



***2020-2021 Student Learning Outcomes  
Assessment Report***

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs) .....	2
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs).....	2
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs).....	4
INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs).....	4
<b>COURSES SELECTED FOR ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>8</b>
GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs) .....	8
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs).....	8
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs).....	8
INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs).....	9
<b>ASSESSMENT TEAMS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs) .....	10
PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs).....	10
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs).....	10
INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs).....	10
<b>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.....	12
VERBAL COMMUNICATION.....	12
LITERATURE/FINE ARTS .....	13
ETS PROFICIENCY PROFILE .....	13
<b>PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
BACHELOR OF ARTS IN RELIGION .....	15
MASTER OF ARTS IN APOLOGETICS .....	16
MASTER OF ARTS IN BIBLICAL COUNSELING.....	17
MASTER OF ARTS IN CHRISTIAN STUDIES.....	18
MASTER OF ARTS IN LEADERSHIP.....	19
MASTER OF ARTS IN MINISTRY .....	20
MASTER OF DIVINITY .....	21
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY.....	22
<b>COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
2018-2019 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	23
2019-2020 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	23
2020-2021 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	23
<b>INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
UNDERGRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	24
GRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	25

DOCTORAL INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	28
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>30</b>
APPENDIX A – DESCRIPTION OF RUBRIC SCORES FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	30
APPENDIX B – GELO RUBRIC, WRITTEN COMMUNICATION .....	32
APPENDIX C – GELO RUBRIC, VERBAL COMMUNICATION.....	33
APPENDIX D – GELO RUBRIC, LITERATURE .....	35
APPENDIX E – BAR PLO RUBRIC .....	36
APPENDIX F – MAA PLO RUBRIC .....	37
APPENDIX G – MABC PLO RUBRIC .....	38
APPENDIX H – MACS PLO RUBRIC.....	39
APPENDIX I – MAL PLO RUBRIC.....	40
APPENDIX J – MAM PLO RUBRIC.....	41
APPENDIX K – MDIV PLO RUBRIC.....	42
APPENDIX L – DMIN PLO RUBRIC.....	43
APPENDIX M – ILLO RUBRIC, UNDERGRADUATE.....	44
APPENDIX N – ILLO RUBRIC, GRADUATE.....	45
APPENDIX O – ILLO RUBRIC, DOCTORAL.....	46

## 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 2020-2021 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)**

The general education component of the Bachelor of Arts in Religion (BAR) emphasizes fine arts and humanities and includes courses in science and mathematics. The following GELOs have been designed by the BAR Program Committee in response to ongoing assessment of the BAR. Bloom's taxonomy was used to ensure an appropriate degree of rigor:

1. Demonstrate a proposition clearly and persuasively in written and oral form (Communication)
2. Interpret the meaning of a literary work, as well as to discuss its genre, themes, and relationships to other works (Literature/Fine Arts)
3. Critically and constructively evaluate styles of argumentation, recognized assumptions, and draw valid and sound conclusions based upon evidence (Critical Thinking)
4. Demonstrate awareness of the forces that shape matter, and be able to quantify these forces using standard scientific formulae (Natural Science)

GELOs are assessed annually by a team of three or more full-time faculty who hold or are completing a terminal degree in their respective areas of expertise.

GELOs compliment the PLOs of the BAR program. Graduates of the BAR are required to demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication; articulate ideas, events, and factors that have contributed to the development of world civilizations, and modern society and culture; critically and constructively apply a Christian worldview as it relates to various disciplines; demonstrate a knowledge of the Bible, Christian theology, and church history; and develop foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.

### **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 full-time faculty who hold or are completing a terminal degree in their respective areas of expertise.

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).

### **Bachelor of Arts**

1. Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication.

2. Articulate the ideas, events, and factors that have contributed to the development of world civilizations, and modern society and culture.
3. Critically and constructively apply a Christian worldview as it relates to various disciplines.
4. Demonstrate knowledge of the Bible, Christian theology, and church history with the purpose of ministry application.
5. Develop foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.

### **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 cultural and 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 leader and follower 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.

## **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 (BA, MA, DMIN) offered at Luther Rice College and Seminary. ILLOs were written by the Information Literacy Committee and implemented by the faculty. They are assessed by a team of three or more full-time faculty who hold or are completing a terminal degree in their respective areas of expertise.

Work products are selected for assessment from each level of instruction (BA, MA, DMIN). 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 BA level, the MA level, and the DMIN 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 is Constructed and Contextual**

ILLO 1.1 - Students identify differences between a scholarly and a popular source, and select sources accordingly. While appreciating the authority of a scholarly source, students recognize that all argument is underwritten by assumptions or worldviews.

ILLO 1.2 - Students recognize various types of authority (such as scholarship, societal position, or special experience) and utilize sources with the appropriate level of authority, according to the research need. Students use informed skepticism to evaluate the authority of sources based on their origin, context, purpose, and the current information need.

ILLO 1.3 - Students recognize various types of authority (such as scholarship, societal position, or special experience) and utilize sources with the appropriate level of authority, according to the research need. Students acknowledge they are developing their own authoritative voices in a particular area and recognize the responsibility this entails (accuracy, reliability, and ethical use of the ideas of others).

### **Frame 2—Information Creation as a Process**

ILLO 2.1 - Students differentiate between various types of information resources and understand when it is appropriate to use those resources. Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information.

ILLO 2.2 - Students identify the appropriate level of scholarship and currency among publication formats (scholarly journals, magazines, websites, etc.) within their field in order to use resources appropriately for their information needs.

ILLO 2.3 - Students utilize a variety of information formats in their area of research including subject-specific databases, core journals, and reference materials. Students employ information from appropriate formats based on the currency, depth, formality, and accuracy of the information needed.

### **Frame 3—Information has Value**

ILLO 3.1 - Students differentiate between valuable and valueless information, give credit to original ideas, and describe the importance of information in the overall effectiveness of written and oral communication.



