

# Degree Program Student Learning Report

Revised August 2017

## Department of English & Humanities

### **BA 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.

<b>University Mission</b>	<b>School Mission</b>	<b>Department Mission</b>	<b>Degree Program Mission</b>
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.

<b>University Commitments</b>	<b>School Purposes</b>	<b>Department Purposes</b>	<b>Student Learning Outcomes</b>
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.	<p>#1. Demonstrate creative and critical thinking.</p> <p>#2. Reflect meaningfully on their educational experience.</p>

<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.	#3. Demonstrate 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. 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**

Revise 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 and update: SLO #1. Students will demonstrate competence in their written, oral, and visual communication skills, as well as the ability to think creatively and critically.	Y	Revised: SLO #1. Demonstrate creative and critical thinking. Old SLO #1 was too convoluted in its formulation. Revised SLO #1 is more direct, clearer, and more consistent with Bloom's taxonomy.
Revise and update: SLO #2. Students will be able to critique their work in oral and written form.	Y	Revised: SLO #2. Reflect meaningfully on their educational experience. Old SLO #2 was too convoluted in its formulation. Revised SLO #2 is more direct, clearer, and more consistent with Bloom's taxonomy.
Revise and update: SLO #3. Students will evidence an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on the human condition.	Y	Revised: SLO #3. Demonstrate an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on the human condition. Old SLO #3 was too convoluted in its formulation. Revised SLO #3 is more direct, clearer, and more consistent with Bloom's taxonomy.
Revise and update: SLO #4. Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve, the degree program.	Y	Revised: SLO #4. Express satisfaction with the degree program. Old SLO #4 was too convoluted in its formulation. Revised SLO #4 is more direct, 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>
No Peer Review of 2020-21 BA-LA Degree Program in 2021-22	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.

<b>A.</b>																								
<b>Student Learning Outcome #1</b>																								
<b>SLO #1:</b>	<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>1A</b> Students in the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) are required to create a <b>Capstone Project Proposal</b>.</p> <p>NOTE: HUM 4993 is taught fall semesters only.</p>	<p>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 <b>Capstone Project Proposal</b>.</p> <p>The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.</p>	<p>Data from all students completing the <i>Humanities Seminar</i> (HUM 4993) is included.</p> <p>All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.</p>	<p>5 total students</p> <hr/> <p>5 On-Ground 0 Online</p> <hr/> <p>3 English = 3 OG + 0 OL 2 Global Humanities = 2 OG + 0 OL</p>	<p>3 of 5 total students = 60% met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>3 of 5 On-Ground = 60% 0 of 0 Online = NA</p> <hr/> <p>2 of 3 English (3 OG + 0 OL) = 66.67% 1 of 2 Global Humanities (2 OG + 0 OL) = 50%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N</p>																			
<p>Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>SCORE</th> <th>STUDENTS</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 3.5 Average Score of All Scores = 2.7</p>							SCORE	STUDENTS	%	4	1	20%	3.5	1	20%	3	1	20%	2	1	20%	1	1	20%
SCORE	STUDENTS	%																						
4	1	20%																						
3.5	1	20%																						
3	1	20%																						
2	1	20%																						
1	1	20%																						

