

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: B.A. in Humanities & Religious Studies (Concentration in Humanities OR Religious Studies)

B2. Report author(s): Jeffrey Brodd, Bradley Nystrom

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: 50 (34 in Humanities, 16 in Religious Studies)

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

Our Critical Thinking PLO for the HRS B.A. (both Humanities and Religious Studies concentrations) is included along with the other four WASC core competencies under the Program Learning Goal “Intellectual and Communication Skills.” This PGL states:

Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate analytical reading skills, critical thinking skills, information competence, and effective written and oral communication skills in order to facilitate clear understanding and articulation of subject matter in academic and professional pursuits.

The Critical Thinking PLO states:

Demonstrate comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
---	--------

	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]**

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

X	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
X	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
X	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

PLO: Critical Thinking

We have collected rubric scores for assignments in HRS 10 (Arts and Ideas of the West: Ancient to Medieval) and HRS 108 (Approaches to Religious Studies). HRS 10 is a required core course for both HRS B.A. degree concentrations; it also serves a large number of non-major GE students. HRS 108 is a required core course for the Religious Studies concentration, and is an elective option for the Humanities concentration; it is not a GE course. The overall rubric score range for HRS 10 is 0.7 to 3.0 with average of 1.9; the range for HRS 108 is 1.7 to 4.0 with average of 2.8. While we had not yet attempted to set formal expectations/standards of performance for critical thinking, we are pleased to see the upper-division majors scoring significantly higher than the mix of GE and majors in the lower-division HRS 10. Regarding scores for specific rubric categories, we note that the high and low scores correspond between courses consistently except for 6.4 (Student's position); we suspect this has much to do with the varying nature of the assignments (see Q4.3.2 below). In general, these scores suggest to us a need to enhance the teaching of critical thinking, especially at the lower-division level. We also believe we now have data

suitable for establishing formal expectations/standards of performance.

Modified VALUE Rubric: Critical Thinking

Criterion	Capstone 4	Milestone 3	Milestone 2	Benchmark 1
6.1: Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering relevant information sufficient for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
6.2: Evidence	Draws sufficient and relevant information from legitimate sources to enable the development of a coherent and comprehensive analysis or synthesis.	Draws relevant information from legitimate sources to enable the development of a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Draws information from sources, but not sufficiently to enable the development of a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Draws information from source. Viewpoints are taken as fact, without question.
6.3: Influence of context and assumptions	Recognizes and evaluates the context and assumptions affecting the evidence when presenting a position.	Recognizes the context and assumptions affecting the evidence when presenting a position.	Partially acknowledges the context and assumptions affecting the evidence when presenting a position.	Shows a preliminary acknowledgment of context and assumptions.
6.4: Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue and indicating independent thought. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue, suggesting independent thought.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) partially acknowledges the complexities of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
6.5: Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	Conclusion is comprehensive, logical, and cogently tied to the evidence.	Conclusion is logical and cogently tied to the evidence.	Conclusion is logical and tied to the evidence.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the evidence and is oversimplified.

Average total rubric scores (4 points possible):

PAPER	AVERAGE
HRS 10 1	1.6
HRS 10 2	0.7

PAPER	AVERAGE
HRS 108 1	2.6
HRS 108 2	1.7

HRS 10 3	2.4
HRS 10 4	3.0
HRS 10 5	2.0
HRS 10 6	1.8
HRS 10 7	2.1
TOTAL	1.9

HRS 108 3	2.8
HRS 108 4	2.8
HRS 108 5	4.0
HRS 108 6	2.2
HRS 108 7	3.6
TOTAL	2.8

Average scores for each rubric category (4 points possible):

	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.4	6.5
HRS 10 1	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.8
HRS 10 2	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.0	0.7
HRS 10 3	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.5	3.0
HRS 10 4	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.5	3.0
HRS 10 5	2.3	2.5	1.8	1.5	1.8
HRS 10 6	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5	2.0
HRS 10 7	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3	2.3
AVERAGE:	1.9	2.2	1.9	1.8	2.1
	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.4	6.5
HRS 108 1	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.6	2.3
HRS 108 2	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.5
HRS 108 3	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.8	2.8
HRS 108 4	2.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.8
HRS 108 5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
HRS 108 6	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
HRS 108 7	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
AVERAGE:	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.1	2.9

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

As this is the first year we have assessed this PLO, we have not yet acquired evidence in order to establish formal expectations/standards of performance. Informally however, we find that students are not doing as well as we had hoped, and we shall strategize means of attempting to improve student learning.

