

#1. Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department/Program/Unit: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages
September 20, 2016

Date:

Related: University Goal/Outcome(more than one may be selected): Communication Knowledge Select Select

Members involved with development of Program Assessment Plan: Paul Holtorf, Charles Blanco, David Coe, Terence Groth, Mark Meehl, and Russ Sommerfeld

Departmental/Program/Unit Student Outcome: *What student outcome from the departmental matrix will be assessed? (It is suggested that you cut and paste directly from the matrix. Outcomes should represent the absolute priorities for learning- students must be able to do [this] when they finish our program). State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something].*

Students will use appropriate source material to write a research-based paper that meets the standards of the discipline.

Background: *What factors caused you to choose this particular assessment outcome? If you chose this outcome because of a perceived problem, please explain.*

The selection of this outcome is based upon the institution's selection of communication in the General Education Assessment Plan for 2016-17.

Question: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)*

1. Can the student demonstrate good research skills in the construction of a research paper?
2. Can the student write a research paper in the style of MLA?

Methodology:

1. **OBJECT*** - *What data (i.e. artifact, exam score, detailed description of assignment) will be collected?* Research paper-Theo 489 (Writing Intensive)
 - a. *How does this data address the assessment question?* The data will demonstrate to what degree the student is able to use good research skills and MLA formatting when writing a research-based paper that meets the standards of the discipline.
 - i. *Include/attach a description/example of assessment tool to be used.*
2. *How will data be collected?* The research papers will be collected following the Fall 2016 semester.

Analysis of Artifacts: *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - Discuss:*

- 1) *How the artifacts will be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):* Following the collection of the research papers from Theo 489, the department will randomly select 30-40% from the class and score them. Attached is the rubric.
- 2) *How you will know if it is good (i.e. score required by % of students):* The department desires to see scores in the 3 range, based on a Likert scale of 1 (fails to meet outcome) to 5 (exceeds the outcome).

Submitted by: Paul Holtorf

Date: September 20, 2016

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 10/28/16

Department Chair notified of approval or additional action needed: 11/18/16 - Plan approved - all revisions made.

10/28/16

1. Matrix

a. A15 should be noted in the courses where data was collected last year so that this becomes a historical document for the department.

b. In the Gen Ed Goals and Requirements - A16 should be noted in courses where artifacts will be collected for the Gen Ed plan.

2. Departmental Plan - approved with revision of the rubric.

3. Departmental Rubric - under the "Question" section makes use of a fair amount of subjective criteria – "good research skills", "ability to communicate in an organized and coherent manner" and the Scoring Rubric uses the same criteria only puts them into a scale...but it doesn't define what constitutes "fail to meet outcomes" or "meets outcomes" or "exceeds outcomes".

The criteria for each level of the scale (1 3 5) needs to be specific enough to differentiate between each score.