



***2023-2024 Student Learning Outcomes
Assessment Report***

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	2
GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs)	2
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs).....	2
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs).....	6
INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs).....	7
COURSES SELECTED FOR ASSESSMENT.....	9
GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs)	9
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs).....	9
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs).....	11
INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs).....	11
ASSESSMENT TEAMS	12
GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs)	12
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs).....	12
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs).....	13
INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs).....	13
ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES	14
GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS	15
WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.....	15
VERBAL COMMUNICATION.....	16
LITERATURE/FINE ARTS	17
E-PROFICIENCY PROFILE	18
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS.....	19
CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS.....	19
BACHELOR OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY	22
BACHELOR OF ARTS IN RELIGION	24
MASTER OF ARTS IN APOLOGETICS	26
MASTER OF ARTS IN BIBLICAL COUNSELING.....	27
MASTER OF ARTS IN CHRISTIAN STUDIES.....	28
MASTER OF ARTS IN LEADERSHIP.....	29
MASTER OF ARTS IN MINISTRY	30
MASTER OF DIVINITY	32
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY.....	33
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS	34
2021-2022 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	34
2022-2023 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	34
2023-2024 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	35
INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS.....	37

UNDERGRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES	37
GRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES -- SEMINARY.....	43
GRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES – LEADERSHIP	46
DOCTORAL INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	47
APPENDICES.....	48
APPENDIX A – DESCRIPTION OF RUBRIC SCORES FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	48
APPENDIX B – GELO RUBRIC, WRITTEN COMMUNICATION	49
APPENDIX C – GELO RUBRIC, VERBAL COMMUNICATION.....	50
APPENDIX D – GELO RUBRIC, LITERATURE	51
APPENDIX E – PLO RUBRICS, UCBS.....	52
APPENDIX F – PLO RUBRICS, GCBC.....	54
APPENDIX G – PLO RUBRIC, GCBS	56
APPENDIX H – PLO RUBRIC, GCPM	57
APPENDIX I – PLO RUBRICS, BAPY	58
APPENDIX J – PLO RUBRICS, BAR.....	63
APPENDIX K – PLO RUBRICS, MAA	66
APPENDIX L – PLO RUBRICS, MABC.....	69
APPENDIX M – PLO RUBRICS, MACS	73
APPENDIX N – PLO RUBRIC, MAL	75
APPENDIX O – PLO RUBRIC, MAM	76
APPENDIX P – PLO RUBRICS, MDIV	77
APPENDIX Q – PLO RUBRIC, DMIN	80
APPENDIX R – ILLO RUBRICS, UNDERGRADUATE	81
APPENDIX S – ILLO RUBRIC, GRADUATE SEMINARY.....	83
APPENDIX T – ILLO RUBRIC, GRADUATE LEADERSHIP.....	84
APPENDIX U – ILLO RUBRIC, DOCTORAL	85

Introduction

The mission of Luther Rice College and Seminary is “to serve the church and community by providing biblically based on-campus and distance education to Christian men and women for ministry and the marketplace with an end to granting undergraduate and graduate degrees.” To demonstrate fulfillment of this mission, Luther Rice assesses five levels of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):

- Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
- General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs)
- Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
- Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)
- Information Literacy Learning Outcomes (ILLOs).

Institutional Learning Outcomes are measured every five years by the faculty. They were last measured in 2019-2020 and will be measured again in 2024-2025. Consequently, in the 2023-2024 academic year, Luther Rice performed direct assessment of General Education Learning Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, Course Learning Outcomes, and Information Literacy Learning Outcomes.

The following report provides an overview of the assessment process, corresponding results, and recommendations for improvement.

Student Learning Outcomes

General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs)

General education is a required curricular component of the Associate of Arts in General Studies (AAGS) program, the Bachelor of Arts in Religion (BAR) program, and the Bachelor of Arts in Psychology (BAPY) program. General education curricula at Luther Rice emphasize fine arts and humanities and include courses in science and mathematics.

The following General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) have been designed by the AAGS committee in response to ongoing assessment of general education in the AAGS, BAR, and BAPY programs. Bloom's taxonomy was used to ensure an appropriate degree of rigor:

1. Communication: Demonstrate a proposition clearly and persuasively in written and oral form.
2. Critical Thinking: Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills through the presentation, interpretation, and evaluation of ideas.
3. Humanities: Evaluate the role of the humanities in the human experience.
4. Natural Sciences: Apply scientific methods of inquiry to explain natural phenomena and/or analyze mathematical principles and techniques to solve applied problems.
5. Social Sciences: Analyze the behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact on the individual, society, and culture.

GELOs are assessed annually by a team of three or more faculty who hold terminal degrees in the humanities or related fields. GELOs are identical to AAGS PLOs and complement BAR and BAPY PLOs.

Work products selected for assessment are intended to demonstrate mastery of General Education Learning Outcomes. Assessors use rubrics specific to the learning outcome to assess student competency. Rubrics are scaled from 1 or 2 (Incompetent) to 5 or 6 (Very Competent), with an expected outcome of greater than or equal to 3 or 4 (Competent).

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Program committees design PLOs using Bloom's Taxonomy to ensure an appropriate level of rigor for each degree program. PLOs are assessed each year by a team of three or more faculty who hold a master's or doctoral degree in the field.

Work products selected for assessment are intended to demonstrate mastery of Program Learning Outcomes. Assessors use rubrics specific to the program to assess student competency. Rubrics are scaled from 1 or 2 (Incompetent) to 5 or 6 (Very Competent), with an expected outcome of greater than or equal to 3 or 4 (Competent).

Undergraduate Certificate in Apologetics

1. Introduce students to a rational and biblical case for the truth of Christianity.
2. Introduce students to a defense to major objections to Christianity.

Undergraduate Certificate in Biblical Counseling

1. Introduce students to primary components of biblical counseling.
2. Practice foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.

Undergraduate Certificate in Biblical Studies

1. Survey the skills necessary for biblical interpretation.
2. Introduce students to the study of the Old Testament books.
3. Introduce students to the study of the New Testament books.

Undergraduate Certificate in Pastoral Ministry

1. Introduce students to the nature, goals, and biblical qualifications of a Christian minister.
2. Practice foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.

Undergraduate Certificate in Theology

1. Demonstrate a working knowledge of the doctrine of Christ.
2. Demonstrate a working knowledge of orthodox theology.

Graduate Certificate in Apologetics

1. Demonstrate an understanding of apologetics in relation to the Bible and theology.
2. Demonstrate effectiveness in writing responses to objections to Christianity.

Graduate Certificate in Biblical Counseling

1. Introduce students to a biblical philosophy of counseling.
2. Introduce students to empathetic and pastoral care or referral.

Graduate Certificate in Biblical Greek

1. Demonstrate knowledge of New Testament Greek vocabulary, morphology, grammar, and syntactical functions.
2. Demonstrate the ability to translate sentences from the Greek New Testament.
3. Analyze syntactical relationships in select texts from the Greek New Testament.

Graduate Certificate in Biblical Hebrew

1. Demonstrate an understanding of Hebrew grammar and translate Hebrew sentences.
2. Demonstrate proficiency in the use of lexical and exegetical resources.
3. Explain and understand the process of Hebrew textual criticism and the development of Hebrew critical editions.

Graduate Certificate in Biblical Studies

1. Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.
2. Communicate biblical and theological truths in writing.
3. Demonstrate an awareness of the introductory matters associated with the Old Testament books.

4. Demonstrate an awareness of the introductory matters associated with the New Testament books.

Graduate Certificate in Church Revitalization

1. Introduce students to biblical and philosophical principles in church revitalization.
2. Practice assessing church health and communicating those findings.
3. Practice implementing strategies for revitalizing a local church.

Graduate Certificate in Organizational Leadership

1. Introduce students to research methods for organizational analysis and problem solving.
2. Introduce students to a philosophy of leading and following consistent with their vocation.

Graduate Certificate in Pastoral Ministry

1. Introduce students to evaluating ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.
2. Introduce students to developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs.

Graduate Certificate in Theology

1. Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of Christian theology.

Associate of Arts in General Studies

1. Demonstrate a proposition clearly and persuasively in written and oral form.
2. Demonstrate effective critical thinking skills through the presentation, interpretation, and evaluation of ideas.
3. Evaluate the role of the humanities in the human experience.
4. Apply scientific methods of inquiry to explain natural phenomena and/or analyze mathematical principles and techniques to solve applied problems.
5. Analyze the behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact on the individual, society, and culture.

Bachelor of Arts in Religion

1. Demonstrate a knowledge of the Bible, interpret Scripture's original meaning, and apply Scripture to contemporary situations.
2. Examine Christian theology and history with the purpose of ministry application.
3. Articulate a Christian worldview and discuss its implications to daily life.
4. Apply foundational skills for ministry and service in a church and community.

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

1. Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication.

2. Evaluate psychological theories under the authority of the bible in the development of a scripturally reliable and empirically informed model of human psychology.
3. Critically and constructively apply a biblical worldview of scientific methodology to the subject matter of psychology.
4. Develop a fundamental knowledge of the physiological, psychological, social, and spiritual foundations of human life in the context of a consistent biblical/Christian worldview.
5. Build/practice essential skills for a career in clinical, academic, or church/ missional settings.

Master of Arts in Apologetics

1. Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.
2. Relate the Church's theological heritage to current apologetical issues.
3. Articulate a rational and biblical case for the truth of Christianity.
4. Articulate a defense to major objections to Christianity.

Master of Arts in Biblical Counseling

1. Articulate a biblical philosophy of counseling.
2. Communicate biblical and theological truths through counseling.
3. Exemplify empathetic pastoral care or referral.
4. Convey principles of ethically and legally informed counseling practices.
5. Employ interpersonal skills in counseling.

Master of Arts in Christian Studies

1. Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of Christian theology.
3. Communicate biblical and theological truths in writing.

Master of Arts in Leadership

1. Employ research methods for organizational analysis and problem solving.
2. Articulate a biblical philosophy of leading and following consistent with their vocation.
3. Apply Christian leader and follower principles.
4. Utilize leadership theories to diagnose and/or design organizations.

Master of Arts in Ministry

1. Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.
2. Utilize the Church's theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry.
3. Evaluate ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.
4. Lead in developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs.
5. Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or such other ways as may be appropriate.

Master of Divinity

1. Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.

2. Utilize the Church's historical and theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry.
3. Articulate a biblical philosophy of ministry consistent with their vocation.
4. Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or in such other ways as may be appropriate.
5. Evaluate and develop ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.
6. Accurately and empathetically evaluate people and their personal circumstances and provide appropriate pastoral care or referral.
7. Lead in developing goals and designing and implementing ministry.
8. Serve with Christian character in their personal and professional lives.