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

<b>SLO #1:</b>	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>														
<b>1B1</b> Students in the <i>Capstone Project/ Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) may choose to complete a 25-35-page <b>Scholarly Paper</b> = Option #1.  NOTE: This measure changed 2013-14 and again 2017-18  NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	At least 75% of the students in the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) who choose Option #1 will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 25-35-page <b>Scholarly Paper</b> .  The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students who complete Option #1 in 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.	3 total students  3 On-Ground 0 Online  2 English = 2 OG + 0 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OG	1 of 3 total students = 33.34% met the performance standard.  1 of 3 On-Ground = 33.34% 0 of 0 Online = NA  1 of 2 English (4 OG + 0 OL) = 50% 0 of 1 Global Humanities (OG) = 0%  Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale <table border="1" data-bbox="787 609 966 808"> <thead> <tr> <th>SCORE</th> <th>STUDENTS</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4.5</td> <td>1</td> <td>33.34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.5</td> <td>1</td> <td>33.34%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>33.34%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4.5 Average Score of All Scores = 3	SCORE	STUDENTS	%	4.5	1	33.34%	2.5	1	33.34%	2	1	33.34%	N		
SCORE	STUDENTS	%																	
4.5	1	33.34%																	
2.5	1	33.34%																	
2	1	33.34%																	
<b>1B2</b> Students in the <i>Capstone Project/ Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) may choose to complete a 7-10-page <b>Research Paper</b> & Complementary <b>Triptych</b> = Option #2.  NOTE: This measure	At least 75% of the students in the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) who choose Option #2 will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 7-10-page <b>Research Paper</b> .	Data from all students who complete Option #2 in the <i>Capstone Project/Portfolio</i> (HUM 4013) is included.  All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors;	2 total students  2 On-Ground 0 Online  1 English = 1 OG + 0 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OG	1 of 2 total students = 50% met the performance standard.  1 of 2 On-Ground = 50% 0 of 0 Online = NA  0 of 1 English (1 OG + 0 OL) = 0% 1 of 1 Global Humanities (1 OG) = 100%	N														

**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>									
<p>changed 2013-14 and again 2017-18</p> <p>NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.</p>	<p>The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.</p>	<p>the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.</p>		<p>Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;">SCORE</th> <th style="width: 30%;">STUDENTS</th> <th style="width: 40%;">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3.5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 3.5 Average Score of All Scores = 2.75</p>	SCORE	STUDENTS	%	3.5	1	50%	2	1	50%	
SCORE	STUDENTS	%												
3.5	1	50%												
2	1	50%												

**H.**  
**Conclusions**

SLO #1 conclusions involve analyzing and interpreting data results from two fall-to-spring-semester counterpart or complementary Assessment Measures (AMs 1A & 1B), the second of which resolves into a pair (Option #1 & Option #2) of alternative measures (AMs 1B1 & 1B2). Each AM aims to assess students' creative and critical thinking through a substantial writing assignment, as counterparts, or complementary, from fall to spring semesters. Thus, AM 1A = a Capstone Project Proposal in *Humanities Seminar* (HUM 4993, fall sem.) *vis-à-vis* AM 1B1 = a Scholarly Paper (Option #1) or AM 1B2 = a Research Paper (Option #2), both in *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM 4013, spring sem.). Year-Over-Year distribution tables below present comparative and trend data for each of the three total AMs.

As the AM 1A (Capstone Proposal) table below shows, AM 1A 2021-22 performance results (3 of 5 = 60%) declined 15% from 2020-21 results (9 of 12 = 75%) and are the second-lowest in nine years (cf. 2019-20 = 54.55%). Nevertheless, comparative analysis of AM 1A 2021-22 performance results indicates that their percentage is distorted downwardly by the very small sample size of only 5 students--the smallest sample size in nine years (cf. 2018-19 small sample size of 6 with 66.67% results).

For AM 1A, all 5 students completed the same written Project Proposal fall 2021, but both of the 2 students who failed to meet the AM 1A performance standard completed Option #2 (AM 1B2) spring 2022. In brief, the 2 students who failed to meet the AM 1A standard were weaker, less academic students. Of these same 2 students, however, 1 did improve her performance for AM 1B2 and surpass the performance standard, which indicates her learning improvement fall to spring.

The Capstone Committee believes that at least part of the explanation for AM 1A lower results is simply a function of its preliminary, provisional character, *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 (AM 1B1) historically score higher than do their proposals. This difficulty seems especially so for OL and Option #2 students and is discussed further below. The Committee does want to see stronger student performance results for AM 1A, but the Committee also observes that the 2021-22 cohort of students was severely disadvantaged academically by the various turmoil of two years of covid issues that disrupted their degree coursework and harmed their preparation for the culminating Capstone.

