



***2021-2022 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)..... | 4 |
| INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs)..... | 5 |
| COURSES SELECTED FOR ASSESSMENT..... | 7 |
| GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs) | 7 |
| PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs)..... | 7 |
| COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs)..... | 8 |
| INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs)..... | 8 |
| ASSESSMENT TEAMS | 9 |
| GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES (GELOs) | 9 |
| PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs)..... | 9 |
| COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES (CLOs)..... | 10 |
| INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILLOs)..... | 10 |
| ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES | 11 |
| GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS | 12 |
| WRITTEN COMMUNICATION..... | 12 |
| VERBAL COMMUNICATION..... | 12 |
| LITERATURE/FINE ARTS | 13 |
| ETS PROFICIENCY PROFILE | 13 |
| PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS..... | 15 |
| UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN BIBLICAL STUDIES | 15 |
| GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN BIBLICAL STUDIES | 16 |
| BACHELOR OF ARTS IN RELIGION | 17 |
| MASTER OF ARTS IN APOLOGETICS | 18 |
| MASTER OF ARTS IN BIBLICAL COUNSELING..... | 19 |
| MASTER OF ARTS IN CHRISTIAN STUDIES..... | 20 |
| MASTER OF ARTS IN LEADERSHIP..... | 21 |
| MASTER OF ARTS IN MINISTRY | 22 |
| MASTER OF DIVINITY | 23 |
| DOCTOR OF MINISTRY..... | 24 |
| COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS | 25 |
| 2019-2020 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES..... | 25 |
| 2020-2021 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES..... | 25 |
| 2021-2022 COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES..... | 25 |
| INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT RESULTS..... | 26 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| UNDERGRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES | 26 |
| GRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES..... | 27 |
| GRADUATE INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES – MAL..... | 30 |
| DOCTORAL INFORMATION LITERACY LEARNING OUTCOMES..... | 31 |
| APPENDICES..... | 32 |
| APPENDIX A – DESCRIPTION OF RUBRIC SCORES FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES..... | 32 |
| APPENDIX B – GELO RUBRIC, WRITTEN COMMUNICATION | 34 |
| APPENDIX C – GELO RUBRIC, VERBAL COMMUNICATION | 35 |
| APPENDIX D – GELO RUBRIC, LITERATURE | 36 |
| APPENDIX E – UCBS PLO RUBRIC | 37 |
| APPENDIX F – GCBS PLO RUBRIC..... | 38 |
| APPENDIX G – BAR PLO RUBRIC..... | 39 |
| APPENDIX H – MAA PLO RUBRIC | 40 |
| APPENDIX I – MABC PLO RUBRIC | 41 |
| APPENDIX J – MACS PLO RUBRIC | 42 |
| APPENDIX K – MAL PLO RUBRIC..... | 43 |
| APPENDIX L – MAM PLO RUBRIC | 44 |
| APPENDIX M – MDIV PLO RUBRIC | 45 |
| APPENDIX N – DMIN PLO RUBRIC | 47 |
| APPENDIX O – ILLO RUBRIC, UNDERGRADUATE | 48 |
| APPENDIX P – ILLO RUBRIC, GRADUATE | 49 |
| APPENDIX Q – ILLO RUBRIC, MAL | 50 |
| APPENDIX R – ILLO RUBRIC, DOCTORAL | 51 |

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 2021-2022 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 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 quantify these forces using standard scientific formulas (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 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).

Undergraduate Certificate in Biblical Studies

1. Be introduced to the knowledge of the Bible, Christian theology, and Church history with the purpose of ministry application.

2. Practice foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church

Graduate Certificate in Biblical Studies

1. Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.
2. Practice communicating biblical and theological truths in writing.

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 personnel who hold graduate degrees in the fields of education and library science.

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 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 are quoted and cited appropriately.

ILLO 3.3 - Students employ information ethically. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately.

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 - Students seek information from multiple perspectives and evaluate the changes in scholarly or critical consensus over time.

