

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Learning Outcome to be assessed:

Program Learning Outcome 1: Interpret scripture evidencing biblical literacy

Outcome Measure (assignment and schedule):

Signature Assignment: BIB 240 Contextual Bible Interpretation (Fall 2018; Nov. 27)

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Students are to score 80% or higher on distinguished or commendable.

Longitudinal Data Table: First time assessed in the new curriculum revision.

USE OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The results are:

Distinguished (90-100) **8 students**

Commendable (80-89) **3 students**

Adequate (70-79) **1 student**

Minimal (60-69)

Failure (59-0)

Changes to be Made Based on Data: Consider re-weighting format (currently 90% written)

Rubric Used: See below

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

BIB 240 Contextual Bible Interpretation

Rubric:

0-15 = Failed
16-23 = Below Expectations
24-27 = Met expectations
28-30 = Exceeded Expectations

Rubric (oral synthesis):

0-5 = Failed
6-7 = Below Expectations
8 = Met expectations
9-10 = Exceeded Expectations

Student	Textual Analysis (0-30)	Summary of Scholarship (0-30)	Contextual Analysis (0-30)	Oral Synthesis (0-10)	Total Score (0-100)
#1	30	30	30	9	99
#2	25	25	30	8	88
#3	27	30	28	9	94
#4	25	25	28	10	88
#5	28	28	28	10	94
#6	28	28	28	9	93
#7	28	28	30	9	95
#8	30	27	30	8	95
#9	28	27	28	9	92
#10	28	25	28	8	89
#11	30	28	30	9	97
#12	25	24	22	8	79

Contextual Analysis Instructions

Textual Analysis

Refer to Gorman (Elements of Biblical Exegesis), chapters 2-6

Address the genre of the passage, characterization (as discussed in class), content (plot for narratives), and the literary context of the passage (in the surrounding chapters, and in the book as a whole). Also, discuss relevant literary forms (Gorman, ch.5) and intertextuality (Gorman, ch.6) as it applies to your passage. Finally, describe specific aspects of your passage that point to ancient cultural contexts. At this stage, you do not need to do additional research about the cultural context of your passage. Rather, indicate what cultural issues you will need to research, and how understanding them better will clarify your interpretation of the passage.

Summary of Scholarship

Summarize existing scholarly and ecclesial interpretations of your chosen text. You must cite **at least six** scholarly interpreters in your essay. At least two interpreters must provide commentary on the original audience(s) of the passage. This is your chance to investigate what scholars have said about the cultural context issues you raised in your Textual Analysis essay. At least one interpreter must discuss relevant themes raised in the passage. At least one interpreter must articulate an *application* of the text for a contemporary audience. In this final section of the essay, explore some ways in which scholars and/or ecclesial leaders have applied this text for communities of faith. The goal of this part of the essay is to spark your imagination about possible ways *you* could apply the text in your context. Be sure to briefly describe the interpreter's context and audience.

Contextual Analysis

1. Articulate your own context
 - a. Rewrite your synthesis of your chosen passage
 - b. Take notes on Gottwald's Contextual Analysis (handout) as applied to yourself
 - c. Write about how your answers to (b) have influenced the passage you chose and your synthesis of it. Why are the themes you have chosen to focus on important to you?
2. Describe in detail the context of the audience of your interpretation

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

- a. Take notes on Gottwald's Contextual Analysis (handout) as applied to your audience. Your audience could be just one person or a large audience with diverse perspectives.
 - b. Identify *what* theme and/or application of your interpretation would be helpful to your specific audience, remembering the function of Scripture as a guide to salvation and a life of righteousness.
 - i. Review the "reflection" sections of the exegesis examples in appendix C of Gorman's book.
3. Evaluate *how* you can best communicate your interpretation to your particular audience
- a. What groundwork would you need to lay to communicate your message effectively? In other words, does your audience already trust you as an interpreter of God's Word, or do you need to establish trust? Is your audience likely to quickly accept your interpretation, or will they be suspicious of any aspect of it?
 - b. What format would you use? A sermon, bible study, a conversation, service project, work of art, etc.