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

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

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard		D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)		F. Results			G. Standard Met (Y/N)
	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	
RUBRIC SCORE										9-YR
5		2 16.67%	2 18.18%		1 10%	1 7.1%	3 25%		2 11.8%	11 of 96 11.46%
4.5		2 16.67%			1 10%	1 7.1%		1 11.1%		5 of 96 5.21%
4	1 20%	1 8.34%		1 16.67%	2 20%	3 21.4%	3 25%	3 33.3%	5 29.4%	19 of 96 19.79%
3.5	1 20%	1 8.34%		1 16.67%	2 20%	3 21.4%			2 11.8%	10 of 96 10.42%
3	1 20%	3 25%	4 36.36%	2 33.34%	1 10%	1 7.1%	3 25%	5 55.6%	5 29.4%	25 of 96 26.04%
2.5			1 9.09%		1 10%					2 of 96 2.08%
2	1 20%	2 16.67%	2 18.18%	2 33.34%	1 10%	5 35.7%	1 8.3%		2 11.8%	16 of 96 16.67%
1	1 20%	1 8.34%	2 18.18%		1 10%		2 16.7%		1 5.9%	8 of 96 8.33%
<b>MET "3" STANDARD</b>	<b>3 60%</b>	<b>9 75%</b>	<b>6 54.55%</b>	<b>4 66.67%</b>	<b>7 70%</b>	<b>9 64.3%</b>	<b>9 75%</b>	<b>9 100%</b>	<b>14 82.4%</b>	<b>70 of 96 72.92%</b>
AVE PASSING SCORE	3.5	3.94	3.67	3.38	3.93	3.89	4	3.5	3.7	3.72
AVE OF ALL SCORES	2.7	3.375	2.77	2.92	3.3	3.21	3.33	3.5	3.35	3.16

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

In proceeding to analyze AM 1B1, the Capstone Scholarly Paper (spring sem.), note, again, that it constitutes Option #1 of the completed counterpart to AM 1A, the Project Proposal (fall sem.). If one compares the AM 1B1 table of year-over-year performance results (below) to the AM 1A table of year-over-year performance results (above), one observes for AM 1B1 annually consistently higher performance results (excepting 2014-15) and higher average passing scores than AM 1A performance results. The AM 1B1 historically consistently higher performance results are significant toward showing students' positive learning outcome(s) of improved creative and critical thinking, demonstrated through writing, through the process of their completing, in the spring, their fall-proposed Capstone project.

That said, as the AM 1B1 (Capstone Project, Option #1) table below shows, AM 1B1 2021-22 performance results (1 of 3 = 33.33%) declined 66.67% from 2020-21 results (5 of 5 = 100%) and are the lowest in nine years. Nevertheless, comparative analysis of AM 1B1 2021-22 performance results indicates that their percentage is distorted significantly downwardly by the very small sample size of only 3 students--the smallest sample size in nine years. Furthermore, Option #1 Capstone students have significantly surpassed the performance standard year-over-year over the previous eight years (except 2014-15).