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

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.

| 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:

| Program | Course Designated for Assessment | Work Selected for Assessment |
|---------|---|--|
| UCBS | BI1200 | Biblical Interpretation Paper |
| GCBS | NT5200 | Biblical Background Paper |
| BAR | HI1102 MP4403 Last OT/NT Book Study | Research Paper Case Study Exegetical Paper |
| MAA | AP6911 | Final Paper |
| MABC | CO5702 CO5703 CO6705 CO6708 | Discussion 13 Final Paper "Ethics Discussion" Forum Final Paper |

| | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| MACS | Last OT/NT Book Study TH6301 | Exegetical Paper Theology DQs |
| MAL | LD6812 | Leadership Project Paper |
| MAM | CM7402 | Philosophy of Pastoral Ministry Paper |
| MDIV | CM7407 | Portfolio |
| DMIN | DM9500 | 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:

| Level | Course |
|----------------------|---|
| 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 at least three professors. Each professor holds a terminal degree.

| Program | Assessors | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| UCBS | David Mapes, Ph.D. | Doug Taylor, Ph.D. | Matt Solomon, Ph.D. | |
| GCBS | David Mapes, Ph.D. | Doug Taylor, Ph.D. | Matt Solomon, Ph.D. | |
| BAR | David Casas, Ph.D. | Scott Henderson, Ph.D. | Tim Skinner, Ph.D. | |
| MAA | Alan Posey, Ph.D. | Tim Skinner, Ph.D. | Bill Gordon, Ph.D. | |
| MABC | Ann Kerlin, Ph.D. | Ron Cobb, Ph.D. | Angela Scruggs, Ph.D. | |
| MACS | William Wilson, Ph.D. | Brad Arnett, Ph.D. | Joshua Stewart, Ph.D. | Matt Solomon, Ph.D. |
| MAL | Rusty Ricketson, Ph.D. | Steve Knox, Ph.D. | Jamie Swalm, Ph.D. | |
| MAM | Rusty Ricketson, DMIN | Bill Coleman, DMIN | Scott Moody, DMIN | |
| MDIV | Joshua Stewart, Ph.D. | David Mapes, Ph.D. | Casey Hough, Ph.D. | |
| DMIN | Marcus Merritt, DMIN | Scott Moody, DMIN | Bill Coleman, DMIN | |

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

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

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes (ILLOs)

ILLOs were assessed by the Librarian, the Registrar, and the Dean. Each holds a graduate degree in library science or education.

| Information Literacy Learning Outcomes |
|--|
| Alisha Blevins, MLS |
| Steve Pray, Ed.D. |
| Thomas Mapes, M.Ed., 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 | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| GELOCOM-1 | <i>Focus - the sections of the essay or speech make a unified argument; all sections support the same argument.</i> | 4.70 | 4.00 | 4.73 |
| GELOCOM-2 | <i>Paragraph organization - each paragraph addresses a single topic that contributes to the overall argument of the essay or speech.</i> | 4.53 | 4.13 | 4.53 |
| GELOCOM-3 | <i>Sentence style - the sentences of the essay or speech flow smoothly and clearly, and demonstrate facility with English grammar.</i> | 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.33 |
| 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> | 4.13 | 4.00 | 3.93 |
| GELOCOM-5 | <i>Research/Information Literacy - the student uses appropriate sources to support claims.</i> | 4.20 | 4.00 | 4.8 |

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

Verbal Communication¹

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2020-2021 | 2021-2020 |
|------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| GELOPSP-1 | <i>Focus – the sections of the speech make a unified argument. All sections support the same argument.</i> | 5.27 | 4.33 |
| 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> | 4.00 | 3.60 |
| 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> | 4.47 | 4.07 |
| 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> | 4.20 | 3.53 |
| 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> | 5.20 | 4.00 |

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

¹ 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.

Literature/Fine Arts

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| GELOLIT-1 | <i>Statement of meaning (thesis) - the student identifies the author's message or purpose in writing/creating.</i> | 4.27 | 4.80 | 4.40 |
| GELOLIT-2 | <i>Analysis of genre - the student identifies and describes the work's genre.</i> | 3.80 | 4.67 | 4.87 |
| 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> | 3.87 | 4.87 | 4.80 |
| GELOLIT-4 | <i>Comparison with other works (theme) - the student examines thematic connections between the selected work and other works of art.</i> | 3.53 | 4.27 | 5.00 |

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

ETS Proficiency Profile

| Area of Competency | Luther Rice (Aggregated 2017-2022 Exit Scores) | ETS Comparison Group (Aggregated 2017-2022 Exit Scores) ² |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| ETS: Reading | 117.27 | 116.0 |
| ETS: Writing | 113.33 | 113.0 |
| ETS: Critical Thinking | 111.02 | 110.6 |
| ETS: Mathematics | 110.16 | 112.2 |
| ETS: Humanities | 115.63 | 114.6 |
| ETS: Social Sciences | 113.97 | 112.7 |
| ETS: Natural Sciences | 114.00 | 113.9 |
| ³ Total Score: | 438.21 | 437.5 |

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

² The comparison group consists of 12,573 seniors (90+ credit hours) from 32 colleges in the United States.

