



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities

Program Coordinator: Michael Buesking

Academic Program Evaluated: Art

Program Review Year: 2020

Note: This document replicates some information from the Art SLAR report because PLOs #1-8 are shared by Art and Art Education. PLO#9 is specific to Art Education and is addressed in this SLAR.

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)		Mr. Michael Buesking Mrs. LaDonna Friesen		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Please See Appendix A below.	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:

Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)		Please See Appendix A below.		
<i>Additional Data:</i> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)	For the Spring and Summer of 2019, 100% (2 of 2) Art Education students passed the Missouri General Educational Assessment [MoGEA], and 66% (2 of 3) passed the Missouri Content Assessment [MoCA].	See the ACAT scores in Appendix B No MoGEA or MoCA test scores are available for 2020.		
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		Faculty member assessed PLOs in course syllabi using specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and the faculty member evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria: 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient The average assessment		

		score for each outcome is in Appendix A.		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		See Appendix A		
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)		See Appendix A and B		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		See Appendix C		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		See Appendix C		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		See Appendix C		
Improvements made: (List completed improvement		See Appendix C		

plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.				
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix A

	The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric. 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient					
Program Learning Outcome Assessed	Fall 2019			Spring 2020		
	Score	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used	Score for all courses assessing this outcome	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used
1. Speak and write knowledgeably about art history and its relationship to societies past and present, to faith, and to one's own artistic practice.			Not assessed in ART 330, a Fall course; Not assessed in ART 102, a Fall course	3.50	2	ART 334 Art History IV: Completed Course Project/Thesis Paper Final Exam
2. Explain the basic structural elements and operative principles in works of art and design from any major period in human history.			Not assessed in ART 330, a Fall course; Not assessed in ART 102, a Fall course	3.50	2	ART 334 Art History IV: Completed Course Project/Thesis Paper Final Exam
3. Demonstrate interpretive skills by discussing the philosophical potentials in works of art.			Not assessed in ART 330, a Fall course;	3.19	22	ART 334 Art History IV: Completed Course Project/Thesis Paper; Final Exam ART 103 Art History II: Discussion on Titian

						Writing on Ghent Altarpiece Question on the Final Note: this PLO is not usually associated with ART 103 and should not appear in future assessments of student learning in ART 103.
4. Integrate personal Christian faith and the arts by explaining their mutual relevance and by demonstrating it in one's own personal artwork.			Not assessed			Not assessed
5. Produce creative original artwork in a variety of media, using appropriate tools and methods skillfully.			Not assessed	3.00	13	ART 206 Drawing II: Expressive or Double Self Portrait Assignment
6. Develop the beginnings of a personal artistic style that can be extended into a professional career in the arts.			Not assessed			Not assessed
7. Demonstrate professional dedication to promotion of the arts in general and the disciplined study and practice of one's own area of interest in particular.			Not assessed			Not assessed
8. Demonstrate enthusiasm for the undertaking a career in the arts			Not assessed			Not assessed
9. Demonstrate in-depth understanding of Art teaching methods, best practices, standards (national, state, and institutional), and pedagogical theories by applying them to classroom situations to improve students' art proficiencies and competence.			Not assessed In spring 2020, an adjunct faculty taught the course that assesses PLO #9 and may not have had the instruction needed to assess this outcome in Canvas.			

All scores assessed show an average score for each area at the level of “Proficient” or above. However, assessments of Program Learning Outcomes are lacking over all. Drawing II is the only studio course represented in this chart, and ***all*** of the studio courses should be recording scores for *PLO #5 – produce original artwork*.

According to the Curriculum Map, ART 102 should not be assessing *PLO #3*, while ART 330 should be – along with *PLO #'s 1 & 2*. A low number of students in ART 334 (only 2 this year), makes analysis on any data resulting from that course less reliable, while the inclusion of ART 103 on that particular PLO (generally targeted toward higher level students in Art) may effectively have lowered that average score.

Low reporting generally reflects the faculty conditions in the Art area currently: loss of an adjunct in the Ceramics area and heavy reliance on adjuncts in general. This is combined with what until now has been a general reluctance to use the campus LMS in the Art area since so much activity is studio-based.

Appendix B

ACAT scores:

Art majors take the ACAT exam in Senior Seminar in the fall semester prior to graduation, so the following scores are from FA2019.

These scores should be interpreted with caution. The ACAT is intended to evaluate an entire group of graduating seniors. The accuracy of scores for individual students, particularly in the separate content areas, is limited. The overall performance score is illustrative of the general performance of each student. Individual student performance can be expected to vary across administrations of the same test and can be affected by numerous factors, including motivation and the circumstances under which the test is administered. PACAT Incorporated does not recommend the use of these scores for making decisions about the academic achievement of individual students. Institutions using the scores for individual evaluation should take these limitations into account.

Student	ID	1 (History of Art)	2 (Design: General)	3 (Studio Art)	Overall Score	%'ile
CK	1715227	598	606	524	598	84
FA	1713666	611	606	561	616	88
FB	174546	451	527	470	487	45
SH	11717115	587	527	548	561	73

Unlike a classroom examination, the ACAT content areas are calibrated so the average student will receive an un-weighted score of approximately 49%

correct. ACAT standard scores include a graduated weight for item difficulty and deductions for incorrect responses. Neither of these corrections have been applied to the un-weighted averages shown here. Items that fail to meet PACAT's psychometric standards are excluded from scoring. The values in the table to the right should be interpreted with caution. Note: Standard deviations are not calculated for samples smaller than 5.

This graph illustrates that three of our graduating Seniors in art scored well above ACAT standard scores, and one scored below average.

Appendix C

Item ID	1	2	3	Overall Score	%ile
4632	615	605	611	634	91
2807	434	444	506	450	31

- Comparing the ACAT scores to the previous year (FA2018) indicates a similar split in high and low scorers, though improvement shows in the lowest score from 2019 being much closer to the average on this ACAT test. With so few students, however, it is difficult to draw any correlations between Program strengths and outcomes. In the most recent scores from FA2019, the **lowest score** across the board for the below average student was in Art History. The more academic nature of that area of study compared to the hands-on aspect of studio art hurt that person's score.
- In terms of the Objectives associated with the Art History courses (PLO #'s 1-3), scores are Proficient even when including scores from the survey course on the more demanding PLO #3.
- The area most in need of improvement in the Art Department is in faculty position. Permanency and stability in terms of full-time faculty compared to part-time or adjunct faculty should yield stronger results in Program assessment.
- Training is necessary to ensure adjunct faculty utilize the LMS system for tracking course and Program Learning Objectives in each of the disciplines (Drawing, Painting, Graphics, Printmaking, etc.) and in the different levels of Art History.

- Training and assistance will be provided by Mr. Buesking to the other faculty, full-time and adjunct, to accomplish this for the FA2020 semester.



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities

Program Coordinator: Michael Buesking

Academic Program Evaluated: Art Education

Program Review Year: 2020

Note: This document replicates some information from the Art SLAR report because PLOs #1-8 are shared by Art and Art Education. PLO#9 is specific to Art Education and is addressed in this SLAR.

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: <small>(List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)</small>		Mr. Michael Buesking Mrs. LaDonna Friesen		
Number of students in sample: <small>(If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)</small>	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Please See Appendix A below.	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: <small>(List the</small>		Please See Appendix A below.		

exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)				
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)	For the Spring and Summer of 2019, 100% (2 of 2) Art Education students passed the Missouri General Educational Assessment [MoGEA], and 66% (2 of 3) passed the Missouri Content Assessment [MoCA].	See the ACAT scores in Appendix B No MoGEA or MoCA test scores are available for 2020.		
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		Faculty member assessed PLOs in course syllabi using specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and the faculty member evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria: 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient The average assessment score for each outcome is in Appendix A.		

Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		See Appendix A		
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)		See Appendix A and B		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		See Appendix C		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		See Appendix C		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		See Appendix C		
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this		See Appendix C		

program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.				
---	--	--	--	--

Appendix A

	The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric. 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient					
Program Learning Outcome Assessed	Fall 2019			Spring 2020		
	Score	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used	Score for all courses assessing this outcome	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used
1. Speak and write knowledgeably about art history and its relationship to societies past and present, to faith, and to one's own artistic practice.			Not assessed in ART 330, a Fall course; Not assessed in ART 102, a Fall course	3.50	2	ART 334 Art History IV: Completed Course Project/Thesis Paper Final Exam
2. Explain the basic structural elements and operative principles in works of art and design from any major period in human history.			Not assessed in ART 330, a Fall course; Not assessed in ART 102, a Fall course	3.50	2	ART 334 Art History IV: Completed Course Project/Thesis Paper Final Exam
3. Demonstrate interpretive skills by discussing the philosophical potentials in works of art.			Not assessed in ART 330, a Fall course;	3.19	22	ART 334 Art History IV: Completed Course Project/Thesis Paper; Final Exam ART 103 Art History II: Discussion on Titian Writing on Ghent Altarpiece Question on the Final

						Note: this PLO is not usually associated with ART 103 and should not appear in future assessments of student learning in ART 103.
4. Integrate personal Christian faith and the arts by explaining their mutual relevance and by demonstrating it in one's own personal artwork.			Not assessed			Not assessed
5. Produce creative original artwork in a variety of media, using appropriate tools and methods skillfully.			Not assessed	3.00	13	ART 206 Drawing II: Expressive or Double Self Portrait Assignment
6. Develop the beginnings of a personal artistic style that can be extended into a professional career in the arts.			Not assessed			Not assessed
7. Demonstrate professional dedication to promotion of the arts in general and the disciplined study and practice of one's own area of interest in particular.			Not assessed			Not assessed
8. Demonstrate enthusiasm for the undertaking a career in the arts			Not assessed			Not assessed
9. Demonstrate in-depth understanding of Art teaching methods, best practices, standards (national, state, and institutional), and pedagogical theories by applying them to classroom situations to improve students' art proficiencies and competence.			Not assessed In spring 2020, an adjunct faculty taught the course that assesses PLO #9 and may not have had the instruction needed to assess this outcome in Canvas.			

All scores assessed show an average score for each area at the level of "Proficient" or above. However, assessments of

Program Learning Outcomes are lacking over all. Drawing II is the only studio course represented in this chart, and ***all*** of the studio courses should be recording scores for *PLO #5 – produce original artwork*.

According to the Curriculum Map, ART 102 should not be assessing *PLO #3*, while ART 330 should be – along with *PLO #'s 1 & 2*. A low number of students in ART 334 (only 2 this year), makes analysis on any data resulting from that course less reliable, while the inclusion of ART 103 on that particular PLO (generally targeted toward higher level students in Art) may effectively have lowered that average score.

Low reporting generally reflects the faculty conditions in the Art area currently: loss of an adjunct in the Ceramics area and heavy reliance on adjuncts in general. This is combined with what until now has been a general reluctance to use the campus LMS in the Art area since so much activity is studio-based.

Appendix B

ACAT scores:

Art majors take the ACAT exam in Senior Seminar in the fall semester prior to graduation, so the following scores are from FA2019.

These scores should be interpreted with caution. The ACAT is intended to evaluate an entire group of graduating seniors. The accuracy of scores for individual students, particularly in the separate content areas, is limited. The overall performance score is illustrative of the general performance of each student. Individual student performance can be expected to vary across administrations of the same test and can be affected by numerous factors, including motivation and the circumstances under which the test is administered. PACAT Incorporated does not recommend the use of these scores for making decisions about the academic achievement of individual students. Institutions using the scores for individual evaluation should take these limitations into account.

Student	ID	1 (History of Art)	2 (Design: General)	3 (Studio Art)	Overall Score	%'ile
CK	1715227	598	606	524	598	84
FA	1713666	611	606	561	616	88
FB	174546	451	527	470	487	45
SH	11717115	587	527	548	561	73

Unlike a classroom examination, the ACAT content areas are calibrated so the average student will receive an un-weighted score of approximately 49% correct. ACAT standard scores include a graduated weight for item difficulty and deductions for incorrect responses. Neither of these corrections have been applied to the un-weighted averages shown here. Items that fail to meet PACAT's psychometric standards are excluded from scoring. The values in the table to the right should be interpreted with caution. Note: Standard deviations are not calculated for samples smaller than 5.

