

School of Theology and Christian Ministry
Core Competencies, Fa2021 - Sp2022

Learning Outcome: Core Competencies, Critical Thinking/Reading

Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

Specialized Knowledge

Broad Integrative Knowledge

Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies

Applied and Collaborative Learning, and

Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient

	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22
ETS Proficiency	85.7%	75%	71.4%	91.7%	80%	41.7%	37.5%	77.8%	83.3%
Profile Level 2	N=7	N=4	N=7	N=12	N=10	N=12	N=8	N=9	N=6
Critical Thinking									

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Christian Studies and Philosophy students scored above the criteria for success for critical thinking, except in 18-19 and 19-20. We will further monitor these results. One reason for low scores may be due to the stress of going online to remote learning during Covid-19. Student scores improved in 21-22.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes to the program.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

Learning Outcome: Core Competencies, Writing

Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through written communication.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Writing.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- Specialized Knowledge
- Broad Integrative Knowledge
- Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies**
- Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient								
	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22
ETS Proficiency	85.7%	75%	85.7%	83.3%	80%	66.7%	37.5%	55.6%	66.7%
Profile Level 2	N=7	N=4	N=7	N=12	N=10	N=12	N=8	N=9	N=6
Writing									

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Christian Studies and Philosophy students scored above the criteria for success for writing until 18-19 when the scores dipped slightly below 70%. Then scores plummeted in 19-20. One reason for low scores may be due to the stress of going online to remote learning during Covid-19. We will continue to monitor these results. Student scores improved in 21-22.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes to the program.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

Learning Outcome: Core Competencies, Quantitative Reasoning/Math

Students will be able to solve problems that are quantitative in nature.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Math.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- Specialized Knowledge
- Broad Integrative Knowledge
- Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies**
- Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient								
	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22
ETS Proficiency	85.7%	75%	71.4%	75%	80%	50.0%	25%	66.7%	50.0%
Profile Level 2	N=7	N=4	N=7	N=12	N=10	N=12	N=8	N=9	N=6
Math									

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Christian Studies and Philosophy students scored above the criteria for success for writing until 18-19 when the scores dipped below 70%. Then scores plummeted in 19-20. One reason for low scores may be due to the stress of going online to remote learning during Covid-19. We will continue to monitor these results. Math continues to be our student's weakest test score. Christian Studies and Philosophy courses seem to focus more on qualitative learning than quantitative learning. We will continue to monitor our students and these scores.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes to the program.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

Learning Outcome: Core Competencies, Oral Communication

Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through oral communication.

Outcome Measure:

SP22 CMI 3000 Teaching and Preaching the Bible

Signature Assignment: Students will preach a sermon before their peers, receive feedback from peers and professors.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

75% of the students will receive a competent or higher score (score 15 or above)

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

Specialized Knowledge

Broad Integrative Knowledge

Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies

Applied and Collaborative Learning, and

Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Competent or Higher				
	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22
Oral Communication: Preaching a Sermon	87.5% N=8	85.0% N=20	100% N=11	100% N=6	100% N=10

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The assignment adequately challenged the students to preach in front of their peers with skill and competence. Students are prepared and ready for oral presentation and preaching.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes needed.

Rubric Used

1. Sermons will be faithful to the themes and doctrines of biblical text
2. Sermons will follow a particular form of preaching
3. Sermons will be delivered with appealing vocal qualities
4. Sermons will include a call to deeper discipleship

	Excellent 20 19 18	Competent 17 16 15	Needs Work 14 13 12
General Content	The sermon demonstrates accurate understanding of the sermon form and biblical faithfulness	The sermon shows basic understanding of the sermon form and biblical faithfulness	The sermon was not coherent or faithful to the biblical text.
	Excellent 20 19 18	Competent 17 16 15	Needs Work 14 13 12
Creativity and Communication	The sermon was well delivered, flowed easily and was appropriately crafted for the context of worship.	The sermon was adequately led, generally flowed well and was generally applicable for the context of worship.	The sermon was not well delivered, it did not flow easily, or was not appropriately crafted for the context of worship.
	Excellent 20 19 18	Competent 17 16 15	Needs Work 14 13 12
Call to Action	The sermon called the listeners to deeper discipleship and action.	The sermon gave some suggestions for deeper discipleship and action.	The sermon did not include a call to deeper discipleship or action.

Learning Outcome: Core Competencies, Information Literacy

Students will be able to use information effectively. Students will be able to access and cite information as well as evaluate the logic, validity, and relevance of information from a variety of sources.

Outcome Measure:

SP22 THE4095 Christian Studies Senior Capstone: Justice in the Church

Signature Assignment: Oral Exam, including presentation and discussion on semester term paper (Oikos Paper) in seminar setting.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

80% of students will score distinguished or commendable. 80% or above.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- Specialized Knowledge
- Broad Integrative Knowledge
- Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies**
- Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students Distinguished or Commendable			
	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22
Info Literacy: Final Paper	100% N=12	67% N=9	100% N=11	100% N=6

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Students reflected weekly on major themes and connected with learning across their college career and disciplines. We received strong feedback on using case studies to integrate their learning over four years. We will add more of this approach in the coming year. The students' final papers exhibited a strong level of vocational awareness and academic skill. The same approach to the class is recommended going forward.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Data from the previous year led us to determine the need to add weekly building blocks to help students recall and reconnect previous learning with new course material for the final cumulative paper. Even with the near/far, hybrid classroom due to Covid-19, the students did exceptionally well. Spring 2020 was the lowest score and this is most likely due to moving to remote learning and stress of Covid-19.

Students reflected weekly on major themes and connected with learning across their college career and disciplines. We received strong feedback on using case studies to integrate their learning over four years. We will add more of this approach in the coming year. The students' final papers exhibited a strong level of vocational awareness and academic skill. The same approach to the class is recommended going forward.

Rubric Used

	Distinguished (5) (90-100%)	Commendable (4) (80-89%)	Adequate/Sufficient (3) (70-79%)	Minimal (2) (60-69%)	Unacceptable (1) (50-59%)
Organization	The paper has 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 paper has 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 don't seem to be clearly related to the overall thesis.	The paper's theme or argument is 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 paper's theme or argument is somewhat apparent but is presented in unclear or confusing ways. Transitions are often weak or illogical. Topic sentences don't clearly declare the subject of the paragraph, or the paragraphs drift from their topics.	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 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 is clear and concepts are articulated relatively effectively.	The paper tends toward vagueness and its ideas or arguments are difficult to identify. The paper lacks depth and insight.	The paper 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 uses an appropriate number of substantive sources and consistently utilizes an accepted academic citation style (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	The paper 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	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.