³ 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 committee was pleased by the results of the ETS Proficiency Profile. The committee observed that between 2017-present, Luther Rice students on average have outperformed the comparison group in all areas except Mathematics. The committee was particularly pleased by the results in Natural Sciences. In the past, Luther Rice students have lagged behind the comparison group in this area, but the latest scores show that Luther Rice is beginning to pull ahead. The Physical Science professor is to be commended for his work and creativity in developing students' proficiency in this area.

Regarding Literature and Fine Arts, the committee observed that all scores fell in the "Competent" to "Very Competent" range.

Regarding Verbal Communication, the committee observed that the students' performance this year was generally less accomplished than in previous years. While fluctuations are to be expected, the committee felt that attention to the aesthetics of video recording would improve scores overall.

Regarding Written Communication, the committee observed that while scores in Information Literacy are up, scores in Sentence Style are down. The English professor stated that he had removed several grammar units from EN1102 to make room for additional instruction in Information Literacy. The committee asked him to restore the grammar units.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Add lectures in Modules 8-15 of MA1600-College Algebra. These lectures should walk students through the process of solving the type of problem addressed in the module.
2. Restore the grammar units in EN1102—English Composition II.
3. Add instruction in EN2103—Public Speech to help students prepare themselves and the physical environment for video recording.
4. Provide the GELOPSP rubric to the EN2103—Public Speech professor. The intent of this recommendation is to permit the professor to understand how his course will be assessed.
5. The course objectives for EN2103--Public Speech and the assessment rubric for the Speech of Persuasion will be provided to the committee for future analysis.

Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

Undergraduate Certificate in Biblical Studies

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2021-2022 |
|------------|--|-------------|
| CPPLO-1 | Introduce students to the knowledge of the Bible, theology, and church history with the purpose of ministry application. | 4.17 |
| CPPLO-2 | Practice foundational skills for ministry and service within a local church. | 4.00 |

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

Analysis

The committee observed that PLOs are more extensive than the program content. For instance, the Undergraduate Certificate in Biblical Studies does not have a theology or church history class, but theology and church history are included in PLO #1. Likewise, the Undergraduate Certificate in Biblical Studies does not have a ministry component, but PLO #2 addresses ministry.

Accordingly, the Certificate Programs Committee recommends revising the PLOs for the Undergraduate Certificate in Biblical Studies. Please see the recommended PLOs, below.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Change PLOs to the following:
 - a. PLO-1: Survey the skills needed for biblical interpretation.
 - b. PLO-2: Introduce students to the study of the Old Testament books.
 - c. PLO-3: Introduce students to the study of the New Testament.
2. Assesses PLOs via the following assignments
 - a. PLO-1: NT1200 Introduction to New Testament Books assignment AND OT1200 Annotated Bibliography.
 - b. PLO-2: NT1200 Introduction to New Testament Books assignment.
 - c. PLO-3: OT1200 Annotated Bibliography.

Graduate Certificate in Biblical Studies

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2021-2022 |
|------------|--|-------------|
| CPPLO-1 | Introduce students to interpreting the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context. | 5.33 |
| CPPLO-2 | Practice communicating biblical and theological truths in writing. | 5.50 |

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

Analysis

The committee observed that PLOs are less extensive and less rigorous than program content. The verbs in the PLOs – “introduce” and “practice” – are more appropriate for undergraduate courses than graduate courses.

Accordingly, the Certificate Programs Committee recommends revising the PLOs for the Graduate Certificate in Biblical Studies. Please see the recommended PLOs, below.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Revise the PLOs as follows:
 - a. PLO-1: Interpret the Bible in the light of its historical-grammatical context
 - b. PLO-2: Communicate biblical truths in writing
 - c. PLO-3: Demonstrate an awareness of the introductory matters associated with the Old Testament books.
 - d. PLO 4: Demonstrate an awareness of the introductory matters associated with the New Testament books.
2. Assess the PLOs as follows:
 - a. PLO-1: OT5200 Guided Research Project AND NT5200 Background Paper
 - b. PLO-2: OT5200 Guided Research Project AND NT5200 Background Paper
 - c. PLO-3: OT5200 Guided Research Project
 - d. PLO-4: NT5200 Background Paper

Bachelor of Arts in Religion

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| BARPLO-1 | <i>Demonstrate effectiveness in oral and written communication.</i> | 4.53 | 3.73 | 4.00 |
| BARPLO-2 | <i>Articulate the ideas, events, and factors that have contributed to the development of world civilizations, and modern society and culture.</i> | 4.67 | 4.67 | 5.15 |
| BARPLO-3 | <i>Critically and constructively apply a Christian worldview as it relates to various disciplines.</i> | 3.13 | 3.60 | 3.80 |
| BARPLO-4 | <i>Demonstrate knowledge of the Bible, Christian theology, and church history with the purpose of ministry application.</i> | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.33 |
| BARPLO-5 | <i>Develop foundational skills for ministry and service in a local church.</i> | 4.87 | 4.47 | 4.07 |

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

Analysis

The committee observed that PLOs 1, 2, and 4 are fluctuating in place. While PLO—1 declined sharply in 2020-2021, it rebounded in 2021-2022.