Doctor of Ministry

1. Articulate and apply a comprehensive and critical philosophy of ministry.
2. Evaluate ministry efforts for biblical veracity and effective ministry outcomes.
3. Design and implement effective strategies for ministry settings.
4. Communicate researched conclusions with competence and purpose.
5. Ph.D. in Christian Scripture

Doctor of Philosophy in Christian Scripture

1. Develop Hebrew and Greek exegetical skills necessary for advanced engagement with the Christian Scripture.
2. Synthesize, evaluate, and apply various methods of biblical interpretation and biblical theology to any text of the Christian Scripture.
3. Understand the value of the biblical backgrounds and the history of interpretation of the Christian Scripture.
4. Develop theories and methods of education as applied to teaching the Christian Scripture.
5. Produce a well-researched and well-written dissertation related to the Christian Scripture.

Doctor of Philosophy in Organizational Leadership

1. Demonstrate the ability to develop a philosophy of leadership consistent with a biblical worldview.
2. Demonstrate the ability to apply leadership theories, principles, and practices to improve personal and organizational performance.
3. Demonstrate the ability to analyze the cause(s) of organizational challenges and develop leadership recommendations to meet these challenges.
4. Demonstrate the ability to synthesize and evaluate current theory and apply appropriate methodologies to conduct meaningful research in the field of leadership.

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

Program committees design CLOs for each course in the program using Bloom's taxonomy to ensure an appropriate degree of rigor. Assessment of CLOs is performed each year by the Dean of the College and Seminary.

Course grades provide a direct measure of students' ability to demonstrate CLOs. The competency scale for grades is as follows: A (Excellent); B (Good); C (Average); D (Poor); and F (Fail). The desired outcome is that 75% of the grades within a degree program each year will be at least a C.

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes (ILLOs)

ILLOs are assessed annually for each level of instruction (Undergraduate, Graduate Leadership, Graduate Seminary, Doctoral) offered at Luther Rice College and Seminary. ILLOs were written by the ad hoc Information Literacy Committee and implemented by the faculty. They are assessed by a team of three or more personnel who hold graduate degrees in library science, education, or general education fields such as literature, philosophy, or history.

Work products are selected for assessment from each level of instruction (undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral). Assessors use rubrics specific to the level of instruction. Rubrics are scaled from 1 or 2 (Incompetent) to 5 or 6 (Very Competent), with an expected outcome of greater than or equal to 3 or 4 (Competent).

Luther Rice ILLOs are based on the six "frames" of the ACRL Framework. Each frame has been restated appropriate to the undergraduate level, the graduate level, and the doctoral level. For instance, ILLO 1.1 represents Frame 1 appropriate to an undergraduate level of study, ILLO 1.2 represents Frame 1 appropriate to a graduate level of study, and ILLO 1.3 represents Frame 1 appropriate to a doctoral level of study.

Frame 1—Authority of Sources

ILLO 1.1 - Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information, distinguishing reliable from unreliable sources.

ILLO 1.2 - Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.

ILLO 1.3 - Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.

Frame 2—Variety of Sources

ILLO 2.1 - Some variety evident in selection of sources.

ILLO 2.2 - Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.

ILLO 2.3 - Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.

Frame 3—Academic Integrity

ILLO 3.1 - Students cite sources appropriately and relate sources' claims accurately.

ILLO 3.2 - Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately according to the latest edition of *A Manual for Writers*.

ILLO 3.3 - Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately according to the latest edition of *A Manual for Writers*.

Frame 4—Dialog with Opposition

ILLO 4.1 - Students seek information from multiple perspectives.

ILLO 4.2 - Students seek information from multiple perspectives.

ILLO 4.3 - Methodological research is both broad and evaluative. Student researches the methods of numerous other authors (broad), and highlights points of similarity and dissimilarity among them (evaluative).

Frame 5—Interaction with Sources

ILLO 5.1 - Students make an attempt to assess sources' logic and evidence instead of simply summarizing conclusions.

ILLO 5.2 - Students evaluate sources' claims from a perspective of informed skepticism, critically assessing sources' logic and evidence rather than simply summarizing their conclusions.

ILLO 5.3 - Methodological research is intellectually rigorous. Student goes beyond merely summarizing what prior researchers have done by examining the reasons and rationales in their work.

Frame 6—Scope of Research

ILLO 6.1 – Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.

ILLO 6.2 - Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.

ILLO 6.3 - Students make meaningful contributions to the field of study.

Courses Selected for Assessment

General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs)

GELOs are assessed via student samples culled from the courses identified below. The *ETS Proficiency Profile* serves as a secondary assessment for the Communication, Critical Thinking, and Natural Sciences GELOs.

Outcome	Course Designated for Assessment	Work Selected for Assessment	Secondary Assessment
GELO 1: Communication (Written)	EN 1102-English Composition II	Final Research Paper	E-Proficiency Profile: Writing
GELO 1: Communication (Oral)	EN 2103-Public Speech	Persuasive Speech	Not Applicable
GELO 2: Critical Thinking	PH 1900-Critical Thinking	E-Proficiency Profile: Critical Thinking	Not Applicable
GELO 3: Humanities	EN 2104-World Literature	Close Reading Paper	E-Proficiency Profile: Humanities
GELO 4: Natural Sciences	SC 1501-Physical Science	E-Proficiency Profile: Natural Sciences	Not Applicable
GELO 5: Social Sciences		E-Proficiency Profile: Social Sciences	Not Applicable

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

PLOs are assessed via student samples culled from the courses identified below:

Program	Course Designated for Assessment	Work Selected for Assessment
UCAP	AP4903	Week 12 Resurrection Primer
UCBC	CO3702	Week 14 Case Study
UCBS	BI1200 – PLO 1 OT1200/NT1200 – PLO 2	Biblical Interpretation Paper OT Ann. Bib./NT Book Intros
UCPM		
UCTH	TH4303 – PLO 1	Book Review Paper

	TH3302 – PLO 2	Lesson 4 DQ#1: Creation Account in NT
GCAP	AP6907	Term Paper (Resurrection)
GCBC	CO5702 – PLO 1 CO6706 – PLO 2	DQ#13 – Philosophy of Counseling Independent Study Paper
GCBG	GR6203	Final Exam
GCBH	HE6203	Final Project (Hosea 6:1-6)
GCBS	OT5200 NT5200	Guided Research Project Background Paper
GCCR		
GCOL	LD5803	Philosophy of Leading Paper
GCPM	CM7406 – PLO 1 EV7401 – PLO 2	Church Policies and Procedures Paper Design a One-Day Evangelism Seminar
GCTH	TH6303	Day of the Lord DQs
BAPY	EN2103 – PLO 1 PY4700 – PLO 2 PY1701 – PLO 3 PY3700 – PLO 4 PY4703 – PLO 5	Speech of Persuasion Reaction Paper Reaction Paper Reaction Paper Reaction Paper
BAR	Last OT/NT Book Study – PLO 1 HI2300 – PLO 2 MP4403 – PLOs 3 and 4	Exegetical Paper Historically Illustrated Sermon Final Project
MAA	AP5905 – PLO 1 AP5906 – PLO 2 AP6907 – PLOs 3 and 4	Major Writing Assignment Major Writing Assignment Major Writing Assignment
MABC	CO5702 – PLO 1 CO6708 – PLO 2 CO5703 – PLOs 3 and 5 CO6705 – PLO 4	WK14/DQ13 – Phil. of Bib. Counseling Final Paper Final Paper Final DQ – Ethics Statement

MACS	Last OT/NT Book Study – PLOs 1 and 3 TH6303 – PLO 2	Exegetical Paper Exams 1 and 2 – Kingdom of God
MAL	LD6812	Leadership Project Paper
MAM	CM7402	Philosophy of Pastoral Ministry Paper
MDIV	CM7407	Portfolio
DMIN	DM9500	Doctoral Ministry Project
PHDL	LD9804	Dissertation
PHDCS	CS9201	Dissertation

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

Course grades provide a direct measure of students' ability to demonstrate CLOs. Grade data is collected from all courses institution-wide, including undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral courses.

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes (ILLOs)

ILLOs are assessed via student samples culled from the courses identified below:

Level	Course Designated for Assessment	Work Selected for Assessment
Undergraduate	EN 1102-English Composition II	Final Research Paper
Graduate (Leadership)	LD5802-Organizational Communication	Organizational Communication Paper
Graduate (Seminary)	BI 5201-Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics	Exegetical Paper
Doctoral	DM 9500-Research and Writing for Ministry	Doctoral Ministry Project

Assessment Teams

General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs)

GELOs were assessed by a team of three professors. Each professor holds a terminal degree.

General Education
David Casas, Ph.D.
Scott Henderson, Ph.D.
Thomas Mapes, Ph.D.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

PLOs were assessed by teams of at least three professors. All but one professor (Javan Payne) hold a terminal degree in the teaching field. The one professor who does not hold a terminal degree has a master's degree and is currently enrolled in a Ph.D. program.

The chart below includes four certificate programs (UCBC, GCBC, GCBS, and GCPM). The other certificate programs were not assessed in the year 2023-2024 because no certificate students enrolled in the courses designated to assess certificate PLOs.

Likewise, the PHDL and PHDCS programs were not assessed in 2023-2024 because they are new Ph.D. programs and no students have yet completed a dissertation. The first PHDL dissertation is expected in 2024-2025 and the first PHDCS dissertation is expected in 2025-2026.

Program	Assessors			
UCBS	David Mapes, Ph.D.	Matt Solomon, Ph.D.	Tim Skinner, Ph.D.	
GCBC	Ann Kerlin, Ph.D.	Javan Payne, MA ¹	John Hofecker, Ph.D.	
GCBS	Brad Arnett, Ph.D.	Doug Taylor, Ph.D.	William Wilson, Ph.D.	
GCPM	Bill Coleman, D.Min.	Brad Arnett, D.Min.	Rusty Ricketson, Ph.D., D.Min.	
BAPY	Ann Kerlin, Ph.D.	Ron Cobb, Ph.D.	Thomas Mapes, Ph.D.	

¹ Javan Payne holds an MA and is currently enrolled in a Ph.D. program.

BAR	David Mapes, Ph.D.	Matt Solomon, Ph.D.	Tim Skinner, Ph.D.	William Wilson, Ph.D.
MAA	Alan Posey, Ph.D., D.Min.	Doug Taylor, Ph.D.	Scott Henderson, Ph.D.	Tim Skinner, Ph.D.
MABC	Ann Kerlin, Ph.D.	Javan Payne, MA ²	John Hofecker, Ph.D.	
MACS	Brad Arnett, Ph.D.	David Casas, Ph.D.	Doug Taylor, Ph.D.	William Wilson, Ph.D.
MAL	Jamie Swalm, Ph.D.	Jared Thompson, Ph.D.	Rusty Ricketson, Ph.D., D.Min.	
MAM	Bill Coleman, D.Min.	Brad Arnett, Ph.D.	Rusty Ricketson, Ph.D., D.Min.	
MDIV	Bill Jaggar, Ph.D.	Casey Hough, Ph.D.	David Casas, Ph.D.	Joshua Stewart, Ph.D.
DMIN	Bill Coleman, D.Min.	Marcus Merritt, D.Min.	Scott Moody, D.Min.	