ILLO 3.2 – Students employ information legally and ethically to engage in scholarship, while demonstrating an understanding of the value of information.

ILLO 3.3 - Students employ information legally and ethically to contribute to the information marketplace, while understanding the value of various types of information.

#### **Frame 4—Research as Inquiry**

ILLO 4.1 - Students formulate questions for research based on information gaps or on reexamination of existing information in order to determine an appropriate scope for current research projects.

ILLO 4.2 - Students simplify research tasks by breaking complex questions into simple ones, while experimenting with various research methods, based on need, circumstance, and type of inquiry. Students monitor gathered information, assess for gaps or weaknesses, and explore diverse disciplinary perspectives.

ILLO 4.3 - Students organize information in meaningful ways, while synthesizing ideas gathered from multiple sources. Students draw reasonable conclusions based on the analysis and interpretation of information.

#### **Frame 5—Scholarship as Conversation**

ILLO 5.1 - Students cite the contributions of others in their own projects and contribute to scholarly conversation through guided discussion or other appropriate methods. Students identify barriers to entering scholarly conversation via various venues.

ILLO 5.2 - Students critique and appraise contributions made by others in their field of study. Students engage in scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, seek information from multiple perspectives, and understand a good research question will not have a single uncontested answer.

ILLO 5.3 - Students summarize and evaluate the changes in scholarly perspective over time on a particular topic within a specific discipline. Students begin to see themselves as contributors to the scholarly conversation, within their field of study, and thus participate in a consistently meaningful and responsible manner.

#### **Frame 6—Searching as Strategic Exploration**

ILLO 6.1 – Students engage in searching as a process of exploration involving browsing and utilizing multiple sources, tools, and search strategies, including the assistance of a librarian.

ILLO 6.2 - Students demonstrate the use of appropriate search tools and language (natural language vs. controlled vocabulary). Students are able to refine the initial research inquiry

based on results, ask for expert guidance, manage a large number of results, and know when enough information has been gathered.

ILLO 6.3 - Students apply advanced search strategies with an understanding that information sources vary greatly in content and format and have varying degrees of relevance and value, depending on the needs and nature of the search. Students seek a wide range of sources and recognize the value of ongoing research in a particular field, including updates on new scholarship in their 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.

Area of Competency	Course Designed for Assessment	Work Selected for Assessment	Secondary Assessment
Communication	EN 1102-English Composition II	Final Research Paper	ETS Proficiency Profile
Public Speech	EN 2103-Public Speech	Persuasive Speech	Not Applicable
Literature/Fine Arts	EN 2104-World Literature	Close Reading Paper	Not Applicable
Critical Thinking	PH 1900-Critical Thinking	ETS Proficiency Profile	ETS Proficiency Profile
Natural Sciences	SC 1501-Physical Science	ETS Proficiency Profile	ETS Proficiency Profile

### Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

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

BAR	MAA	MABC	MACS	MAL	MAM	MDIV	DMIN
MP 4403-Christian Ministry Practicum; HI 1101 and 1102-World Civilizations I and II; Final Book Study	AP 6911-Apologetics Practicum	CO 6708-Biblical Counseling Practicum	Last Book Study Before Graduation; TH 6301-Systematic Theology I	LD 6812-Leadership Practicum	CM 7402-The Work of Ministry	CM 7407-Ministry Practicum	DM 9500-Doctoral Ministry Project

### Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

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 (Average).

## Information Literacy Learning Outcomes (ILLOs)

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

Undergraduate	EN 1102-English Composition II
Graduate	BH 5201-Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics; LD 5802-Organizational Communication
Doctoral	DM 8000-Research and Writing for Ministry

## 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 three professors. Each professor holds or is completing a terminal degree.

BAR	MAA	MABC	MACS	MAL	MAM	MDIV	DMIN
Brad Arnett, Ph.D.	Doug Taylor, Ph.D.	Ron Cobb, Ph.D.	David Mapes, Ph.D.	Rusty Ricketson, Ph.D.	Alan Posey, Ph.D.	Joshua Stewart, Ph.D.	Alan Posey, Ph.D.
Scott Henderson, Ph.D.	Tim Skinner, Ph.D. candidate	Ann Kerlin, Ph.D.	William Wilson, Ph.D.	Jamie Swalm, Ph.D.	Scott Moody, Ph.D.	Bill Coleman, D.Min.	Scott Moody Ph.D.
Tim Skinner, Ph.D. candidate	Bill Gordon, Th.D	Max Mills, Ph.D.	Joshua Stewart, Ph.D.	Steve Knox, Ph.D.	Marcus Merritt, Ph.D.	Casey Hough, Ph.D.	Bill Coleman, D.Min.

### Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

CLOs were assessed by the Dean of the College and Seminary.

### Information Literacy Learning Outcomes (ILLOs)

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

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes
Ron Cobb, Ph.D.
Ann Kerlin, Ph.D.
Thomas Mapes, Ph.D.

## Assessment Procedures

Each team was given a random sample of assignments from the courses selected for assessment. The random sample represented no less than 10 percent of the actual enrollment in the course. For example, a course that had 40 students would yield 4 assignments.

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 the assessment process. Rubric scores have been averaged and are presented below. Written recommendations will be made available to program coordinators and/or program committees upon request.