PLO-3 is steadily climbing. It remains the lowest-scoring PLO, but the trend is upward.

PLO-5 is trending downward. It was the highest-scoring PLO in 2019-2020, but it has dropped over the past two years. The committee will focus its efforts on improving this PLO.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Change PLO-5 to read, “Apply foundational skills for ministry and service in a church and community.”
2. Develop bulleted subpoints for PLO-5 in the assessment rubric to provide more clarity as to the meaning of “foundational skills for ministry and service.”
3. Exclude from assessment any assignment that was graded by the professor-of-record with a D or lower.

Master of Arts in Apologetics

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MAAPLO-1 | <i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.</i> | 4.80 | 5.07 | 4.60 |
| MAAPLO-2 | <i>Relate the Church's theological heritage to current cultural and apologetical issues.</i> | 4.80 | 4.93 | 4.13 |
| MAAPLO-3 | <i>Articulate a rational and biblical case for the truth of Christianity.</i> | 5.33 | 5.33 | 4.60 |
| MAAPLO-4 | <i>Articulate a defense to major objections to Christianity.</i> | 5.27 | 5.20 | 4.80 |

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

Analysis

The Committee felt that the Capstone paper in AP6911 is ill-suited to assess all four of the program PLOs. Accordingly, the committee voted to adopt a portfolio method of assessment for the 2022-2023 assessment cycle.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Adopt a portfolio system of assessment. Assess the following PLOs according to the following student work samples:
 - a. PLO-1: AP5905 Major Writing Assignment
 - b. PLO-2: AP5906 Major Writing Assignment
 - c. PLO-3 and PLO-4: AP6907 Major Writing Assignment

Master of Arts in Biblical Counseling

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|-------------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| MABCPLO-1 | <i>Articulate a biblical philosophy of counseling.</i> | 5.27 | 4.87 | 4.67 |
| MABCPLO-2 | <i>Communicate biblical and theological truths through counseling.</i> | 5.13 | 5.00 | 4.73 |
| MABCPLO-3 | <i>Incorporate empathetic pastoral care or referral.</i> | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.8 |
| MABCPLO-4 | <i>Implement ethically and legally informed counseling practices.</i> | 5.13 | 4.80 | 4.8 |
| MABCPLO-5 | <i>Employ interpersonal skills in counseling.</i> | 5.13 | 5.00 | 5.07 |

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

Analysis

The committee observed that scores fall into the “Competent” and “Highly Competent” range.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. In the future, use the “Ethics Statement” discussion in CO6705 to assess PLO-4.

Master of Arts in Christian Studies

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MACSPLO-1 | <i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context</i> | 5.00 | 4.73 | 4.40 |
| MACSPLO-2 | <i>Demonstrate an understanding of Christian Theology</i> | 4.30 | 3.07 | 4.14 |
| MACSPLO-3 | <i>Communicate biblical and theological truths in writing</i> | 4.80 | 4.73 | 3.80 |

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

Analysis

The committee noted that scores have been decreasing steadily over the past three years and raised the topic of methodology. Does the selection of sub-par assignments predetermine the competency scores? Should and could student effort factor in to the statistical results?

The committee raised the issue of rubric clarity. What exactly is the difference between the numerical levels of competency on the rubric?

Ongoing problems with assessing PLO 2 were discussed. For those who participated in the MACS summer assessment, the consensus is that the assignment is not adequately focused on theology exclusively. The way the assignment is described and structured, student responses gravitate toward hermeneutics or apologetics rather than theology proper.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Create a list of criteria explaining the numerical values in the PLO rubric.
2. Pull only "C" graded assignments or better for assessment data.
3. Request from the theology department an assignment that is focused exclusively on theology proper. For the sake of assessment clarity and efficiency, the assignment should not include extra-disciplinary overlap (e.g. hermeneutics, apologetics, polemics, etc.).