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

CLOs were assessed by the Dean of the College and Seminary, who holds an M.Ed. and a Ph.D.

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes (ILLOs)

ILLOs were assessed by the Librarian, and English professor, and the Dean. Each holds a graduate degree in library science, education, or a general education field such as literature, philosophy, or history.

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes
Alisha Blevins, MLS
Jenny Medlin, MA Comparative Literature
Thomas Mapes, M.Ed., Ph.D.

² Javan Payne holds an MA and is currently enrolled in a Ph.D. program.

Assessment Procedures

Each team was given a random sample of assignments from the courses selected for assessment. The number of assignments in the random sample was equal to 10 percent of yearly course enrollment rounded up to the nearest whole number, with a minimum of 5 assignments. For instance if yearly enrollment was 40 students, the random sample would consist of 5 assignments since 5 assignments is the minimum number permitted. However, if yearly enrollment was 66 students, the random sample would consist of 7 assignments since the number of assignments is equal to 10 percent of yearly enrollment rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Team members assessed the assignments using a rubric specific to each program or instructional level. Rubrics were scaled from 1 or 2 (Incompetent) to 5 or 6 (Very Competent), with 3 or 4 representing Competent. These rubrics are made available in appendices A-H of this document.

In addition to scoring the assessment rubrics, each team produced written recommendations to improve program curriculum and/or the assessment process. Rubric scores have been averaged and are presented below. Written recommendations were made available to program coordinators and program committees.

General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

The charts below show GELO assessment data from the past three years.

Written Communication

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
GELOCOM-1	Focus - the sections of the essay or speech make a unified argument; all sections support the same argument.	4.73	4.80	4.13
GELOCOM-2	Paragraph organization - each paragraph addresses a single topic that contributes to the overall argument of the essay or speech.	4.53	4.53	4.20
GELOCOM-3	Sentence style - the sentences of the essay or speech flow smoothly and clearly, and demonstrate facility with English grammar.	3.33	4.00	3.40
GELOCOM-4	Audience awareness - the student recognizes an audience's potential reservations, and employs appropriate logical, emotional, and ethical strategies of persuasion (logos, pathos, and ethos) to win assent.	3.93	4.33	4.13
GELOCOM-5	Research/Information Literacy - the student uses appropriate sources to support claims.	4.80	4.73	2.93

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The AAGS Committee observed that all five outcomes declined. Notably, GELOCOM-3 (Sentence style) declined 1.60 points and GELOCOM-5 (Information literacy) declined 1.80 points. Three out of the five assessment samples were given mediocre scores by the assessors. Assessors' scores agreed closely, indicating the accuracy of the assessment.

Since the overall drop in the five outcomes is remarkable, several recommendations are in order. While these recommendations apply across the General Education curriculum, they apply specifically to EN1102, the course used to assess GELOCOMs 1-5.

GELOCOM-5 has been identified as an information literacy skill. The noticeable decline for this outcome reinforces the need for Luther Rice's RISE QEP.

Recommendations

The AAGS coordinator will invite EN1102 faculty to a meeting of the AAGS committee. During the meeting, EN1102 faculty will review elements of their courses to demonstrate the following:

1. Students receive instruction in gathering data, assessing data, distinguishing between evidence and conclusions, and properly incorporating sources.
2. Students are given sample papers demonstrating standards of research and argumentation.

3. A rough draft and peer-review or professor-review assignment has been implemented for the EN1102 Research Paper.
4. EN1102-Composition II will be included in Luther Rice's RISE QEP.

Verbal Communication

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
GELOPSP-1	Focus – the sections of the speech make a unified argument. All sections support the same argument.	4.33	4.53	4.53
GELOPSP-2	Argument – the speaker expresses awareness that the audience may disagree. Accordingly, the speaker responds to opposing arguments explicitly and employs appropriate logical, emotional, and ethical strategies (logos, pathos, ethos) to win assent.	3.60	3.93	3.47
GELOPSP-3	Appeal – the speaker catches listeners' interest at the beginning of the speech. Throughout the speech, the speaker uses appropriate rhetorical strategies (storytelling, imagery, verbal patterning and repetition, humor, etc.) to heighten listeners' interest and engagement.	4.07	3.80	4.27
GELOPSP-4	Presentation – the speaker's non-verbal cues (posture, gestures, dress, grooming, mannerisms) increase his persuasive appeal. The speaker seems prepared, relaxed, and confident.	3.53	3.47	3.93
GELOPSP-5	Diction – the speaker speaks clearly, with appropriate volume, tempo, tone, energy, and pronunciation. The speaker's choice of words indicates thought and preparation.	4.00	3.67	3.87

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The AAGS committee noted marginal gains for 2023-2024 scores with the exception of GELOPSP-2. Comparing scores from the past five years, the committee observed a noticeable dip after 2019-2020 and a modest recovery in 2023-2024 with the exception, again, of GELOPSP-2. Given the persistent downward trend for GELOPSP-2, the committee determined to focus its analysis on it.

Once again, the committee observed that assessors' scores were remarkably consistent for GELOPSP outcomes. Pertaining to GELOPSP-2, assessors' written comments demonstrate that the low scores were due to students' neglect to discuss opposing perspectives.

GELOPSP-2 is an information literacy skill, as is GELOCOM-5 (see above). The fact that scores for both outcomes declined reinforces the necessity of Luther Rice's RISE QEP.

Recommendations

1. To encourage students to discuss opposing perspectives, the EN2103-Public Speech professor will collaborate with the PH1900-Philosophy and Critical Thinking professor to review material from PH1900, Lesson 3 on "How to Have Rational and Moral Arguments." Selected resources from PH1900 will be added to EN2103. Given that students take PH1900 during their first year of study, the resources added to EN2103 will serve as a reminder and review of prior learning.
2. EN2103-Public Speech, the source of GELOPSP data, should be included in Luther Rice's QEP.

Literature/Fine Arts

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
GELOLIT-1	Statement of meaning (thesis) - the student identifies the author's message or purpose in writing/creating.	4.40	4.60	4.40
GELOLIT-2	Analysis of genre - the student identifies and describes the work's genre.	4.87	5.13	4.47
GELOLIT-3	Close reading of work - the student discusses the literary work to support the thesis stated at the beginning of the essay.	4.80	5.33	5.07
GELOLIT-4	Comparison with other works (theme) - the student examines thematic connections between the selected work and other works of art.	5.00	4.27	4.00

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

Between 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, scores for GELOLIT-1, GELOLIT-2, and GELOLIT-3 rose while scores for GELOLIT-4 dropped. Between 2022-2023 and 2023-2024, all scores declined marginally.

The decline in scores for 2023-2024 may result from a disagreement among assessors. Two of the 2023-2024 assessors' scores and comments were favorable while those of the third assessor were critical. Given this disagreement, the committee recommends training for assessors -- or perhaps simply discussion among assessors -- to standardize assessment and produce more consistent results.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. The committee recommends training for assessors -- or perhaps simply discussion among assessors -- to standardize assessment and produce more consistent results.

E-Proficiency Profile

Area of Competency	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	Mean of Comparison Group ³
ETS: Reading	115.91.	117.27	116.0	115.0	117.0
ETS: Writing	111.94	113.33	112.6	112.7	113.7
ETS: Critical Thinking	109.69	111.02	110.6	109.2	110.9
ETS: Mathematics	109.16	110.16	109.7	107.8	112.9
ETS: Humanities	114.63	115.63	114.7	115.8	114.6
ETS: Social Sciences	112.44	113.97	113.1	112.2	112.9
ETS: Natural Sciences	112.97	114.00	113.7	112.5	114.6

Analysis

The AAGS committee observed that E-Proficiency scores jumped sharply in 2021-2022 relative to 2020-2021 and have settled since in 2022-2023 and 2023-2024. In general, 2023-2024 scores are lower than those of the four years previous and the mean of the comparison group.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. An additional mathematics course (MA1601-Statistics) is being developed to bolster the mathematics component of General Education.
2. The Dean will monitor grades and student success in MA1600-College Algebra.
3. The Dean will collaborate with mathematics faculty to increase students' access to tutoring with faculty members and Pear Deck.
4. The recommendations made for GELOCOM, GELOLIT, and GELOPSP outcomes, stated above, apply to E-Proficiency Profile data as well.

³ The comparison group consists of 14,725 undergraduate seniors who took the E-Proficiency Profile between July 2019 and June 2024.

Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

The charts below show PLO assessment data from the past three years. Programs developed immediately prior to 2022-2023 have data from two years only. Programs developed immediately prior to 2023-2024 have data from one year only.

Certificate Programs

UCBS PLOs

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Survey the skills necessary for biblical interpretation.	4.17	5.00	2.80
PLO-2	Introduce students to the study of the Old/New Testament books.	4.00	5.00	4.47

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis:

Scores for PLO 1 declined 2.20 points between 2022-2023 and 2023-2024. Furthermore, assessors' scores diverged widely. One assessor rated the PLO-1 samples positively, one neutrally, and one negatively.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. When assessing PLOs, assessors should be required to provide written comments explaining their numerical scoring.
2. The Dean should offer assessment training during Spring faculty meetings to ensure assessors' expectations are commensurate with the program being assessed.

GCBC PLOs

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Introduce students to a biblical philosophy of counseling.	3.00	5.00
PLO-2	Introduce students to empathetic and pastoral care or referral.	5.00	3.67

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

GCBC PLOs were first assessed in 2022-2023. As a result of assessors' feedback that year, the assignments used to assess PLO-1 and PLO-2 were changed. Consequently, 2023-2024 scores constitute a new baseline.

According to the new 2023-2024 baseline, student performance relative to PLO-1 is "Very Competent" while performance relative to PLO-2 is "Competent." Regarding PLO-2 specifically, all three assessors noted that the students frequently neglected critical portions of the assignment. Students "focused on summarizing the book" (Assessor #1) but typically neglected the assignment's directions to describe

“What might you have done or said to the person/family if you were invited to offer pastoral care?” Additionally, Assessor #2 notes that some of the papers lack subheadings and are disorganized.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Regarding PLO-2, the committee recommends that the CO6706 professor identify required subheadings that students must include in their papers. This requirement will improve essay organization in line with Assessor #2’s feedback. Additionally, if one of the required subheadings is “Treatment Plan for Pastoral Care,” students will be encouraged to follow the assignment directions to describe “What might you have done or said to the person/family if you were invited to offer pastoral care?” in line with all three assessors’ feedback.