## General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

### Written Communication

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
GELOCOM-1	<i>Focus - the sections of the essay or speech make a unified argument; all sections support the same argument.</i>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>4.00</b>
GELOCOM-2	<i>Paragraph organization - each paragraph addresses a single topic that contributes to the overall argument of the essay or speech.</i>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>4.13</b>
GELOCOM-3	<i>Sentence style - the sentences of the essay or speech flow smoothly and clearly, and demonstrate facility with English grammar.</i>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.60</b>
GELOCOM-4	<i>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.</i>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>4.00</b>
GELOCOM-5	<i>Research/Information Literacy - the student uses appropriate sources to support claims.</i>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.00</b>

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

### Verbal Communication<sup>1</sup>

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2020-2021
GELOPSP-1	<i>Focus – the sections of the speech make a unified argument. All sections support the same argument.</i>	<b>5.27</b>
GELOPSP-2	<i>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.</i>	<b>4.00</b>
GELOPSP-3	<i>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.</i>	<b>4.47</b>
GELOPSP-4	<i>Presentation – the speaker's non-verbal cues (posture, gestures, dress, grooming, mannerisms) increase his persuasive appeal. The speaker seems prepared, relaxed, and confident.</i>	<b>4.20</b>
GELOPSP-5	<i>Diction – the speaker speaks clearly, with appropriate volume, tempo, tone, energy, and pronunciation. The speaker's choice of words indicates thought and preparation.</i>	<b>5.20</b>
GELOPSP-6	<i>Information Literacy – the speaker uses appropriate sources to support claims.</i>	<b>4.53</b>

<sup>1</sup> Prior to the year 2020-2021, written and verbal communication were assessed together. 2020-2021 is the first year that verbal communication was assessed separately.

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

## Literature/Fine Arts

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
GELOLIT-1	<i>Statement of meaning (thesis) - the student identifies the author's message or purpose in writing/creating.</i>	4.08	4.27	4.80
GELOLIT-2	<i>Analysis of genre - the student identifies and describes the work's genre.</i>	3.92	3.80	4.67
GELOLIT-3	<i>Close reading of work - the student discusses the literary work to support the thesis stated at the beginning of the essay.</i>	4.12	3.87	4.87
GELOLIT-4	<i>Comparison with other works (theme) - the student examines thematic connections between the selected work and other works of art.</i>	4.28	3.53	4.27

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

## ETS Proficiency Profile

Area of Competency	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	ETS Comparison Group <sup>2</sup>
ETS: Reading	116.30	116.18	115.91.	116.2
ETS: Writing	112.88	112.35	111.94	113.2
ETS: Critical Thinking	111.28	110.09	109.69	110.8
ETS: Mathematics	110.88	110.00	109.16	112.3
ETS: Humanities	114.74	115.65	114.63	114.8
ETS: Social Sciences	114.56	112.88	112.44	112.8.
ETS: Natural Sciences	113.98	112.79	112.97	114.0
<sup>3</sup> Total Score:	437.56	434.56	432.94	439.6

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

---

<sup>2</sup> The comparison group consists of the test scores of 12,979 seniors from 32 liberal arts colleges between the years 2016 and 2021.

<sup>3</sup> The score range for each individual area of competency is 100 to 130. The total score range for the proficiency profile is 400 to 500.



## Analysis

The BAR Committee observed that verbal and written communication had been assessed jointly in prior years. 2020-2021 was the first year they had been assessed separately. As a result, 2020-2021 scores set a new baseline for both skills. The committee recommends monitoring verbal and written scores in future years for any departure from the new baseline established by 2020-2021 scores.

The committee observed a sharp increase in Literature/Fine Arts performance. Much of this may be attributed to the addition of a rough draft assignment and peer review session for the Close Reading paper.

In light of the Literature/Fine Arts improvement, the committee recommends that professors create opportunities for tutoring and coaching in their courses, particularly when students are working on essays and other major writing assignments. "Tutoring and coaching" may take the form of feedback on rough drafts, Collaborate and Professor's Virtual Office sessions, and peer review sessions with other students.

## Recommendations for Improvement

1. The committee will monitoring verbal and written GELO scores in future years to identify any departure from the new baseline established by 2020-2021 scores.
2. Professors should create opportunities for tutoring and coaching in their courses, particularly when students are working on essays and other major writing assignments. "Tutoring and coaching" may take the form of feedback on rough drafts, Collaborate and Professor's Virtual Office sessions, and peer review sessions with other students.

## Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

### Bachelor of Arts in Religion

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
BARPLO-1	<i>Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication.</i>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>3.73</b>
BARPLO-2	<i>Articulate the ideas, events, and factors that have contributed to the development of world civilizations, and modern society and culture.</i>	<b>4.88</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>4.67</b>
BARPLO-3	<i>Critically and constructively apply a Christian worldview as it relates to various disciplines.</i>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.60</b>
BARPLO-4	<i>Demonstrate knowledge of the Bible, Christian theology, and church history with the purpose of ministry application.</i>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.27</b>
BARPLO-5	<i>Develop foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.</i>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>4.87</b>	<b>4.47</b>

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

### Analysis

The BAR Committee observed that PLO scores fluctuated in place. For instance, for PLO 1, the 2020-2021 score of 3.73 is much lower than the 2019-2020 score of 4.53 but is nearly equal to the 2018-2019 score of 3.80.

The same applies to the other scores. The committee observed the difficulty of distinguishing meaningless fluctuation from meaningful trends. While this fluctuation may be partially attributed to ebb and flow of student performance, it may also be attributable to changes in assessment personnel. Given this problem, the committee recommends that the personnel who assess a PLO one year assess it the next year. Uniformity of personnel year-over-year may decrease fluctuation year-over-year.

The committee also recommends that each cell of the PLO rubric include a brief written description instead of or in addition to a number. The committee noted that without written, objective criteria, grading is likely to vary among assessors. The addition of written, objective criteria for each cell of the rubric may encourage greater accuracy and consistency of assessment.

Finally, the committee recommends that PLOs be rewritten to avoid overlap with GELOs. For example, PLO 1 overlaps with the Written Communication and Verbal Communication GELOs.

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. Personnel who assess a PLO one year should assess it the next year.
2. Each cell of the PLO rubric should include a brief written description instead of or in addition to a number.
3. PLOs should be rewritten to avoid overlap with GELOs.