Master of Arts in Leadership

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|-------------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| MALPLO-1 | <i>Employ research methods for organizational analysis and problem solving.</i> | 4.67 | 5.47 | 5.40 |
| MALPLO-2 | <i>Articulate a biblical philosophy of leading and following consistent with their vocation.</i> | 5.00 | 5.60 | 5.47 |
| MALPLO-3 | <i>Apply Christian leader and follower principles.</i> | 5.00 | 5.73 | 5.40 |
| MALPLO-4 | <i>Utilize leader and follower theories to diagnose and/or design organizations.</i> | 4.87 | 5.00 | 5.53 |

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

Analysis

The committee observes that all scores are in the “Very Competent” range. Accordingly, the committee recommends maintaining the current level of teaching and rigor.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Maintain the current level of teaching and rigor.

Master of Arts in Ministry

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MAMPLO-1 | <i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context</i> | 4.73 | 4.80 | 4.80 |
| MAMPLO-2 | <i>Utilize the Church's theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry</i> | 4.47 | 4.20 | 4.60 |
| MAMPLO-3 | <i>Evaluate ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment</i> | 4.73 | 4.87 | 4.93 |
| MAMPLO-4 | <i>Lead in developing, designing, and implementing ministry programs</i> | 4.60 | 4.40 | 3.13 |
| MAMPLO-5 | <i>Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or such other ways as may be appropriate</i> | 4.53 | 4.73 | 4.93 |

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

Analysis

The committee considers the PLOs to be representative of program curriculum. Likewise, it finds that students are performing at an acceptable or high level of achievement.

The one deficiency is in PLO 4. As observed by the assessors, the low score for this PLO is likely due to the structure of the major writing project for CM 7402. Therefore, in consultation with the committee, the professor will re-structure the assignment to address this PLO. The writing project, "My Philosophy of Ministry," will include a practical emphasis, reflecting the ability to develop, design, and implement a ministry program. This adjustment in the project will be reflected in the Fall 2023 course.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Restructure the "My Philosophy of Ministry" assignment in CM7402 to emphasize students' ability to develop, design, and implement a ministry program.

Master of Divinity

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MDIVPLO-1 | <i>Interpret the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context.</i> | 4.50 | 5.00 | 4.33 |
| MDIVPLO-2 | <i>Utilize the Church's historical and theological heritage as an important resource in their personal spiritual development and ministry.</i> | 4.33 | 4.73 | 4.33 |
| MDIVPLO-3 | <i>Articulate a biblical philosophy of ministry consistent with their vocation.</i> | 4.80 | 5.60 | 5.27 |
| MDIVPLO-4 | <i>Communicate biblical and theological truths through preaching, teaching, writing, or in such other ways as may be appropriate.</i> | 4.67 | 5.40 | 4.60 |
| MDIVPLO-5 | <i>Evaluate and develop ministries in light of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment.</i> | 4.80 | 5.53 | 4.93 |
| MDIVPLO-6 | <i>Accurately and empathetically evaluate people and their personal circumstances and provide appropriate pastoral care or referral.</i> | 4.73 | 5.40 | 4.80 |
| MDIVPLO-7 | <i>Lead in developing goals and designing and implementing ministry.</i> | 4.93 | 5.73 | 5.27 |
| MDIVPLO-8 | <i>Serve with Christian character in their personal and professional lives.</i> | 5.60 | 5.20 | 5.47 |

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

Analysis

The committee recommends a review of the criteria explaining the numerical values on the assessment rubric (the assessment scale 1-6). While a description of these numerical values is found in the 2020-2021 Assessment report in "Appendix A, A Description of Rubric Scores for Learning Outcomes," the committee believes that the assessment scale rankings need redefined to remove any subjective or nebulous statements from the descriptions resulting in clear sharp distinctions between each scale level. In addition, the appendix should be printed on the assessment rubrics themselves.

We recommend that the capstone course assignments included in the assessment do not include weekly quizzes or discussion boards. If discussion boards are included than at least include the prompt. The document for assessment becomes overwhelming for the purpose of assessment.

The committee recommends that it reevaluate MDiv PLO #8 "*Serve with Christian character in their personal and professional lives*" to determine whether the criteria in this PLO can be effectively assessed or not.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Review the criteria explaining the numerical values on the PLO assessment rubric.
2. Print the criteria on the PLO rubric itself.
3. Eliminate quizzes from the MDIV assessment portfolio.
4. Remove PLO-8 because there is no way to assess the PLO directly through course work within the program.