Oral Synthesis

In 10-12 minutes, teach the class about your Scripture passage and your interpretation of it. Do not include every detail from your paper. Instead, highlight the most important points in an interesting and engaging manner. Leave time for discussion with your classmates about how you could best communicate your interpretation to the audience you chose for your paper. The best presentations will include either: engaging use of media, class activity, or other creative facilitation of learning.

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Learning Outcome to be assessed:

Program Learning Outcome 2: Articulate clear theological doctrines relevant to Christian life and ministry

Outcome Measure (assignment and schedule):

Signature Assignment: THE 250: 10-12-page research paper addressing a particular doctrine, theologian, or theological controversy that is relevant to the course materials.

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Students are to score 80% or higher on distinguished or commendable.

Longitudinal Data Table: First time assessed in the new curriculum revision.

USE OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The results are:

Distinguished (90-100) – six students

Commendable (80-89) – two students

Adequate (70-79) – three students

Minimal (60-69) –

Failure (59-0) –

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes in particular; I plan on continuing to utilize a book specifically devoted to organizing and writing theological papers, and to give further, deeper attention in class discussion to that important aspect of scholarship.

Rubric Used:

See below

Template No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

Grading Rubric:

	Distinguished (5) (90 – 100%)	Commendable (4) (80 – 89%)	Adequate (3) (70 – 79%)	Minimal (2) (60 – 69%)	Unacceptable (1) (50 – 59%)
Organization	The reflections have a clear structure. Each paragraph is concise and talks about only one idea. There are transitions between paragraphs that create a logical progression. The progression builds from premise(s) to conclusion in a way that supports the thesis.	The reflections have a clear recognizable structure but is not always easy to follow due to some disordered paragraphs or weak transitions. Some paragraphs attempt too much. Others do not seem to be clearly related to the overall thesis.	The reflections are apparent but can be a bit confusing, with jumps or missing logic. Transitions tend to be weak or illogical. Topic sentences don't clearly declare the subject of the paragraph, or the paragraphs drift from their topics.	The reflections are apparent but is very confusing. Transitions are often weak or illogical. Topic sentences don't clearly declare the subject of the paragraph, or the paragraph, or the paragraphs drift from their topics.	There is no recognizable structure. Sentences and / or paragraphs drift from idea to idea. The essay lacks transitions between paragraphs.
Content	The reflections are very clear and concepts are articulated. The student limited the scope of the paper enabling them to add depth to the argument.	The reflections are clear and concepts are articulated. The student paper lacks depth and insight.	The reflections are vague and the concepts are lacking. The student's paper lacks depth and insight.	The reflections are significantly vague and the concepts are significantly lacking in depth and insight.	The reflections are not clear and concepts are not present. The paper's content is very poor.
Sources and Citation	The paper uses the appropriate number of substantive sources and used a professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	The paper uses the appropriate number of substantive sources but only uses some of the professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Few of the sources are substantive. Most are used peripherally. For the most part, the paper consistently and accurately uses a professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Few of the sources are substantive. Most are used peripherally. The paper does not use a professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	No sources or citation page.

<p>Writing and Grammar</p>	<p>Sentences are clear and concise, with college-level diction. There is variation in sentence structure. There are no significant errors in spelling, grammar, or formatting.</p>	<p>Sentences not always clear and with some informal diction. Sentence structure is generally varied. There are very few errors in spelling, grammar, or formatting</p>	<p>Some sentences lack clarity. Little sentence variety. Diction is informal or simplistic. Spelling, grammar, and / or format errors occasionally become distracting.</p>	<p>Sentence structure is repetitive or simple. Diction is inappropriate for college writing. Spelling, grammar, or format errors overwhelm the reader</p>	<p>The writing made the paper very difficult to read and to follow. Significant improvement is needed.</p>
----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING
<p>Learning Outcome to be assessed: Program Learning Outcome 3: Engage the perennial questions of the human condition using resources from philosophy</p> <p>Outcome Measure (assignment and schedule): Signature Assignment: Exam on speaking meaningfully about God</p> <p>Criteria for Success (if applicable): We would like 75% of our students to achieve proficient or above.</p> <p>Longitudinal Data Table: First time assessed in the new curriculum revision.</p>