## Master of Arts in Apologetics

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
MAAPLO-1	<i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.</i>	<b>4.92</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>5.07</b>
MAAPLO-2	<i>Relate the Church's theological heritage to current cultural and apologetical issues.</i>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>4.93</b>
MAAPLO-3	<i>Articulate a rational and biblical case for the truth of Christianity.</i>	<b>5.08</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>5.33</b>
MAAPLO-4	<i>Articulate a defense to major objections to Christianity.</i>	<b>4.88</b>	<b>5.27</b>	<b>5.20</b>

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

### Analysis

The MAA Committee observed that all scores, with the exception of PLO 2, were in the “Very Competent” range of 5-6. PLO 2 was slightly lower at 4.93. Accordingly, the committee targeted PLO 2 for future improvement.

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. The professor of AP6911—Apologetics Capstone will build a template that details expectations for the final paper. The template will include a subheading for each section of the paper, along with a description of what should be found in that section. This template will give students a model to follow for their papers and will prompt them to ask questions of the professor to clarify expectations.
2. Since MAA PLO 2 is very similar to MAM PLO 2, the MAA and MAM Program Committees will collaborate to identify strategies to improve PLO 2.
3. The MAA Program Committee will review each course in the program once per year. During this review, the committee will evaluate whether course assignments may be designed or redeployed to emphasize MAA PLO2.

## Master of Arts in Biblical Counseling

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
MABCPLO-1	<i>Articulate a biblical philosophy of counseling.</i>	<b>4.64</b>	<b>5.27</b>	<b>4.87</b>
MABCPLO-2	<i>Communicate biblical and theological truths through counseling.</i>	<b>4.72</b>	<b>5.13</b>	<b>5.00</b>
MABCPLO-3	<i>Incorporate empathetic pastoral care or referral.</i>	<b>4.72</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.73</b>
MABCPLO-4	<i>Implement ethically and legally informed counseling practices.</i>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>5.13</b>	<b>4.80</b>
MABCPLO-5	<i>Employ interpersonal skills in counseling.</i>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>5.13</b>	<b>5.00</b>

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

### Analysis

The MABC Committee observed that 2020-2021 scores for all PLOs declined relative to 2019-2020 but increased relative to 2018-2019. Results of assessment are turbulent and no clear trend can be ascertained.

To help define the results of assessment, the committee recommends that a portfolio system be implemented for 2021-2022. Currently, assessment is based on a single assignment in CO6708. The committee anticipates that a portfolio system of assessment will showcase students' strengths in more precise detail, enabling more accurate assessment.

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. Create a portfolio system of assessment. The following table identifies assignments to be included in the portfolio:

Course Name	Assignment
CO5701—Introduction to Counseling Theories	Resume
CO5702—Foundations in Counseling	Discussion # 13: Philosophy of BC
CO5703—Helping Skills	Video #2 Link: Demonstrate the active counseling state and helping skills
CO6705—Issues, Ethics, and Legal Concerns for Counselors	Discussion #13: Ethics and legal concerns in biblical counseling
CO6706—Crisis Counseling	Independent Study Assignment
CO6708—Counseling Practicum	Strengths and Weaknesses Assessment

## Master of Arts in Christian Studies

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
MACSPLO-1	<i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context</i>	<b>4.76</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.73</b>
MACSPLO-2	<i>Demonstrate an understanding of Christian Theology</i>	<b>4.76</b>	<b>4.30</b>	<b>3.07</b>
MACSPLO-3	<i>Communicate biblical and theological truths in writing</i>	<b>4.52</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>4.73</b>

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

### Analysis

The MACS Committee observed that slight decreases in score for PLOs 1 and 3 do not seem to be statistically relevant. The committee observed that the competency scores for PLO 2 continue to decline. The committee recommends that professors of theology classes in the MACS create an assignment designed specifically to address PLO 2.

The committee observed a potential conflict of interest when professors are assigned to assess their own assignments. The committee recommends that the institution contract subject matter experts from outside the institution to assess program PLOs.

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. Professors of theology classes should create an assignment specifically to assess PLO 2.
2. The institution should contract subject matter experts from outside the institution to assess program PLOs.

## Master of Arts in Leadership

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
MALPLO-1	<i>Employ research methods for organizational analysis and problem solving.</i>	<b>5.28</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>5.47</b>
MALPLO-2	<i>Articulate a biblical philosophy of leading and following consistent with their vocation.</i>	<b>5.48</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.60</b>
MALPLO-3	<i>Apply Christian leader and follower principles.</i>	<b>5.52</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.73</b>
MALPLO-4	<i>Utilize leader and follower theories to diagnose and/or design organizations.</i>	<b>5.40</b>	<b>4.87</b>	<b>5.00</b>

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

### Analysis

Assessment results for the program fall within the “Very Competent” category, with PLO 4 being the lowest at 5.0.

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. PLO 4 may be improved by adding new lectures and assignments to LD5801, LD5804, and LD6807. These lectures and assignments will address the ways that leader-follower theories aid in the diagnosis of organizational challenges.
2. PLO 1 was the next lowest area and may be improved by emphasizing the application of research methods to organizational structures in LD5806. This emphasis can take place through adding new lectures, minor assignments, and discussion posts.

## Master of Arts in Ministry

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
MAMPLO-1	<i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context</i>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>4.80</b>
MAMPLO-2	<i>Utilize the Church's theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry</i>	<b>4.48</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>4.20</b>
MAMPLO-3	<i>Evaluate ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment</i>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>4.87</b>
MAMPLO-4	<i>Lead in developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs</i>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>4.40</b>
MAMPLO-5	<i>Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or such other ways as may be appropriate</i>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>4.73</b>

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

### Analysis

The MAM Committee looks forward to working with the MAA committee to implement their recommendations for PLO 2. In addition, the MAM Committee is developing a bibliography of church historical resources. The bibliography will nudge students to “utilize the Church’s theological heritage” when they write their “Philosophy of Pastoral Ministry” paper in CM7402.

The MAM Committee is also designing a rubric to assess the “Philosophy of Pastoral Ministry” paper. The rubric will require students to include at least three original sources from church history (i.e., Church Fathers, Reformation, English or American Puritans, etc.).

Additionally, the Committee recommends a process approach to writing the “Philosophy of Ministry Paper.” The process will involve progressive submissions of an introduction, outline, bibliography, rough draft, and final draft. This process will enable students to receive critique and recommendations from the professor throughout the writing process.