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

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

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard		D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)		F. Results				G. Standard Met (Y/N)									
	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	9-YR										
RUBRIC SCORE																				
5		2	40%	2	33.34%				2	15.4%		1	11.1%	4	28.6%	11 of 68	16.18%			
4.75				1	16.67%											1 of 68	1.47%			
4.5	1	33.3%		1	16.67%	1	25%		2	15.4%	3	33.3%				8 of 68	11.76%			
4								1	20%	4	30.8%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	11 of 68	16.18%			
3.75								1	20%							1 of 68	1.47%			
3.5		1	20%	1	16.67%	2	50%	2	40%	1	7.7%	1	11.1%			8 of 68	11.76%			
3		1	20%	1	16.67%	1	25%			2	15.4%	3	33.3%	2	22.2%	15 of 68	23.06%			
2.5	1	33.3%						1	20%			1	11.1%			4 of 68	5.88%			
2	1	33.3%										4	44.4%	1	7.1%	6 of 68	8.82%			
1.5										2	15.4%					2 of 68	2.94%			
1														1	7.1%	1 of 68	1.47%			
																9-YR				
<b>MET "3" STANDARD</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>83.34%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>55.6%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>55 of 68</b>	<b>80.88%</b>
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.5	4.1	4.55	3.63	3.63	4.55	3.63	3.63	3.44	3.44	4.05	3.75	3.8	3.8	3.83	3.96				
AVE OF ALL SCORES	3	4.1	4.21	3.63	3.63	4.21	3.65	3.61	3.25	3.25	3.65	3.61	3	3.5	3.5	3.55				

AM 1B1: Scholarly Paper (Spring Semester; Option #1) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Performance Results

In the final analysis, Capstone Project Option #1 students (AM 1B1) have performed consistently well over the previous eight years; this supports the conclusion that 2021-22 results are an anomaly due to the various turmoil of covid issues, as referenced above in AM 1A conclusions.

One caveat to celebrating the historical consistent year-over-year improvement in student learning demonstrated through fall-to-spring counterpart or complementary assessment measures is the separating of all AM 1A sample students into two sub-cohorts: Option #1 (AM 1B1) and Option #2 (AM 1B2). As mentioned in the AM 1A conclusions above, and as indicated more clearly in the AM 1B2 table of year-over-year performance results below, Option #2 students (historically, especially Online students) do (have) not necessarily show(n) improvement from their fall proposal (AM 1A) to their spring completed project (AM 1B2).



**A.  
Student Learning Outcome #1**

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

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results		G. Standard Met (Y/N)
		2020-21	2019-20		2017-18	2018-19	
AM 1B2: Research Paper (Spring Semester; Option #2) = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Performance Results							
RUBRIC SCORE		2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	5-YR
5			1	20%			1 of 17
4.5							
4				1	20%		1 of 17
3.5	1	50%					1 of 17
3			1	20%		2	66.67%
2.5			1	20%	1	50%	3 of 17
2	1	50%	2	40%	1	50%	7 of 17
1			1	20%		1	33.34%
							1 of 17
		2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	5-YR
<b>MET "3" STANDARD</b>	1	50%	2	40%	1	20%	0
AVE PASSING SCORE	3.5		4		4	NA	3
AVE OF ALL SCORES	2.75		2.9		2.3	2.25	2.67
							3.625
							2.57

The positive conclusion for 2021-22 Option #2 students is that while neither of the 2 met the AM 1A performance standard, 1 of the 2 did improve her performance and surpass the standard for AM 1B2 (per above); this indicates her learning improvement from the fall 2021 proposal to the spring 2022 completed project.

More generally, as the AM 1B2 table above shows, 2021-22 performance results (1 of 2 = 50%) did improve 10% over 2020-21 results (2 of 5 = 40%), 30% over 2019-20 results (1 of 5 = 20%), and 50% over 2018-19 results (0 of 2 = 0%), and they are the second-highest results in five years (the lifetime of Option #2). This improvement is an encouraging positive trend, though the annual very small sample sizes--only 17 total students over five years--distort the differences among performance percentages, and the 2021-22 students still failed to meet the 75% performance standard. If one compares the AM 1B2 table of year-over-year performance results (immediately above) to the AM 1B1 table of year-over-year performance results (higher above), one observes for AM 1B2 consistently much lower performance results for the previous four years (essentially the lifetime of Option #2).

The Capstone Committee continues to analyze these data and to deliberate to try to clarify why a certain set of students struggle with the Capstone process.