USE OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING
<p>Conclusions Drawn from Data:</p> <p>I had 9 CS majors in my class and 100 % scored at least 80% on the exam (100% were at least proficient)</p>
<p>Changes to be Made Based on Data:</p> <p>Maybe the exam needs to be harder</p> <p>Rubric Used: See below</p>

Rubric Used:

Failure: Shows minimal engagement with the topic. Failing to recognize multiple dimensions or perspectives; lacking even basic observations

Basic: Shows some engagement with the topic without elaboration; offers basic observations but rarely original insight

Proficient: Demonstrates engagement with the topic, recognizing multiple dimension and/ or perspectives; offers some insight

Excellent: Demonstrates engagement with the topic, recognizing multiple dimensions and/or perspectives with elaboration and depth, offers considerable insight

*See www.roanoke.edu for source.

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Learning Outcome to be assessed:

Program Learning Outcome 4: Apply principles of Christian formation for the practice of ministry.

Outcome Measure (assignment and schedule):

Signature Assignment: CMI155 Spiritual Formation Project. Students are to design a retreat or monthly series of lessons for a particular age group (children, youth, adults) on spiritual practices. The project includes a 1000-1250-word summary of materials.

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Students are to score 80% or higher on distinguished or commendable.

Longitudinal Data Table: Third time assessed in the new curriculum revision.

USE OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

There were 23 students in the class and 20/23 scored 80% (distinguished or commendable).

The results are:

Distinguished (90-100)—10 students

Commendable (80-89)—10 students

Adequate (70-79)-1 student

Minimal (60-69)-0 students

Failure (59-0)-2 student

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The scores indicate that students understand the content of Spiritual formational practices and know how to contextualize them in a teaching context. Students provided strong evidence of the formational practices learned in the class. More clear expectations about how to complete spiritual formational practices are needed to provide students with more clarity in the assignment.

Rubric Used:

See below

Template No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

Grading Rubric:

	Distinguished (5) (90 – 100%)	Commendable (4) (80 – 89%)	Adequate (3) (70 – 79%)	Minimal (2) (60 – 69%)	Unacceptable (1) (50 – 59%)
Organization	The reflections have a clear structure. Each paragraph is concise and talks about only one idea. There are transitions between paragraphs that create a logical progression. The progression builds from premise(s) to conclusion in a way that supports the thesis.	The reflections have a clear recognizable structure but is not always easy to follow due to some disordered paragraphs or weak transitions. Some paragraphs attempt too much. Others do not seem to be clearly related to the overall thesis.	The reflections are apparent but can be a bit confusing, with jumps or missing logic. Transitions tend to be weak or illogical. Topic sentences don't clearly declare the subject of the paragraph, or the paragraphs drift from their topics.	The reflections are apparent but is very confusing. Transitions are often weak or illogical. Topic sentences don't clearly declare the subject of the paragraph, or the paragraph, or the paragraphs drift from their topics.	There is no recognizable structure. Sentences and / or paragraphs drift from idea to idea. The essay lacks transitions between paragraphs.
Content	The reflections are very clear and concepts are articulated. The student limited the scope of the paper enabling them to add depth to the argument.	The reflections are clear and concepts are articulated. The student paper lacks depth and insight.	The reflections are vague and the concepts are lacking. The student's paper lacks depth and insight.	The reflections are significantly vague and the concepts are significantly lacking in depth and insight.	The reflections are not clear and concepts are not present. The paper's content is very poor.
Sources and Citation	The paper uses the appropriate number of substantive sources and used a professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	The paper uses the appropriate number of substantive sources but only uses some of the professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Few of the sources are substantive. Most are used peripherally. For the most part, the paper consistently and accurately uses a professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Few of the sources are substantive. Most are used peripherally. The paper does not use a professional citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	No sources or citation page.