This graph illustrates that three of our graduating Seniors in art scored well above ACAT standard scores, and one scored below average.

Appendix C

Student ID	1	2	3	Overall Score	%ile
#632	615	605	611	634	91
2807	434	444	506	450	31

- Comparing the ACAT scores to the previous year (FA2018) indicates a similar split in high and low scorers, though improvement shows in the lowest score from 2019 being much closer to the average on this ACAT test. With so few students, however, it is difficult to draw any correlations between Program strengths and outcomes. In the most recent scores from FA2019, the **lowest score** across the board for the below average student was in Art History. The more academic nature of that area of study compared to the hands-on aspect of studio art hurt that person's score.
- In terms of the Objectives associated with the Art History courses (PLO #'s 1-3), scores are Proficient even when including scores from the survey course on the more demanding PLO #3.
- The area most in need of improvement in the Art Department is in faculty position. Permanency and stability in terms of full-time faculty compared to part-time or adjunct faculty should yield stronger results in Program assessment.
- Training is necessary to ensure adjunct faculty utilize the LMS system for tracking course and Program Learning Objectives in each of the disciplines (Drawing, Painting, Graphics, Printmaking, etc.) and in the different levels of Art History.
- Training and assistance will be provided by Mr. Buesking to the other faculty, full-time and adjunct, to accomplish this for the FA2020 semester.



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities

Program Coordinator: LaDonna Friesen

Academic Program Evaluated: English

Program Review Year: 2023

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Dr. Diane Awbrey Mrs. LaDonna Friesen Dr. Luke Gibbs Dr. Jennifer Morrison Dr. Nathan Nelson		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)		Please see Appendix A	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)		Literary analysis essays, exams, exam essays, written and oral discussions, and project writings. <i>Please see more details</i>		

		<i>in Appendix A</i>		
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)		<i>Please see Appendix A for annual ACAT results</i>		
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		<p>Faculty assessed PLOs in their syllabi using specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and faculty evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria:</p> <p>4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient</p> <p>The average assessment score for each outcome is in Appendix A.</p>		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		Please see Appendix A for the table used to discuss these outcomes.		
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to		Please see Appendix B.		

the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)				
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		

2020 Appendix A: Number of Students in Sample and Instrument(s) used in assessment

	The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric.
4 Exceeds Proficiency	

	3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient					
Program Learning Outcome Assessed	Fall 2019			Spring 2020		
	Score	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used	Score for all courses assessing this outcome	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used
1. Demonstrate familiarity with literary periods and traditions in the broad sweep of British and American history, including knowledge of prominent authors, genres, topics, philosophical issues, literary movements, and artistic styles.	3.8	20	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	3.56	27	ENGL 302 English Lit. Survey II: Final REC Exam, subtest #4 ENGL 331 Shakespeare: Final Literary Analysis Essay
2. Analyze a text competently for its structural elements and interpretive potentials—particularly in the categories of diction, imagery, figurative language, irony, setting, character, plot, narrative point of view, and genre characteristics.	3.5	48	ENGL 123 Lec. 4 Introduction to Literature ENGL 222 Young Adult Literature: Socratic Writing and Discussion on <i>The Book Thief</i> by Marcus Zusak ENGL 330 Children's Literature: Literary Thinker's Project writing on the novel <i>Holes</i> by Louis Sachar	3.04	98	ENGL 123 Introduction to Literature: Short Fiction Exam Essay ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2 ENGL 440 C.S. Lewis: Midterm Exam
3. Apply knowledge of history, culture, human nature, and a variety of literary-theoretical perspectives to analyze texts competently for	3.9	18	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	2.88	16	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2

their philosophical potentials and to discuss those findings in coherent interpretive discourse.						
4. Demonstrate high proficiency in using the protocols of standard written North American English.			Not assessed	3.14	28	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2 ENGL 298 English Practicum: Final Exam ENGL 445 History and Structure of English Language: Final Exam
5. Produce mature writing in a variety of modes for various audiences and purposes, showing editorial ease in making textual adjustments for readability and rhetorical or literary effectiveness.	3.3	14	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	3.09	31	ENGL 341 Technical Writing: Literature Review
6. Use pertinent research information effectively as necessary or advantageous within written or spoken discourse.			Not assessed	3.44	66	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2 ENGL 331 Shakespeare: Final Literary Analysis Essay ENGL 341 Technical Writing: Literature Review
7. Demonstrate advanced skills of integrative and independent thinking in written and verbal expression.	3.8	17	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	No results	7	This criteria may have been assessed in ENGL 302 English Literature Survey II, but the results were not in the Canvas report.

8. Demonstrate the ability to hold contradictory ideas in mind during discussion by calmly considering others' perspectives, asking productive questions, articulating respectful responses, and finding ways to synthesize others' ideas with one's own.		Not assessed	3.22	116	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Discussion before the Midterm Exam ENGL 302 English Literature Survey II: Discussion First Half of Term ENGL 331 Shakespeare: Final Literary Analysis Essay ENGL 341 Technical Writing: Revised Literature Review ENGL 440 C.S. Lewis: Discussion First Half of Term and Discussion Second Half of Term
9. Discuss various ways in which the Christian faith is, has been, or can be in meaningful dialogue with literary texts of any kind.		Not assessed	3.0	46	ENGL 302 English Literature Survey II: Discussion First Half of Term ENGL 440 C.S. Lewis: Discussion First Half of Term and Discussion Second Half of Term

Additional Data

[ACAT Assessment: English Literature](#) (Click here to view the literary content areas assessed.)

Assessment Instrument	What is evaluated? (Connection to Student Learning Outcomes)	When administered?	Analysis of fairness, consistency and accuracy	Criteria	Schedule for Review
Area Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT)Literature	English Education Program Learning Outcome 1. Demonstrate familiarity with literary periods and traditions in the broad sweep of British and American history,	Senior Year	Instrument reliability and validity assured by ACAT	Score of 600 or above.	January Department Meeting

<i>Assessment Instrument</i>	<i>What is evaluated? (Connection to Student Learning Outcomes)</i>	<i>When administered?</i>	<i>Analysis of fairness, consistency and accuracy</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Schedule for Review</i>
in: ENGLISH	<p>including knowledge of prominent authors, genres, topics, philosophical issues, literary movements, and artistic styles.</p> <p>English Education Program Learning Outcome 2. Analyze a text competently for its structural elements and interpretive potentials— particularly in the categories of diction, imagery, figurative language, irony, setting, character, plot, narrative point of view, and genre characteristics.</p> <p>English Education Program Learning Outcome 3. Apply knowledge of history, culture, human nature, and a variety of literary-theoretical perspectives to analyze texts competently for their philosophical potentials and to discuss those findings in coherent interpretive discourse.</p>				

Results for ACAT Literature in English:

Senior English Education majors take the **ACAT Literature in English** exam in November while they are enrolled in ENGL 497 Senior Seminar.

The following year-end report dated 6/01/2020 refers to the **ACAT Literature in English** exam given at the end of ENGL 497 in November 2019:

ACAT

Departmental Score Report

Institution: **Evangel University**
Discipline: **Literature in English**
Testing Year: **2019-20 (52)**
Date Prepared: **6/1/2020**
Report Type: **Interim - Senior - Profile 1**

ACAT scores range from 200 to 800 with an average of 500 and a standard deviation of 100. A score of 600 would be 1 standard deviation above average. A score of 450 would be .5 standard deviations (50 points) below average. Nationally, 68% of the scores in any given year should fall between approximately 400 and 600. Year-to-year variations in the size of the reference groups will cause scores to fall outside these limits. The content area scores are compared with a reference group of other examinees taking the same content area. The overall performance score is compared with other examinees taking the ACAT in this discipline with the same number of content areas. The overall score is a separately determined performance appraisal rather than a numerical average of the area scores. The percentile shown on the table is the percent of students in the national reference group expected to obtain a score equal to or less than the one shown. The reference groups are composed of the examinees during the most recent 6-year period.

Area	Standard Score	%'ile	Reference Group Size
American to 1865	499	50	478
American Modern (1860's to present)	528	61	478
British Medieval Period	562	73	478
British Renaissance	560	73	478
British Romantic	552	70	478
British Victorian	548	68	478
Shakespeare	502	51	478
Linguistics	572	76	478
Restoration/18th Cent./PreRomantic	592	82	478
OVERALL PERFORMANCE	571	76	478

Based on a reference group of 478 graduating students taking an ACAT in Literature in English with 9 areas, 76% would be expected to achieve at or below your overall performance score of 571, 24% would be expected to achieve a higher score.

Individual Examinee Standard Scores Sorted Alphabetically by Last Name

These scores should be interpreted with caution. The ACAT is intended to evaluate an entire group of graduating seniors. The accuracy of scores for individual students, particularly in the separate content areas, is limited. The overall performance score is illustrative of the general performance of each student. Individual student performance can be expected to vary across administrations of the same test and can be affected by numerous factors, including motivation and the circumstances under which the test is administered. PACAT Incorporated does not recommend the use of these scores for making decisions about the academic achievement of individual students. Institutions using the scores for individual evaluation should take these limitations into account.

Name	Student ID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Overall Score	%ile
B English majors are the lines for letters	11715402	563	562	501	500	670	601	522	520	580	507	80
J	1715039	520	552	614	533	478	697	551	686	645	630	90
H	100041061	406	406	622	600	146	561	466	681	460	511	54
R	1715392	468	447	421	510	441	551	551	510	561	489	46
H	11715259	520	607	614	500	712	607	420	726	582	669	95
M	1714971	563	589	488	510	511	469	371	370	472	473	39
N	11715875	368	452	523	467	562	364	428	442	614	456	22
L	11715022	520	595	606	745	553	510	531	564	623	627	90
B	11714772	511	406	488	585	455	405	502	532	472	473	39
N	197	358	589	515	350	553	417	383	573	552	467	37
T	11716516	596	595	713	703	646	697	735	604	800	778	100
N	1715149	577	452	606	778	595	615	559	686	725	685	97

1 = American to 1865

2 = American Modern (1880's to present)

3 = British Medieval Period

4 = British Renaissance

5 = British Romantic

6 = British Victorian

7 = Shakespeare

8 = Linguistics

9 = Restoration/18th Cent./PreRomantic

Appendix B: Results of Assessment

What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes?

For outcomes that were assessed, all scores except one were 3.0 or above, indicating "proficient" for students enrolled in most English courses. Also, the outcomes were evaluated through literary studies from varied times and contexts and from students' writing in genres such as essay, technical writing, and creative writing. The outcome assessments, then, were not limited to one type of assignment, genre, or particular literary period. The outcomes allow for the literary scope of English survey courses and writing mediums.

(A) What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and (B) what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?

- A. In the English 2019 analysis, one of our goals was to designate at least one course that would assess PLO #9: "Discuss various ways in which the Christian faith is, has been, or can be in meaningful dialogue with literary texts of any kind." Though this outcome was not assessed in fall 2019, discussion assignments in two English courses evaluated student fulfillment of this outcome in Spring 2020 with an average of 3.0.

In addition to PLOs, our department discussed strengthening alumni engagement. One example was inviting Dr. Milta Little (Spanish and Biology double major who graduated in 2002) to speak in ENGL 123 Introduction to Literature about the importance of a Humanities education in medical practice. Dr. Little was Evangel's 2019 Outstanding Young Alumnus and currently serves as Associate Professor of Geriatric Medicine at Duke University. Students in the English course listened to Dr. Little's experience of practicing Humanities attributes, such as empathy, engaging patients through storytelling, and enlarging one's understanding of life through the Humanities disciplines.

- B. English faculty can assess all nine PLOs in the coming academic year, and each course should assess the outcome designated to it on the curriculum map. From reviewing these assessment scores, English faculty can continue discussing how students can strengthen their application of historical, cultural, and literary knowledge; analyze that knowledge; and produce mature writing that effectively expresses their analyses.

Appendix C: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, Areas in Need of Improvement, Plans for Improvement, and Improvements Made

Strengths

- By the conclusion of spring 2020, most Program Learning Outcomes had been assessed, including #9, which was not assessed last year.
- Results of the Program Learning Outcomes assessment indicates that students perform most outcomes proficiently on major or culminating assignments in English courses.
- Most fulltime faculty are linking Program Learning Outcomes to Course Learning Outcomes in course syllabi.

- The average ACAT English Literature exit assessment score was 1% higher than last year, and one English major earned 100%.
- Two English faculty, Dr. Nathan Nelson and Dr. Luke Gibbs, received awards for outstanding teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Dr. Jennifer Morrison, Evangel English professor, received her Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from Texas Tech University. The title of her dissertation is *We Are Cultivating the Cherokee Language: Stories of Language Renewal from the Cherokee Language Master/Apprentice Program*. Also, Dr. Morrison and EU TESOL students partnered with The International Institute of Southwest Missouri to provide an after-school learning program for several local English Language Learners in the area. Evangel provided classrooms for the program, and current EU TESOL students, alums, and other local volunteers taught English lessons and provided content tutoring. We hope to continue this great partnership in the future.
- Alumni updates: Alumna Mary Lutze earned her PhD in English studies from Loyola University and was hired as Assistant Professor of English and Writing Center Director at the University of Arkansas; Alyssa (Orr) Morrison began her Master's in English at Missouri State University and received a teaching assistantship; Jason Morrison was accepted into Seattle Pacific's MFA in poetry program.
- Students had varied extracurricular creative writing opportunities: publication in *Epiphany* magazine, flash fiction and poetry writing contests, and live coffeehouse readings.
- Qualified students can participate in the Sigma Tau Delta English honor society.
- The department sent a newsletter to alumni with faculty news, alumni news, and current department information such as a faculty-sponsored student trip to England. Alumni continued to be involved as guest speakers in classes and in donating funds to the department.

Areas in need of improvement

- Adjunct faculty can be trained how to include Program Learning Outcomes in their syllabi and assess them in Canvas.
- For fall 2019, PLOs 4, 6, 8, and 9 were not assessed. While these were assessed in spring 2020, they could be evaluated through course assignments in both semesters. English faculty with Program Learning Outcomes in their syllabi should assess these outcomes in Canvas whenever the courses are offered.
- Faculty should review their courses on the curriculum map and remember to assess the PLO(s) designated for that course.

- As stated in Appendix B, English faculty can continue discussions of strengthening students' application of historical, cultural, and literary knowledge; analyzing that knowledge; and producing mature writing that effectively expresses their analyses.

Plans for improvement

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Train English adjunct faculty how to include Program Learning Outcomes in their syllabi and assess them for their courses.	Review with adjunct faculty in the fall and spring semesters	Mrs. LaDonna Friesen and Dr. Jennifer Morrison
Assess all PLOs in both fall and spring semesters to facilitate discussion about PLO results.	Review with English faculty in the fall and spring semesters	All English faculty
Faculty should review their courses on the curriculum map and remember to assess the PLO (s) designated for that course.	Fall 2020	Dr. Brenda Adcock and all English faculty
Continue alumni engagement for those who are accepted in graduate schools, who earn degrees, and who have careers in which they use their English degrees.	2020-2021	All English faculty

Improvements made:

- Program Learning Outcome #9 was assessed during the 1999-2000 academic year.
- By spring 2020, most PLOs were assessed as well as CLOs in English courses.
- Results of the Program Learning Outcomes assessment indicates that students perform most outcomes proficiently on major or culminating assignments in English courses.
- The viability of Evangel English studies continues to be supported by anecdotal feedback from alumni who have received graduate degrees, are accepted into graduate school, or whose vocation directly involves English skills they developed at Evangel



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities

Program Coordinator: LaDonna Friesen

Academic Program Evaluated: English Education

Program Review Year: 2023

Note: This document replicates some information from the English SLAR report because PLOs #1-9 are shared by English and English Education. PLO#10 is specific to English Education and is addressed in this SLAR.

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: <small>(List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)</small>	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Dr. Diane Awbrey Mrs. LaDonna Friesen Dr. Luke Gibbs Dr. Jennifer Morrison Dr. Nathan Nelson		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)		Please see Appendix A	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests,		Literary analysis essays, exams, exam essays, written and oral		

portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)		<p>discussions, and project writings.</p> <p><i>Please see more details in Appendix A</i></p>		
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)		<i>Please see Appendix A for annual ACAT results.</i>		
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		<p>Faculty assessed PLOs in their syllabi using specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and faculty evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria:</p> <p>4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient</p> <p>The average assessment score for each outcome is in Appendix A.</p>		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		Please see Appendix A for the table used to discuss these outcomes.		
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve		Please see Appendix B.		

learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)				
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		

2020 Appendix A: Number of Students in Sample and Instrument(s) used in assessment

	The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric.							
		4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient						
Program Learning Outcome Assessed		Fall 2019			Spring 2020			
		Score	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used	Score for all courses assessing this outcome	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used	
10. Demonstrate familiarity with literary periods and traditions in the broad sweep of British and American history, including knowledge of prominent authors, genres, topics, philosophical issues, literary movements, and artistic styles.		3.8	20	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	3.56	27	ENGL 302 English Lit. Survey II: Final REC Exam, subtest #4 ENGL 331 Shakespeare: Final Literary Analysis Essay	
11. Analyze a text competently for its structural elements and interpretive potentials—particularly in the categories of diction, imagery, figurative language, irony, setting, character, plot, narrative point of view, and genre characteristics.		3.5	48	ENGL 123 Lec. 4 Introduction to Literature ENGL 222 Young Adult Literature: Socratic Writing and Discussion on <i>The Book Thief</i> by Marcus Zusak ENGL 330 Children's Literature: Literary Thinker's Project	3.04	98	ENGL 123 Introduction to Literature: Short Fiction Exam Essay ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2 ENGL 440 C.S. Lewis: Midterm Exam	

			writing on the novel <i>Holes</i> by Louis Sachar			
12. Apply knowledge of history, culture, human nature, and a variety of literary-theoretical perspectives to analyze texts competently for their philosophical potentials and to discuss those findings in coherent interpretive discourse.	3.9	18	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	2.88	16	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2
13. Demonstrate high proficiency in using the protocols of standard written North American English.			Not assessed	3.14	28	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2 ENGL 298 English Practicum: Final Exam ENGL 445 History and Structure of English Language: Final Exam
14. Produce mature writing in a variety of modes for various audiences and purposes, showing editorial ease in making textual adjustments for readability and rhetorical or literary effectiveness.	3.3	14	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	3.09	31	ENGL 341 Technical Writing: Literature Review

15. Use pertinent research information effectively as necessary or advantageous within written or spoken discourse.			Not assessed	3.44	66	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Final Draft of Essay #2 ENGL 331 Shakespeare: Final Literary Analysis Essay ENGL 341 Technical Writing: Literature Review
16. Demonstrate advanced skills of integrative and independent thinking in written and verbal expression.	3.8	17	ENGL 301 English Lit. Survey I: <i>Twelfth Night</i> (Shakespeare) Literary Analysis Essay	No results	7	This criteria may have been assessed in ENGL 302 English Literature Survey II, but the results were not in the Canvas report.
17. Demonstrate the ability to hold contradictory ideas in mind during discussion by calmly considering others' perspectives, asking productive questions, articulating respectful responses, and finding ways to synthesize others' ideas with one's own.			Not assessed	3.22	116	ENGL 212 Composition and Literary Analysis: Discussion before the Midterm Exam ENGL 302 English Literature Survey II: Discussion First Half of Term ENGL 331 Shakespeare: Final Literary Analysis Essay ENGL 341 Technical Writing: Revised Literature Review ENGL 440 C.S. Lewis: Discussion First Half of Term and Discussion Second Half of Term
18. Discuss various ways in which the Christian faith is, has been, or can be in			Not assessed	3.0	46	ENGL 302 English Literature Survey II: Discussion First Half of Term

meaningful dialogue with literary texts of any kind.					ENGL 440 C.S. Lewis: Discussion First Half of Term and Discussion Second Half of Term
19. Demonstrate in-depth understanding of secondary-level English teaching methods, best practices, standards (national, state, and institutional), and pedagogical theories by applying them to classroom situations to improve students' proficiencies and competence in English language and literature			Not assessed In fall 2019, an adjunct faculty taught the course that assesses PLO #10 and may not have had the instruction needed to assess this outcome in Canvas.		Course not offered

Additional Data

[**ACAT Assessment: English Literature**](#) (Click here to view the literary content areas assessed.)

<i>Assessment Instrument</i>	<i>What is evaluated? (Connection to Student Learning Outcomes)</i>	<i>When administered?</i>	<i>Analysis of fairness, consistency and accuracy</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Schedule for Review</i>
Area Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT)Literature in: ENGLISH	English Education Program Learning Outcome 1. Demonstrate familiarity with literary periods and traditions in the broad sweep of British and American history, including knowledge of prominent authors, genres, topics, philosophical issues, literary movements, and artistic styles. English Education Program Learning Outcome 2. Analyze a text competently for its structural elements and interpretive potentials—particularly in the categories	Senior Year	Instrument reliability and validity assured by ACAT	Score of 600 or above.	January Department Meeting

<i>Assessment Instrument</i>	<i>What is evaluated? (Connection to Student Learning Outcomes)</i>	<i>When administered?</i>	<i>Analysis of fairness, consistency and accuracy</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Schedule for Review</i>
	<p>of diction, imagery, figurative language, irony, setting, character, plot, narrative point of view, and genre characteristics.</p> <p>English Education Program Learning Outcome 3. Apply knowledge of history, culture, human nature, and a variety of literary-theoretical perspectives to analyze texts competently for their philosophical potentials and to discuss those findings in coherent interpretive discourse.</p>				

Results for ACAT Literature in English:

Senior English Education majors take the **ACAT Literature in English** exam in November while they are enrolled in ENGL 497 Senior Seminar.

The following year-end report dated 6/01/2020 refers to the **ACAT Literature in English** exam given at the end of ENGL 497 in November 2019:

ACAT

Departmental Score Report

Institution: **Evangel University**
Discipline: **Literature in English**
Testing Year: **2019-20 (52)**
Date Prepared: **6/1/2020**
Report Type: **Interim - Senior - Profile 1**

ACAT scores range from 200 to 800 with an average of 500 and a standard deviation of 100. A score of 600 would be 1 standard deviation above average. A score of 450 would be .5 standard deviations (50 points) below average. Nationally, 68% of the scores in any given year should fall between approximately 400 and 600. Year-to-year variations in the size of the reference groups will cause scores to fall outside these limits. The content area scores are compared with a reference group of other examinees taking the same content area. The overall performance score is compared with other examinees taking the ACAT in this discipline with the same number of content areas. The overall score is a separately determined performance appraisal rather than a numerical average of the area scores. The percentile shown on the table is the percent of students in the national reference group expected to obtain a score equal to or less than the one shown. The reference groups are composed of the examinees during the most recent 6-year period.

Area	Standard Score	%'ile	Reference Group Size
American to 1865	499	50	478
American Modern (1860's to present)	528	61	478
British Medieval Period	562	73	478
British Renaissance	560	73	478
British Romantic	552	70	478
British Victorian	548	68	478
Shakespeare	502	51	478
Linguistics	572	76	478
Restoration/18th Cent./PreRomantic	592	82	478
OVERALL PERFORMANCE	571	76	478

Based on a reference group of 478 graduating students taking an ACAT in Literature in English with 9 areas, 76% would be expected to achieve at or below your overall performance score of 571, 24% would be expected to achieve a higher score.

Individual Examinee Standard Scores Sorted Alphabetically by Last Name

These scores should be interpreted with caution. The ACAT is intended to evaluate an entire group of graduating seniors. The accuracy of scores for individual students, particularly in the separate content areas, is limited. The overall performance score is illustrative of the general performance of each student. Individual student performance can be expected to vary across administrations of the same test and can be affected by numerous factors, including motivation and the circumstances under which the test is administered. PACAT Incorporated does not recommend the use of these scores for making decisions about the academic achievement of individual students. Institutions using the scores for individual evaluation should take these limitations into account.