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

SLO #1:	B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
SLO #1:	Demonstrate creative and critical thinking.					
<p>Though an incomplete analysis, five broader, year-over-year reflections on AM 1A <i>vis-à-vis</i> AMs 1B1 &amp; 1B2 perhaps afford some clarity about weak performances.</p> <p><b>First</b>, AM 1A is a <i>proposal</i> for a project that students will complete in the spring semester (AM 1B1 or AM 1B2). As explained above in AM 1A conclusions, students’ developing their proposals (fall sem.) are still working to conceptualize clearly and to articulate cogently their preliminary ideas and scholarship/research plans. Moreover, while students know in advance that they must develop a proposal and complete a project, few begin to think ahead before the official process starts.</p> <p><b>Second</b>, the BA-LA degree emphasizes creative and critical thinking demonstrated through strong writing skills, whether students concentrate in English or in Humanities. Hence, the Capstone Committee rightly has the highest expectations for students’ formal writing skills in developing their proposals and in completing their projects. In brief, the Committee correctly holds students’ academic writing to a very high standard and is properly stingy regarding assessment scores.</p> <p><b>Third</b>, an anecdotal factor in the proposal process that clarifies some low(er) results for AM 1A is that too many students, in developing their proposal, do not interact enough with their selected faculty mentor--despite explicit instructions to do so! Unfortunately, this issue is perhaps most prevalent among and problematic regarding the already weaker students, and perhaps especially Online students, who often least interact with and/or seek help from their faculty mentor. This ignoring-one’s-mentor problem too often persists from the proposal process through students’ project research and writing--even when students have been instructed directly by the Committee to “work closely with your mentor!”--which clarifies some low(er) results for AM 1B1, and especially for AM 1B2. In brief, students who most need faculty mentoring too often least seek and/or accept it. This issue has been especially problematic during covid, as distancing, masking, and student self-isolation have largely prevented normal student-faculty interaction so crucial to students’ learning and developing intellectual skills.</p> <p><b>Fourth</b>, another anecdotal explanation for the poor performance of Option #2 students on AMs 1A &amp; 1B2 historically is simply that it reflects these students’ natural 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 historically, pre-Capstone weaker students (more/most) choose Option #2 in the false belief that it will be less work for their Capstone.</p> <p><b>Fifth</b>, a convergent explanation involves Online versus On-Ground students. For 2021-22, all 5 Capstone students did complete the fall-to-spring Capstone process On-Ground, so no new specific data contribute to the year-over-year analysis presented in the table below. Nevertheless, 1 of 2 Option #2 students, did complete much, if not most, of her preparatory degree coursework (and other RSU coursework) Online. Online students generally underperform On-Ground students.</p> <p>For example, 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, 2 additional Online students are included, but neither continued from fall 2020 to spring 2021: 1 because he failed, and 1, although he earned a “5,” withdrew for family reasons. Of the 6 total Online students who began fall 2020, only 4 completed their Capstone spring 2021, and only 1 met or surpassed the performance standard. In brief, the Capstone Committee annually observes the consistently weaker performance across all measures of Online versus On-Ground students.</p>						

**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>							
			2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	8-YR		
1A = Fall	66.67% 2 of 4	50% NA	0 of 1 0%	0 of 1 0%	0 of 2 0%	NA	50%	4 of 6	1 of 3	100%	1 of 3	33.3%	9 of 19	47.37%
1B1 = Spring	NA NA	NA NA	1 of 1 100%	1 of 1 100%	NA NA	NA	NA	NA	1 of 1	50%	1 of 1	100%	3 of 4	75%
1B2 = Spring	25% 1 of 3	33.34% NA	NA	NA	0 of 1 0%	NA	33.34%	1 of 4	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 of 8	25%

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

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 *Humanities Seminar* (HUM 4993) or the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (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, in program-required and program-elective courses, satisfies competence (a "3" score) or demonstrates excellence (a "5" score). 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' creative and critical thinking (SLO #1).

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

**SLO #2:** Reflect meaningfully on their educational experience.

<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>Students in the <b>Capstone Project/ Portfolio</b> (HUM 4013) are required to complete a 12-15-page <b>Reflective Essay</b>.</p> <p>NOTE: This measure changed 2015-16.</p> <p>NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.</p>	<p>At least 75% of the students in the <b>Capstone Project/Portfolio</b> (HUM 4013) will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 12-15-page <b>Reflective Essay</b>.</p> <p>The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.</p>	<p>Data from all students completing the <b>Capstone Project/Portfolio</b> (HUM 4013) is included.</p> <p>All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.</p>	<p>5 total students</p> <hr/> <p>5 On-Ground 0 Online</p> <hr/> <p>3 English = 3 OG + 0 OL 2 Global Humanities = 2 OG + 0 OL</p>	<p>5 of 5 total students = 100% met the performance standard.</p> <hr/> <p>5 of 5 On-Ground = 100% 0 of 0 Online = NA</p> <hr/> <p>3 of 3 English (3 OG + 0 OL) = 100% 2 of 2 Global Humanities (2 OG + 0 OL) = 100%</p> <p>Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="846 212 1024 814"> <thead> <tr> <th>SCORE</th> <th>STUDENTS</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4 Average Score of All Scores = 4</p>	SCORE	STUDENTS	%	5	1	20%	4	3	60%	3	1	20%	<p>Y</p>
SCORE	STUDENTS	%															
5	1	20%															
4	3	60%															
3	1	20%															

**H. Conclusions**

As with SLO #1 AM 1A, all 5 Capstone students completed the same Reflective Essay to assess SLO #2. The Capstone Committee concluded that all 5 Reflective Essays were strong and a very positive sign of student learning in the degree program despite some students' covid-related struggles in their degree coursework and low performances in the Capstone process (cf. SLO #1).

As the AM 2 table below shows, 2021-22 performance results (5 of 5 = 100%) improved 20% over 2020-21 results (8 of 10 = 80%), marking the best results in three years, and matching the 100% performance results of 2018-19 and 2017-18. Likewise, both the average passing score ("4") and the average of all scores ("4") for 2021-22 are consistent with year-over-year performance results and essentially equal to the 9-YR average (see table below). Moreover, both Option #1 and Option #2 students performed essentially equally well.

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

**SLO #2:** Reflect meaningfully on their educational experience.

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

**AM 2: Reflective Essay = Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Performance Results**

RUBRIC SCORE	2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		2017-18		2016-17		2015-16		2014-15		2013-14		9-YR		
	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36.36%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16.67%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.15%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>26 of 85</b>	<b>30.59%</b>
<b>4.5</b>			<b>2</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18.18%</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>12.5%</b>									<b>5 of 85</b>	<b>5.88%</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10%</b>			<b>3</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.1%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21.43%</b>	<b>20 of 85</b>	<b>23.53%</b>	
<b>3.5</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>10%</b>					<b>3</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.7%</b>							<b>5 of 85</b>	<b>5.88%</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10%</b>			<b>2</b>	<b>33.34%</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>28.57%</b>	<b>15 of 85</b>	<b>17.65%</b>	
<b>2.5</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9.1%</b>					<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>							<b>4 of 85</b>	<b>4.71%</b>	
<b>2</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27.27%</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>	<b>8 of 85</b>	<b>9.41%</b>	
<b>1</b>					<b>1</b>	<b>9.1%</b>											<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>	<b>2 of 85</b>	<b>2.35%</b>	
<b>MET "3" STANDARD</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>54.55%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>84.62%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>88.87%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>77.78%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>71 of 85</b>	<b>83.53%</b>	
<b>AVE PASSING SCORE</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>4.31</b>		<b>4.83</b>		<b>3.83</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>4.41</b>		<b>4.25</b>		<b>3.57</b>		<b>4.08</b>		<b>4.14</b>		
<b>AVE OF ALL SCORES</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>3.9</b>		<b>3.5</b>		<b>3.83</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>4.11</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>3.22</b>		<b>3.71</b>		<b>3.81</b>		

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

<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>
Students in <b>Comparative Religion (HUM 3633)</b> are required to complete a <b>Reflective Essay</b> , asking them to compare and contrast their own religious background to that of another religious tradition.	At least 80% of the students in <b>Comparative Religion (HUM 3633)</b> will score 70% or higher on their <b>Reflective Essay</b> .	All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors.  Each course Instructor reports the performance of BA-LA students separately from the General Education student population.	17 total students  3 Online; Summer 2021  2 On-Ground; Fall 2021  4 Online; Fall 2021  8 On-Ground; Spring 2022  No Blended sections taught 2021-22	17 of 17 total students = 100% met the performance standard.  3 of 3 Online = 100%; Summer 2021  2 of 2 On-Ground = 100%; Fall 2021  4 of 4 Online = 100%; Fall 2021  8 of 8 On-Ground = 100%; Spring 2022	Y

**H.**  
**Conclusions**

SLO #3 results are very positive and indicate solid student success. BA-LA program majors have been tracked separately for the past eleven years. Program majors have been more successful than non-BA-LA students, although the small sample sizes of BA-LA students relative to the larger General Education 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**

<b>SLO #4:</b>	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>	<b>G. Standard Met (Y/N)</b>																																				
Students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BA-LA) degree will complete the <b>Graduating Senior Survey</b> as a part of their graduation application process.	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 <b>Graduating Senior Survey</b> at the time they apply for graduation.	0 total students  All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors.	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																																				
In the <b>Survey</b> , students will rate their degree of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in response to a series of categories/questions.		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.  NOTE: According to Dr. Millikin, no graduates in the BA in Liberal Arts completed a survey for 2021-2022 academic year.		<p><b>1. "Quality of Instruction in Major"</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="771 1732 885 1906"> <tr><td>Very Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> <tr><td>Somewhat Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> </table> <p><b>2. "Preparation for Advanced Classes in Major"</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="885 1732 998 1906"> <tr><td>Very Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> <tr><td>Somewhat Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> </table> <p><b>3. "Availability of Faculty for Academic Help"</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="998 1732 1096 1906"> <tr><td>Very Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> <tr><td>Somewhat Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> </table> <p><b>4. "Overall Major Experience"</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1096 1732 1209 1906"> <tr><td>Very Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> <tr><td>Somewhat Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> </table> <p><b>5. "Overall Department Experience"</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1209 1732 1323 1906"> <tr><td>Very Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> <tr><td>Somewhat Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> </table> <p><b>6. "Overall RSU Experience" [Comparison/Control]</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1732 1437 1906"> <tr><td>Very Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> <tr><td>Somewhat Satisfied</td><td>ND</td><td>ND</td></tr> </table>	Very Satisfied	ND	ND	Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND	Very Satisfied	ND	ND	Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND	Very Satisfied	ND	ND	Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND	Very Satisfied	ND	ND	Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND	Very Satisfied	ND	ND	Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND	Very Satisfied	ND	ND	Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND	
Very Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Very Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Very Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Very Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Very Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Very Satisfied	ND	ND																																							
Somewhat Satisfied	ND	ND																																							