Doctor of Ministry

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | <u>2019-2020</u> | <u>2020-2021</u> | <u>2021-2022</u> |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| DMINPLO-1 | <i>Articulate and apply a biblical philosophy of ministry.</i> | 4.90 | 5.20 | 4.80 |
| DMINPLO-2 | <i>Evaluate ministry efforts for biblical veracity and effective ministry outcomes.</i> | 4.90 | 5.20 | 4.87 |
| DMINPLO-3 | <i>Design and implement effective strategies for ministry settings.</i> | 5.10 | 5.13 | 4.80 |
| DMINPLO-4 | <i>Communicate researched conclusions with competence and purpose.</i> | 5.10 | 5.20 | 4.87 |

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

Analysis

The committee observed that while scores have declined slightly for all PLOs, the scores still reflect a high degree of “Competence.” Slight fluctuations in score are to be expected and do not constitute cause for alarm. The committee will monitor scores during subsequent assessment cycles to determine the existence of any positive or negative trend.

Recommendations or Improvement

None at this time.

Course Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

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% |

2021-2022 Course Learning Outcomes

| Degree Program | A | B | C | SC | Total |
|----------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 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% |

Information Literacy Learning Outcomes Assessment Results

Undergraduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Frame 1.1 | Students look for indicators of quality when seeking information, distinguishing reliable from unreliable sources. | 4.80 | 4.93 | 3.93 |
| Frame 2.1 | Some variety evident in selection of sources. | 4.90 | 4.67 | 3.67 |
| Frame 3.1 | Students cite sources appropriately and relate sources' claims accurately. | 5.10 | 4.20 | 3.27 |
| Frame 4.1 | Students seek information from multiple perspectives. | 4.10 | 4.67 | 3.53 |
| Frame 5.1 | Students make an attempt to assess sources' logic and evidence instead of simply summarizing conclusions. | 4.10 | 4.47 | 3.60 |
| Frame 6.1 | Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately. | 3.20 | 4.60 | 4.13 |

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

Analysis

The Dean of the College and Seminary informed the committee that much of the downturn in scoring for 2021-2022 could be attributed to revisions made to the ILLO rubric. These revisions were made to eliminate unnecessary words and to focus each frame of the rubric on a single criterion. The resulting clarity and focus of the rubric enables more rigorous assessment.

As a result of the revision of the rubric, the committee considers the scores for 2021-2022 to establish a new baseline. While the committee will observe ILLO scores closely in future years, it does have several recommendations for immediate improvement.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Add a short "Library Introduction" video announcement to all 1000-level courses.
2. Link a longer "Library Tour" video to all undergraduate courses. This link will appear in the blue "Links" area of Blackboard.
3. Link the library's "Research Libguide" to all undergraduate courses. This link will also appear in the blue "Links" area of Blackboard.

Graduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Frame 1.2 | Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority. | 4.40 | 4.20 | 4.67 |
| Frame 2.2 | Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials. | 4.95 | 4.45 | 4.36 |
| Frame 3.2 | Students employ information ethically. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately. | 4.55 | 4.45 | 3.79 |
| Frame 4.2 | Students seek information from multiple perspectives. | 4.55 | 4.48 | 4.15 |
| 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. | 3.65 | 4.14 | 3.64 |
| Frame 6.2 | Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately. | 3.50 | 4.50 | 4.45 |

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

Recommendations for Improvement

MAA Committee

The MAA committee focused its efforts on improving Frame 2.1 and 2.2. They will add the following statement to all paper assignments within the program.

For the purpose of this assignment, the student is required to use not less than ____ sources. All sources are required to be scholarly in nature. The successful submission will include at least one source from each of the following: Scholarly Journals, Monographs, and Reference Material.

“Scholarly” means the author is a specialist in this field of study and has the academic qualifications, usually measured by earned degrees in the subject area, which allows that person to speak as an authority on the subject. No author name, no date of publication, no city of publication, no footnotes / endnotes / bibliography, or similar issues are a good warning sign that the source probably does not qualify as scholarly material.

Scholarly journals include sources such as “The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society”, “Biblia Sacra”, “Scottish Journal of Theology”, and others similar to these. The journals may be from Theology, Apologetics, Bibliology, or other field as appropriate based on the assignment. (As an example, see the following: <https://www-galaxie-com.us1.proxy.openathens.net/>). A scholarly journal article will cite at

least ten independent sources and be published in a peer-reviewed journal. The library's One SEARCH box includes a peer-review limiter to help you narrow down to these scholarly journals.

Monographs include books written by single or multiple authors and are the detailed study of a single specialized subject or some aspect of that specialized subject. A scholarly monograph will cite at least ten independent sources per chapter. (<https://www.library.lutherrice.edu>) Use the eBooks tab of the One SEARCH box to begin searching for eBooks.