Regarding PLO 4, the MAM Committee will review assignments in CM7402 and CM7406 pertinent to developing and implementing a ministry project.

As a general rule, the committee recommends that where specific expectations are required, examples of student work should be provided.

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. Develop a bibliography of church historical resources to improve student’s discussion of “the Church’s theological heritage” (PLO 2).
2. Develop a rubric for the “Philosophy of Pastoral Ministry” paper in CM7402.
3. Implement a process-writing approach for the “Philosophy of Pastoral Ministry” paper to enable students to receive feedback from the professor throughout the writing process.
4. Review assignments in CM7402 and CM7406 pertinent to PLO 4.
5. Provide samples of student work to illustrate assignment expectations and requirements.

## Master of Divinity

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
MDIVPLO-1	<i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.</i>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>5.00</b>
MDIVPLO-2	<i>Utilize the Church's historical and theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry.</i>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.73</b>
MDIVPLO-3	<i>Articulate a biblical philosophy of ministry consistent with their vocation.</i>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>5.60</b>
MDIVPLO-4	<i>Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or in such other ways as may be appropriate.</i>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>5.40</b>
MDIVPLO-5	<i>Evaluate and develop ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.</i>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>5.53</b>
MDIVPLO-6	<i>Accurately and empathetically evaluate people and their personal circumstances and provide appropriate pastoral care or referral.</i>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>5.40</b>
MDIVPLO-7	<i>Lead in developing goals and designing and implementing ministry.</i>	<b>4.52</b>	<b>4.93</b>	<b>5.73</b>
MDIVPLO-8	<i>Serve with Christian character in their personal and professional lives.</i>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>5.60</b>	<b>5.20</b>

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

### Analysis

The committee examined assessment data from CM7407—Ministry Practicum. The data showed small weaknesses in PLO 2 and PLO 8.

### Recommendations for Improvement.

1. The professor of HI5311 and HI5312 will incorporate an assignment in each course requiring a historically illustrated sermon or Bible study. This assignment will prepare the student to understand the historical and theological heritage of their personal ministry. By including this assignment, the weakness seen in PLO2 should be strengthened.
2. The professor of CM7407 will require a brief historical or theological illustration in the “Expository Sermon” assignment. This requirement will give students more exposure to the historical and theological heritage relevant to the subject of the sermon. The intent of this assignment is to strengthen students’ performance relative to PLO 2.
3. The committee recommends that all course assignments for CM7404 be included in the ministry portfolio. The complete range of assignments will give the assessors greater ability to evaluate MDIV PLOs.
4. The committee recommends that the ministry supervisor’s report be modified to contain a section in which the supervisor evaluates the student’s Christian character. The supervisor’s evaluation will give the reviewers a window into the student’s life to determine whether PLO 8 is being met.



## Doctor of Ministry

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	<u>2018-2019</u>	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>
DMINPLO-1	<i>Articulate and apply a biblical philosophy of ministry.</i>	<b>4.92</b>	<b>4.90</b>	<b>5.20</b>
DMINPLO-2	<i>Evaluate ministry efforts for biblical veracity and effective ministry outcomes.</i>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.90</b>	<b>5.20</b>
DMINPLO-3	<i>Design and implement effective strategies for ministry settings.</i>	<b>5.16</b>	<b>5.10</b>	<b>5.13</b>
DMINPLO-4	<i>Communicate researched conclusions with competence and purpose.</i>	<b>5.08</b>	<b>5.10</b>	<b>5.20</b>

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

## Analysis

The DMIN Committee observed that all scores fall within the “Very Competent” range. The committee identified several recommendations for further improvement.

## Recommendations or Improvement

1. Doctoral Ministry Projects, as opposed to Doctoral Ministry Proposals, should always be used as the criteria for the assessment of DMINPLOs (DMINPLO-1, 2, 3, & 4).
2. Doctor of Ministry faculty should design course assignments that creatively challenge their students to develop and incorporate innovative pastoral ministry into their area of real-life ministry service (DMINPLO-3).

## Course Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

### 2018-2019 Course Learning Outcomes

Degree Program	A	B	C	Total
BAR	44.01%	28.00%	13.87%	85.87%
MAA	60.32%	26.46%	6.88%	93.65%
MABC	57.60%	28.57%	9.22%	95.39%
MACS	55.93%	28.81%	8.05%	92.80%
MAL	52.38%	24.49%	10.20%	87.07%
MAM	48.26%	27.61%	13.40%	89.28%
MDIV	50.55%	27.85%	14.09%	92.49%
DMIN	81.15%	16.23%	0.52%	97.91%

### 2019-2020 Course Learning Outcomes

Degree Program	A	B	C	Total
BAR	42.70%	27.62%	15.36%	85.67%
MAA	63.64%	20.66%	10.74%	95.04%
MABC	51.26%	31.05%	14.44%	96.75%
MACS	47.89%	26.84%	13.68%	88.42%
MAL	55.84%	22.08%	14.29%	92.21%
MAM	51.24%	31.10%	9.54%	91.87%
MDIV	45.63%	30.00%	14.63%	90.25%
DMIN	81.15%	16.39%	0.82%	98.36%

### 2020-2021 Course Learning Outcomes

Degree Program	A	B	C	Total
BAR	48.55%	27.48%	13.14%	89.17%
MAA	65.38%	25.00%	6.73%	97.11%
MABC	58.51%	26.14%	9.96%	94.61%
MACS	42.50%	28.13%	13.13%	83.76%
MAL	43.90%	28.05%	18.29%	90.24%
MAM	59.58%	26.67%	7.50%	93.75%
MDIV	51.11%	25.73%	14.41%	91.25%
DMIN	88.79%	9.48%	0.00%	98.27%

