Assurance of Student Learning				
2018-2019				
Potter College of Arts and Letters	Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies			
769	- Religious Studies			

	ng Outcome 1: Students will be able to construct and effectively write a thesis for a research paper and defend that the	esis through	the use of
relevant literatur			
Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of Senior Seminar papers		
Based on your r	results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met
Student Learnin	ng Outcome 2: Students will be able to locate the relevant literature or resources for research paper.		<u> </u>
Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of Senior Seminar papers		
Based on your r	results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	<mark>Met</mark>	Not Met
Student Learnin	ng Outcome 3: Students will be able to utilize relevant literature or resources to defend research paper thesis.		
Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of Senior Seminar papers		
Based on your r	results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	Met	Not Met
Program Summ	lary		
our assessment p are intended.	Its from this assessment indicate that our learning outcomes do not accurately reflect what we intend students to learn process does not adequately assess what percentage of students are meeting the learning outcomes as stated or meeting		
<ol> <li>We have</li> <li>We have</li> <li>We have</li> <li>We have</li> <li>We have</li> <li>We have</li> <li>The second second</li></ol>	everal steps to address this: modified stated student learning outcomes so that each outcome can be assessed with one Leap VALUE rubric rather modified stated student learning outcomes so that the outcomes are distinct from each other. modified stated student learning outcomes so that the outcomes include only one outcome instead of several wrappe e decided to assess a higher quantity of artifacts for direct assessments so that the "percentage of program achieving curately reflects the actual percentage of the program achieving target. added one additional form of direct assessment and one form of indirect assessment per learning outcome so that our a the fullness of student learning and does not rely on only one measurement instrument.	d into one. g target" in o	our assessment
• The "per	he changes we have made: centage of program achieving target" reported in the assessment for each measurement in the assessment will more a am achieving target.	ccurately the	e actual percent

- The "percentage of program achieving target" will be at least 90%.
  The learning outcomes we are tracking will more accurately reflect what we want students in our program to learn.
- Our assessment methods will more accurately assess if students in our program are learning the things we want students to learn. ٠

		Student Learning (	Dutcome 1		
Student Learning Outcome	Students will be able	e to construct and effectively wri	te a thesis for a research paper and defend thesis	through the us	e of relevant
	literature and resource				
Measurement Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of S	Senior Seminar Papers			
Criteria for Student Success	<ul> <li>student success is as</li> <li>1. Critical Thin Capstone or</li> <li>2. Information</li> </ul>	follows (modified rubric attachen nking Leap VALUE Rubric: On Upper Milestone level.	ation literacy, inquiry and analysis, and written or ed): Student's Position (perspective, thesis/hypothesi. Paluate information and Its Sources Critically, st	s), students sho	ould score at
	3. Written Con Milestone le		ic: On Sources and Evidence, students should sc	ore at Capston	e or Upper
Program Success Target for t	his Measurement	90%	Percent of Program Achieving Target		75%
Methods	all identifiers remov faculty so that each between the two facu	ed. We then randomly selected 5 paper was read twice by two diff ulty members, a third faculty me ng was drawn from the Critical 7	ourse final paper were collected from all students 0% of those papers to assess. The papers were sperent reviewers. In the event there was a notable mber read it and the score was average between Thinking, Information Literacy, and Written Con	plit among two difference in t the three reade	full-time he score rs. The
Based on your results, circle	or highlight whether	the program met the goal Stud	lent Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision	-making process and a	actions planned for program imp	rovement. The actions should include a timeline	)	
		this learning outcome #1, were n	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet.	me #1, were s	ated and the
process for assessing if learning The student learning outcomes	g outcomes, including , as written, overlappe ne, were actually seve	this learning outcome #1, were red with each other and were rep		g this learning	outcome #1,
process for assessing if learning The student learning outcomes while written as a single outcom what we intend student to learn Further, given the process we o	g outcomes, including , as written, overlappe ne, were actually seven designed for this asses	this learning outcome #1, were need with each other and were repral outcomes wrapped up into on	net. etitive. Additionally several outcomes, including	g this learning utcomes so tha outcome) did	outcome #1, t they reflect not meet the

- We have modified student learning outcome, including this outcome #1, so that each outcome can be assessed with one Leap VALUE rubric rather than with several.
- We have modified student learning outcomes, including this outcome #1, so that the outcomes are distinct from each other.
- We have modified student learning outcomes, including this outcome #1, so that the outcomes include only one outcome instead of several wrapped into one.
- We have decided to assess a higher quantity of artifacts for direct assessments so that the "percentage of program achieving target" in our assessment more accurately reflects the actual percentage of the program achieving target.
- We have added one additional form of direct assessment and one form of indirect assessment so that our assessment more accurately captures the fullness of student learning and does not rely on only one measurement instrument.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

In the 2019-20 academic year:

- The "percentage of program achieving target" reported in the assessment for each measurement in the assessment will more accurately the actual percent of program achieving target.
- The "percentage of program achieving target" will be at least 90%.
- The learning outcomes we are tracking will more accurately reflect what we want students in our program to learn.
- Our assessment methods will more accurately assess if students in our program are learning the things we want students to learn.

	Capstone (4)	Upper Milestone (3)	Lower Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
Student's Thesis	Thesis is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Other points of views are synthesized.	Thesis takes into account the complexity of an issue, acknowledging other points of view.	Thesis acknowledges different sides of an issue	Thesis is stated, but simplistic and obvious.
Evaluate Information and Its Sources Critically	Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to religious studies and the thesis. Selects sources after considering the importance of relevance to research questions, authority, audience, and bias or point of view.	Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the religious studies and the thesis. Select sources using multiple criteria such as relevance to the research question, audience, and authority.	Choses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria such as relevant to the research question.	Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria such as relevance to the research question.

## **Rubric for Student Learning Outcome #1**

Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for religious studies research papers.	Demonstrates consistent use of relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for religious studies research papers.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for religious studies research papers.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in writing.
Uses Information to Accomplish a Specific Purpose (defend thesis)	Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources to defend thesis with clarity and depth	Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources to defend thesis.	Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the thesis is not adequately defended.	Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately so that the thesis is not adequately defended.

		Student Learning Out	tcome 2		
Student Learning Outcome	Students will be able	e to locate the relevant literature or	resources for research paper.		
Measurement Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of Senior Seminar Papers				
Criteria for Student Success	student success is as <b>1.</b> Information Milestone le	follows (modified rubric attached) Literacy VALUE Rubric: On Acce evel nmunication Leap VALUE Rubric:	on literacy, inquiry and analysis, and written o : ss the needed Information, students should sco On Sources and Evidence, students should sc	ore at Capston	e or Upper
Program Success Target for t	his Measurement	90%	Percent of Program Achieving Target		100%
Based on your results, circle of	faculty so that each p between the two fact rubric used for scori AAC&U.	paper was read twice by two differe ulty members, a third faculty memb	6 of those papers to assess. The papers were spent reviewers. In the event there was a notable per read it and the score was average between a Literacy and Written Communication Leap Vat Learning Outcome 2.	difference in t the three reade	he score ers. The
Actions (Describe the desision	making process and s	actions planned for program improv	vement. The actions should include a timeline		110011100
Our primary concerns were not process for assessing if learning The student learning outcomes, allowed a reliable assessment o students' ability to locate relev- reflect what we intend student t Further, given the process we c outcome, then it meant that we	t with student learning g outcomes, including as written, overlappe of student learning bas ant literature based or to learn and have adjust lesigned for this asses did not meet our "pro- s that we have 100%	g, per se, but with the way the lear this learning outcome #2, were me d with each other and were repetitive ed on the measurement instruments in the measurement instruments we sted measurement instruments so the ssment, if only one paper (of the for ogram success target" for that meas	ming outcomes, including this learning outco	me #2, were s as not worded lifficult to accu /differentiate o ning. outcome) did the program s	in a way that trately assess butcomes that not meet the uccess target
Below are the ways we have ad	dressed the challenge	s to outcomes and the process of as	sessing said outcomes.		

- We have modified student learning outcome, including this outcome #2, so that each outcome can be assessed with one Leap VALUE rubric rather than with several.
- We have modified student learning outcomes, including this outcome #2, so that the outcomes are distinct from each other.
- We have modified student learning outcomes, including this outcome #2, so that the outcomes are able to be measured by the instruments that we have available and plan to use.
- We have decided to assess a higher quantity of artifacts for direct assessments so that the "percentage of program achieving target" in our assessment more accurately reflects the actual percentage of the program achieving target.
- We have added one additional form of direct assessment and one form of indirect assessment so that our assessment more accurately captures the fullness of student learning and does not rely on only one measurement instrument.

#### Follow-Up

In the 2019-20 academic year:

- The "percentage of program achieving target" reported in the assessment for each measurement in the assessment will more accurately the actual percent of program achieving target.
- The "percentage of program achieving target" will be at least 90%.
- The learning outcomes we are tracking will more accurately reflect what we want students in our program to learn.
- Our assessment methods will more accurately assess if students in our program are learning the things we want students to learn.

### **Rubric for Student Learning Outcome #2**

	Capstone (4)	Upper Milestone (3)	Lower Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
Access the Needed Information	Accesses information using effective, well- designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources.	Access information using a variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search.	Access information using simple search strategies, retries information from limited and similar sources.	Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for religious studies research papers.	Demonstrates consistent use of relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for religious studies research papers.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for religious studies research papers.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in writing.

		Student Learning (	Dutcome 3		
Student Learning Outcome	Students will be able		esources to defend research paper thesis.		
Measurement Instrument 1	Analysis of Senior Se	eminar Papers			
Criteria for Student Success	Drawing from AAC&	&U VALUES rubrics for inform	ation literacy, inquiry and analysis, and written c	ommunication	n, criteria for
	student success is as	follows (modified rubric attache	ed):		
	1 Information	Literacy VALUE Dubrics On E	alusto information and the Sources Critically on	I Ugog Inform	ation to
			valuate information and Its Sources Critically and s), students should score at Capstone or Upper M		
			ric: On <i>Sources and Evidence</i> , students should sco		
	Milestone le	vel.		L	
Program Success Target for	this Measurement	90%	Percent of Program Achieving Target		75%
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from	n the senior seminar capstone co	burse final paper were collected from all students	in the course	(N=8) and
			50% of those papers to assess. The papers were sp		
	faculty so that each p	aper was read twice by two diff	erent reviewers. In the event there was a notable	difference in	the score
			mber read it and the score was average between t		
		ng was drawn from the Informat	ion Literacy, and Written Communication Leap V	ALUE Rubr	ics from
	AAC&U.				
Paged on your regults single	 or highlight whothor i	the program met the goal Stud	lont Looming Outcome 3		
based on your results, circle	or mgninght whether	the program met the goal Stud	ient Learning Outcome 5.		
				Met	Not Met
				Met	<mark>Not Met</mark>
Actions (Describe the decision	-making process and a	ctions planned for program imp	rovement. The actions should include a timeline.		Not Met
			rovement. The actions should include a timeline. earning outcomes, including this learning outcom	)	
Our primary concerns were no	ot with student learning		earning outcomes, including this learning outcor	)	
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin	t with student learning outcomes, including	g, per se, but with the way the l this learning outcome #3, were a	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet.	) ne #3, were s	tated and the
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin The student learning outcomes,	t with student learning outcomes, including	g, per se, but with the way the l this learning outcome #3, were a	earning outcomes, including this learning outcor	) ne #3, were s	tated and the
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin	t with student learning outcomes, including	g, per se, but with the way the l this learning outcome #3, were a	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet.	) ne #3, were s	tated and the
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin. The student learning outcomes, we intend student to learn.	ot with student learning g outcomes, including , as written, overlapped	this learning outcome #3, were not with each other and were repeti	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet. tive. Thus we have worked to clarify/differentiate	) ne #3, were s outcomes tha	tated and the
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin The student learning outcomes, we intend student to learn. Further, given the process we	ot with student learning g outcomes, including , as written, overlapped designed for this asses	g, per se, but with the way the l this learning outcome #3, were r with each other and were repeti sment, if only one paper (of the	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet. tive. Thus we have worked to clarify/differentiate four randomly selected papers assessed for this	) ne #3, were s outcomes tha outcome) did	tated and the t reflect what not meet the
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin The student learning outcomes, we intend student to learn. Further, given the process we outcome, then it meant that we	ot with student learning g outcomes, including , as written, overlapped designed for this asses did not meet our "pro	g, per se, but with the way the l this learning outcome #3, were r with each other and were repeti sment, if only one paper (of the gram success target" for that me	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet. tive. Thus we have worked to clarify/differentiate	) ne #3, were s outcomes tha outcome) did the program s	tated and the t reflect what not meet the success target
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin The student learning outcomes, we intend student to learn. Further, given the process we outcome, then it meant that we	ot with student learning g outcomes, including , as written, overlapped designed for this assess did not meet our "prog rs that we have 100%	g, per se, but with the way the l this learning outcome #3, were r with each other and were repeti sment, if only one paper (of the gram success target" for that me	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet. tive. Thus we have worked to clarify/differentiate four randomly selected papers assessed for this easurement. Likewise, if all papers assessed met	) ne #3, were s outcomes tha outcome) did the program s	tated and the t reflect what not meet the success target
Our primary concerns were no process for assessing if learnin The student learning outcomes, we intend student to learn. Further, given the process we outcome, then it meant that we for this measurement, it appea program was achieving the targ	ot with student learning g outcomes, including , as written, overlapped designed for this assess did not meet our "prog rs that we have 100% get.	g, per se, but with the way the l this learning outcome #3, were r with each other and were repeti sment, if only one paper (of the gram success target" for that me	earning outcomes, including this learning outcomet. tive. Thus we have worked to clarify/differentiate four randomly selected papers assessed for this easurement. Likewise, if all papers assessed met eving the garget. This does not adequately conve	) ne #3, were s outcomes tha outcome) did the program s	tated and the t reflect what not meet the success target

- We have modified student learning outcome, including this outcome #3, so that each outcome can be assessed with one Leap VALUE rubric rather than with several.
- We have modified student learning outcomes, including this outcome #3, so that the outcomes are distinct from each other.
- We have modified student learning outcomes, including this outcome #3, so that the outcomes include only one outcome instead of several wrapped into one.
- We have decided to assess a higher quantity of artifacts for direct assessments so that the "percentage of program achieving target" in our assessment more accurately reflects the actual percentage of the program achieving target.
- We have added one additional form of direct assessment and one form of indirect assessment so that our assessment more accurately captures the fullness of student learning and does not rely on only one measurement instrument.

# Follow-Up

In the 2019-20 academic year:

- The "percentage of program achieving target" reported in the assessment for each measurement in the assessment will more accurately the actual percent of program achieving target.
- The "percentage of program achieving target" will be at least 90%.
- The learning outcomes we are tracking will more accurately reflect what we want students in our program to learn.
- Our assessment methods will more accurately assess if students in our program are learning the things we want students to learn.

## **Rubric for Student Learning Outcome #3**

	Capstone (4)	Upper Milestone (3)	Lower Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
Evaluate	Chooses a variety of	Chooses a variety of	Choses a variety of information sources.	Chooses a few information sources.
Information and	information sources	information sources	Selects sources using basic criteria such	Selects sources using limited
Its Sources	appropriate to religious	appropriate to the religious	as relevant to the research question.	criteria such as relevance to the
Critically	studies and the thesis.	studies and the thesis. Select		research question.
	Selects sources after	sources using multiple		
	considering the	criteria such as relevance to		
	importance of relevance	the research question,		
	to research questions,	audience, and authority.		
	authority, audience, and			
	bias or point of view.			
Sources and	Demonstrates skillful use	Demonstrates consistent use	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible	Demonstrates an attempt to use
Evidence	of high-quality, credible,	of relevant sources to	and/or relevant sources to support ideas	sources to support ideas in writing.
	relevant sources to	support ideas that are	that are appropriate for religious studies	
	develop ideas that are	appropriate for religious	research papers.	
	appropriate for religious	studies research papers.		
	studies research papers.			

Uses Information	Communicates,	Communicates, organizes,	Communicates and organizes	Communicates information from
to Accomplish a	organizes, and	and synthesizes information	information from sources. The	sources. The information is
Specific Purpose	synthesizes information	from sources to defend	information is not yet synthesized, so the	fragmented and/or used
(defend thesis)	from sources to defend	thesis.	thesis is not adequately defended.	inappropriately so that the thesis is
	thesis with clarity and			not adequately defended.
	depth			