Reference Material includes Commentaries, Handbooks, Bible dictionaries, Theological dictionaries, encyclopedias, language studies, Bible Reference Guide, etc. (As an example, see the following: <https://libguides.lutherrice.edu/biblreference>).

Likewise, the MAA committee will add the following statement to all discussion board assignments within the program:

3 scholarly sources are required for the initial post (only one source may be a course textbook). "Scholarly" means the author is a specialist in the field of study and has the academic qualifications, usually measured by earned degrees in the subject area, which allows that person to speak as an authority on the subject. No author name, no date of publication, no city of publication, no footnotes / endnotes / bibliography, or similar issues are a good warning sign that the source probably does not qualify as scholarly material.

MABC Committee

The MABC Committee will add instruction in information literacy to help students complete the "Bibliography" assignment in CO5701. This bibliography assignment is a component of the course's Major Writing Assignment.

MACS Committee

The MACS Committee proposed the following recommendations:

1. Create a list of criteria explaining the numerical values in the PLO rubric.
2. Pull only "C" graded assignments or better for assessment data.

MAM Committee

The MAM Committee is concerned about students' general weakness in technical writing skills, particularly grammar and formatting. The committee asserts that students who have done undergraduate work elsewhere would benefit from a Writing and Research Course. The committee is presently working on the following draft description of the course:

As professors, we have a desire to critically evaluate the content of our students' work to give constructive comments and grades. This desire is often diverted by having to deal with significant issues in basic grammar, sentence structure, and formatting of written work. To ensure that our master's-level students are writing at the proper academic level and are on a pathway to success in the program, we recommend:

1. *Every student entering the Master of Arts in Ministry program must complete a research and writing module in his or her first semester of the program.*
2. *This module would cover basic grammar and formatting for good academic writing.*

3. *This module does not have to be semester long and could be covered in as many or few lessons as needed.*
4. *The student would need to complete some form of evaluative assignment to confirm that he or she has taken the lessons.*

The form of the lessons, the evaluation of completion of the lessons, the credit hour(s) earned, and the cost involved is beyond the scope of this team and would need to be addressed by administration; however, whatever feedback from or questions directed to this team regarding these issues is welcomed.

Additional recommendations from the MAM Committee:

1. Revise Frame 3.2 to include the following: “according to the latest edition of *A Manual for Writers*.”
2. Revise Frame 4.2 as follows: “Students seek information from various biblical interpretive models and theological viewpoints, with emphases on significant historical perspectives.”
3. Revise Frame 5.2: “Students utilize critical thinking skills to evaluate (assess) various biblical interpretive models and theological viewpoints and engage these models and viewpoints in thoughtful conversation.”

MDIV Committee

The MDIV Committee proposed the following recommendation:

1. Use assignment that have been graded C or better. The reason for this recommendation is that a student who earns a D or less has already been identified as not competent by the professor.
2. Ensure that our rubrics for the major writing assignments are sufficient to measure the competencies found in the information literacy outcomes and that the rubrics have sufficient weight in the Turabian areas to make it worthwhile for the student to take Turabian seriously.
3. Professors should incorporate links in their Blackboard course directing students to the Research and Writing course or specific parts of the course.
4. The Center for Research and Writing course needs to have Turabian section 3, 4, and 15 included if they are not now part of the course.

Graduate Information Literacy Learning Outcomes – MAL

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Frame 1.2 | Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority. | 4.40 | 4.20 | 3.80 |
| Frame 2.2 | Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials. | 4.95 | 4.45 | 3.60 |
| Frame 3.2 | Students employ information ethically. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately. | 4.55 | 4.45 | 4.00 |
| Frame 4.2 | Students seek information from multiple perspectives. | 4.55 | 4.48 | 3.60 |
| 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. | 3.65 | 4.14 | 3.33 |
| Frame 6.2 | Students make a focused argument, limiting the scope of research appropriately. | 3.50 | 4.50 | 3.67 |

Analysis

1. Trend line goes down over the three years.
2. Would need to see specific data in order to determine specific reasons for this trend.
3. May be the result of more rigor grading on the part of the assessors.
4. What was the number of students assessed per year?