<p>Writing and Grammar</p>	<p>Sentences are clear and concise, with college-level diction. There is variation in sentence structure. There are no significant errors in spelling, grammar, or formatting.</p>	<p>Sentences not always clear and with some informal diction. Sentence structure is generally varied. There are very few errors in spelling, grammar, or formatting</p>	<p>Some sentences lack clarity. Little sentence variety. Diction is informal or simplistic. Spelling, grammar, and / or format errors occasionally become distracting.</p>	<p>Sentence structure is repetitive or simple. Diction is inappropriate for college writing. Spelling, grammar, or format errors overwhelm the reader</p>	<p>The writing made the paper very difficult to read and to follow. Significant improvement is needed.</p>
----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Learning Outcome to be assessed:

Program Learning Outcome 1: Interpret scripture evidencing biblical literacy

Program Learning Outcome 2: Articulate clear theological doctrines relevant to Christian life and ministry

Program Learning Outcome 3: Engage the perennial questions of the human condition using resources from philosophy

Program Learning Outcomes 4: Apply principles of Christian formation for the practice of ministry

Outcome Measure (assignment and schedule):

- 1) **Signature Assignment:** Oral exam, including presentation and discussion of semester term paper in seminar setting.

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

Students are to score 80% or higher on distinguished or commendable.

Longitudinal Data Table: Second time assessed in the new curriculum revision.

USE OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The results are:

Distinguished (90-100): seven students

Commendable (80-89): five students

Adequate (70-79):

Minimal (60-69):

Failure (59-0)

Changes to be Made Based on Data: No changes to be made based on data.

This was a remarkable graduating class.

TEMPLATE No. 3: Assessment Data for the Evidence of Student Learning and the Use of Evidence

Rubric Used:

Grading Rubric

	Distinguished (5) (90-100%)	Commendable (4) (80-89%)	Adequate/Sufficient (3) (70-79%)	Minimal (2) (60-69%)	Unacceptable (1) (50-59%)
Organization	The presentation of ideas is clear. Student displays effective understanding of Scripture, theology and pertinent philosophical ideas. Student is able to respond thoughtfully to questions and comments from professor and peers.	The presentation of ideas is relatively clear and coherent, but not always easy to follow due to some vague ideas or weak transitions. Some errors in theological ideas, but not to overall detriment of oral performance. Student's responses to questions reflect good but not excellent understanding of issues.	The presentation of ideas is adequate but perfunctory with minimal appreciation for further implications. Understanding of scriptural, theological or philosophical concepts and implications for presentation acceptable, but deeper understanding is lacking. Student's responses to questions from professor or peers may miss the point.	The presentation of ideas is vague, disconnected and ineffective. Minimal appreciation of relevant scriptural, theological or philosophical concepts and their implications. Student misunderstands questions from professor or peers and shows little capacity for serious reflection.	There is no recognizable structure in the paper. Sentences and/or paragraphs drift from idea to idea. The essay lacks transitions between paragraphs.
Content	The paper on which oral presentation and exam are based is very clear and concepts are articulated. The student limited the scope of the paper, enabling him or her to add depth to the argument.	The paper on which oral presentation and exam are based is clear and concepts are articulated relatively effectively.	The paper on which oral presentation and exam are based tends toward vagueness and its ideas or arguments are difficult to identify. The paper lacks depth and insight.	The paper on which the oral presentation and exam are based is significantly vague and its ideas significantly lacking in substance, depth, and insight.	The paper is not clear and lacking in real content.
Sources and Citation	The paper on which oral presentation and exam are based uses an appropriate number of substantive sources and consistently utilizes an accepted academic citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	The paper on which the oral presentation and exam are based uses an appropriate number of substantive sources but is inconsistent in its usage of an academic citation style.	Few of the sources are substantive. Most are used peripherally. For the most part, the paper consistently and accurately uses an academic citation style.	Few if any of the sources are substantive. Most are used peripherally. The paper demonstrates no serious awareness of academic citation style.	No sources or citation page., or if present, is entirely lacking in proper utilization or documentation of sources.
Writing and Grammar	In the paper on which the oral presentation and exam are based, sentences are clear and concise, with college-level diction. There is variation in sentence structure. There are no more than a few errors in spelling, grammar, or format.	Sentences not always clear and with some informal or inappropriate diction. Sentence structure is generally varied. There are some errors in spelling, grammar, or format, but not so many as to be distracting.	Some sentences lack clarity. Little sentence variety. Diction is informal or simplistic. Spelling, grammar, and/or format errors occasionally become distracting.	Sentence structure is repetitive or simple. Diction is inappropriate for college writing. Spelling, grammar, or format errors overwhelm the reader.	The writing made the paper very difficult to read and to follow. Significant improvement is needed.