## Information Literacy Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

### Undergraduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
Frame 1.1	Students identify differences between a scholarly and a popular source, and select sources accordingly. While appreciating the authority of a scholarly source, students recognize that all argument is underwritten by assumptions or worldviews.	4.28	4.80	4.93
Frame 2.1	Students differentiate between various types of information resources and understand when it is appropriate to use those resources. Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information.	4.36	4.90	4.67
Frame 3.1	Students differentiate between valuable and valueless information, give credit to original ideas, and describe the importance of information in the overall effectiveness of written and oral communication.	4.32	5.10	4.20
Frame 4.1	Students formulate questions for research based on information gaps or on reexamination of existing information in order to determine an appropriate scope for current research projects.	4.24	4.10	4.67
Frame 5.1	Students cite the contributions of others in their own projects and contribute to scholarly conversation through guided discussion or other appropriate methods. Students identify barriers to entering scholarly conversation via various venues.	4.24	4.10	4.47
Frame 6.1	Students engage in searching as a process of exploration involving browsing and utilizing multiple sources, tools, and search strategies, including the assistance of a librarian.	4.16	3.20	4.60

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

### Analysis

The BAR Committee is pleased to observe the high scores of the ILLO assessment. All scores are well above the “Competent” threshold, and many approach the “Very Competent” threshold.

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. In light of Frame 3.1, the BAR Committee recommends that professors take time at the beginning of the semester to distinguish between sources that are acceptable for academic research and sources that are unacceptable.
2. The committee also recommends striking Frame 6.1. One of the three assessors marked N/A for Frame 6.1 for each of the student samples assessed. Moreover, a second assessor remarked on the difficulty of scoring the frame.

## Graduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
Frame 1.2	Students recognize various types of authority (such as scholarship, societal position, or special experience and utilize sources with the appropriate level of authority, according to the research need. Students use informed skepticism to evaluate the authority of sources based on their origin, context, purpose, and the current information need.	3.86	4.40	4.20
Frame 2.2	Students identify the appropriate level of scholarship and currency among publication formats (scholarly journals, magazines, websites, etc.) within their field in order to use resources appropriately for their information needs.	4.08	4.95	4.45
Frame 3.2	Students employ information legally and ethically to engage in scholarship, while demonstrating an understanding of the value of information.	3.92	4.55	4.45
Frame 4.2	Students simplify research tasks by breaking complex questions into simple ones, while experimenting with various research methods, based on need, circumstance, and type of inquiry. Students monitor gathered information, assess for gaps or weaknesses, and explore diverse disciplinary perspectives.	3.96	4.55	4.48
Frame 5.2	Students critique and appraise contributions made by others in their field of study. Students engage in scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, seek information from multiple perspectives, and understand a good research question will not have a single uncontested answer.	3.70	3.65	4.14
Frame 6.2	Students demonstrate the use of appropriate search tools and language (natural language vs. controlled vocabulary). Students are able to refine the initial research inquiry based on results, ask for expert guidance, manage a large number of results, and know when enough information has been gathered.	3.78	3.50	4.50

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

### Analysis

For Frames 1.2, 2.2, 3.2, and 4.2, scores rose sharply in 2019-2020 and then declined in 2020-2021. The decline in 2020-2021 is slight, with the exception of Frame 2.2.

For Frames 5.2 and 6.2, scores declined slightly in 2019-2020 and then rose sharply in 2020-2021.

Overall, 2020-2021 scores show marked improvement when compared to 2018-2019 scores.

### Recommendations for Improvement

The MAA Committee proposed the following recommendations:

1. All discussion board assignments in graduate Apologetics courses will require a minimum of three scholarly sources, with no more than one source being from required texts.
2. The MAA Committee will develop a standard grading rubric to assess discussion board assignments. The rubric will require discussion and citation of three scholarly sources.
3. During its periodic review of Apologetics courses, the MAA Committee will evaluate course syllabi and assignments to determine whether additional writing assignments will improve students' skills of research and writing.

The MABC Committee responded to Frames 4.2 and 6.2. They observed that these frames presuppose assessors' ability to observe students directly as the students conduct research. The committee noted that assessors cannot observe students directly and must infer the effectiveness of students' research habits given the quality of students' work. Accordingly, the committee recommended the following:

1. Frames 4.2 and 6.2 should be omitted or revised to state that "The quality of students' research indicates the suitability of their research strategies."
2. Professors should include links within each course to library tutorials. These tutorials teach students how to find sources appropriate for academic research in the Luther Rice Library databases.

The MACS Committee proposed the following recommendations:

1. Professors should take advantage of the library's resources for information literacy by embedding a selection of relevant videos in their courses (see for example NT6206, Lesson 11).
2. These videos should be embedded, not linked, since students may pass over a mere link.
3. To view the library's information literacy videos, professors should navigate to the library's webpage and browse the two links underlined in red below.
  - a. The ProQuest Research Companion provides embed links, and the information taught is explicitly relevant to information literacy.
  - b. The "Research Instruction Guide" is a well-organized tool, but it necessitates navigation away from Blackboard.

## New Resources and Research Starters

**New eBooks Gallery**

**Credo Reference Database (Dictionaries & Encyclopedias)**

**ProQuest Research Companion** ([Learn how to research](#))

**Database Searching Tips Guide**

**Research Instruction Guide**

The MAL committee proposed the following recommendation:

1. Each course should contain a lecture specific to academic research. These lectures will teach students to distinguish sources that are appropriate for academic research from sources that are inappropriate for academic research.

The MDIV Committee proposed the following recommendation:

1. All graduate courses should include, at some point in the course, the videos produced by the library related to research methods (e.g., types of commentaries, journals vs. periodicals, etc.). These videos will help students distinguish sources suitable for academic research from those that are not suitable.

