Degree Program Student Learning Report
Revised August 2017

Department of English & Humanities

BA in Liberal Arts

For 2022-2023 Academic Year

PART 1
Degree Program Mission and Student Learning Outcomes

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

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

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

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking.	The School of Arts and Sciences offers innovative degrees, which focus upon developing skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, creativity, empirical and evidenced-based inquiry, experimental investigation and theoretical	Foster the skills of critical and creative thinking, writing, communication, and research among our students.	#1. Demonstrate creative and critical thinking. #2. Reflect meaningfully on their educational experience.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
	explanation of natural phenomena, and innovative technology		
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	The School of Arts and Sciences will offer and promote artistic, scientific, cultural, and public affairs events on the campus and in the region.		

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves.			

PART 2
Revisit Proposed Changes Made in Previous Assessment Cycle

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

Proposed Change	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comments
For SLO #4: "Express satisfaction with the degree program." Develop a Department-conducted Capstone Student Survey to replace the RSU Graduating Senior Survey.	Y	The Graduating Senior Survey, from the Office of Academics and Accountability, has not generated sufficient results since it changed to an online survey. The BA-LA faculty implemented a degree-specific Survey, administered in conjunction with the Capstone process.

PART 3
Response to University Assessment Committee Peer Review

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

Peer Review Feedback	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comment
"Part 1. SLO #4 is not a learning outcome. Student satisfaction, in and of itself, is not a knowledge or skill acquired from a learning activity. Satisfaction could be used as an indirect assess measure for other program learning outcomes" (sic)	Y	The BA-LA Program will continue to use a survey as an indirect assessment measure. See Part 2 above.
"Part 4. The results tables in this section are a little confusing. The standard indicates a student work was assigned a numerical score on a five-point scale (1-5) using a custom	Y	The Capstone Committee has determined that half-point scores are midway in-between

rubric. The score column in all of the tables show tables show half-point scores (2.5, 3.5). Does the rubric permit half-point scores or are these somehow derived mathematically (i.e. average)? Not a big issue, but some clarity might benefit the reader" (sic)		full-point scores on the five-point scale of the rubric.
"Part 4. The large tables summarizing student scores for the last several years are helpful, but a bit overwhelming. Can these be simplified? Two of the tables report nine years of data. Could these be condensed to five? Also, you might report just the number of students or just the percentage of students in each year. That would greatly reduce the clutter" (sic)	Y	The tables now report only the past five years of data.

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. <u>Note</u>: 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: 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)**
1A Students in the *Humanities Seminar* (HUM 4993) are required to create a **Capstone Project Proposal**. NOTE: HUM 4993 is taught fall semesters only.	At least 75% of the students completing the *Humanities Seminar* (HUM 4993) will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their **Capstone Project Proposal**. The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric	Data from all students completing the *Humanities Seminar* (HUM 4993) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English;	14 total students 8 On-Ground 6 Online 13 English = 8 OG + 5 OL 1 Global Humanities = 0 OG + 1 OL	8 of 14 total students = 57.14% met the performance standard. 6 of 8 On-Ground = 75% 2 of 6 Online = 33.33% 8 of 13 English (6 OG + 2 OL) = 61.54% 0 of 1 Global Humanities (0 OG + 0 OL) = 0% Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale <table><tr><td>SCORE</td><td>STUDENTS</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>**5**</td><td>**1**</td><td>**7.14%**</td></tr></table>		N

4

<table>
<tr><th colspan="7" style="text-align:center">A.
Student Learning Outcome #1</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="7">SLO #1: Demonstrate creative and critical thinking.</td></tr>
<tr>
<th>B.
Assessment Measure</th>
<th>C.
Performance Standard</th>
<th>D.
Sampling Method</th>
<th>E.
Sample Size (n)</th>
<th colspan="2">F.
Results</th>
<th>G.
Standard Met (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</table>

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
	with specific criteria for each number assigned.	[2] Global Humanities.		Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale (see table below) Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4 Average Score of All Scores = 3.14	

SCORE	STUDENTS	%
4.5	**4**	**28.57%**
3	**3**	**21.43%**
2.5	2	14.29%
2	3	21.49%
1	1	7.14%

Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4
Average Score of All Scores = 3.14