Name	Student ID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Overall Score	%ile
B	11715402	563	562	501	500	670	601	522	520	580	507	80
J	1715039	520	552	614	533	478	697	551	686	645	630	90
H	100041061	406	406	622	600	146	561	466	681	460	511	54
R	1715392	468	447	421	510	441	551	551	510	561	489	46
H	11715259	520	607	614	500	712	607	420	726	582	669	95
M	1714971	563	589	488	510	511	469	371	370	472	473	39
N	11715875	368	452	523	467	562	344	428	442	614	456	22
L	11715022	520	595	606	745	553	510	531	564	623	627	90
B	11714772	511	406	488	585	455	405	502	532	472	473	39
N	197	358	589	515	350	553	417	383	573	552	467	37
T	11716516	596	595	713	703	646	697	735	604	800	778	100
N	1715149	577	452	606	778	595	615	559	686	725	685	97

1 = American to 1865

2 = American Modern (1880's to present)

3 = British Medieval Period

4 = British Renaissance

5 = British Romantic

6 = British Victorian

7 = Shakespeare

8 = Linguistics

9 = Restoration/18th Cent./PreRomantic

Appendix B: Results of Assessment

What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes?

For outcomes that were assessed, all scores except one were 3.0 or above, indicating "proficient" for students enrolled in most English courses. Also, the outcomes were evaluated through literary studies from varied times and contexts and from students' writing in genres such as essay, technical writing, and creative writing. The outcome assessments, then, were not limited to one type of assignment, genre, or particular literary period. The outcomes allow for the

literary scope of English survey courses and writing mediums.

(B) What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and (B) what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?

- C. In the English 2019 analysis, one of our goals was to designate at least one course that would assess PLO #9: “Discuss various ways in which the Christian faith is, has been, or can be in meaningful dialogue with literary texts of any kind.” Though this outcome was not assessed in fall 2019, discussion assignments in two English courses evaluated student fulfillment of this outcome in Spring 2020 with an average of 3.0.

In addition to PLOs, our department discussed strengthening alumni engagement. One example was inviting Dr. Milta Little (Spanish and Biology double major who graduated in 2002) to speak in ENGL 123 Introduction to Literature about the importance of a Humanities education in medical practice. Dr. Little was Evangel’s 2019 Outstanding Young Alumnus and currently serves as Associate Professor of Geriatric Medicine at Duke University. Students in the English course listened to Dr. Little’s experience of practicing Humanities attributes, such as empathy, engaging patients through storytelling, and enlarging one’s understanding of life through the Humanities disciplines.

- D. English faculty can assess all nine PLOs in the coming academic year, and each course should assess the outcome designated to it on the curriculum map. From reviewing these assessment scores, English faculty can continue discussing how students can strengthen their application of historical, cultural, and literary knowledge; analyze that knowledge; and produce mature writing that effectively expresses their analyses.

Appendix C: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, Areas in Need of Improvement, Plans for Improvement, and Improvements Made

Strengths

- Dr. Jennifer Morrison, who advises most Evangel English Education majors, received her Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from Texas Tech University. The title of her dissertation is *We Are Cultivating the Cherokee Language: Stories of Language Renewal from the Cherokee Language Master/Apprentice Program*. Also, Dr. Morrison and EU

TESOL students partnered with The International Institute of Southwest Missouri to provide an after-school learning program for several local English Language Learners in the area. Evangel provided classrooms for the program, and current EU TESOL students, alums, and other local volunteers taught English lessons and provided content tutoring. We hope to continue this great partnership in the future.

- By the conclusion of spring 2020, most Program Learning Outcomes had been assessed, including #9, which was not assessed last year.
- Results of the Program Learning Outcomes assessment indicates that students perform most outcomes proficiently on major or culminating assignments in English courses.
- Most fulltime faculty are linking Program Learning Outcomes to Course Learning Outcomes in course syllabi.
- Two English faculty, Dr. Nathan Nelson and Dr. Luke Gibbs, received awards for outstanding teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Alumni updates: Alumna Mary Lutze earned her PhD in English studies from Loyola University and was hired as Assistant Professor of English and Writing Center Director at the University of Arkansas; Alyssa (Orr) Morrison began her Master's in English at Missouri State University and received a teaching assistantship; Jason Morrison was accepted into Seattle Pacific's MFA in poetry program.
- Students had varied extracurricular creative writing opportunities: publication in *Epiphany* magazine, flash fiction and poetry writing contests, and live coffeehouse readings.
- Qualified students can participate in the Sigma Tau Delta English honor society.
- The department sent a newsletter to alumni with faculty news, alumni news, and current department information such as a faculty-sponsored student trip to England. Alumni continued to be involved as guest speakers in classes and in donating funds to the department.
- The average ACAT English Literature exit assessment score was 1% higher than last year, and one English major earned 100%.

Areas in need of improvement

- Adjunct faculty can be trained how to include Program Learning Outcomes in their syllabi and assess them in Canvas.
- For fall 2019, PLOs 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 were not assessed. While all of these were assessed in spring 2020 except #10, they could be evaluated through course assignments in both semesters when the courses are offered. In fall 2020, an

adjunct faculty taught the course that assesses PLO #10 and may not have had the instruction needed to assess this outcome in Canvas.

- Faculty should review their courses on the curriculum map and remember to assess the PLO(s) designated for that course.
- As stated in Appendix B, English faculty can continue discussions of strengthening students' application of historical, cultural, and literary knowledge; analyzing that knowledge; and producing mature writing that effectively expresses their analyses.

Plans for improvement

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Train adjunct faculty how to include Program Learning Outcomes in their syllabi and assess them for their courses.	Review with adjunct faculty in the fall and spring semesters	Mrs. LaDonna Friesen and Dr. Brenda Adcock
Assess PLO #10 in ENGL 336 Methods of Teaching English when this course is offered	Spring 2020	Dr. Jennifer Morrison
Assess all PLOs in both fall and spring semesters to facilitate discussion about PLO results.	Review with English faculty in the fall and spring semesters	All English faculty
Faculty should review their courses on the curriculum map and remember to assess the PLO (s) designated for that course.	Fall 2020	Dr. Brenda Adcock and all English faculty
Continue alumni engagement for those who are accepted in graduate schools, who earn degrees, and who have careers in which they use their English degrees.	2020-2021	Mrs. LaDonna Friesen and all English faculty

Improvements made:

- Program Learning Outcome #9 was assessed during the 1999-2000 academic year.
- By spring 2020, most PLOs were assessed as well as CLOs in English courses.
- Results of the Program Learning Outcomes assessment indicates that students perform most outcomes proficiently on major or culminating assignments in English courses.
- The viability of Evangel English studies continues to be supported by anecdotal feedback from alumni who have received graduate degrees, are accepted into graduate school, or whose vocation directly involves English skills they developed at Evangel.



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities
Friesen

Program Coordinator: LaDonna

Academic Program Evaluated: French

Program Review Year: 2021

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Mrs. Sara Schall Mrs. LaDonna Friesen		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)		Please see Appendix A.	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in				

assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)				
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)				
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		<p>Last year, Mrs. Sara Schall assessed PLOs using a specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and faculty evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria:</p> <p>4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient</p>		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		Please see Appendix A.		
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since)		Please see Appendix B.		

the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)				
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		

2020 Appendix A: Number of Students in Sample and Instrument(s) used in assessment

	<p>The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric.</p> <p>4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient</p>					
Program Learning Outcome Assessed	Fall 2019			Spring 2020		
	Score	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used	Score for all courses assessing this outcome	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used
20. Achieve at least the Advanced level of French competence in speaking, listening, reading, and writing comprehension as defined by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (ACTFL guidelines .)			<p>On the curriculum map, FREN 333 and 334 are scheduled to review this outcome, but these courses were not taught in Fall 2019-2020.</p> <p><i>Academic Council passed this major in April 2019, so it needs time to build enrollment. Some courses are not taught in an academic year.</i></p>			The same note for Fall 2019 applies here.
21. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas, practices, and products from the diverse French-speaking world, placing them in their historical, political,			<p>On the curriculum map, FREN 333 and 334 are scheduled to review this outcome, but these courses were not taught in Fall 2019-2020.</p> <p><i>Academic Council passed this major in April 2019, so it needs time to build</i></p>			The same note for Fall 2019 applies here.

and social contexts, and interpreting the unique perspectives on human experience that they reveal.			<i>enrollment. Some courses are not taught in an academic year.</i>			
22. Demonstrate an understanding of major dialectal differences in the Francophone world by reference to fundamentals of phonetics, semantics, morphology, syntax, and sociolinguistic aspects.			Course not offered in the fall.	3.5	2	FREN 326 Conversation: <i>Buenvenue Chez les Ch'tis</i>
23. Demonstrate the ability to function well in French-speaking cultures while exhibiting cross-cultural humility in relation to those cultures.			Course not offered in the fall.	3.5	2	FREN 326 Conversation: Discussion Participation—Second Half of the Semester
24. Use French effectively to integrate personal faith and cross-cultural interactions with French speakers.	4	1	FREN 325 Composition: Final Draft of a French Composition essay			Course not offered in the spring.

Appendix B: Results of Assessment

What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes?

All PLO scores are 3.0 or above, indicating “proficient” for students enrolled in 300-level French courses. The outcomes pertained to the course focus, with an essay assessment in FREN 325 Composition and a discussion assessment in FREN 326 Conversation, respectively representing the writing and oral components of foreign language practice.

(C) What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and (B) what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?

E. This program was approved by Academic Council in April 2019, so fall 2019-spring 2020 were the first semesters for professors to assess and report Program Learning outcomes for French courses. The department chair instructed the French adjunct professor to use Canvas as the online learning system for assessing PLOs for a culminating assignment in 300-level courses.

F. Though the outcome average for the two assessed courses was 3.5, the maximum enrollment for an upper-division course was two students. The Humanities department needs to energetically promote the major on campus.

Appendix C: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, Areas in Need of Improvement, Plans for Improvement, and Improvements Made

Strengths

Many of the strengths detailed in last year’s assessment, acknowledging the new French program starting in April 2019, also apply this year. These are in green. New information is in brown.

- Long-standing and recently enriched consortium relationship with the Chez Vous Summer Program at the Jacque Lefevre Institute in Normandy, France
 - New courses available
 - New alternating-years schedule of courses to facilitate program-customization for French students

- Multiple opportunities for study abroad
 - Within International Study Abroad (ISA) consortium listings
 - Within AG World Missions (AGWM) internship placements
- A strong adjunct with a master's degree and much teaching experience currently available to help with the program.
- Slight increase in French minors, from 2 in spring 2019 to 3 by spring 2020.
- Slight enrollment increase in elementary and intermediate French courses

Course	Fall 2018-Spring 2019	Fall 2019-Spring 2020
FREN 115	5	6
FREN 215	0	2
FREN 116	4	5
FREN 216	0	0

Areas in need of improvement

- The program has no fulltime faculty member to promote French studies. Adjunct faculty are qualified, experienced teachers and skilled language communicators but cannot devote the same time to strengthening the program as a fulltime professor.
- The curriculum map and PLOs for French courses could be reviewed by two adjunct French professors and the new Humanities department chair.
- If French majors are graduating this year, the department may consider an exit review exam. In last year's SLAR, the possibility of using Language Testing International was considered and is still being reviewed. The assessment has not been imperative with a low number of French students.
- As a new program and without a fulltime French professor, department faculty in other Humanities disciplines will need to promote the French majors and minor. Currently, the program has three students who are French minors.

Plans for improvement

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
----------------------	----------	--------------------

Discuss ways to promote French studies on campus through Founders (high-achieving) student visits, reaching out to students with bi-literacy seals in French, etc.	Discuss in fall and spring faculty meetings and with students in French courses	Prof. LaDonna Friesen with the assistance of the Humanities Department and adjunct professors Prof. Sara Schall and Prof. Cyndie Everson
Review the curriculum map with current French faculty and update if necessary	Fall 2020	Prof. LaDonna Friesen, Prof. Sara Schall, Prof. Cyndie Everson
Discuss using Language Testing International as a potential program exit assessment	Fall 2020	Prof. LaDonna Friesen, Prof. Sara Schall, Prof. Cyndie Everson

Improvements made:

- Program Learning Outcomes were assessed for the French courses designated on the French major curriculum map that were taught in fall 2019-spring 2020.
- Last year, only one French adjunct professor taught all French courses. This year an additional French professor will assist with elementary and intermediate French courses. Both professors are experienced teachers with graduate degrees and secondary education certification.
- The program slightly increased enrollment and minors in the past year.



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities
Friesen

Program Coordinator: LaDonna

Academic Program Evaluated: French Education

Program Review Year: 2021

Note: This document replicates information from the French SLAR report because PLOs #1-5 are shared by French and French Education. PLO#6 is specific to French Education and is addressed in this SLAR.

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Mrs. Sara Schall Mrs. LaDonna Friesen		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were		Please see Appendix A.	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors:

used in the assessment report.)			Seniors: Graduate:	Seniors: Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)		Please see Appendix A.		
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)		<i>Note: No MoGEA or MoCA testing assessments are reported for this year since Evangel did not have any French Education majors.</i>		
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		Last year, Mrs. Sara Schall assessed PLOs using a specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and faculty evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria: 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		Please see Appendix A.		

Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)		Please see Appendix B.		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the		Please see Appendix C.		

changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.				
---	--	--	--	--

2020 Appendix A: Number of Students in Sample and Instrument(s) used in assessment

<p>The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric.</p> <p>4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient</p>						
Program Learning Outcome Assessed	Fall 2019			Spring 2020		
	Score	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used	Score for all courses assessing this outcome	Number of Students	Courses and Assessments Used
25. Achieve at least the Advanced level of French competence in speaking, listening, reading, and writing comprehension as defined by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (ACTFL guidelines)			<p>On the curriculum map, FREN 333 and 334 are scheduled to review this outcome, but these courses were not taught in Fall 2019-2020.</p> <p><i>Academic Council passed this major in April 2019, so it needs time to build enrollment. Some courses are not taught in an academic year.</i></p>			The same note for Fall 2019 applies here.

<p>26. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas, practices, and products from the diverse French-speaking world, placing them in their historical, political, and social contexts, and interpreting the unique perspectives on human experience that they reveal.</p>		<p>On the curriculum map, FREN 333 and 334 are scheduled to review this outcome, but these courses were not taught in Fall 2019-2020.</p> <p><i>Academic Council passed this major in April 2019, so it needs time to build enrollment. Some courses are not taught in an academic year.</i></p>			<p>The same note for Fall 2019 applies here.</p>
<p>27. Demonstrate an understanding of major dialectal differences in the Francophone world by reference to fundamentals of phonetics, semantics, morphology, syntax, and sociolinguistic aspects.</p>		<p>Course not offered in the fall.</p>	<p>3.5</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>FREN 326 Conversation: <i>Buenvenue Chez les Ch'tis</i></p>
<p>28. Demonstrate the ability to function well in French-speaking cultures while exhibiting cross-cultural humility in relation to those cultures.</p>		<p>Course not offered in the fall.</p>	<p>3.5</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>FREN 326 Conversation: Discussion Participation—Second Half of the Semester</p>

29. Use French effectively to integrate personal faith and cross-cultural interactions with French speakers.	4	1	FREN 325 Composition: Final Draft of a French Composition essay			Course not offered in the spring.
30. Demonstrate in-depth understanding of foreign-language teaching methods, best practices, standards (national, state, and institutional), and pedagogical theories by applying them to classroom situations to improve students' French-language proficiency and French-cultural competence.			On the curriculum map, FREN 336 is scheduled to review this outcome, but this course was not taught in Fall 2019-2020 because there were no French Education majors. <i>Academic Council passed this major in April 2019, so it needs time to build enrollment. Some courses are not taught in an academic year.</i>			The same note for Fall 2019 applies here.

Appendix B: Results of Assessment

What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes?

All PLO scores are 3.0 or above, indicating “proficient” for students enrolled in 300-level French courses. The outcomes pertained to the course focus, with an essay assessment in FREN 325 Composition and a discussion assessment in FREN 326 Conversation, respectively representing the writing and oral components of foreign language practice.

(D) What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and (B) what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?

G. This program was approved by Academic Council in April 2019, so fall 2019-spring 2020 were the first semesters for professors to assess and report Program Learning outcomes for French courses. The department chair instructed the French adjunct professor to use Canvas as the online learning system for assessing PLOs for a culminating assignment in 300-level courses.

H. Though the outcome average for the two assessed courses was 3.5, the maximum enrollment for an upper-division course was two students. The Humanities department needs to energetically promote the major on campus.

Appendix C: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, Areas in Need of Improvement, Plans for Improvement, and Improvements Made

Strengths

Many of the strengths detailed in last year's assessment, acknowledging the new French program starting in April 2019, also apply this year. These are in green. New information is in brown.

- Long-standing and recently enriched consortium relationship with the Chez Vous Summer Program at the Jacque Lefevre Institute in Normandy, France
 - New courses available
 - New alternating-years schedule of courses to facilitate program-customization for French students
- Multiple opportunities for study abroad
 - Within International Study Abroad (ISA) consortium listings
 - Within AG World Missions (AGWM) internship placements
- A strong adjunct with a master's degree and much teaching experience currently available to help with the program.
- Slight increase in French minors, from 2 in spring 2019 to 3 by spring 2020.
- Slight enrollment increase in elementary and intermediate French courses

Course	Fall 2018-Spring 2019	Fall 2019-Spring 2020
FREN 115	5	6
FREN 215	0	2
FREN 116	4	5

FREN 216	0	0
----------	---	---

Areas in need of improvement

- The program has no fulltime faculty member to promote French studies. Adjunct faculty are qualified, experienced teachers and skilled language communicators but cannot devote the same time to strengthening the program as a fulltime professor.
- The curriculum map and PLOs for French courses could be reviewed by two adjunct French professors and the new Humanities department chair.
- If French majors are graduating this year, the department may consider an exit review exam. In last year's SLAR, the possibility of using Language Testing International was considered and is still being reviewed. The assessment has not been imperative with a low number of French students.
- As a new program and without a fulltime French professor, department faculty in other Humanities disciplines will need to promote the French majors and minor. Currently, the program has three students who are French minors and no students with a French or French Education major.

Plans for improvement

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Discuss ways to promote French studies on campus through Founders (high-achieving) student visits, reaching out to students with bi-literacy seals in French, etc.	Discuss in fall and spring faculty meetings and with students in French courses	Prof. LaDonna Friesen with the assistance of the Humanities Department and adjunct professors Prof. Sara Schall and Prof. Cyndie Everson
Review the curriculum map with current French faculty and update if necessary	Fall 2020	Prof. LaDonna Friesen, Prof. Sara Schall, Prof. Cyndie Everson
Discuss using Language Testing International as a	Fall 2020	Prof. LaDonna Friesen, Prof. Sara Schall, Prof.

potential program exit assessment		Cyndie Everson
--------------------------------------	--	----------------

Improvements made:

- Program Learning Outcomes were assessed for the French courses designated on the French Education major curriculum map that were taught in fall 2019-spring 2020.
- Last year, only one French adjunct professor taught all French courses. This year an additional French professor will assist with elementary and intermediate French courses. Both professors are experienced teachers with graduate degrees and secondary education certification.
- The program slightly increased enrollment and minors in the past year.



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities

Program Coordinator: Brenda Adcock

Academic Program Evaluated: Spanish

Program Review Year: 2020

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Acade mic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academ ic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process:	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness	Dr. Brenda Adcock		

	site.	Freshmen: 6; Sophomores: 4; Juniors:11; Seniors: 4; Graduate: 0		
Number of students in sample:				
Instrument(s) used in assessment:	Submit Final Essay EU 20: E4A, G4A, PLO 1, CLO 1 Personal Worldview / Language Competence EU 20 G1A, E5B, G3B, PLO 2 PowerPoint Presentation I – History Culture PowerPoint (Technology Proficiency) EU 20 Assignment: E 5B, E 3B, G3C. PLO 2, CLO 2 PLO 4 Cross-Cultural Humility, E5B Technology, PowerPoint Presentation III Submit Final Essay EU 20: E4A, G4A, PLO 1, CLO 1 Personal Worldview / Language Competence EU 20 G1A, E5B, G3B, PLO 2 PowerPoint Presentation I - History	Language Competence Cultural Competence. Cultural Competence Cross-cultural Sensitivity Language Competence. Cultural Competence	4 4 4 4 4	SPAN 338 LEC 1 Golden Age Literature SPAN 326 LEC 1 Conversation SPAN 338 LEC 1 Golden Age Literature SPAN 326 LEC 1 Conversation SPAN 338 LEC 1 Golden Age Literature SPAN 326 LEC 1 Conversation
Methodology:		Data was collected by results from Rubrics		
Data:		See rubrics below		
Results of Assessment:		Results show that students are achieving between a 3 and 4 on results from Rubrics. Results show that there is progress for the students since they are successfully completing their projects. Changes that will be made are to clarify instructions and have a question and answer activity before projects begin.		

Strengths:		The strengths we see from the program are that students are meeting the expectations that the assignments call for and that they are showing the ability to meet the requirements for success in the Spanish Language.		
Areas in need of improvement:		Need for improvement would be in the area of more clearly stating the instructions and procedures for each Assessment.		
Plans for improvement:		I plan to have a question and answer activity before allowing the students to begin their projects to make sure they are completely aware of what is expected.		

Spanish 115

Rubric 1 EU 20, G3C , PLO 2, CLO 4, E5B Cultural Competence and Technology

Criteria	Ratings
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome G3C: Cultural Elements	Correctly identifies key cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.
Threshold: 3	
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome Cultural Competence.	Can accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences (using sophisticated and tightly organized extended discourse).
Threshold: 3	
This criterion is linked to CLO Cultural Competence	At a superior level, student will demonstrate the ability to create a PowerPoint that demonstrates cultural understanding of a Spanish Speaking country and present it to the class.
Threshold: 3	

Criteria	Ratings
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E5B: Communicate	Incorporates current technology smoothly and appropriately in professional communication.
Threshold: 3	

Spanish 116

Rubric 1 EU 20: G1A, I1A, PLO 5 Sharing Faith, PowerPoint Presentation

Criteria	Ratings	Pts
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E5B: Communicate	<p>4 pts Incorporates current technology smoothly and appropriately in professional communication.</p>	Points <input type="text"/> /
Threshold: 3	<p>3 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication.</p> <p>2 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication inappropriately and/or erroneously.</p> <p>1 pts Incorporates inappropriate and/or no technology in professional communication.</p>	4 pts Add Additional Comments

Criteria	Ratings	Pts
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome G1A: Audience, Context, and Purpose	<p>4 pts Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the audience, context, and purpose of the assigned task.</p>	<input type="text"/> / 4 pts Add Additional Comments
Threshold: 3	<p>3 pts Demonstrates adequate consideration of the audience, context, and purpose of the assigned task.</p> <p>2 pts Demonstrates awareness of the audience, context, and/or purpose of the assigned task.</p> <p>1 pts Lacks awareness of the audience, context, and purpose of the assigned task.</p>	
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome I1A: Integration of Faith and Learning	<p>4 pts Clearly articulates a specific relationship between faith and aspects of an academic discipline</p> <p>3 pts Clearly articulates the interconnectedness of faith and academic inquiry.</p> <p>2 pts Vaguely articulates connections between elements of faith and academic inquiry.</p> <p>1 pts Unable to articulate truths found in academics as relevant to faith and vice versa.</p>	4 pts

Criteria	Ratings	Pts
<p>This criterion is linked to CLO: Create and present a PowerPoint in Spanish demonstrating oral and written proficiency.</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4 pts Full Marks Accurately creates and presents a PowerPoint in Spanish demonstrating oral and written proficiency at a Novice Mid Level.</p> <p>3 pts full marks Demonstrates the ability to create and present a PowerPoint in Spanish demonstrating oral and written proficiency a little below a Novice Mid Level.</p> <p>2 pts full marks With limited ability can creates and present a PowerPoint in Spanish demonstrating oral and written proficiency at a level quite a bit lower than a Novice Mid Level.</p> <p>1 pts full marks Lacks the ability to create and present a PowerPoint in Spanish demonstrating oral and written proficiency at a level quite a bit lower than a Novice Mid Level.</p>	4 pts

Spanish 325

Rubric 1: E5 B Technological Proficiency/Grammar PowerPoint Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Ratings			
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E5B: Communicate</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4.0 pts Incorporates current technology smoothly and appropriately in professional communication.</p>	<p>3.0 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication.</p>	<p>2.0 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication inappropriately and/or erroneously.</p>	<p>1.0 pts Incorporates inappropriate and/or no technology in professional communication.</p>

EU 20 Assignment: Essay 2, E4A (Research)

Criteria	Ratings
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E4A: Evaluation of Research</p>	
<p>Threshold: 3</p>	<p>Identifies, comprehends, and synthesizes high quality sources appropriate to the topic</p>
<p>CLO 1</p>	
<p>Threshold: 3</p>	<p>At a superior level, demonstrates the ability to write a three page essay in Spanish using accurate grammar with a reference research article from high quality source</p>
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome Language Competence.</p>	
<p>Threshold: 3</p>	<p>Can clearly articulate (in Spanish) topics from readings (in oral and written form) and participate in conversational activities related to the topics at a Superior level as defined by the ACTFL guidelines.</p>

Rubric 2**EU 20 G1, PLO 5, CLO 5 - Faith/Interaction Survey**

Criteria	Ratings				
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome G1B: Language Skills</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	4.0 pts Uses compelling language that skillfully communicates meaning to the audience with clarity and fluency and is virtually error-free.	3.0 pts Uses straightforward language with few errors that generally conveys meaning to the audience.	2.0 pts Uses mundane language to convey meaning and/or displays many errors.	1.0 pts Uses language that impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	0.0 pts Not attempted

Criteria	Ratings				
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome Integration of Faith and Spanish.</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4.0 pts At a superior level, demonstrates an ability to use Spanish effectively to integrate personal faith and cross-cultural interactions with Spanish speakers.</p>	<p>3.0 pts Demonstrates an ability to use Spanish effectively to integrate personal faith and cross-cultural interactions with Spanish speakers.</p>	<p>2.0 pts Has limited ability to use Spanish effectively to integrate personal faith and cross-cultural interactions with Spanish speakers.</p>	<p>1.0 pts Cannot demonstrate the ability to use Spanish effectively to integrate personal faith and cross-cultural interactions with Spanish speakers.</p>	<p>0.0 pts Did not attempt.</p>
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome CLO Faith/Interaction</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4.0 pts Full Marks At a superior level, student will create a survey in Spanish that will ask a Spanish speaker 20 questions related to their faith, and orally share the</p>	<p>3.0 pts Full Marks Student will demonstrate the ability to create a survey in Spanish that will ask a Spanish speaker 20 questions related to their faith, and orally share the</p>	<p>2.0 pts Full Marks Student has limited ability to create a survey in Spanish that will ask a Spanish speaker 20 questions related to their faith, and orally share the</p>	<p>1.0 pts Full Marks Student cannot demonstrate the ability to create a survey in Spanish that will ask a Spanish speaker 20 questions related to their faith, and orally share the</p>	<p>0.0 pts No Marks</p>

Criteria	Ratings				
	results with the class.	share the results with the class.	results with the class.	share the results with the class.	

Spanish 337 and 338

Rubric 1: EU 20: E5B, E 3B, G3C. PLO 2, CLO 2 Culture Elements/Competence - PowerPoint (Technology Proficiency)

Criteria	Ratings				
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome G3C: Cultural Elements Threshold: 3.0 pts	4.0 pts Correctly identifies key cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.	3.0 pts Identifies some of the key cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.	2.0 pts Identifies a few cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.	1.0 pts Cannot identify cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.	0.0 Not attained

Criteria	Ratings
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome Cultural Competence.</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4.0 pts Can accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences (using sophisticated and tightly organized extended discourse).</p> <p>3.0 pts Can accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences.</p> <p>2.0 pts Has limited ability to accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences.</p> <p>1.0 pts Cannot accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences.</p> <p>0.0 pts Does not attempt.</p>
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome CLO 2</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4.0 pts Demonstrates at a superior level the ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.</p> <p>3.0 pts Accurately demonstrates the ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.</p> <p>2.0 pts Has limited ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.</p> <p>1.0 pts Cannot demonstrate the ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.</p> <p>0.0 pts Shows No Match Does not attempt.</p>

Criteria	Ratings					
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E3B: Identification of Approaches</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue using specific and accurate details.</p>	<p>3.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue in general but accurate terms</p>	<p>2.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue vaguely and/or inaccurately</p>	<p>1.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue insufficiently and/or inaccurately</p>		0.0 Not atte d
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E5B: Communicate</p> <p>Threshold: 3.0 pts</p>	<p>4.0 pts Incorporates current technology smoothly and appropriately in professional communication.</p>	<p>3.0 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication.</p>	<p>2.0 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication inappropriately and/or erroneously.</p>	<p>1.0 pts Incorporates inappropriate and/or no technology in professional communication.</p>		0.0 Not atte d

Rubric 2

EU 20: E4A, G4A, PLO 1, CLO 1 Personal Worldview/Language Competence - Final Essay/Discussion

Criteria	Ratings	
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome G4A: Personal Worldview</p> <p>Threshold: 3</p>	<p>Articulates a comprehensive personal worldview.</p>	
<p>This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome Language Competence.</p> <p>Threshold: 3</p>	<p>Can clearly articulate (in Spanish) topics from readings (in oral and written form) and participate in conversational activities related to the topics at a Superior level as defined by the ACTFL guidelines.</p>	

EU 20: E4A, G4A, PLO 1, CLO 1 Personal Worldview/Language Competence - Final Essay/Discussion

Criteria	Ratings
CLO Worldview/Language Competence - Final Essay/Discussion	At a superior level, student will demonstrate the ability to create a 3 page essay in Spanish over a literary work using critical analysis, present his/her own perspective and also the worldviews of others, and interact in a class discussion about the essay.
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E4A: Evaluation of Research	Identifies and accurately references research articles from high quality sources
Threshold: 3	



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

“How are students learning?”

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to “Program Review Year” and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities

Program Coordinator: Brenda Adcock

Academic Program Evaluated: Spanish Education

Program Review Year: 2020

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process:	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Dr. Brenda Adcock		
Number of students in sample:		Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: 1 Seniors:		

		Graduate:		
Instrument(s) used in assessment:		<p>EU 20 Assignment: E5B, E3B, G3C. PLO 2, CLO 2 Culture Elements/Competence - PowerPoint (Technology Proficiency)</p> <p>EU 20: E4A, G4A, PLO 1, CLO 1 Personal Worldview/Language Competence - Final Essay/Discussion</p>		
Additional Data:				
Methodology:		Data was collected by results from Rubrics		
Data:		See below		
Results of Assessment:		Results show that students are achieving between a 3 and 4 on results from Rubrics. Results show that there is progress for the students since they are successfully completing their projects. Changes that will be made are to clarify instructions and have a question and answer activity before projects begin.		
Strengths:		The strengths we see from the program are that students are meeting the expectations that the assignments call for and that they are showing the ability to meet the requirements for success in the Spanish Language.		
Areas in need of improvement:		Need for improvement would be in the area of more clearly stating the instructions and procedures for each Assessment.		
Plans for improvement:		I plan to have a question and answer activity before allowing the students to begin their projects to make sure they are completely aware of what is expected.		
Improvements made:		Improvements made are that we are now using Specific Rubrics related to University and Department Outcomes for all assessments that will record the necessary data to show progress.		

Spanish 337 and 338

Rubric 1 EU 20 Assignment: E 5B, E 3B, G3C. PLO 2, CLO 2 Culture Elements/Competence - PowerPoint (Technology Proficiency)

Criteria	Ratings			
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome G3C: Cultural Elements Threshold: 3.0 pts	<p>4.0 pts Correctly identifies key cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.</p>	<p>3.0 pts Identifies some of the key cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.</p>	<p>2.0 pts Identifies a few cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.</p>	<p>1.0 pts Cannot identify cultural elements in nations and/or regions of the world in a given context.</p>
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome Cultural Competence. Threshold: 3.0 pts	<p>4.0 pts Can accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences (using sophisticated and tightly organized extended discourse).</p>	<p>3.0 pts Can accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences.</p>	<p>2.0 pts Has limited ability to accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences.</p>	<p>1.0 pts Cannot accurately demonstrate knowledge and understanding of topics related to the culture of the Spanish-speaking world concerning historical, political, and social contexts as they relate to real world experiences.</p>

Criteria	Ratings			
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome CLO 2 Threshold: 3.0 pts	4.0 pts Demonstrates at a superior level the ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.	3.0 pts Accurately demonstrates the ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.	2.0 pts Has limited ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.	1.0 pts Cannot demonstrate the ability to create a PowerPoint presentation that displays knowledge and understanding of cultural ideas and orally present it to the class.
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E3B: Identification of Approaches Threshold: 3.0 pts	4.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue using specific and accurate details.	3.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue in general but accurate terms	2.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue vaguely and/or inaccurately	1.0 pts Describes the historical response to the issue insufficiently and/or inaccurately
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E5B: Communicate Threshold: 3.0 pts	4.0 pts Incorporates current technology smoothly and appropriately in professional communication.	3.0 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication.	2.0 pts Incorporates current technology in professional communication inappropriately and/or erroneously.	1.0 pts Incorporates inappropriate and/or no technology in professional communication.

Rubric 2 EU 20: E4A, G4A, PLO 1, CLO 1 Personal Worldview/Language Competence - Final Essay/Discussion

Criteria	Ratings
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome G4A: Personal Worldview view longer description Threshold: 3	Articulates a comprehensive personal worldview.
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome Language Competence. view longer description Threshold: 3	Can clearly articulate (in Spanish) topics from readings (in oral and written form) and participate in conversational activities related to the topics at a Superior level as defined by the ACTFL guidelines.
This criterion is linked to CLO Worldview/Language Competence - Final Essay/Discussion Threshold: 3	At a superior level, student will demonstrate the ability to create a 3 page essay in Spanish over a literary work using critical analysis, present his/her own perspective and also the worldviews of others, and interact in a class discussion about the essay.
This criterion is linked to Learning Outcome E4A: Evaluation of Research view longer description Threshold: 3	Identifies and accurately references research articles from high quality sources



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities Program Coordinator: Dr. Vickie Wisdom

Academic Program Evaluated: Theatre Program Review Year: 2020

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Dr. Vickie Wisdom Mrs. LaDonna Friesen		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each		Please see Appendix A.	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors:

class/year who were used in the assessment report.)			Graduate:	Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)		Final stagecraft, performance, and technical theatre projects and presentations, as listed in the assessment tables		
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)				
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		Last year, Dr. Vickie Wisdom assessed PLOs using specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and faculty evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria: 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that		Please see Appendix A.		

were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)				
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)		Please see Appendix B.		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)		Please see Appendix C.		

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.				
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		

2020 Appendix A: Number of Students in Sample and Instrument(s) used in assessment

	The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric. 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient
--	---

Fall 2020

Row Labels	Count of student sis id	Average of outcome score
Character Analysis - Rainmaker		

THTR 239 LEC 1 Rehearsal and Performance

3. Acting	4	3.25
5. Integration	4	4

Final Project**THTR 130 LEC 1 Stagecraft Lab 1**

2. Technical Theatre	8	3.25
----------------------	---	------

Final Project - Final Drawing**THTR 321 LEC 1 Technical Theatre II: Lighting Design**

2. Technical Theatre	13	2.923076923
----------------------	----	-------------

Grand Total**29 3.206896552**

Spring 2020

Row Labels	Count of student sis id	Average of outcome score
2. Technical Theatre		
Final Project		
THTR 130 LEC 1 Stagecraft Lab	1	4
Final Project Presentation		
THTR 271 LEC 1 Technical Theatre I: Scenic Design	9	3.333333333
Grand Total	10	3.4

Appendix B: Results of Assessment*What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes?*

For outcomes that were assessed, all scores were 3.3 or above, indicating “proficient” for students enrolled in these Theatre courses. Also, the outcomes were evaluated through varied theatre studies in acting, stagecraft, and scenic design. THTR 271 achieved a lower score than other courses; however, it was the first time for this course to be offered and tweaks will be made to strengthen the course and its ability to meet necessary outcomes for technical theatre. Four years ago, there were no objectives or learning outcomes for any of the programs upon Dr.