## Doctoral Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

Outcome ID	Learning Outcome	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
Frame 1.3	Students recognize various types of authority (such as scholarship, societal position, or special experience) and utilize sources with the appropriate level of authority, according to the research need. Students acknowledge they are developing their own authoritative voices in a particular area and recognize the responsibility this entails (accuracy, reliability, and ethical use of the ideas of others).	4.12	4.50	4.27
Frame 2.3	Students utilize a variety of information formats in their area of research including subject-specific databases, core journals, and reference materials. Students employ information from appropriate formats based on the currency, depth, formality, and accuracy of the information needed.	4.20	4.00	3.80
Frame 3.3	Students employ information legally and ethically to contribute to the information marketplace, while understanding the value of various types of information.	4.16	4.00	4.53
Frame 4.3	Students organize information in meaningful ways, while synthesizing ideas gathered from multiple sources. Students draw reasonable conclusions based on the analysis and interpretation of information.	4.04	3.71	4.53
Frame 5.3	Students summarize and evaluate the changes in scholarly perspective over time on a particular topic within a specific discipline. Students begin to see themselves as contributors to the scholarly conversation, within their field of study, and thus participate in a consistently meaningful and responsible manner.	4.20	3.63	4.20
Frame 6.3	Students apply advanced search strategies with an understanding that information sources vary greatly in content and format and have varying degrees of relevance and value, depending on the needs and nature of the search. Students seek a wide range of sources and recognize the value of ongoing research in a particular field, including updates on new scholarship in their field of study.	4.16	4.00	3.40

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

### Analysis

The DMIN Committee observed that scores for Frames 2.3 and 6.3 had decreased relative to previous years' scores. The committee suspects the reason for the decrease is that assessors were given students' Practice Proposals from DM8000 instead of the Doctoral Research Project from DM9500. The Practice Proposal in DM8000 is a work-in-progress, not a final product. The committee feels that the Doctoral Research Project would provide a much more conclusive sample of students' aptitude.

## Recommendations for Improvement

1. Doctoral Ministry Projects, as opposed to Doctoral Ministry Proposals, should always be to assess Institutional Literacy Learning Outcomes.
2. Professors in the DMIN Program should strive to develop course assignments that will challenge students to mature their scholarly literary voices ethically and with both validity and reliability (Frame 1.3).
3. Students in Doctor of Ministry courses need to be creatively challenged to discover supportive research materials for written assignments from databases that contain quality scholarly journals and reference sources (Frame 2.3).
4. Developers of Doctor of Ministry courses should provide access for students to Luther Rice online library resources that demonstrate how to incorporate advanced research strategies into the art of doctoral research (Frame 6.3).



## **Appendices**

### **Appendix A – 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 (Incompetent) to 10 (Very Competent).

#### **1 – Incompetent**

The student demonstrates unsatisfactory performance with no mastery of the learning outcome. The student does not demonstrate an understanding of the component elements of the learning outcome, how the learning outcome relates to other concepts within the course, or how to apply the learning outcome.

#### **2 – Incompetent**

The student demonstrates unsatisfactory performance with slight mastery of the learning outcome. The student appears to have a basic grasp of the component elements of the learning outcome, but does not demonstrate an understanding of how the learning outcome relates to other concepts within the course, or how to apply the learning outcome.

#### **3 – Competent**

The student demonstrates satisfactory performance with below average mastery of the learning outcome. The student demonstrates an acceptable knowledge of the component elements of the learning outcome, demonstrates an acceptable understanding of how the learning outcome relates to other concepts within the course, but does not appear to know how to apply the learning outcome.

#### **4 – Competent**

The student demonstrates satisfactory performance with average mastery of the learning outcome. The student demonstrates an acceptable knowledge of the component elements of the learning outcome, demonstrates an acceptable understanding of how the learning outcome relates to other concepts within the course, and demonstrates a basic knowledge of how to apply the learning outcome.

#### **5 – Very Competent**

The student demonstrates exceptional performance with significantly above average mastery of the learning outcome. The student demonstrates a command of the component elements of the learning outcome, demonstrates an understanding of how the learning outcome relates to other concepts within the course, and demonstrates the ability to apply the learning outcome.

#### **6 – Very Competent**

The student demonstrates exceptional performance with mastery of the learning outcome. The student demonstrates a command of the component elements of the learning outcome, demonstrates an

exceptional understanding of how the learning outcome relates to other concepts within the course, and clearly demonstrates the ability to apply the learning outcome.

## Appendix B – GELO Rubric, Written Communication

EW 1102  
SID

English Composition II

Final Research Paper

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
GELOCOM1	Focus - the sections of the essay or speech make a unified argument; all sections support the same argument	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOCOM2	Paragraph organization - each paragraph addresses a single topic that contributes to the overall argument of the essay or speech	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOCOM3	Sentence style - the sentences of the essay or speech flow smoothly and clearly, and demonstrate facility with English grammar	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOCOM4	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
GELOCOM5	Research/Information Literacy - the student uses appropriate sources to support claims	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

NOTES:

[illegible]

## Appendix C – GELO Rubric, Verbal Communication

EN 2103

Public Speech

Speech

SID

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
GELOPSP1	Focus-The sections of the speech make a unified argument. All sections support the same argument.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOPSP2	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
GELOPSP3	Appeal-The speaker catches listeners' interest at the beginning of the speech. Throughout the speech, the speakers 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
GELOPSP4	Presentation-The speaker's non-verbal cues (posture, gestures, dress, grooming, mannerisms) increase his persuasive appeal. The student seems prepared, relaxed, and confident.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOPSP5	Diction-The student speaks clearly, with appropriate volume, tempo, tone, energy, and pronunciations. The student's choice of words indicates thought and preparation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOPSP6	Information Literacy-The speaker uses appropriate sources to support claims.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

NOTES:

---



---



---



---



## Appendix D – GELO Rubric, Literature

EN 2104

British Literature

Close Reading Paper

SID \_\_\_\_\_

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
GELOUT1	Statement of meaning (thesis) - the student identifies the author's message or purpose in writing/creating	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOUT2	Analysis of genre - the student identifies and describes the work's genre	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
GELOUT3	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
GELOUT4	Comparison with other works (theme) - the student examines thematic connections between the selected work and other works of art	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