GCBS PLOs

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	5.33	4.11	4.67
PLO-2	Communicate biblical and theological truths in writing.	5.50	4.11	5.00
PLO-3/4	Demonstrate an awareness of the introductory matters associated with the Old/New Testament books.	***⁴	4.44	4.67

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The committee notes with satisfaction that PLO-1, PLO-3, and PLO-4 scores were in the high “Competent” range, while PLO-2 scores were in the “Very Competent” range.

The question does arise as to why the graduate certificate students performed so much better relative to their peers in the MACS than the undergraduate certificate students performed relative to their peers in the BAR. What prepared the graduate certificate students to do so?

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Collaborate with the Dean and the MACS committee to determine the point at which MACS PLOs are assessed. What accounts for the success of GCBS students relative to their MACS peers given that UCBS students performed much more poorly relative to their BAR peers?

GCPM PLOs

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Introduce students to evaluating ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.	5.00	3.67

⁴ GCBS PLO-3 was added for 2022-2023. It did not exist during the 2021-2022 assessment cycle.

PLO-2	Introduce students to developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs.	*** 5	*** 6
--------------	--	-------	-------

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

No data was available for PLO-2 from the years 2022-2023 and 2023-2024. For PLO-1, data was available from one student in 2022-2023 and one other student in 2023-2024.

While the data for PLO-1 shows a significant decline between 2022-2023 and 2023-2024, it should be remembered that only two students are involved in the comparison. The student from 2022-2023 earned an "A" in the assessment course (CM7406) while the student from 2023-2024 earned a "C" in the course. The committee notes with satisfaction that PLO assessment tracks very closely with students' grades. This observation supports not only the accuracy of professors' grading, but also justifies the claim that PLOs are an accurate assessment of students' learning in the program. Beyond this, little can be observed except the need to market the program to attract additional students.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. The certificates program coordinator will collaborate with the Directory for Ministry Relations to determine strategies to attract additional students to the GCPM program.

⁵ The assessment course for GCPM PLO-2 is EV7401. Excluding the summer semester, no certificate students took EV7401 during the 2022-2023 year.

⁶ The assessment course for GCPM PLO-2 is EV7401. No certificate students took EV7401 during the 2023-2024 year.

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

The BAPY program was launched in 2022-2023. Accordingly, the chart below shows data from the past two years.

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication.	3.67	4.06
PLO-2	Evaluate psychological theories under the authority of the bible in the development of a scripturally reliable and empirically informed model of human psychology	3.60	2.93
PLO-3	Critically and constructively apply a biblical worldview of scientific methodology to the subject matter of psychology	3.53	3.67
PLO-4	Develop a fundamental knowledge of the physiological, psychological, social, and spiritual foundations of human life in the context of a consistent biblical/Christian worldview	3.73	3.60
PLO-5	Build/practice essential skills for a career in clinical, academic, or church/ missional settings	3.60	3.00

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The Bachelor of Arts in Psychology program has concluded its second year. As such, these assessments and recommendations represent the first time that data for the purposes of comparison has been available. All assessments are based on a 1-6 scale where 1-2 represents Incompetent work, 3-4 represents Competent work, and 5-6 represents Very Competent work. Assessor 1 gave an average per student score of 2.73 on fifteen assessments and assessors 2 and 3 assigned per student scores of 3.88 and 3.62 respectively on seventeen assessments.

PLO-1: Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication.

Student work was assessed at 4.06 compared to 3.67 in the previous year representing a slight improvement. Sample 1 was evaluated as Competent, Sample 2 as Very Competent, and Sample 3 as Competent. Assessors' comments indicated a general degree of competence in writing, but much room remains to improve oral communication skills.

PLO-2: Evaluate psychological theories under the authority of the Bible in the development of a scripturally reliable and empirically informed model of human psychology.

Assignments evaluated for this PLO were down markedly from the previous year (from 3.60 to 2.93). Samples 6 and 10 were solidly Competent while Samples 7-9 were marginally Competent and Sample 8 bordered on Incompetent. Assessors pointed out that although papers were fairly well organized and

formatted, they failed to address biblical authority and scriptural veracity in an informed manner while straying from the paper's assigned purpose frequently.

PLO-3: Critically and constructively apply a biblical worldview of scientific methodology to the subject matter of psychology.

Academic assessment data for PLO 3 demonstrated a slight increase over year one from 3.53 to 3.67, both in the lower Competent range of scores (3-4). Assessors were remarkably consistent in scoring assessment Samples 11-13. In particular, the assessors were complimentary of student efforts at applying a biblical worldview to psychology but noted that there is much room for improvement in clearly establishing scriptural connections with psychological dogma.

PLO-4: Develop a fundamental knowledge of the physiological, psychological, social, and spiritual foundations of human life in the context of a consistent biblical/Christian worldview.

The student academic data assessed for PLO 4 showed a slight decrease of 3.73 to 3.60 from the previous year to the current year. Assessors 2 and 3 were consistent in their assessments of student work Samples 16-20, while assessor 1 marked student samples quite low and even failed to score two of the samples (numbers 17 and 19). Both assessors 2 and 3 were generally positive in their comments about students' abilities to apply a biblical worldview to all aspects of human life. However, assessor 3 felt that students in all samples categorically failed to apply a Christian worldview to any aspect of human life.

PLO-5: Build/practice essential skills for a career in clinical, academic, or church/missional settings.

Only one sample of student work was available to assess PLO 5, and all assessors had an identical score of 3.00 which is average Competence. All assessors indicated that the student met basic skills for the implementation of psychological practice into real life settings but that much room for improvement is needed. On the whole, PLO 1 showed good improvement and PLO 3 slight improvement while PLO 4 showed a slight decline. Attention should be given in particular to PLOs 2 and 5 where a demonstrable decrease in student work was indicated.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. The BAPY Program Committee recommends that psychology courses be reviewed and that emphasis in written assignments be made to strengthen student application of biblical authority to psychological theories. (PLO 2)
2. The BAPY Program Committee recommends that psychology course developers look for ways to strengthen the relational dynamic between a biblical worldview and the ontological essence of human life. (PLO 4)
3. The BAPY Program Committee recommends that attention be given to approaches that will bolster student awareness in developing essential skills for integrating psychology in real life settings. (PLO 5)

Bachelor of Arts in Religion

BAR PLOs were revised for 2023-2024. The charts below compare PLO data from 2020-2021 through 2022-2023 with PLO data from 2023-2024.

Bar PLOs from 2020-2021 through 2022-2023

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
PLO-1	Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication.	3.73	4.00	4.53
PLO-2	Articulate the ideas, events, and factors that have contributed to the development of world civilizations, and modern society and culture.	4.67	5.15	4.00
PLO-3	Critically and constructively apply a Christian worldview as it relates to various disciplines.	3.60	3.80	4.33
PLO-4	Demonstrate knowledge of the Bible, Christian theology, and church history with the purpose of ministry application.	4.27	4.33	4.97
PLO-5	Develop foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.	4.47	4.07	4.47

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Revised BAR PLOs beginning 2023-2024

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2023-2024
PLO-1	Demonstrate a knowledge of the Bible, interpret Scripture's original meaning, and apply Scripture to contemporary situations.	5.00
PLO-2	Examine Christian theology and history with the purpose of ministry application.	3.30
PLO-3	Articulate a Christian worldview and discuss its implications to daily life.	3.43
PLO-4	Apply foundational skills for ministry and service in a church and community.	3.23

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The scores for the most recent year have no previous data to be compared 1:1 directly. The indirect comparisons are based on parallel or similar outcomes and are as follows: New PLOs 1 and 2 may be compared to Old PLO 4. New PLO 3 may be compared to Old PLO 3. New PLO 4 may be compared to Old PLO 5. Old PLO 1 is now evaluated by the GELOCOM and GELOPSP assessment.

Specific Outcomes:

- PLO 1: A “very competent” score. This outcome is relatively the same as the previous year (+0.03). This PLO is measured by the student’s last exegetical paper in a Bible book study course (OT/NT).
- PLO 2: A “competent” score, but only just. This PLO is assessed by the assignment “Historically Illustrated Sermon” in an HI course.
- PLO 3: A “competent” score, but only just. This demonstrates a significant drop from last year’s score (-0.90). This assessment was based on a case study assignment in the capstone course (MP4403 Christian Ministry Practicum).
- PLO 4: Also a “competent” score, but the lowest of the four PLOs. A drastic drop from the previous year (-1.24) and lower than all previous years’ data. Also assessed by the case study assignment in the capstone course.

Synthesis:

- No recommendations concerning PLO 1 seem necessary.
- The low scores (sub 4.0) on PLOs 2-4 call for further consideration and possible action.
- Numerous comments from assessors pertaining to PLO 2 indicated that students did not complete the assignment properly.
- Comments from the assessors on PLOs 3 and 4 indicate that a few of the submissions did not describe a true ministry effort and/or did not connect the ministry effort to Scripture or to a biblical worldview.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Encourage the instructor of HI1102 to remind students of the importance of the historical connections of the assignment (PLO 2).
2. Encourage the instructor of MP4403 to remind students to incorporate Scripture references into their case studies and to evaluate the study in light of a Christian worldview (PLO 3).
3. Encourage the instructor of MP4403 to discuss with students the difference between ministry and social functions. Admittedly, there is overlap, but several of the assessors felt the students’ case studies described social events instead of ministry. More discussion and application of Scripture (see previous recommendation) may be beneficial here as well (PLO 4).

Master of Arts in Apologetics

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	4.60	5.00	3.67
PLO-2	Relate the Church's theological heritage to current apologetical issues.	4.13	4.47	4.60
PLO-3	Articulate a rational and biblical case for the truth of Christianity.	4.60	4.27	4.80
PLO-4	Articulate a defense to major objections to Christianity.	4.80	4.33	4.73

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

PLO 1 showed a very noticeable decrease relative to 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. In 2021-2022, the average score for PLO 1 was 4.60 and rose to 5.00 in 2022-2023. However, in 2023-2024, the PLO 1 average dropped to 3.67.

Contrarily, scores for PLOs 2-4 increased relative to scores from 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. Accordingly, the committee's recommendations address PLO 1.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. It is recommended the link to LibGuides be added under the Course Documents section for all Apologetics courses.
2. It is recommended the links to the Library's "Research Instruction" and "Turabian Citation" libguides be added under the Course Documents section for all Apologetics courses.
3. It is recommended a well-written sample paper from a course outside the MAA be added under the Course Documents for all Apologetics courses.
4. It is recommended Administration facilitate having "Term Paper Instructions", "Quotations Rules and Tips", and "Writing Guidelines Document" into a single, LR branded document for use system-wide. Upon completion the document should be added under Course Documents section for all Apologetics courses.
5. It is recommended the RISE videos (QEP) be added under Course Documents section for all Apologetics courses.