Recommendations

1. Frame 1.2: emphasize the use of bibliography listed in the text
2. Frame 2.2: use of journal articles required in all dialogue posts.
3. Frame 3.2: emphasize citations and the bibliography at the end of all posts
4. Frame 4.2: emphasize RPs as scholastically challenging the IP
5. Frame 5.2: emphasize comparisons and contrasts of articles within papers
6. Frame 6.2: emphasize staying on topic

Doctoral Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

| Outcome ID | Learning Outcome | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Frame 1.3 | Students use sources with an appropriate level of authority. | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.93 |
| Frame 2.3 | Students seek a wide range of sources in a variety of formats including journals, monographs, and reference materials. | 4.00 | 3.80 | 4.60 |
| Frame 3.3 | Students employ information ethically. Sources are quoted and cited appropriately. | 4.00 | 4.53 | 4.67 |
| Frame 4.3 | Students seek information from multiple perspectives and evaluate the changes in scholarly or critical consensus over time. | 3.71 | 4.53 | 4.00 |
| Frame 5.3 | Students evaluate sources' claims from a perspective of informed skepticism, critically assessing sources' logic and evidence rather than simply summarizing their conclusions. | 3.63 | 4.20 | 3.80 |
| Frame 6.3 | Students make meaningful contributions to the field of study. | 4.00 | 3.40 | 4.93 |

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

Analysis

The committee observed that frames 4.3 and 5.3 are more appropriate to the type of research required to earn a Ph.D. degree than that required to earn a DMIN degree. While Ph.D. research emphasizes textual analysis, DMIN research resembles social science closely in that it emphasizes human-subject research. While the DMIN program does require library research, this research typically explores different methods of solving a real-world problem instead of exploring different interpretations of a text. Accordingly, the DMIN committee proposes the following recommendations (please see below).

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Change Frame 4.3 to the following: "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)."
2. Change Frame 5.3 to the following: "Methodological research is intellectually rigorous. Student goes beyond merely summarizing what prior researchers have done by examining the reasons and rationales in their work."

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

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

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

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 – UCBS PLO Rubric

BI1200

Survey of Biblical Interpretation

Biblical Interpretation Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

| Program Learning Outcomes | | Levels of Competence | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|---|-----------|---|----------------|---|-----|
| | | Incompetent | | Competent | | Very Competent | | N/A |
| 1 | Introduce students to the knowledge of the Bible, theology, and church history with the purpose of ministry application | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | N/A |
| 2 | Practice foundational skills for ministry and service within a local church | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | N/A |

Notes:

Appendix F – GCBS PLO Rubric

NT5200

Introduction to the New Testament

Biblical Background Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

| Program Learning Outcomes | | Levels of Competence | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------|---|-----------|---|----------------|---|-----|
| | | Incompetent | | Competent | | Very Competent | | N/A |
| 1 | Introduce students to interpreting the Bible in light of its historical-grammatical context. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | N/A |
| 2 | Practice communicating biblical and theological truths in writing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | N/A |

Notes:

Appendix G – BAR PLO Rubric

BAR PLOs

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

| BAR PLO | | 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 H – MAA PLO Rubric

AP6911

Apologetics Capstone

Final Paper

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 |
| 2 | Relate the Church's theological heritage to current cultural and apologetic 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 I – MABC PLO Rubric

MABC PLOs

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 |
| 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 while counseling | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | N/A |

Notes:

Appendix J – MACS PLO Rubric

MACS PLOs

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 |
| 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 K – MAL PLO Rubric

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 L – MAM PLO Rubric

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 M – MDIV PLO Rubric

MDIV PLOs

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 |
| 2 | Utilize the Church's historical and theological heritage as an important resource in their personal and 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 N – DMIN PLO Rubric

DM9500 **Doctoral Ministry 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 O – ILLO Rubric, Undergraduate

EN1102 English Composition II Final Research Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

| <i>Information Literacy Learning Outcomes</i> | | <i>Levels of Competence</i> | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|---|------------|-----|
| | | <i>Incompetent</i> | <i>Competent</i> | | <i>Very Competent</i> | | <i>N/A</i> | |
| 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 P – ILLO Rubric, Graduate

BH5201

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 Q – ILLO Rubric, MAL

LD5802

Org Communication

Org Com Paper

Sample ID: _____

Year: _____

Assessor's Name: _____

| <i>Information Literacy Learning Outcomes</i> | | <i>Levels of Competence</i> | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------|---|---|-----------------------|------------|-----|
| | | <i>Incompetent</i> | <i>Competent</i> | | | <i>Very Competent</i> | <i>N/A</i> | |
| 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 R – ILLO Rubric, Doctoral

DM9500

Doctoral Ministry Project

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 | Students seek information from multiple perspectives and evaluate the changes in scholarly or critical consensus over time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | N/A |
| 5.3 | 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 |
| 6.3 | Students make meaningful contributions to the field of study. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | N/A |

Notes: