Experience" with Category 5. "Overall RSU Experience." AA-LA students' overall satisfaction with both their "Overall Major Experience" (96.36%) and their "Overall Department Experience" (92.73%) surpasses that of their "Overall RSU Experience" (89.09%).

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION KEY: VS = "Very Satisfied"; SS = "Somewhat Satisfied"; TOT = Total Overall Degree of Satisfaction

## 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
Eliminate SLO #3: "Express satisfaction with the degree program."	SLO #3	First, "Express satisfaction with the degree program" is not a Student Learning Outcome. Second, 2021-22 is the second year in the past three years that no students completed the Graduating Student Survey (no data results). Since 2018-19 (the past four years), only one student has completed the Survey each of only two years. In brief, even if "express satisfaction . . ." were a Student Learning Outcome, the Survey as an Assessment Measure is unreliable and provides no meaningful data due to the small sample sizes.



## PART 6

### Summary of Assessment Measures

- A. How many different assessment measures were used? = 5
- B. List the direct measures (see appendix):
  - [1] Humanities I (HUM 2113) Presentation; [2] Humanities II (HUM 2223) Presentation; [3] Humanities I (HUM 2113) "Diverse Forces" Essay; [4] Humanities II (HUM 2223) "Diverse Forces" Essay
- C. List the indirect measures (see appendix):
  - [5] Graduating Senior Survey

**PART 7**  
**Faculty Participation and Signatures**

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

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

B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	Mary M Mackie	<i>Mary M Mackie</i>	6-15-2022
Dean	Keith W Martin	<i>Keith W. Martin</i>	6/15/22

## Appendix

### Student Learning Outcome

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

#### Examples:

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

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

### Assessment Measure

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

#### Direct Measures

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

#### Indirect Measures

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

### **Performance Standard**

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

#### Examples:

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

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

### **Sampling Method**

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

#### Examples:

*All students enrolled in BIOL 4801 Biology Research Methods II*

*All majors graduating in the 2016-17 academic year.*

### **Sample Size**

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

### **Results**

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

### **Standard Met?**

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

### **Conclusion**

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

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