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
1B1 Students in the *Capstone Project/ Portfolio* (HUM 4013) may choose to complete a 25-35-page **Scholarly Paper** = Option #1. NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	At least 75% of the students in the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM 4013) who choose Option #1 will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 25-35-page **Scholarly Paper**. The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students who complete Option #1 in the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM 4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	5 total students 5 On-Ground 0 Online 5 English = 5 OG + 0 OL 0 Global Humanities = 0 OG	5 of 5 total students = 100% met the performance standard. 5 of 5 On-Ground = 100% 0 of 0 Online = NA 5 of 5 English (5 OG + 0 OL) = 100% 0 of 0 Global Humanities (OG) = NA Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale (see table below) Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4 Average Score of All Scores = 4	Y

Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale

SCORE	STUDENTS	%
5	**2**	**40%**
4	**1**	**20%**
3	**2**	**40%**

Average Score of All Passing Scores = 4
Average Score of All Scores = 4

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
1B2 Students in the *Capstone*	At least 75% of the students in the	Data from	9 total students	2 of 9 total students = 22.22% met the performance standard.	N

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)
Project / Portfolio (HUM 4013) may choose to complete a 10-12-page **Research Paper** & Complementary **Triptych** = Option #2. NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	*Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM 4013) who choose Option #2 will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 10-12-page **Research Paper**. The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	all students who complete Option #2 in the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM 4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	3 On-Ground 6 Online 8 English = 3 OG + 5 OL 1 Global Humanities = 1 OL	0 of 3 On-Ground = 0% 2 of 6 Online = 33.33% 2 of 8 English (0 OG + 2 OL) = 25% 0 of 1 Global Humanities (0 OL) = 0% Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale <table><tr><td>SCORE</td><td>STUDENTS</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>11.11%</td></tr><tr><td>3.5</td><td>1</td><td>11.11%</td></tr><tr><td>2.5</td><td>2</td><td>22.22%</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>44.44%</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>11.11%</td></tr></table> Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 3.75 Average Score of All Scores = 1.56	

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.

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)

As the AM 1A (Capstone Proposal) table below shows, AM 1A 2022-23 performance results (8 of 14 = 57.14%) declined only 2.86% from 2021-22 results, but they are 17.86% below the performance standard and are the second-lowest results in five years (cf. 2019-20 = 54.55%).

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 (especially AM 1B1 = 100% performance results) historically score higher than do their AM 1A proposals. This difficulty seems especially so for Online (OL) and Option #2 (AM 1B2) 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 2022-23 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.

Covid negative impact, and overall academic deficiency issues, seem especially to plague OL students, all 6 of whom for 2022-23 pursued Option #2 (AM 1B2). As the sample sizes for AM 1B1 and AM 1B2 indicate, the total sample size for AM 1A (14 students) divides into a size of only 5 students for AM 1B1 and of 9 students for AM 1B2. This division is significant for two reasons. First, all 5 of 5 = 100% AM 1B1 students met or surpassed the performance standard for both AM 1A and AM 1B1. Second, of the 9 students for AM 1B2, 6 of 9 = 66.67% were Online (OL) students, and only 2 of 6 = 33.33% OL students met the AM 1A performance standard. In the final analysis, 6 of 14 = 42.86% of total students were OL, and only 2 of 6 = 33.33% OL students met the AM 1A performance result.

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

RUBRIC SCORE		2022-23		2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19	*5-YR*	
5	1	7.14%			2	16.67%	2	18.18%			*5 of 48*	*10.42%*
4.5	4	28.57%			2	16.67%					*6 of 48*	*12.5%*
4			1	20%	1	8.34%			1	16.67%	*3 of 48*	*6.25%*
3.5			1	20%	1	8.34%			1	16.67%	*3 of 48*	*6.25%*
3	3	21.43%	1	20%	3	25%	4	36.36%	2	33.34%	*13 of 48*	*27.08%*
2.5	2	14.29%					1	9.09%			*3 of 48*	*6.25%*
2	3	21.43	1	20%	2	16.67%	2	18.18%	2	33.34%	*10 of 48*	*20.83%*
1	1	7.14%	1	20%	1	8.34%	2	18.18%			*5 of 48*	*10.42%*
		2022-23		2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19	*5-YR*	
MET "3" STANDARD	8	57.14%	3	60%	9	75%	6	54.55%	4	66.67%	*30 of 48*	*62.5%*

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)
AVE PASSING SCORE	4	3.5	3.94	3.67	3.38	*3.7*
AVE OF ALL SCORES	3.14	2.7	3.375	2.77	2.92	*2.981*

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 2021-22, skewed by a small sample size) 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 their academic writing. In brief, through the process of their completing at greater length, in the spring, their fall-proposed Capstone project, students seem to improve their creative and critical thinking.
In the final analysis, Option #1 (AM 1B1) Capstone students have significantly surpassed the performance standard year-over-year over the past five years.

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

RUBRIC SCORE	2022-23		2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		*5-YR*	
5	2	40%			2	40%	2	33.34%			*6 of 23*	*26.1%*
4.5			1	33.3%			2	33.34%	1	25%	*4 of 23*	*17.39%*
4	1	20%			1	20%					*2 of 23*	*8.7%*
3.5					1	20%	1	16.67%	2	50%	*4 of 23*	*17.39%*
3	2	40%			1	20%			1	25%	*4 of 23*	*17.39%*
2.5			1	33.3%			1	16.67%			*2 of 23*	*8.7%*
2			1	33.3%							*1 of 23*	*4.35%*
1												
	2022-23		2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		*5-YR*	
MET "3" STANDARD	5	100%	1	33.3%	5	100%	5	83.34%	4	100%	*20 of 23*	*86.96%*
AVE PASSING SCORE	4		4.5		4.1		4.55		3.63		*4.16*	
AVE OF ALL SCORES	4		3		4.1		4.21		3.63		*3.79*	

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)

A significant qualification to celebrating the historical consistent year-over-year improvement in student learning for Option #1 students, 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 OL students) have not shown improvement from their fall proposal (AM 1A) to their spring completed project (AM 1B2).

As the AM 1B2 table below shows, 2022-23 performance results (2 of 9 = 22.22%) declined from 2021-22 performance results, even with a larger sample size to mitigate somewhat the downward distortion of percentages in small sample sizes. If one compares the AM 1B2 table of year-over-year performance results (below) to the AM 1B1 table of year-over-year performance results (above), one observes for AM 1B2 consistently much lower performance results over the past five years.

AM 1B2: Capstone Course Research Paper = Option #2 (Spring Semester) Year-Over-Year Distribution of Students' Performance Results

RUBRIC SCORE	2022-23		2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		5-YR	
5					1	20%					1 of 23	4.35%
4.5												
4	1	11.11%					1	20%			2 of 23	8.7%
3.5	1	11.11%	1	50%							2 of 23	8.7%
3					1	20%					1 of 23	4.35%
2.5	2	22.22%			1	20%	1	20%	1	50%	5 of 23	21.74%
2	4	44.44%	1	50%	2	40%	2	40%	1	50%	10 of 23	43.48%
1	1	11.11%					1	20%			2 of 23	8.7%
	2022-23		2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		5-YR	
MET "3" STANDARD	2	22.22%	1	50%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	6 of 23	26.09%
AVE PASSING SCORE	3.75		3.5		4		4		NA		3.81	
AVE OF ALL SCORES	1.56		2.75		2.9		2.3		2.25		2.35	

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)

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. Though an incomplete analysis, five broader, year-over-year reflections on AM 1A *vis-à-vis* AM 1B1 & AM 1B2 perhaps afford some clarity about weak performances.

First, AM 1A is a *proposal* 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. The Capstone Committee is deliberating about how to encourage, incentivize, and/or compel students to forethink about the Capstone process toward developing better proposals, which should lead to better completed projects. This issue is especially urgent and necessary for Option #2 and/or OL students.

Second, 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, academic writing skills in developing their proposals (AM 1A) and in completing their projects (AM 1B1 & AM 1B2). In brief, the Capstone Committee correctly holds students' academic writing to a very high standard and is properly stingy regarding assessment scores.

Third, 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 chosen 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 OL 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 weak AM 1A students have been instructed directly (!) by the Capstone Committee to "work closely with your mentor!" Student irresponsibility clarifies some low(er) results for AM 1B1, and especially for AM 1B2 and the disparity in results between these two options (Option #1 and Option #2). In brief, students who most need faculty mentoring too often least seek and/or accept it. This issue was exacerbated by Covid, as distancing, masking, and student self-isolation disrupted traditional student-faculty interaction so crucial to students' learning and developing intellectual skills.

Fourth, another anecdotal explanation for the poor performance of Option #2 students on AM 1A and AM 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 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.

Fifth, a convergent explanation involves Online (OL) versus On-Ground (OG) students. For 2022-23, 6 of 14 = 42.86% students were OL, and all 6 OL students pursued Option #2, but only 2 of 6 = 33.33% met the performance standard. The year-over-year analysis presented in the table below indicates the historically

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)**

weak(er) performance of OL students. For example, of the 6 total OL students who began fall 2020, only 4 completed their Capstone spring 2021, and only 1 met the performance standard. In brief, the Capstone Committee annually observes the consistently weaker performance across all measures of OL versus OG students.

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

Measures	2022-23		2021-22	2020-21		2019-20		2018-19	*5-YR*	
1A = Fall	2 of 6	33.33%	NA	4 of 6	66.67%	2 of 4	50%	NA	*8 of 16*	*50%*
1B1 = Spring	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*
1B2 = Spring	2 of 6	33.33%	NA	1 of 4	25%	1 of 3	33.34%	NA	*4 of 13*	*30.77%*

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 in-person with classmates; thus, the Committee urges normally-OL-students to pursue the Capstone process OG. Despite the evidenced benefits for all students of an OG Capstone experience, OL students cite their family obligations, work-schedule conflicts, and travel-distance or out-of-state constraints as prohibitive. The Capstone Committee acknowledges OL 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; hence, the Capstone Committee expects students' Capstone work to surpass the quality that would otherwise, in program-required and program-elective courses, satisfy competence (equivalent to a "3" score) or demonstrates excellence (equivalent to 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). The Committee continues to review and evaluate the current two-option framework—Option 2 was designed as a pathway for all students to complete their degree and learning outcomes more manageably. Assessment results (and the overall quality of Option 2 proposals and projects) suggest it may not be working successfully.

A.
Student Learning Outcome #2

SLO #2:   Reflect meaningfully on their educational experience.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
Students in the *Capstone Project/ Portfolio* (HUM 4013) are required to complete a 12-15-page **Reflective Essay**. NOTE: HUM 4013 is taught spring semesters only.	At least 75% of the students in the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM 4013) will score a "3" or higher (on a five-point scale) on their 12-15-page **Reflective Essay**. The score is determined by the Capstone Committee according to a rubric with specific criteria for each number assigned.	Data from all students completing the *Capstone Project/Portfolio* (HUM 4013) is included. All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors; the program has two options for concentration: [1] English; [2] Global Humanities.	14 total students 8 On-Ground 6 Online 13 English = 8 OG + 5 OL 1 Global Humanities = 0 OG + 1 OL	9 of 14 total students = 64.29% met the performance standard. 6 of 8 On-Ground = 75% 3 of 6 Online = 50% 9 of 13 English (6 OG + 3 OL) = 69.23% 0 of 1 Global Humanities (0 OG + 0 OL) = 0%	Standard met on-ground (Y); standard not met online (N).

Overall Distribution of Scores on 5-Point Scale

SCORE	STUDENTS	%
5	**4**	**28.57%**
4.5	**3**	**21.43%**
3	**2**	**14.29%**
2	4	28.57%
1	1	7.14%

Average Score of All <u>Passing</u> Scores = 4
Average Score of All Scores = 4

H. Conclusions

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

RUBRIC SCORE	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	*5-YR*

A. Student Learning Outcome #2												

SLO #2:   Reflect meaningfully on their educational experience.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard		D. Sampling Method		E. Sample Size (n)						F. Results		G. Standard Met (Y/N)
5	4	28.57%	1	20%	3	30%	4	36.36%	1	16.67%	13 of 46		28.26%
4.5	3	21.43%			2	20%	2	18.18%			7 of 46		15.22%
4			3	60%	1	10%			3	50%	7 of 46		15.22%
3.5					1	10%					1 of 46		2.17%
3	2	14.29%	1	20%	1	10%			2	33.34%	6 of 46		13.04%
2.5					1	10%	1	9.1%			2 of 46		4.35%
2	4	28.57%			1	10%	3	27.27%			8 of 46		17.39%
1	1	7.14%					1	9.1%			2 of 46		4.35%
	2022-23		2021-22		2020-21		2019-20		2018-19		5-YR		
MET "3" STANDARD	9	64.29%	5	100%	8	80%	6	54.55%	6	100%	34 of 46		73.91%
AVE PASSING SCORE	4.39		4		4.31		4.83		3.83		4.27		
AVE OF ALL SCORES	3.46		4		3.9		3.5		3.83		3.74		

As with SLO #1 AM 1A, all 14 Capstone students completed the same Reflective Essay to assess SLO #2. As the AM 2 table above shows, 2022-23 performance results (9 of 14 = 64.29%) were 10.71% below the performance standard and declined from 2021-22 performance results (5 of 5 = 100%, though with a small sample size). Also as with SLO #1 AM 1A, the division of students between Option #1 (AM 1B1) and Option #2 (AM 1B2) clarifies the lower AM 2 performance results. All 5 of 5 = 100% Option #1 (AM 1B1) students met or surpassed the AM 2 performance standard. Meanwhile, only 3 of 6 = 50% OL students (all 6 of whom also pursued Option #2, AM 1B2) met the AM 2 performance standard.

A.
Student Learning Outcome #3

SLO #3: Demonstrate an understanding of the Western cultural heritage, and an appreciation of the diversity of perspectives on the human condition.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
Students in *Comparative Religion* (HUM 3633) are required to complete a **Reflective Essay**, asking them to compare and contrast their own religious background to that of another religious tradition.	At least 80% of the students in *Comparative Religion* (HUM 3633) will score 70% or higher on their **Reflective Essay**	All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors. Each course Instructor reports the performance of BA-LA students separately from the General Education student population.	5 total students 5 Online; Summer 2022 (only section in 22-23)	5 of 5 total students = 100% met the performance standard.	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 twelve 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					

SLO #4: 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)
Students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BA-LA) degree will complete a **Graduating Senior Survey** as a part of their completing the Capstone course. In the **Survey**, students will rate their degree of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in response to a series of categories/ questions.	At least 80% of the students graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts (BA-LA) degree will rate overall satisfaction with the educational experience afforded by the degree program.	All seniors in HUM 4013 were given survey (two online students did not submit).	12 total students (of 14 possible) All students in the sample are BA-LA program majors. 8 on-ground students 4 (of 6) online students	12/12 Satisfied with BALA Program 12/12 Satisfied with Quality of Instruction in BALA After two consecutive years of no data on BALA students' satisfaction because of issues with the RSU Graduating Student Survey, the department implemented a revised version of the survey it used the first decade of the BALA degree. It includes twenty-two questions about various aspects of the degree, the student experience, and their post-baccalaureate plans. Two questions are particularly relevant to assessing student satisfaction. The first asks how satisfied students are with the BALA degree overall, giving them five options ranging from "Ecstatic" to "Extremely Dissatisfied." On-ground, all eight students completed the survey, with two Ecstatic, four Very Satisfied, and two Satisfied (none selected Dissatisfied or Extremely Dissatisfied). Online, four (of six) students completed the survey, with one Ecstatic and three Satisfied. Though this indicates that on-ground students are more satisfied than online, the comment of the one online Ecstatic student was notable: "I could not be happier with my education." The second asks students about their satisfaction with their instruction in BALA courses, and is open-ended. All eight on-ground responses are positive: one said "Pretty satisfied"; another said "I'm satisfied"; the rest are stronger, with one "Very" and another "Very!"; three gave	Y

15

A. Student Learning Outcome #4						

SLO #4:	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)
				numbers (9/10, 8/10, and 8.5/10); finally one said "I am satisfied and thankful for the patience of my professors." Online, one said "Satisfied"; another "Satisfied. There's only so much that professors can do in an online setting." A third said "I feel mostly satisfied." Finally, a fourth (the same who was Ecstatic to the first question) said "I loved the BALA program and courses… All the professors are great and care about their subject." It's important to the department that our students are satisfied with the education they receive, particularly at the conclusion of a rigorous and demanding capstone process.		

H. Conclusions
Survey results positive overall. Survey needs review and revision before next distribution, and will be evaluated by Capstone Committee. Satisfaction higher for on-ground students than online (though both groups expressed satisfaction). Survey used was 22 narrative questions, which is probably too many. The survey is a rich source of information and feedback about curriculum, faculty, and student goals. We would recommend that all departments develop their own surveys and deliver them directly to their major students. Presumably other departments will prefer a more directed survey and fewer open-ended questions, but this survey fits the culture of English and Humanities quite nicely.

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
Capstone requirements	1	The Capstone Committee is still deliberating about possible changes. There is consensus that the two option model may not be the best approach. Any changes introduced during the 2023-24 AY will be reported in Part 2 of the 2023-24 SLR

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] 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
Hayden Bozarth	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Emily Dial-Driver	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Sally Emmons	Capstone Committee Chair. Revised and distributed Satisfaction Survey. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
James Ford	Department Head. Capstone Committee member. Contributed and evaluated data for HUM 3633. Revised Satisfaction Survey and compiled results. Reviewed, edited, and approved final draft.	
Francis Grabowski III	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Laura Gray	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.	

Matthew Oberrieder	Department Assessment Coordinator, University Assessment Committee representative, and Capstone Committee member (on sabbatical Spring 23). Reported and evaluated data from the Graduating Senior Survey. Prepared Student Learning Report and approved final draft.		
Scott Reed	Capstone Committee member. Reviewed and approved final draft.		

B. Reviewed by:

Title	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	James Ford		
Dean	Keith W Martin		

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.

<div style="display:flex">

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.

</div>

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?