Q3.4.1. First PLO: Critical Thinking

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
X	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? 1

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
X	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

HRS 10, Final Exam essay (condensed version)

Choosing three areas of interest from among the semester's eight areas of focus (Mesopotamia, Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome, the rise of Christianity, the Byzantine Empire, Carolingian Culture, Gothic architecture, Italy in the Middle Ages) write three separate short essays (3-4 paragraphs), each one devoted to one area of focus. In each essay you will incorporate the semester's *Threshold Concepts*. *Optional Bonus Short Essay.* For your bonus short essay response (2-3 paragraphs) consider a contemporary idea, philosophy, artistic or architectural expression, or an advance in engineering or biological sciences which you believe has roots in the Arts and Ideas of the ancient Western world. Explain why you think your choice draws inspiration or origins from older traditions. Be creative! But support your choice with solid evidence!

HRS 108, Culminating Theory Application Paper (condensed version)

The culminating theory application paper should be 2400-3000 words in length and should integrate one observation visit and one additional reading. Include notes describing the observation visit, with side comments analyzing at least three distinct moments in relation to one theorist's ideas.

Option A: Analysis of a single religious community's practice and reflection by applying and critiquing three different theorists' ideas.

Option B: Assessment of a single theorist's ideas, illustrated and critiqued using examples from the practice and reflection of three different religious communities.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
X	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We randomly selected seven papers from each of the two classes, HRS 10 (enrollment 43) and HRS 108 (enrollment 13).

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The departmental assessment committee is made up of four faculty members. A modified version of the VALUE critical thinking rubric (see above) has been used to collect data. The modifications were based on those developed by participants in the 2012-2013 FLC on assessing critical thinking, which included one of our committee members who also serves on the GE Honors Program assessment committee. The rubric was applied to directly assess seven student papers selected from two courses offered in spring 2014: HRS 10 and HRS 108 (Approaches to Religious Studies). Each paper was read by at least two faculty members. One paper from each class was read by all four for purposes of norming. The committee scrutinized all scores during this norming stage, discussing interpretation of the rubric criteria and the appropriateness of scores. Other topics of discussion included the varying types of assignments, especially regarding the extent to which they directly prompted students to display critical thinking skills as described by the rubric.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? One

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

	1. Yes
--	--------

	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results from 2012-2013 been used for? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum					X
3. Improving advising and mentoring					X
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals				X	
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations				X	
6. Developing/updating assessment plan			X		
7. Annual assessment reports	X				
8. Program review			X		
9. Prospective student and family information			X		
10. Alumni communication				X	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning			X		
16. Institutional benchmarking		X			
17. Academic policy development or modification		X			
18. Institutional Improvement			X		
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring	X				
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					X
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

Instructors have enhanced formal writing requirements in courses. As the department prepares to undergo program review this coming year, we are working on aspects of a new manual of policies and procedures, which will be a major aspect of our self-study activities. The findings of the Written Communication assessment provide clear direction for important aspects of the manual, including formal departmental standards for writing assignments and critique thereof in all GE courses and major core courses.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

This assessment project and the data it has produced indicate needs and opportunities for enhancing curriculum for purposes of teaching critical thinking skills. HRS 10 and HRS 108 are certainly two courses for which proactive improvements would fortify the overall major, for both concentrations. The mechanisms for implementing these changes will involve new assigned tasks, either to be embedded in exams or longer papers, or as standalone assignments. We look forward to settling into a five-year assessment cycle during which critical thinking will be assessed one year out of the five. We therefore anticipate assessing critical thinking again during the 2019-2020 academic year. However, given that this was the first year of assessing critical thinking and that we now have some basis for benchmarks, we would like to incorporate assessment of critical thinking within the next three years.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above:
	a.
	b.
	c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
X	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
X	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: HRS 195

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: Department of Humanities & Religious Studies

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: (?)

A9. Department Chair's Name: Jeffrey Brodd; Bradley Nystrom (Interim)

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: 3

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

X	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 4

A12.1. List all the name(s): B.A. and Minor in HRS (Humanities Concentration); B.A. and minor in HRS (Religious Studies Concentration)

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 1

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 1

A13.1. List all the name(s): M.A. in Humanities

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 0

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A14.1. List all the names:

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0

A15.1. List the name(s):

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: B.A. (and minor) in HRS, Humanities

Concentration OR Religious Studies Concentration

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: HRS (Humanities); HRS (Religious Studies)