NOTES:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix E – BAR PLO Rubric

MP 4403/4 Christian Service Practicum

Sample ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessors 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
2	Articulate the ideas, events, and factors that have contributed to the development of world civilizations, and modern society and culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Critically and constructively apply a Christian worldview as it relates to various disciplines.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Demonstrate knowledge of the Bible, Christian theology, and church history with the purpose of ministry application.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5	Develop foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

NOTES:

---



---



---

## Appendix F – MAA PLO Rubric

AP 6911

*Apologetics Capstone*

Sample ID

---

Year:

---

Assessors 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	Relate the Church's theological heritage to current cultural and apologetical issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6	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 G – MABC PLO Rubric

CO 6708

Biblical Counseling Practicum

Sample ID

Year:

Assessors Name:

Program Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
1	Articulate a biblical philosophy of counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Communicate biblical and theological truths through counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
3	Exemplify Empathetic pastoral care or referral.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
4	Convey principles of ethically and legally informed counseling practices.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
5	Employ interpersonal skills in counseling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

NOTES:

---



---



---



---



---



---

## Appendix H – MACS PLO Rubric

*NT/OT Book Study*

*Sample ID* \_\_\_\_\_

*Year:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Assessors Name:* \_\_\_\_\_

<i>Program Learning Outcomes</i>		<i>Levels of Competence</i>						
		<i>Incompetent</i>		<i>Competent</i>		<i>Very Competent</i>		<i>N/A</i>
1	Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
2	Demonstrate an understanding of Christian theology.	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:**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix I – MAL PLO Rubric

LD 6812

Leadership Practicum

Sample ID

\_\_\_\_\_

Year:

\_\_\_\_\_

Assessors Name:

\_\_\_\_\_

Program Learning Outcomes		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 J – MAM PLO Rubric

CM 7402

*The Work of Ministry*

Sample ID \_\_\_\_\_

Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessors 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	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 K – MDIV PLO Rubric

CM 7407

Ministry Practicum

Sample ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessors 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	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
3	Articulate a biblical philosophy of ministry consistent with their vocation.	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
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 L – DMIN PLO Rubric

DMRP 9500

*Doctoral Research Project*

*Sample ID*

Year:

**Assessors Name:**

Program Learning Outcomes		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 M – ILLO Rubric, Undergraduate

*Undergraduate*

*Information Literacy*

*Sample ID*

*Year:*

*Assessors Name:*

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
Frame 1.1	Students identify differences between a scholarly and a popular source, and select sources accordingly. While appreciating the authority of a scholarly source, students recognize that all argument is underwritten by assumptions or worldviews.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 2.1	Students differentiate between various types of information resources and understand when it is appropriate to use those resources. Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 3.1	Students differentiate between valuable and valueless information, give credit to original ideas, and describe the importance of information in the overall effectiveness of written and oral communication.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 4.1	Students formulate questions for research based on information gaps or on reexamination of existing information in order to determine an appropriate scope for current research projects.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 5.1	Students cite the contributions of others in their own projects and contribute to scholarly conversation through guided discussion or other appropriate methods. Students identify barriers to entering scholarly conversation via various venues.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 6.1	Students engage in searching as a process of exploration involving browsing and utilizing multiple sources, tools, and search strategies, including the assistance of a librarian.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

**NOTES:**

---



---



---



---



---



---

## Appendix N – ILLO Rubric, Graduate

Graduate

Information Literacy

Sample ID

Year:

Assessors Name:

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
Frame 1.2	Students recognize various types of authority (such as scholarship, societal position, or special experience and utilize sources with the appropriate level of authority, according to the research need. Students use informed skepticism to evaluate the authority of sources based on their origin, context, purpose, and the current information need.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 2.2	Students identify the appropriate level of scholarship and currency among publication formats (scholarly journals, magazines, websites, etc.) within their field in order to use resources appropriately for their information needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 3.2	Students employ information legally and ethically to engage in scholarship, while demonstrating an understanding of the value of information.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 4.2	Students simplify research tasks by breaking complex questions into simple ones, while experimenting with various research methods, based on need, circumstance, and type of inquiry. Students monitor gathered information, assess for gaps or weaknesses, and explore diverse disciplinary perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 5.2	Students critique and appraise contributions made by others in their field of study. Students engage in scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, seek information from multiple perspectives, and understand a good research question will not have a single uncontested answer.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 6.2	Students demonstrate the use of appropriate search tools and language (natural language vs. controlled vocabulary). Students are able to refine the initial research inquiry based on results, ask for expert guidance, manage a large number of results, and know when enough information has been gathered.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A



## Appendix O – ILLO Rubric, Doctoral

Doctoral

Information Literacy

Sample ID

Year:

Assessors Name:

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes		Levels of Competence						
		Incompetent		Competent		Very Competent		N/A
Frame 1.3	Students recognize various types of authority (such as scholarship, societal position, or special experience) and utilize sources with the appropriate level of authority, according to the research need. Students acknowledge they are developing their own authoritative voices in a particular area and recognize the responsibility this entails (accuracy, reliability, and ethical use of the ideas of others).	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 2.3	Students utilize a variety of information formats in their area of research including subject-specific databases, core journals, and reference materials. Students employ information from appropriate formats based on the currency, depth, formality, and accuracy of the information needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 3.3	Students employ information legally and ethically to contribute to the information marketplace, while understanding the value of various types of information.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 4.3	Students organize information in meaningful ways, while synthesizing ideas gathered from multiple sources. Students draw reasonable conclusions based on the analysis and interpretation of information.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Frame 5.3	Students summarize and evaluate the changes in scholarly perspective over time on a particular topic within a specific discipline. Students begin to see themselves as contributors to the scholarly conversation, within their field of study, and thus participate in a consistently meaningful and responsible manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

Frame 6.3	Students apply advanced search strategies with an understanding that information sources vary greatly in content and format and have varying degrees of relevance and value, depending on the needs and nature of the search. Students seek a wide range of sources and recognize the value of ongoing research in a particular field, including updates on new scholarship in their field of study.	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
-----------	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----