Wisdom's arrival. In the past four years, curriculum has been revised, outcomes developed and now have the first real set of data from which to begin decision making.

(E) *What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and (B) what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?*

- A. To encourage participation for student performances, which are essential to this program, the last SLAR listed an upgrade for online ticket sale software as a goal for improvement. The program is now using GoFan, a digital ticketing platform, that allows patrons to purchase tickets online. This process has facilitated accessible and secure ticket purchases for seats specific to Evangel's theatre, helping to minimize box office lines on performance nights. Tickets for mainstage productions, such as *My Fair Lady*, are well attended by the community, with a sellout of 5 out of 6 performances. This audience connection is essential for students to practice PLO #2 (Competently perform basic tasks of script-analysis, set-design, construction, technical operation, and other "crew" tasks necessary to mount a dramatic stage production), #3 (Demonstrate effective use of the theatre artist's own imagination and physical resources to develop a compelling theatrical character who can serve the plot of a stage drama well) and #4 (Use the powers and resources of the director's role to help actors and crew members to perform well in a given stage-production).
- B. Based upon feedback from alumni and students, content areas that were previously combined and minimally covered in one or two courses have been separated out to offer a full range of instruction in the various elements of theatre in order to give our graduates a complete education in the field. Graduates are now prepared academically to feel completely ready to teach in the high school classroom, get accepted into the graduate school of their choice, and pursue positions that allow them to use the skills developed in their theatre courses. With the challenges of Covid-19 to the performing arts, our team has developed online opportunities of learning and alternative ways to perform theatre in order to continue offering a complete education for our majors and minors.

Appendix C: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, Areas in Need of Improvement, Plans for Improvement, and Improvements Made

Strengths

- By the conclusion of spring 2020, Program Learning Outcomes 2, 3 and 5 had been assessed with proficient results.
- Students have written evidence of fulfilling Program Learning Outcome #5 (Integrate biblical values with theory and praxis in theatrical

arts). These two student responses are evidence of this integration:

“As we go through life, our reactions and emotions, how we live our lives, are on display for all to see. There will always be people observing and judging. What people say about us affects how we feel about ourselves. But at the end of the day, our message and our mission are what matter most. It is the same way in theatre. Everything is out in plain sight. There is no place to hide. In fact, you want people to see what you’re doing. It is a risk. You are vulnerable before an audience. No day is quite the same as the one before it. There will be judgment and ridicule. But if you care about what you are saying, if you care about showing people how to see the world in a new light, then it is worth it. Connecting people through theatre is worth the pain and the heartbreak. In the same way, the pain and heartache in life make beautiful moments that much sweeter. In our class, we all came from different backgrounds and stories, but we were willing to be vulnerable, to compromise our pride and work together to create something beautiful. Though we probably won’t be best friends because of this class, we will still be connected and more aware of how important each individual is. We were shown the world in a new light. That is precious and something I will enjoy sharing with those around me in my everyday life.”

“Much like theatre, the experiences that we have with the Holy Spirit are ephemeral. The experience is there for a moment, filling us with hope, or instruction, or peace. The Holy Spirit isn’t incessantly talking to us. He gives us moments of inspiration and guidance, and then he is quite again, at least that’s the way it is for me. Also, like theatre, experiencing the Holy Spirit is a moving and enlightening moment, but it is not exactly the same every time we experience Him.”

- Adjunct faculty experts in stage craft and acting assist students with their learning.
- Strong Springfield community attendance at shows is evidence of marketing and hospitality to the community that are important for students’ learning as they prepare for theatre community connections in future vocations.
- Because Theatre shows are designed for all Theatre majors (Theatre, Theatre/Music, Theatre/Speech Education), students experience varied genres, including musicals, historical plays, and realistic plays. Within the past three years, students have performed *Music Man*, *A Christmas Carol*, *My Fair Lady*, *Our Town* (Pulitzer Prize winner), and *The Rainmaker* in addition to student-directed one-acts.

Areas in need of improvement

- Program Learning Outcomes to be assessed should be designated in syllabi according to the program’s curriculum map.
- Program Learning Outcomes #1 and #4 should be assessed in the 2020-2021 academic year.
- Although the theatre program has qualified adjuncts, a second full-time professor is needed to cover all coursework and specialties within the field as well as for tasks such as scheduling, advising, directing, supervising theatre education majors in field experiences and student teaching, recruitment, promotion of financial support, locating adjuncts, building donor and alumni base, and curriculum

development.

- As noted earlier, THTR 271 achieved a lower score than other courses; however, it was the first time for this course to be offered and tweaks will be made to strengthen the course and its ability to meet necessary outcomes for technical theatre.

Plans for improvement

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Assess all PLOs in the fall and spring semesters to facilitate discussion about PLO results.	Review with Theatre faculty in the fall and spring semesters	Theatre faculty
Faculty review courses on the curriculum map and remember to assess the PLO(s) designated for that course.	Fall 2020	Theatre faculty
Continue communication with the provost about hiring a second theatre professor	2020-2021	Mrs. LaDonna Friesen, Dr. Vickie Wisdom, and provost Dr. McCorcle
Continue to strengthen THTR 271	Spring 2021	Dr. Vickie Wisdom

Improvements Made

- Program Learning Outcomes are beginning to be assessed for theatre courses.
- In 2017, only four students had a major in Theatre, Theatre/Music, and Theatre/Speech Education. These are the numbers for Theatre majors for fall 2020:

Theatre	8
---------	---

Theatre/Music	3
Theatre/Speech Education	4
Total for all Theatre Majors	15
Theatre Minors	12

The increase in theatre majors is strong evidence that the program is attracting students to significant learning experiences, that the program is increasingly becoming more sustainable, and that these programs are benefiting not only Evangel students but the larger Springfield community who purchase tickets, donate to the program, and attend performances.



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities Program Coordinator: Dr. Vickie Wisdom

Academic Program Evaluated: Theatre/Music Program Review Year: 2020

Note: This document replicates information from the Theatre SLAR report because PLOs #1-5 are shared by Theatre/Music and Theatre/Speech Education. PLO #6-12 in the Theatre/Music curriculum map are specific to this program and are currently under review to consider what courses will assess them.

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Dr. Vickie Wisdom Mrs. LaDonna Friesen		
Number of		Please see Appendix A.	Freshmen:	Freshmen:

students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)			Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)		Final stagecraft, performance, and technical theatre projects and presentations, as listed in the assessment tables		
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)				
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		Last year, Dr. Vickie Wisdom assessed PLOs using specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and faculty evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria: 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency		

		1 Not Proficient		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		Please see Appendix A.		
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)		Please see Appendix B.		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan,		Please see Appendix C.		

when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.				
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		

2020 Appendix A: Number of Students in Sample and Instrument(s) used in assessment

	The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric. 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient
--	---

Fall 2020

Row Labels	Count of student sis id	Average of outcome score
Character Analysis – Rainmaker		
THTR 239 LEC 1 Rehearsal and Performance		

3. Acting	4	3.25
5. Integration	4	4

Final Project

THTR 130 LEC 1 Stagecraft Lab 1

2. Technical Theatre	8	3.25
----------------------	---	------

Final Project – Final Drawing

THTR 321 LEC 1 Technical Theatre II: Lighting Design

2. Technical Theatre	13	2.923076923
----------------------	----	-------------

Grand Total

29 3.206896552

Spring 2020

Row Labels	Count of student sis id	Average of outcome score
2. Technical Theatre		
Final Project		
THTR 130 LEC 1 Stagecraft Lab	1	4
Final Project Presentation		
THTR 271 LEC 1 Technical Theatre I: Scenic Design	9	3.333333333
Grand Total	10	3.4

Appendix B: Results of Assessment

What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes?

For outcomes that were assessed, all scores were 3.3 or above, indicating “proficient” for students enrolled in these Theatre courses. Also, the outcomes were evaluated through varied theatre studies in acting, stagecraft, and scenic design. THTR 271 achieved a lower score than other courses; however, it was the first time for this course to be offered and tweaks will be made to strengthen the course and its ability to meet necessary outcomes for technical theatre. Four years ago, there were no objectives or learning outcomes for any of the programs upon Dr. Wisdom’s arrival. In the past four years, curriculum has been revised, outcomes developed and now have the first real set of data from which to begin decision making.

(F) What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and (B) what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?

- C. To encourage participation for student performances, which are essential to this program, the last SLAR listed an upgrade for online ticket sale software as a goal for improvement. The program is now using GoFan, a digital ticketing platform, that allows patrons to purchase tickets online. This process has facilitated accessible and secure ticket purchases for seats specific to Evangel's theatre, helping to minimize box office lines on performance nights. Tickets for mainstage productions, such as *My Fair Lady*, are well attended by the community, with a sellout of 5 out of 6 performances. This audience connection is essential for students to practice PLO #2 (Competently perform basic tasks of script-analysis, set-design, construction, technical operation, and other "crew" tasks necessary to mount a dramatic stage production), #3 (Demonstrate effective use of the theatre artist's own imagination and physical resources to develop a compelling theatrical character who can serve the plot of a stage drama well) and #4 (Use the powers and resources of the director's role to help actors and crew members to perform well in a given stage-production).
- D. Based upon feedback from alumni and students, content areas that were previously combined and minimally covered in one or two courses have been separated out to offer a full range of instruction in the various elements of theatre in order to give our graduates a complete education in the field. Graduates are now prepared academically to feel completely ready to teach in the high school classroom, get accepted into the graduate school of their choice, and pursue positions that allow them to use the skills developed in their theatre courses. With the challenges of Covid-19 to the performing arts, our team has developed online opportunities of learning and alternative ways to perform theatre in order to continue offering a complete education for our majors and minors.

Appendix C: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, Areas in Need of Improvement, Plans for Improvement, and Improvements Made

Strengths

- By the conclusion of spring 2020, Program Learning Outcomes 2, 3 and 5 had been assessed with proficient results.
- Students have written evidence of fulfilling Program Learning Outcome #5 (Integrate biblical values with theory and praxis in theatrical arts). These two student responses are evidence of this integration:

"As we go through life, our reactions and emotions, how we live our lives, are on display for all to see. There will always be people observing and judging. What people say about us affects how we feel about ourselves. But at the end of the day, our message and our mission are what matter most. It is the same way in theatre. Everything is out in plain sight. There is no place to hide. In fact, you want people to see what you're doing. It is a risk. You are vulnerable before an audience. No day is quite the same as the one before it. There will be judgment and ridicule. But if you care about what you are saying, if you care about showing people how to see the world in a new light, then it is worth it. Connecting people through theatre is worth the pain and the heartbreak. In the same way, the pain and heartache in life make beautiful moments that much sweeter. In our class, we all came from different backgrounds and stories, but we were willing to be vulnerable, to compromise our pride and work together to create something beautiful. Though we probably won't be best friends because of this class, we will still be connected and more aware of how important each individual is. We were shown the world in a new light. That is precious and something I will enjoy sharing with those around me in my everyday life."

"Much like theatre, the experiences that we have with the Holy Spirit are ephemeral. The experience is there for a moment, filling us with hope, or instruction, or peace. The Holy Spirit isn't incessantly talking to us. He gives us moments of inspiration and guidance, and then he is quite again, at least that's the way it is for me. Also, like theatre, experiencing the Holy Spirit is a moving and enlightening moment, but it is not exactly the same every time we experience Him."

- Adjunct faculty experts in stage craft and acting assist students with their learning.
- Strong Springfield community attendance at shows is evidence of marketing and hospitality to the community that are important for students' learning as they prepare for theatre community connections in future vocations.
- Because Theatre shows are designed for all Theatre majors (Theatre, Theatre/Music, Theatre/Speech Education), students experience varied genres, including musicals, historical plays, and realistic plays. Within the past three years, students have performed *Music Man*, *A Christmas Carol*, *My Fair Lady*, *Our Town* (Pulitzer Prize winner), and *The Rainmaker* in addition to student-directed one-acts. To ensure that Theatre/Music students have enough music-theatre experience, one musical is performed each year at Evangel, usually with a live orchestra and a cast of over 30 students.
- Under the supervision of Evangel's full-time theatre professor, Dr. Vickie Wisdom, a Music/Theatre major used his education to direct *Night on Broadway*, a fundraising music-theatre production to benefit Weller Elementary (across the street from Evangel).

Areas in need of improvement

- Program Learning Outcomes to be assessed should be designated in syllabi according to the program's curriculum map.

- Program Learning Outcomes #1 and #4 should be assessed in the 2020-2021 academic year.
- Although the theatre program has qualified adjuncts, a second full-time professor is needed to cover all coursework and specialties within the field as well as for tasks such as scheduling, advising, directing, supervising theatre education majors in field experiences and student teaching, recruitment, promotion of financial support, locating adjuncts, building donor and alumni base, and curriculum development.
- As noted earlier, THTR 271 achieved a lower score than other courses; however, it was the first time for this course to be offered and tweaks will be made to strengthen the course and its ability to meet necessary outcomes for technical theatre.

Plans for improvement

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Assess all PLOs in the fall and spring semesters to facilitate discussion about PLO results.	Review with Theatre faculty in the fall and spring semesters	Theatre faculty
Faculty review courses on the curriculum map and remember to assess the PLO(s) designated for that course.	Fall 2020	Theatre faculty
Continue communication with the provost about hiring a second theatre professor	2020-2021	Mrs. LaDonna Friesen, Dr. Vickie Wisdom, and provost Dr. McCircle
Review the Theatre/Music curriculum map to consider what courses	Fall 2021	Dr. Vickie Wisdom and Music professors involved in Theatre/Music courses.

will assess the outlines specific to this program.		
Continue to strengthen THTR 271	Spring 2021	Dr. Vickie Wisdom

Improvements Made

- Program Learning Outcomes are beginning to be assessed for theatre courses.
- In 2017, only four students had a major in Theatre, Theatre/Music, and Theatre/Speech Education. These are the numbers for Theatre majors for fall 2020:

Theatre	8
Theatre/Music	3
Theatre/Speech Education	4
Total for all Theatre Majors	15
Theatre Minors	12

The increase in theatre majors is strong evidence that the program is attracting students to significant learning experiences, that the program is increasingly becoming more sustainable, and that these programs are benefiting not only Evangel students but the larger Springfield community who purchase tickets, donate to the program, and attend performances.



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

"How are students learning?"

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Humanities Program Coordinator: Dr. Vickie Wisdom

Academic Program Evaluated: Theatre/Speech Education Program Review Year: 2020

Note: This document replicates information from the Theatre SLAR report because PLOs #1-5 are shared by Theatre/Music and Theatre/Speech Education. PLO#6 is specific to Theatre/Speech Education and is addressed in this SLAR.

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2019	Year 2 Academic Year: 2020	Year 3 Academic Year: 2021	Year 4 Academic Year: 2022
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	SLAR was completed on a different form and uploaded to the Canvas Institutional Effectiveness site.	Dr. Vickie Wisdom Mrs. LaDonna Friesen		
Number of		Please see Appendix A.	Freshmen:	Freshmen:

students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)			Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)		Final stagecraft, performance, and technical theatre projects and presentations, as listed in the assessment tables		
Additional Data: (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)		Secondary Education students take the MoCA and MoGEA, but no majors needed to take it this year.		
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)		Last year, Dr. Vickie Wisdom assessed PLOs using specific major or culminating assignments. The assessed outcomes were placed in the assignment's Canvas rubric, and faculty evaluated the student's fulfillment of the outcome using this criteria: 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency		

		1 Not Proficient		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)		Please see Appendix A.		
Results of Assessment: (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)		Please see Appendix B.		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)		Please see Appendix C.		
Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan,		Please see Appendix C.		

when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.				
Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.		Please see Appendix C.		

2020 Appendix A: Number of Students in Sample and Instrument(s) used in assessment

	The following Program Learning Outcomes were assessed using the Canvas Learning Management System. The outcomes evaluated student performance on a major or culminating semester assignment, using the following rubric. 4 Exceeds Proficiency 3 Proficient 2 Developing Proficiency 1 Not Proficient
--	---

Fall 2020

Row Labels	Count of student sis id	Average of outcome score
------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

Character Analysis - Rainmaker

THTR 239 LEC 1 Rehearsal and Performance

3. Acting	4	3.25
5. Integration	4	4

Final Project

THTR 130 LEC 1 Stagecraft Lab 1

2. Technical Theatre	8	3.25
----------------------	---	------

Final Project - Final Drawing

THTR 321 LEC 1 Technical Theatre II: Lighting Design

2. Technical Theatre	13	2.923076923
----------------------	----	-------------

Grand Total

29 3.206896552

Spring 2020

Row Labels	Count of student sis id	Average of outcome score
2. Technical Theatre		
Final Project		
THTR 130 LEC 1 Stagecraft Lab	1	4
Final Project Presentation		
THTR 271 LEC 1 Technical Theatre I: Scenic Design	9	3.333333333
Grand Total	10	3.4

Note: THTR 336 Instructional Methods in Speech/Theatre would normally assess PLO#6, but this course did not have enrollment for Fall 2019-2020.

Appendix B: Results of Assessment

What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes?

For outcomes that were assessed, all scores were 3.3 or above, indicating “proficient” for students enrolled in these Theatre courses. Also, the outcomes were evaluated through varied theatre studies in acting, stagecraft, and scenic design. THTR 271 achieved a lower score than other courses; however, it was the first time for this course to be offered and tweaks will be made to strengthen the course and its ability to meet necessary outcomes for technical theatre. Four years ago, there were no objectives or learning outcomes for any of the programs upon Dr. Wisdom’s arrival. In the past four years, curriculum has been revised, outcomes developed and now have the first real set of data from which to begin decision making.

(G) *What changes have been made since the last SLAR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and (B) what changes will be made to the program following this SLAR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?*

- E. To encourage participation for student performances, which are essential to this program, the last SLAR listed an upgrade for online ticket sale software as a goal for improvement. The program is now using GoFan, a digital ticketing platform, that allows patrons to purchase tickets online. This process has facilitated accessible and secure ticket purchases for seats specific to Evangel’s theatre, helping to minimize box office lines on performance nights. Tickets for mainstage productions, such as *My Fair Lady*, are well attended by the community, with a sellout of 5 out of 6 performances. This audience connection is essential for students to practice PLO #2 (Competently perform basic tasks of script-analysis, set-design, construction, technical operation, and other “crew” tasks necessary to mount a dramatic stage production), #3 (Demonstrate effective use of the theatre artist’s own imagination and physical resources to develop a compelling theatrical character who can serve the plot of a stage drama well) and #4 (Use the powers and resources of the director’s role to help actors and crew members to perform well in a given stage-production).
- F. Based upon feedback from alumni and students, content areas that were previously combined and minimally covered in one or two courses have been separated out to offer a full range of instruction in the various elements of theatre in order to give our graduates a complete education in the field. Graduates are now prepared academically to feel completely ready to teach in the high school classroom, get accepted into the graduate school of their choice, and pursue positions that allow them to use the skills developed in their theatre courses. With the challenges of Covid-19 to the performing arts, our team has developed online opportunities of learning and alternative ways to perform theatre in order to continue offering a complete education for our majors and minors.

Appendix C: Strengths, Areas for Improvement, Areas in Need of Improvement, Plans for Improvement, and Improvements Made

Strengths

- By the conclusion of spring 2020, Program Learning Outcomes 2, 3 and 5 had been assessed with proficient results.
- Dr. Wisdom, the full-time professor who teaches the theatre/speech methodology course and who oversees all theatre majors has qualified undergraduate and graduate degrees in education as well as teaching certification: a Bachelor of Music Education and Theatre, a Lifetime Teaching Certificate K-12 Vocal and Instrumental, and a Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership.
- Students have written evidence of fulfilling Program Learning Outcome #5 (Integrate biblical values with theory and praxis in theatrical arts). These two student responses are evidence of this integration:

“As we go through life, our reactions and emotions, how we live our lives, are on display for all to see. There will always be people observing and judging. What people say about us affects how we feel about ourselves. But at the end of the day, our message and our mission are what matter most. It is the same way in theatre. Everything is out in plain sight. There is no place to hide. In fact, you want people to see what you're doing. It is a risk. You are vulnerable before an audience. No day is quite the same as the one before it. There will be judgment and ridicule. But if you care about what you are saying, if you care about showing people how to see the world in a new light, then it is worth it. Connecting people through theatre is worth the pain and the heartbreak. In the same way, the pain and heartache in life make beautiful moments that much sweeter. In our class, we all came from different backgrounds and stories, but we were willing to be vulnerable, to compromise our pride and work together to create something beautiful. Though we probably won't be best friends because of this class, we will still be connected and more aware of how important each individual is. We were shown the world in a new light. That is precious and something I will enjoy sharing with those around me in my everyday life.”

“Much like theatre, the experiences that we have with the Holy Spirit are ephemeral. The experience is there for a moment, filling us with hope, or instruction, or peace. The Holy Spirit isn't incessantly talking to us. He gives us moments of inspiration and guidance, and then he is quite again, at least that's the way it is for me. Also, like theatre, experiencing the Holy Spirit is a moving and enlightening moment, but it is not exactly the same every time we experience Him.”

- Adjunct faculty experts in stage craft and acting assist students with their learning.
- Strong Springfield community attendance at shows is evidence of marketing and hospitality to the community that are important for students' learning as they prepare for theatre community connections in future vocations.
- Because Theatre shows are designed for all Theatre majors (Theatre, Theatre/Music, Theatre/Speech Education), students experience varied genres, including musicals, historical plays, and realistic plays. Within the past three years, students have performed *Music Man*, *A Christmas Carol*, *My Fair Lady*, *Our Town* (Pulitzer Prize winner), and *The Rainmaker* in addition to student-directed one-acts.

- Theatre/Speech Education students have had practicums and student teaching experiences that effectively prepare them for a future vocation in theatre middle school or secondary education. One example is Angeline Bradford, a 2012 alumna who continued her education with a Master of Arts in Theater from the University of Houston. She also trained at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art in London, Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York, and the Steppenwolf Theatre and The Actor's Studio in Chicago. She is currently the Head Theatre Director at Bradley Middle School in San Antonio, TX. She has 215 students in her theatre program, and her school won first place in the UIL (University Interscholastic League) One Act Play contest in 2019 & 2020.

Areas in need of improvement

- Program Learning Outcomes to be assessed should be designated in syllabi according to the program's curriculum map.
- Program Learning Outcomes #1 and #4 should be assessed in the 2020-2021 academic year.
- Although the theatre program has qualified adjuncts, a second full-time professor is needed to cover all coursework and specialties within the field as well as for tasks such as scheduling, advising, directing, supervising theatre education majors in field experiences and student teaching, recruitment, promotion of financial support, locating adjuncts, building donor and alumni base, and curriculum development.
- As noted earlier, THTR 271 achieved a lower score than other courses; however, it was the first time for this course to be offered and tweaks will be made to strengthen the course and its ability to meet necessary outcomes for technical theatre.

Plans for improvement

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Assess all PLOs in the fall and spring semesters to facilitate discussion about PLO results.	Review with Theatre faculty in the fall and spring semesters	Theatre faculty
Faculty review courses on the curriculum map and remember to assess the PLO(s) designated for that course.	Fall 2020	Theatre faculty

Continue communication with the provost about hiring a second theatre professor	2020-2021	Mrs. LaDonna Friesen, Dr. Vickie Wisdom, and provost Dr. McCircle
Continue to strengthen THTR 271	Spring 2021	Dr. Vickie Wisdom

Improvements Made

- Program Learning Outcomes are beginning to be assessed for theatre courses.
- In 2017, only four students had a major in Theatre, Theatre/Music, and Theatre/Speech Education. These are the numbers for Theatre majors for fall 2020:

Theatre	8
Theatre/Music	3
Theatre/Speech Education	4
Total for all Theatre Majors	15
Theatre Minors	12

The increase in theatre majors is strong evidence that the program is attracting students to significant learning experiences, that the program is increasingly becoming more sustainable, and that these programs are benefiting not only Evangel students but the larger Springfield

community who purchase tickets, donate to the program, and attend performances.