Master of Arts in Biblical Counseling

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Articulate a biblical philosophy of counseling.	4.67	4.00	4.60
PLO-2	Communicate biblical and theological truths through counseling.	4.73	4.07	5.13
PLO-3	Exemplify empathetic pastoral care or referral.	4.80	4.60	3.93
PLO-4	Convey principles of ethically and legally informed counseling practices.	4.80	4.47	3.93
PLO-5	Employ interpersonal skills in counseling.	5.07	4.67	4.27

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

- **PLO#1:** A score of 4.60 falls in the “competent” range. To improve scores to the “very competent” range, assignment instructions should be rewritten to state expectations more clearly.
- **PLO#2:** A score of 5.13 falls in the “very competent” range.
- **PLO#3:** A score of 3.93 falls in the “competent” range, but this PLO is tied with PLO#4 as the lowest of the MABC program. Moreover, the 2023-2024 score is much lower than scores for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.
- **PLO#4:** A score of 3.93 falls in the “competent” range, but this PLO is tied with PLO#3 as the lowest of the MABC program. Moreover, the 2023-2024 score is much lower than scores for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.
- **PLO#5:** A score of 4.27 falls in the “competent” range, but is lower than scores for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. **PLO#1:** A revised assignment has been submitted to the MABC committee for evaluation.
2. **PLO#2:** While scores for this PLO were strong, a change was proposed and the assignment was revised accordingly.
3. **PLO#3 and #5:** These PLOs are assessed using the same assignment. Students watch videos of a counseling session, and then write an essay evaluating the practitioner. The essay topic description will be revised to enumerate specific principles of biblical counseling by which to evaluate the practitioner.
4. **PLO#4:** Students must prepare a one-page statement about the most important ethical standards. This assignment will be expanded to a full-length paper.

Master of Arts in Christian Studies

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	4.40	4.40	4.13
PLO-2	Demonstrate an understanding of Christian Theology.	4.14	4.27	4.33
PLO-3	Communicate biblical and theological truths in writing.	3.80	4.27	3.97

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The committee noted that scores have oscillated in place. While a score may rise or fall one year, it typically returns to equilibrium the next. All scores fall in the “Competent” range, but scores for PLO-3 are consistently the lowest. Accordingly, the committee focused its analysis and recommendations on PLO-3.

Regarding PLO-3, the MACS curriculum is solely devoted to Bible and theology courses that presuppose graduate level research and writing ability. It is unclear how much instructional time in each course should be devoted to formal writing instruction at the expense of published course descriptions. Should the curriculum, including course descriptions, be reshaped as hybrid Bible, theology, and writing courses?

Furthermore, it is unclear if current faculty members are credentialed to provide remedial writing instruction.

It is common practice in graduate education to require a dedicated research and writing course. Such a course may answer the questions stated above and help to improve PLO-3.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Add to the MACS curriculum a 1-credit-hour required writing course that must be taken in the first semester of the program.

Master of Arts in Leadership

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Employ research methods for organizational analysis and problem solving.	5.40	4.93	5.33
PLO-2	Articulate a biblical philosophy of leading and following consistent with their vocation.	5.47	5.33	5.17
PLO-3	Apply Christian leader and follower principles.	5.40	5.27	5.33
PLO-4	Utilize leader and follower theories to diagnose and/or design organizations.	5.53	5.27	5.33

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The committee observed that assessment samples were lacking in two key areas, formatting and engagement with the literature. Students cite sources appropriately, but they do not engage with them well. The program coordinator noted that curricular changes made just last semester (Summer 2024) to LD5806 and LD6812 will yield results in the future in both of these areas. Both of these courses have streamlined the process of writing the research paper with deeper explanation and coordination between the courses.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Monitor 2024-2025 assessment results to determine whether curricular changes made in Summer 2024 will improve students' paper format and engagement with sources.

Master of Arts in Ministry

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	4.80	4.00	3.93
PLO-2	Utilize the Church's theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry.	4.60	3.60	4.00
PLO-3	Evaluate ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.	4.93	4.13	4.13
PLO-4	Lead in developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs.	3.13	3.73	3.33
PLO-5	Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or such other ways as may be appropriate.	4.93	3.40	4.47

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

Examination of the raw data comparing assessments of the past 4 years produces the following observations:

- The numbers for 2024 assessment are not appreciably lower than the previous year (2023). Both 2023 and 2024 numbers are significantly lower than the previous years. The committee concluded that this difference is due to the change in assessment format with assessors from different programs.
- The assessment of PLO #4 is the most significant concern. (3.33)

Examination of the comments of the assessors produces the following observations:

- The writing styles of some of the samples continue to reflect a weakness in formal and Turabian-appropriate format.
 - "There were some grammatical and form issues. The consistent use of brackets when opening material from another author was not good."
 - "Page numbers, spacing, and footnotes are accurate format."
 - "Page numbers are wrong, and footnotes are not consistent with Turabian format."
- Two of the three assessors commented that the nature of these samples does not address PLO #4.
 - "A different sample with a practical component needs to be utilized to fulfill PLO #4."
 - "PLO #4 is simply not addressed in this assignment."
 - "Surprisingly, unlike the other papers, this writer has a section on practical implications, which closely addresses more firmly PLO #4."

- One assessor consistently gave “3’s” but provided no comments to aid the committee in analysis.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. While acknowledging the continuing challenge of writing style and format issues, these do not specifically align with any program PLO. The committee’s concerns with these issues were addressed in analysis and recommendations for 2024 ILLO’s.
2. We would recommend that assessors who evaluate a paper as a “3” or lower give helpful feedback and reason for that assessment.
3. Concerning analysis of PLO #4, the committee recommends the following:
 - a. For this capstone project, add the following instruction: Include a concluding section that demonstrates the practical implications of the material researched in the local church or ministry setting.
 - b. Reword PLO #4 to state “demonstrate competence in application of research into a ministry context” instead of “lead in developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs.”

Master of Divinity

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	4.33	3.93	5.27
PLO-2	Utilize the Church's historical and theological heritage as an important resource in their personal and spiritual development and ministry.	4.33	3.80	4.60
PLO-3	Articulate a biblical philosophy of ministry consistent with their vocation.	5.27	4.80	4.73
PLO-4	Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or in such other ways as may be appropriate.	4.60	4.07	5.30
PLO-5	Evaluate and develop ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.	4.93	5.00	4.87
PLO-6	Accurately and empathetically evaluate people and their personal circumstances and provide appropriate pastoral care or referral.	4.80	5.17	5.00
PLO-7	Lead in developing goals and designing and implementing ministry.	5.27	4.93	5.33
PLO-8	Serve with Christian character in their personal and professional lives.	5.47	5.17	5.67

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The committee was encouraged by the improvements observed in five of the eight PLOs for the MDiv program. While the remaining three PLOs experienced a slight decline, their scores remain within the “competent to highly competent” range. We attribute these gains to the adjustments made last year in the selection of assessment data, which now provide a clearer picture of the program’s effectiveness in achieving its goals. Moving forward, we plan to maintain the current assessment data selection to track trends in the coming years.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. We recommend the removal of PLO 8 due to the inability to monitor and measure a student’s personal and professional life.
2. We recommend adding the RISE (QEP) videos (or similar resources) to BI5201, NT5200, OT5200 courses to improve student writing earlier in the MDiv program.

Doctor of Ministry

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
PLO-1	Articulate and apply a biblical philosophy of ministry.	4.80	5.00	4.27
PLO-2	Evaluate ministry efforts for biblical veracity and effective ministry outcomes.	4.87	4.67	4.47
PLO-3	Design and implement effective strategies for ministry settings.	4.80	5.20	4.33
PLO-4	Communicate researched conclusions with competence and purpose.	4.87	4.93	4.47

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

2023-2024 scores for all PLOs fell in the “Competent” range but were noticeably lower than scores from 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. The most noticeable drop was for PLO-3, which decreased 0.87 points between 2022-2023 and 2023-2024. The committee determined that the decline was attributable to a single project, which was of insufficient length to demonstrate PLO-3. The committee observed that more training for faculty advisors would equip them to coach advisees to fulfill PLOs. Likewise, simplifying the DMin Project Template would clarify expectations for both advisors and advisees.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. The DMin Program Coordinator will offer recurring training during faculty meetings and the annual Faculty Summit to ensure faculty advisors understand the requirements of the DMin Project.
2. The DMin Program Coordinator will further simplify the DMin Project Template.

Course Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

2021-2022 Course Learning Outcomes

Luther Rice's benchmark for for-credit courses is 75% of final grades in a program will be an A, B, or C. Below, this benchmark will be referred to as the "ABC rate."

Luther Rice's benchmark for not-for-credit courses is 75% of final grades in a program will be an SC. This benchmark will be referred to as the "SC rate."

Program	A	B	C	SC	ABC/SC Rate
CBSN	--	--	--	91%	91%
UCBC	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
UCBS	80%	0%	0%	--	80%
GCBS	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
BAR	44%	29%	15%	--	88%
MAA	73%	17%	7%	--	97%
MABC	71%	17%	7%	--	94%
MACS	71%	18%	8%	--	97%
MAL	50%	29%	10%	--	89%
MAM	67%	15%	7%	--	89%
MDIV	53%	24%	12%	--	89%
DMIN	87%	11%	0%	--	97%

2022-2023 Course Learning Outcomes

Program	A	B	C	SC	ABC/SC Rate
BAPY	30%	17%	7%	--	54%
BAR	45%	25%	13%	--	83%
CAPN	--	--	--	100%	100%
CBSN	--	--	--	93%	93%
CTHN	--	--	--	93%	93%
DMIN	82%	15%	0%	--	98%
GCAP	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
GCBC	43%	57%	0%	--	100%
GCBS	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
GCOL	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
GCPM	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
MAA	76%	14%	5%	--	94%
MABC	72%	20%	5%	--	97%
MACS	55%	30%	6%	--	90%
MAL	76%	13%	4%	--	93%
MAM	55%	26%	5%	--	87%
MDI8	42%	23%	9%	--	74%

MDIA	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
MDIL	72%	21%	2%	--	95%
MDIM	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
MDIV	60%	19%	10%	--	90%
MDL8	68%	23%	9%	--	100%
MMD	0%	50%	50%	--	100%
PDM1	67%	33%	0%	--	100%
PDM2	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
PHDL	80%	10%	0%	--	90%
SPEC	67%	17%	0%	--	83%
UCAP	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
UCBC	75%	0%	25%	--	100%
UCBS	57%	14%	14%	--	86%