**A.**  
**Student Learning Outcome #4**

**SLO #4:** Express satisfaction with the degree program.

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

**H.**  
**Conclusions**

2021-22 is now the second consecutive year that no students completed the Survey; hence, (new) conclusions are impossible. In the absence of any new data for 2021-22, please consult the 8-YR table below (from 2020-21). 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
	SS	ND	2	28.6%	1	33.3%	2	22.2%	2	15.4%	NA	0%	0	0%	Data Not Collected	7	12.73%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>80%</b>	Data Not Collected	<b>53</b>	<b>96.37%</b>
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%	Data Not Collected	13	23.64%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>92.4%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>80%</b>	Data Not Collected	<b>50</b>	<b>90.91%</b>
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%					Data Not Collected	5	15.63%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>					Data Not Collected	<b>30</b>	<b>93.75%</b>
4. Overall Major Experience	VS	ND	6	85.7%	2	66.7%	7	77.8%	8	61.5%	12	92.3%	7	70%	Data Not Collected	53	77.94%
	SS	ND	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	22.2%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%	1	10%	Data Not Collected	12	17.65%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>80%</b>	Data Not Collected	<b>65</b>	<b>95.59%</b>
5. Overall Department Experience	VS	ND	5	71.4%	2	66.7%	6	66.7%	8	61.5%	11	84.6%	7	70%	Data Not Collected	51	75%
	SS	ND	2	28.6%	0	0%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	2	15.4%	1	10%	Data Not Collected	14	20.59%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>80%</b>	Data Not Collected	<b>65</b>	<b>95.59%</b>
6. Overall RSU Experience	VS	ND	5	71.4%	1	33.3%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	9	69.2%	7	70%	Data Not Collected	41	60.29%
	SS	ND	2	28.6%	1	33.3%	5	55.6%	6	46.2%	4	30.8%	1	10%	Data Not Collected	21	30.88%
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>84.7%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>80%</b>	Data Not Collected	<b>62</b>	<b>91.17%</b>



**A.  
Student Learning Outcome #4**

<b>SLO #4:</b>	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>	<b>G. Standard Met (Y/N)</b>		
<p>Between 2013-14 and 2019-20, 68 students completed the survey. Only 6 (8.82%) expressed any degree of dissatisfaction with the BA-LA program. The very high degree of expressed overall satisfaction year-over-year suggests that any expressions of dissatisfaction 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 written any 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.</p> <p>To contextualize better the very positive results of BA-LA program students' satisfaction, note that between 2013-14 and 2019-20, BA-LA students expressed an average of ~5% higher total satisfaction with the "Quality of Instruction in Major" (QIM), "Overall Major Experience" (OME), and "Overall Department Experience" (ODE) than they expressed regarding their "Overall RSU Experience" (ORE). Assessed by the highest standard, <i>i.e.</i>, "Very Satisfied," BA-LA 8-YR results surpass ORE 8-YR results by significant percentages: QIM = +23.35%; OME = +17.65%; ODE = +14.71%. In the final analysis, BA-LA students are more "Very Satisfied" with their degree experience than with their "Overall RSU Experience" and, thus, are highly satisfied with the educational experience afforded by the degree program.</p>							

**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.








<b>Proposed Change</b>	<b>Applicable Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Rationale and Impact</b>
Develop Department-conducted Capstone Student Survey.	SLO #4 Express satisfaction with the degree program.	SLO #4 relies on data from the Graduating Student Survey, administered by the Office of Academics and Accountability. In days of yore, students completed a paper/hardcopy Survey. Since this Survey changed to being conducted online, students have been largely, if not completely, ignoring it, yielding little-to-no data; thus, it has become essentially unusable. To close the loop and improve data collection and assessment conclusions, the BA-LA faculty will develop a new paper/hardcopy Survey and administer it in-class, in conjunction with the Capstone process.

**PART 6**  
**Summary of Assessment Measures**



- A. How many different assessment measures were used? = 6
- B. List the direct measures (see appendix): [1] Capstone Proposal (AM 1A); [2] Scholarly Paper (AM 1B1); [3] Research Paper (AM 1B2); [4] Reflective Paper (AM 2); [5] Comparative Religion Essay (AM 3).
- C. List the indirect measures (see appendix): [6] School of Liberal Arts Graduating Student Survey (AM 4).

**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.	
Scott Reed	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	

B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	Mary M Mackie		6-14-2022
Dean	Keith W Martin		6/15/22