2023-2024 Course Learning Outcomes

Program	A	B	C	SC	ABC/SC Rate
BAPY	59%	21%	11%	--	91%
BARA	43%	26%	10%	--	80%
BARC	46%	18%	13%	--	77%
BARM	46%	27%	13%	--	87%
CAPN	--	--	--	96%	96%
CBSN	--	--	--	89%	89%
CTHN	--	--	--	100%	100%
DMIN	86%	11%	0%	--	96%
GCBC	50%	33%	17%	--	100%
GCBS	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
GCGK	50%	0%	25%	--	75%
GCOL	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
GCPM	0%	33%	33%	--	67%
MAA	69%	17%	13%	--	100%
MABC	72%	14%	7%	--	92%
MACS	65%	27%	4%	--	96%
MAL	54%	21%	10%	--	84%
MAM	73%	13%	4%	--	89%
MDI8	55%	15%	7%	--	77%
MDIA	50%	50%	0%	--	100%
MDIL	52%	21%	3%	--	76%
MDIV	52%	27%	7%	--	87%
MDL8	65%	15%	8%	--	88%
MMD	75%	25%	0%	--	100%
PDM2	67%	27%	0%	--	93%
PDM3	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
PHDC	92%	8%	0%	--	100%

PHDL	91%	3%	0%	--	94%
SPEC	25%	25%	0%	--	50%
UCAP	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
UCBC	100%	0%	0%	--	100%
UCBS	36%	43%	7%	--	86%
UCPM	50%	0%	0%	--	50%
UCTH	0%	0%	0%	--	0%

Analysis

The dramatic improvement of the BAPY from 2022-2023 to 2023-2024 attests the program coordinator's and program committee's assiduous work to improve the fledgling program. In 2022-2023, the first year the program was in existence, only 54% of final course grades in the program were an A, B, or C. In 2023-2024, 91% of final course grades in the program were an A, B, or C. The fact that 27 students took 131 BAPY courses during the 2023-2024 year underscores the extent of this achievement.

Likewise, the MDI8 made marginal improvements to meet the benchmark. In 2022-2023, 74% of final course grades in the program were an A, B, or C. In 2023-2024, the figure improved to 77%.

However, the UCPM, UCTH, GCPM and SPEC failed to meet the ABC benchmark of 75%. A characteristic common to each of these programs, however, is small size. In 2023-2024, the UCTH had one student, the UCPM and SPEC had two students apiece, and the GCPM had three students. Each of these programs missed their ABC benchmarks in 2023-2024 due to a single student earning failing grades.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Congratulate the BAPY on the dramatic improvement in ABC rate, particularly given the program's rapid increase in size.
2. Monitor UCPM, UCTH, and GCPM, and SPEC. Given the small size of these programs, it may be prudent to assess them according to a three-year rolling average. Doing so would decrease the likelihood of a single student causing a program to miss its ABC benchmark.

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

Undergraduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

Historically, Luther Rice has tracked undergraduate ILLO performance using an assignment in EN1102, a required first-year course. However, in response to a recommendation made by the BAR committee in 2022-2023, a second assessment was added measuring graduating seniors' performance in their final Bible book-study course.

The charts below compare freshman students from 2021-2022 through 2023-2024 against senior students from 2023-2024.

Freshmen

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
Frame 1.1	Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information, distinguishing reliable from unreliable sources.	3.93	3.33	5.07
Frame 2.1	Some variety evident in selection of sources.	3.67	3.20	4.00
Frame 3.1	Students cite sources appropriately and relate sources' claims accurately.	3.27	2.60	3.93
Frame 4.1	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	3.53	2.73	3.93
Frame 5.1	Students make an attempt to assess sources' logic and evidence instead of simply summarizing conclusions.	3.60	2.53	3.93
Frame 6.1	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	4.13	3.13	4.07

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

AAGS Committee

From 2019-2023, outcome scores decreased steadily. However, in 2023-2024, scores increased remarkably, likely as a result of implementing 2022-2023 recommendations. Assessors' comments for 2023-2024 typically were positive with one or two points of criticism. These criticisms typically addressed citation format or the clarity of the thesis.

BAR Committee

While the scores for the most recent year are much improved over the previous year, they are within the norm in comparison to extended five-year data that the Dean shared with the committee.

- 1.1 A good score, this frame is much improved over the previous year.
- 2.1 Satisfactory score; Improved over last year.

- 3.1, 4.1, and 5.1 Lowest scores. Areas of most needed improvement.
- 6.1 Satisfactory score; improved over last year

It should be noted that there appears to be a discrepancy between GELOCOM-5 and the Freshman ILLO assessment. GELOCOM-5 and the Freshman ILLO assessment overlap in that both assess information literacy. Moreover, both are assessed according to student samples taken from EN1102-English Composition II. Given that these assessments use data from the same year and the very same course, the disagreement between them is noteworthy. It is possible that a larger sample size may result in greater consistency between the two assessments. It is also possible that a larger sample size may result in more consistent results year-over-year for the Freshman ILLO assessment.

Senior

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2023-2024
Frame 1.1	Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information, distinguishing reliable from unreliable sources.	4.60
Frame 2.1	Some variety evident in selection of sources.	3.67
Frame 3.1	Students cite sources appropriately and relate sources' claims accurately.	4.07
Frame 4.1	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	2.60
Frame 5.1	Students make an attempt to assess sources' logic and evidence instead of simply summarizing conclusions.	3.40
Frame 6.1	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	4.20

Analysis

AAGS Committee

Most of the learning outcome scores on the chart were below the ILLO UG Freshmen chart. The most remarkable difference is the outcome in Frame 4.1. This pertains to seeking information from multiple perspectives. The most noticeable criticism among the assessors concerns the lack of consideration for counter arguments/positions. Among the assessors' comments are phrases such as: too few sources, does not cite specific sources, does not meet the minimum requirements. While some of the samples were assessed positively, the failure of some students to employ adequate sources or use them effectively indicates that some measure of attention is needed.

BAR Committee

Given the variability of freshman scores, at times seniors outperform freshman as might be expected. This is particularly true if the senior scores of 2023-2024 are compared to the freshman scores of 2022-

2023. At other times, however, freshmen outperform seniors. This is true if 2023-2024 seniors are compared to freshman of the same year.

Freshmen work closely with their professors in EN1102 – Composition II to produce the research paper that furnishes the “Freshmen” assessment data. EN1102 professors require students to critique sources’ claims and to address sources that oppose their thesis. However, judging from the new “Senior” assessment data, these emphases are not consistently maintained after EN1102. This observation is particularly applicable to Frame 4.1. Frame 4.1 scores for 2023-2024 seniors are lower than Frame 4.1 scores for all freshman, including those from 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024. This fact suggests that the undergraduate curriculum post-EN1102 must emphasize Frame 4.1, seeking information from multiple perspectives.

Specific Frames, Compared to an Average of the Freshmen Groups of 2019-21 :

- 1.1 Good score, but a decline from avg 4.86 to 4.60. Negligible difference.
- 2.1 **Needs improvement.** Significant decline from 4.79 (avg) to 3.67.
- 3.1 While a satisfactory score, this frame indicates another decline (-0.58)
- 4.1 **Unsatisfactory.** Scores indicate a sharp decline from 2019-21 (-1.79).
- 5.1 **Needs improvement.** Decline of -0.89.
- 6.1 Satisfactory score. Actually improved +0.39 from 2019-21 (avg).

Synthesis: While all the frames need ongoing attention, the frames that scored below 4.00 call for immediate consideration:

- Varied Sources (2.1) and Multiple Perspectives (4.1). Based on the senior results, the UG programs of study may appear to direct students to rely on sources that hail from a certain perspective. How can instructors lead students to interact with wider perspectives while still maintaining biblical fidelity? Perhaps faculty could temper the expectation to select only sources that align with certain doctrinal positions. They might foster a robust interaction with wider perspectives by teaching students that they can learn from other perspectives, even if it is to identify erroneous logic. This may be a bit advanced for some undergraduates, but steps could be made in that direction by intentionally demonstrating a curious criticism rather than an insulated tribalism.
- Evaluation, not mere summary, of sources (5.1). Students should be encouraged to write their own words rather than regurgitate the ideas of others when producing a research paper. For example, one simple practice would be to forbid students to end a paragraph with a quote, as if that author has the last word, and to require that the student end a paragraph with an evaluative statement. This could be repeated in all courses with research-type papers, since many of the students transfer credits for English composition from previous college enrollments.

BAPY Committee

In two years the Bachelor of Arts in Psychology program has grown to an active enrollment of 40 students. The data assessment below represents the first time that senior undergraduate students in Psychology have been assessed for ILLOs. All assessments below are based on a scale of 1-6 where 1-2 stands for Incompetent work, where 3-4 means Competent work, and where 5-6 represents Very Competent work. After a downward trend in all assessment categories between the 2019-2023 academic years the 2024 academic year saw a remarkable increase in student performance in the 2023-2024 assessment year. Individual assessor scores were not published but copious comments were made available and will be incorporated into the assessment narrative below.

Frame 1.1: Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information, distinguishing reliable from unreliable sources.

Freshman UG students' performance in Frame 1.1 increased a remarkable +1.74 from the previous academic year. This represents an overall increase from low Competence to Very Competent.

Senior UG students' performance in Frame 1.1 was 4.60 which is in the high Competence range.

Positive assessor comments: "Superb use of reliable sources, good use of scholarly academic journal articles, used high quality books and commentary sources."

Negative assessor comments: "More use of scholarly books and reference material is needed; student should learn to use a scholarly Greek lexicon."

Frame 2.1: Some variety evident in selection of sources.

Freshman UG students' performance in Frame 2.1 increased by +.80 from the previous academic year. Assessment scores demonstrate a measurable increase in Competence from year-to-year.

The performance of senior UG students was assessed at 4.00 well established in the mid-level range of Competence.

Positive assessor comments: "Excellent use of scholarly journals in impressive variety, good use of books, commentaries, dictionaries, and atlases."

Negative assessor comments: "Few academic journals used, student needs to use more book sources, number of sources used is underwhelming, too few sources used."

Frame 3.1: Students cite sources appropriately and relate sources' claims accurately.

In Frame 3.1 freshman UG students showed an increase from the previous academic year of +1.33. Students improved overall scores from Incompetence to mid-level Competence.

Senior students' ILLO assessments scored at 4.07 average which reflects academic work that is of mid-level Competence.

Positive assessor comments: "Source claims presented with precision and insight."

Negative assessor comments: "Source claims are distorted, limit the length of quotations, problems apparent with footnoting and citations, student makes assumptions without a reasoned defense."

Frame 4.1: Students seek information from multiple perspectives.

Freshman UG students positively increased +1.20 for Frame 4.1 from the previous academic year. This is noteworthy in that it demonstrates an increase from Incompetence to mid-level Competence.

Senior student scores were problematic for Frame 4.1 in that average scores were 2.60 which are in the Incompetent assessment level. Recommendations need to be made in light of assessor comments regarding needs for improvement.

Positive assessor comments: "Student consults opposing sources, student does well at identifying controversies."

Negative assessor comments: "Lack of investigation and analysis, opposing sources are not cited, no attempt was made to discuss opposing sources, no reasonable defense of opposing sources is offered."

Frame 5.1: Students make an attempt to assess sources' logic and evidence instead of simply summarizing conclusions.

For this Frame UG freshman students registered an impressive increase of +1.40 over the previous academic year. Students moved from Incompetence to mid-level Competence over the course of one year.

The performance of Senior students for Frame 5.1 was 3.40, indicating low-level Competence calling for recommendations based on assessor feedback.

Positive assessor comments: "Student does an impressive job of both assessing the sources logic and evidence in detail and with academic support."

Negative assessor comments: "Student summarizes conclusions but does not assess with logic or with opposing source theses, opposing sources are dealt with quickly and in a rudimentary fashion, sources are assumed to be authoritative, but no discussion of arguments is given".

Frame 6.1: Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.

Freshman UG students scored an average of +.94 higher than the previous year for Frame 6.1. Students moved the overall literacy bar from low Competence to mid-level Competence.

Likewise, senior students scored an average assessment of 4.20 for Frame 6.1 which indicates strong literacy Competence for this measure.

Positive assessor comments: "The length and scope of the paper is appropriate; the student offers a clear thesis for the paper."

Negative assessor comments: “Opposing arguments are covered too quickly, no identifiable thesis, the paper comes across as an annotated bibliography.”

Recommendations for Improvement

AAGS Committee

1. Professors should develop better strategies for improving research, including gathering data, assessing data, distinguishing between evidence and conclusions, and properly incorporating sources.
2. Professors should include examples of papers/assignments that meet quality standards of research and argumentation.
3. Professors should provide resources to students to aid in research and writing/presentation.
4. Professors may want to add a rough-draft assignment. This could be either a peer-review assignment or a professor-review assignment.

BAR Committee

1. Emphasize to students the need to utilize various types of sources (2.1) and to cite those source materials carefully (3.1).
2. Encourage professors to include works of various perspectives in their own course bibliographies and to guide students in the evaluation of works from divergent perspectives (4.1).
3. Encourage students to write their own words rather than reuse the ideas of others when producing a research paper (5.1).
4. Consider increasing the sample size of the Freshman ILLO assessment. This recommendation may apply to sample sizes generally.

BAPY Committee

1. The BAPY Program Committee recommends that psychology course written assignment requirements be reviewed and that emphasis be placed on a variety of sources used such that both scholarly books and journal articles are included in support of the content of the paper or other written assignment.
2. The BAPY Program Committee recommends that psychology course written assignments such as chapter reviews, papers, and discussion questions require the study of and presentation of multiple perspectives regarding the key theme or topic of the written assignment.
3. The BAPY Program Committee recommends that psychology course written assignment requirements be appraised such that students can be assessed on their ability to articulate not merely conclusions but that they are able to demonstrate their assessment of a sources logic and evidence of the claims it is making.

Graduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes -- Seminary

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
Frame 1.2	Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.	4.67	5.44	5.13
Frame 2.2	Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.	4.36	4.50	4.93
Frame 3.2	Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately.	3.79	4.78	4.53
Frame 4.2	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	4.15	4.00	4.50
Frame 5.2	Students evaluate sources' claims from a perspective of informed skepticism, critically assessing sources' logic and evidence rather than simply summarizing their conclusions.	3.64	4.17	3.87
Frame 6.2	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	4.45	4.89	5.00

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

MAA Committee

ILLO Assessment Data is derived by reviewing paper submissions in BI5201. The year-over-year results show improvements as high as 11% and declines as low as 7.2%.

The ILLO assessment is currently conducted by review of a single assignment submission within BI5201. This course is required by all students in all MA and MDiv programs of study. However, the inherent difficulty in making recommendations for improvement to the ILLO frames is that BI5201 is taught from a foundational perspective and not specific to any particular degree program. Thus, any recommendations for improvement within a committee would affect activities or submissions outside the course in which the ILLO assessment data is obtained. As a result, any real or perceived improvements would never be captured or reflected in subsequent evaluations.

MABC Committee

The ILLO assessment results are somewhat mixed for academic year 2023-2024 and all but two are lower than expected. The lowest score (3.87) exceeds two of the five previous years, but not by much. Frame 4.2 is the second lowest score, and exceeds the last 3 academic years, yet is lower than the 2019-2020 academic year. Frame 3.2 is 4.53 and is lower than the 2019-2020 academic year, as is Frame 2.2, with a 4.93 score.

MACS Committee

Frames 1.2, 2.2, 3.2, and 4.2: scores had trended downward but have rebounded. Year over year there seems to be little statistical change. Competencies seem to be stable.

Frame 5.2 remains particularly low. This frame is closely related to MACS PLO 3, so there may be a correlation. There seems to be a general problem with student competency in the areas of writing skill and critical thinking.

Frame 6.2 has shown good progress.

MAM Committee

There were no major shifts in the raw data when compared to assessments from the previous four years. When the raw data and comments from assessors are considered, two areas deserve attention:

- Formatting issues such as proper footnotes and bibliographical entries as well as proper introduction of quotations:
 - “footnotes are improperly formatted”
 - “incorrect format in bibliography”
 - “does not introduce quotes properly”
- Critical evaluation of sources as well as the absence of contrasting or differing viewpoints:
 - “too many quotes without engagement”
 - “questionable sources – gotquestions.org”
 - “no theological synthesis in conclusion”
 - “fails to engage sources”

MDIV Committee

The committee explored ways to improve student performance on written assignments, particularly by aligning our assessments with the six frames of the ILLO framework. We concluded that integrating these frames into our grading rubrics would offer students clearer, more targeted feedback on the specific elements being evaluated. Additionally, we determined that assessing written work from later stages in the program, rather than introductory courses, would provide a more accurate measure of students’ growth as writers throughout their time at Luther Rice.

Recommendations for Improvement

MAA Committee

1. It is recommended Administration assess if there is a way to assess an ILLO frame targeted for improvement by using student submission(s) from a later course within the degree program, filtering for only students who have completed BI5201.

MABC Committee

1. Library instruction and information literacy tutorials were added to all MABC courses in the Summer of 2024. However, since the 2023-2024 assessment was conducted using Fall 2023 and Spring 2024 course, it did not factor in the added tutorials. Accordingly, the committee

recommends reviewing next year's assessment (2024-2025) to determine the effect of the tutorials. No other change is recommended at this time.

MACS Committee

1. Recommendation: Encourage faculty to creatively integrate the 6 ILLO frames into their paper grading rubrics.

MAM Committee

1. Direct students to appropriate library resources pertaining to Turabian format for footnotes and bibliography.
2. Clarify these issues in the rubric for major projects and specify grading deductions for these formatting errors.
3. Model critical analysis in lecture material.
4. Include within the course bibliography authors with opposing theological and hermeneutical viewpoints.

MDIV Committee

1. We recommend the integration of the six frames from the ILLO assessment into grading rubrics to provide students more specific feedback on written assignments.
2. We recommend using the latest possible assignments from students further into their program in the ILLO assessment data.

Graduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes – Leadership

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
Frame 1.2	Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.	3.80	5.25	5.00
Frame 2.2	Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.	3.60	4.67	4.93
Frame 3.2	Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately.	4.00	4.83	4.07
Frame 4.2	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	3.60	4.33	3.90
Frame 5.2	Students evaluate sources' claims from a perspective of informed skepticism, critically assessing sources' logic and evidence rather than simply summarizing their conclusions.	3.33	3.67	3.30
Frame 6.2	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	3.67	4.50	4.17

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

The MAL committee observes that it is a blessing to see that the program has improved across the board since last year. Frame 1.2 was a particular focus in the past year. It was emphasized at length in all MAL courses, and professors graded more rigorously in this area to ensure retention of the principles.

Recommendations for improvement

1. Frame 5.2 is one that the program has recognized as problematic. The step that needs to be taken to address this issue is simply to emphasize this value in the grading of the current assignments. There has already been some improvement because of this emphasis. However, further improvement can be achieved by encouraging students toward deeper engagement with the material. This is already incorporated into the grading rubric, so further alteration should not be necessary.
2. Frame 4.2 is also of note. This can be improved also by the grading emphasis of the professor. More assignments or different assignments are not necessary, but the more focused coaching of the professor should accomplish improvement.

Doctoral Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
Frame 1.3	Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.	4.93	5.53	4.33
Frame 2.3	Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.	4.60	5.67	4.30
Frame 3.3	Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately.	4.67	5.20	4.53
Frame 4.3	Methodological research is both broad and evaluative. Student researches the methods of numerous other authors (broad), and highlights points of similarity and dissimilarity among them (evaluative).	4.00	3.40	3.13
Frame 5.3	Methodological research is intellectually rigorous. Student goes beyond merely summarizing what prior researchers have done by examining the reasons and rationales in their work.	3.80	3.67	2.93
Frame 6.3	Students make meaningful contributions to the field of study.	4.93	5.07	3.93

1 or 2 (Incompetent); 3 or 4 (Competent); 5 or 6 (Very Competent)

Analysis

There can be no mistaking the downward trend in the assessment results. Some of the samples were missing the Literature Review altogether. Frame 5.3 was especially low, dropping from 3.76 last year to 2.93 this year. However, the good news is that a concerted effort is being made to push students from merely summarizing literature/resources to actually analyzing/interacting with them. Please see the "Recommendations for Improvement," below, for a list of changes that have been made in the past year in light of ILLO data.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. A Literature Review Paper has been implemented in DM8000. The paper is discussed at length during the module week.
2. A lecture on analyzing sources has been added to DM8500.
3. Faculty advisors are holding students to the rigors of the DMP template.
4. The DMin program coordinator conducts periodic training for DMin advisors during faculty meetings and the Faculty Summit. Much of this training addresses the "Literature Review" section of the DMin project.

Appendices

Appendix A – Description of Rubric Scores for Learning Outcomes

Description of Rubric Scores for Learning Outcomes

The following provides a description and summary of each numerical valuation associated with the rubrics specified to assess student competency. Student competency is assessed for Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs); Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs); and General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). The rubrics are scaled from 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 6 (Exceptional).

1 – Unsatisfactory

The student demonstrates no comprehension of the learning outcome.

2 – Incompetent

The student demonstrates limited comprehension of the learning outcome, omitting or misunderstanding basic facts and concepts.

3 – Novice

The student demonstrates comprehension of the learning outcome's basic facts and concepts but neglects to discuss examples or draw connections between ideas.

4 – Competent

The student demonstrates comprehension of the learning outcome, discusses examples, and draws connections between ideas.

5 – Very Competent

The student demonstrates the outcome, discusses examples, and draws connections among various ideas. The student's discussion is full and robust.

6 – Exceptional

The student demonstrates the outcome, discusses examples, and draws connections among various ideas. The student's discussion is full and robust and shows a significant command of the field of study.

Appendix B – GELO Rubric, Written Communication

GELOCOM Outcomes #1-5

EN1102

English Composition II

Final Research Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

GELOCOM Outcome		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Focus – the sections of the essay make a unified argument; all sections support the same argument	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Paragraph organization – each paragraph addresses a single topic that contributes to the overall argument of the essay	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Sentence style – the sentences of the essay flow smoothly and clearly and demonstrate facility with English grammar	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Audience awareness – the student recognizes an audience's potential reservations and employs appropriate logical, emotional, and ethical strategies of persuasion (logos, pathos, ethos) to win assent	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5	Research/information literacy – the student uses appropriate sources to support claims	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix C – GELO Rubric, Verbal Communication

GELOPSP Outcomes #1-5

EN2103

Public Speech

Speech of Persuasion

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

GELOPSP Outcome		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Focus – the sections of the speech make a unified argument. All sections support the same argument.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Argument – the speaker expresses awareness that members of the audience may disagree. Accordingly, the speaker responds to opposing arguments explicitly and employs appropriate logical, emotional, and ethical strategies (logos, pathos, ethos) to win assent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Appeal – the speaker catches listeners' interest at the beginning of the speech. Throughout the speech, the speaker uses appropriate rhetorical strategies (story-telling, imagery, verbal patterning and repetition, humor, etc.) to heighten listeners' interest and engagement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Presentation – the speaker's non-verbal cues (posture, gestures, dress, grooming, mannerisms) increase his persuasive appeal. The speaker seems prepared, relaxed, and confident.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5	Diction – the speaker enunciates clearly, with appropriate volume, tempo, tone, energy, and pronunciation. The speaker's choice of words indicates thought and preparation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix D – GELO Rubric, Literature

GELOLIT Outcomes #1-4

EN2104

World Literature

Close Reading Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

GELOLIT Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Statement of meaning (thesis) – the student identifies the author's message or purpose in writing	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Analysis of genre – the student identifies and describes the work's genre	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Close reading of work – the student discusses the literary work to support the thesis stated at the beginning of the essay	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Comparison with other works (theme) – the student examines thematic connections between the selected work and other works of literature	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix E –PLO Rubrics, UCBS

UCBS PLO #1

BI1200

Biblical Interpretation Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Survey the skills necessary for biblical interpretation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

UCBS PLOs #2-3

NT1200/OT1200

OT1200 – Annotated Bibliography/NT1200 – Intro to Paul's Epistles

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
2/3	Introduce students to the study of the Old/New Testament books.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix F – PLO Rubrics, GCBC

GCBC PLO #1 CO5702—Foundations of Counseling

DQ13: Philosophy of Counseling

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Introduce students to a biblical philosophy of counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

GCBC PLO #2

CO6706—Crisis Counseling

Independent Study Paper

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
2	Introduce students to empathetic and pastoral care or referral.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix G – PLO Rubric, GCBS

GCBS PLOs #1-4

OT5200/NT5200

OT5200 – Guided Research Project/NT5200 – Background Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Communicate biblical truths in writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3/4	Demonstrate an awareness of the introductory matters associated with the Old/New Testament books.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix H – PLO Rubric, GCPM

GCPM PLO #1 **CM7406—Church Administration**

“Importance of Church Policies and Procedures” Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor’s Name: _____

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Introduce students to evaluating ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix I – PLO Rubrics, BAPY

BAPY PLO #1

EN2103—Public Speech

Speech of Persuasion

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

BAPY PLO #2

PY 4700—The History and Systems of Psychology

Reaction Paper

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
2	Evaluate psychological theories under the authority of the Bible in the development of a scripturally reliable and empirically informed model of human psychology.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

BAPY PLO #3

PY 1701—Social Psychology

Reaction Paper

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
3	Critically and constructively apply a biblical worldview of scientific methodology to the subject matter of psychology.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

BAPY PLO #4

PY 3700—Introduction to Multicultural Counseling and Diverse Populations

Reaction Paper

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
4	Develop a fundamental knowledge of the physiological, psychological, social, and spiritual foundations of human life in the context of a consistent biblical/Christian worldview.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

BAPY PLO #5

PY 4703—Ethics in the Helping Professions

Reaction Paper

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
5	Build/practice essential skills for a career in clinical, academic, or church/missional settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix J – PLO Rubrics, BAR

BAR PLO #1

Final Book Study Course

Exegetical Paper

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

BAR PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Demonstrate a knowledge of the Bible, interpret Scripture's original meaning, and apply Scripture to contemporary situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

BAR PLO #2

HI12300

Survey of Church History

Historically Illustrated Sermon/Bible Study

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

BAR PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
2	Examine Christian theology and history with the purpose of ministry application.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

BAR PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
3	Articulate a Christian worldview and discuss its implications to daily life	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Apply foundational skills for ministry and service in a church and community: - Communicating biblical truths through a sermon or lesson - Counseling a person through a trauma using biblical truths - Participating in missionary work - Participating in church planting activities - Evangelizing an individual - Discipling an individual	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix K – PLO Rubrics, MAA

MAA PLO #1

AP5905

Biblical Apologetics

Major Writing Assignment

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

MAA PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

MAA PLO #2

AP5906

Theological Apologetics

Major Writing Assignment

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

MAA PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
2	Relate the Church's theological heritage to current apologetical issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

MAA PLOs #3 and #4 AP6907

Apologetics and Miracles

Major Writing Assignment

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

MAA PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
3	Articulate a rational and biblical case for the truth of Christianity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Articulate a defense to major objections to Christianity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix L – PLO Rubrics, MABC

MABC PLO #1

CO5702

Foundations in Counseling

WK14/DQ #13 – Phil. of Bib. Counseling

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

MABC PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
1	Articulate a biblical philosophy of counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

MABC PLO #2

CO6708

Counseling Practicum

Final Paper

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

MABC PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
2	Communicate biblical and theological truths through counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

MABC PLOs #3 and #5 CO5703

Helping Skills

Final Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

MABC PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
3	Exemplify empathetic pastoral care or referral.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5	Employ interpersonal skills in counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

MABC PLO #4

CO6705

Issues, Ethics, and Legal Concerns for Counselors

DQ#14: "Ethics Statement"

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

MABC PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
4	Convey principles of ethically and legally informed counseling practices.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix M – PLO Rubrics, MACS

MACS PLOs #1 and #3

**Final Book Study Course (OT6201, OT6218, OT6219, OT6223, OT6227,
NT6202, NT6204, NT6205, NT6206, NT6207, NT6227)**

Exegetical Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

MACS PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Communicate biblical and theological truths in writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

MACS PLO #2

TH6303

Systematic Theology III

Week 1, Exam 1: The Kingdom of God

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

MACS PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
2	Demonstrate an understanding of Christian theology.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix N – PLO Rubric, MAL

MAL PLOs #1-4

LD6812

Leadership Practicum

Leadership Project Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

MAL PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
1	Employ research methods for organizational analysis and problem solving.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Articulate a biblical philosophy of leading and following consistent with their vocation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Apply Christian leader and follower principles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Utilize leadership theories to diagnose and/or design organizations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix O – PLO Rubric, MAM

MAM PLOs #1-5

CM7402

The Work of Ministry

Philosophy of Pastoral Ministry Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

MAM PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Utilize the Church's theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Evaluate ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Lead in developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5	Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or such other ways as may be appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix P – PLO Rubrics, MDIV

MDIV PLOs #1 and #4 Book Study Course (most recent)

Exegetical Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

MDIV PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or in such other ways as may be appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

MDIV PLO #2

TH6302—Systematic Theology II

Week 7 Exam: Soteriology

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

MDIV PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
2	Utilize the Church's historical and theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

MDIV PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
3	Articulate a biblical philosophy of ministry consistent with their vocation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5	Evaluate and develop ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
6	Accurately and empathetically evaluate people and their personal circumstances and provide appropriate pastoral care or referral.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
7	Lead in developing goals and designing and implementing ministry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
8	Serve with Christian character in their personal and professional lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix Q – PLO Rubric, DMIN

DMIN PLOs #1-4

DM9500

DMIN Project

Sample ID:

Year:

Assessor's Name:

DMIN PLO		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Articulate and apply a biblical philosophy of ministry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Evaluate ministry efforts for biblical veracity and effective ministry outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Design and implement effective strategies for ministry settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Communicate researched conclusions with competence and purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix R – ILLO Rubrics, Undergraduate

Undergraduate ILLOs #1.1-6.1 -- Freshmen

EN1102

English Composition II

Final Research Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1.1	Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information, distinguishing reliable from unreliable sources.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2.1	Some variety evident in selection of sources.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3.1	Students cite sources appropriately and relate sources' claims accurately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4.1	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5.1	Students make an attempt to assess sources' logic and evidence instead of simply summarizing conclusions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
6.1	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1.1	Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information, distinguishing reliable from unreliable sources.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2.1	Some variety evident in selection of sources.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3.1	Students cite sources appropriately and relate sources' claims accurately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4.1	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5.1	Students make an attempt to assess sources' logic and evidence instead of simply summarizing conclusions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
6.1	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix S – ILLO Rubric, Graduate Seminary

Graduate ILLOs #1.2-6.2

BI5201

Intro to Biblical Hermeneutics

Exegetical Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
1.2	Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2.2	Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3.2	Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4.2	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5.2	Students evaluate sources' claims from a perspective of informed skepticism, critically assessing sources' logic and evidence rather than simply summarizing their conclusions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
6.2	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix T – ILLO Rubric, Graduate Leadership

Graduate ILLOs #1.2-6.2

LD5802

Organizational Communication

Org. Com. Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent	Competent		Very Competent		N/A	
1.2	Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2.2	Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3.2	Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4.2	Students seek information from multiple perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5.2	Students evaluate sources' claims from a perspective of informed skepticism, critically assessing sources' logic and evidence rather than simply summarizing their conclusions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
6.2	Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:

Appendix U – ILLO Rubric, Doctoral

Doctoral ILLOs #1.3-6.3

DM9500

Doctoral Ministry Project

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1.3	Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2.3	Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3.3	Students employ information ethically. Sources' claims are represented accurately, without misrepresentation or mischaracterization. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4.3	Methodological research is both broad and evaluative. Student researches the methods of numerous other authors (broad), and highlights points of similarity and dissimilarity among them (evaluative).	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5.3	Methodological research is intellectually rigorous. Student goes beyond merely summarizing what prior researchers have done by examining the reasons and rationales in their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
6.3	Students make meaningful contributions to the field of study.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Notes:
