School of Theology and Christian Ministry
Program Learning Outcomes Data for Christian Studies, Fa2023 - Sp2024

Learning Outcome: PLO1
Interpret scripture evidencing biblical literacy.

Outcome Measure:
BIB2040, Reading Scripture Faithfully (Offered Fall Annually)
Signature Assignment: Each student will prepare a presentation of their Contextual Bible interpretation, to be posted online and viewable to their classmates. Students may prepare either:
● a professional report presenting to the class the most helpful findings from each of the three sub-sections of the essay (textual analysis, scholarship, contextual application),
OR
● a creative application of the CBI (Bible study, devotional, ministry application, artwork, etc.)

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):
80% of the students will achieve distinguished or commendable.

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
Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

PLO1	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23	23-24
Percent Distinguished or Commendable	92% N=12	94% N=17	88% N=17	93% N=14	100% N=14	94% N=16

Conclusions Drawn from Data:
The assignment is scaffolded well throughout the semester and students excel and show excellent growth. This assessment is to be maintained.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:
No changes are needed.

Rubric Used
Distinguished = 90-100 on the rubric
Commendable = 80-89 on the rubric

BIB 2040 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	0	0	0	0	0
#2	30	30	30	9.83	99.83
#3	29	30	30	10	99
#4	30	29	30	9.66	98.66
#5	30	26	30	10	96
#6	30	28	25	9.66	92.66
#7	30	27	26	10	93
#8	30	30	30	10	100
#9	29	26	30	9.83	94.83
#10	30	30	30	10	100
#11	26	29	14	9.33	78.33
#12	29	25	30	9.5	93.5
#13	30	26	30	9.83	95.83
#14	30	30	30	9.83	99.83

Detailed rubrics for each scaffolded assignment

BIB 2040 Summary of Scholarship Essay – Rubric
Heavily adapted from Dr. Sophia McClennen's general evaluation rubric (Penn State)
Superior Paper (A/A-)
Content: Clearly and succinctly summarizes scholarly opinions on these key issues:
- Issues of cultural context (multiple issues considered)
- Relevant themes in the passage
- Applications for a contemporary audience

A superior paper will cite **more than one** scholarly source for each of the above...
...and will cite scholarly research on *some* of these additional points:
- Intertextuality
- Relevant literary forms
- Subgenre of passage
- Literary context
- Characterization

Style:
- Easily discernible, plausible thesis
- Paragraphs support thesis statement.
- Excellent transitions between paragraphs
- Conclusion summarizes how the body of the essay supported the thesis

Mechanics:
- Excellent sentence structure and grammar
- Little to no spelling errors, run-on sentences, or incomplete sentences

- All biblical citations properly cited

Good Paper (B+/B)
Content:
- Cites the minimum required number of scholars
- Identifies all aspects listed above, but some elements incomplete or unclear
- OR Includes all "key" issues (first list), but no "additional" points

Style:
- Slightly unclear thesis
- Paragraphs mostly support thesis statement, but may wander occasionally
- Some paragraphs lack strong topic sentences or clear transitions
- Conclusion summarizes some but not all main points

Mechanics:
- Strong sentence structure and grammar, with occasional errors
- Minor spelling errors,
- 1 or 2 run-on sentences, or incomplete sentences
- Most citations properly formatted

Borderline Paper (B-/C+)
Content:
- Insufficiently summarizes one key issue
- Cites only 5 scholars

Style:
- Weak or no thesis
- Paragraphs often wander, are unorganized, and/or do not clearly support a thesis
- Paragraphs often lack topic sentences or clear transitions
- Conclusion lacks a sufficient summary of arguments made

Mechanics:
- Many errors in sentence structure and grammar (usually not major)
- Several spelling errors
- Some run-on sentences, or incomplete sentences
- Many improper citations

The "Needs Help" Paper (C/C-)
Content:
- Insufficiently summarizes two key issues listed above
- OR lists but fails to sufficiently explain most

Style:
- Non-existent, or barely discernible thesis which may restate an obvious point
- Paragraphs wander, are unorganized, and/or do not clearly support a thesis
- Paragraphs lack topic sentences or clear transitions
- No concluding summary of arguments made

Mechanics:
- Major errors in sentence structure and grammar
- Several spelling errors
- Several run-on sentences, or incomplete sentences
- Many improper citations

<u>The "Really Needs Help" Paper (D+/D)</u>
Is like the "Needs Help" Paper but the problems are more serious or more frequent.

<u>The Failing Paper</u>
Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the assignment. Very difficult to understand owing to major problems with mechanics, structure, and analysis. Has no identifiable thesis, or utterly incompetent thesis. Does not follow paper guidelines for length and format. No citations. Plagiarizes.

BIB 2040 Contextual Analysis Essay or Presentation (video, etc.) – Rubric[1]
<u>Superior Paper (A/A-)</u>
Content: Clearly and carefully describes these <u>key issues</u>:
- Demonstrating your use of Gottwald's categories, describe <u>your context </u>and how that has led you to choose the themes you are focusing on
- Your audience
    - Be specific! (again, make use of Gottwald's categories)
    - The theme(s) and/or application that your audience needs to hear as a Word from God
- The manner of communication that will most effectively communicate this Word of God to your community

Style:
- Easily discernible, plausible thesis
- Paragraphs support thesis statement. [For non-written work: Subpoints support thesis]
- Excellent transitions
- Conclusion summarizes how the body of the essay/presentatoin supported the thesis

Mechanics:
- All citations properly cited (may be necessary to support your analysis of your imagined audience)

<u>Good Paper (B+/B)</u>
Content:
- Includes the required elements listed above, but some are incomplete or unclear

Style:
- Slightly unclear thesis
- Paragraphs/subpoints mostly support thesis statement, but may wander occasionally
- Lacking some strong topic sentences or clear transitions
- Conclusion summarizes some but not all main points

Mechanics:
- Most citations properly formatted

<u>Borderline Paper (B-/C+)</u>
Content:
- Insufficiently summarizes one key issue

Style:
- Weak or no thesis
- Paragraphs/subpoints often wander, are unorganized, and/or do not clearly support a thesis
- Often lacking in topic sentences or clear transitions
- Conclusion lacks a sufficient summary of arguments made

Mechanics:

---

[1] Heavily adapted from Dr. Sophia McClennen's general evaluation rubric (Penn State).

- Many improper citations

The "Needs Help" Paper (C/C-)
Content:
- Insufficiently summarizes two key issues listed above
- OR lists but fails to sufficiently explain all

Style:
- Non-existent, or barely discernible thesis which may restate an obvious point
- Paragraphs/subpoints wander, are unorganized, and/or do not clearly support a thesis
- Lacks topic sentences or clear transitions
- No concluding summary of arguments made

Mechanics:
- Many improper citations

The "Really Needs Help" Paper (D+/D)
Is like the "Needs Help" Paper but the problems are more serious or more frequent. Fails to address all three necessary elements.

The Failing Paper
Shows obviously minimal lack of effort or comprehension of the assignment. Very difficult to understand owing to major problems with mechanics, structure, and analysis. Has no identifiable thesis, or utterly incompetent thesis. Does not follow paper guidelines for length and format. No citations. Plagiarizes.

BIB2040 Oral Presentation of Contextual Bible Interpretation

Content	**Poor**		**Acceptable**		**Excellent**
	Topic is poorly developed. Supporting details absent or vague. Trite ideas and/or unclear wording reflect lack of understanding of topic and audience.		Topic is evident with some supporting details; generally meets requirements of assignment.		Topic is well developed, effectively supported and appropriate for the assignment. Effective thinking is clearly and creatively expressed.
	1	2	3	4	5

Organization	**Poor**		Acceptable		**Excellent**
	Presentation is rambling and unfocused, with main theme and supporting details presented in a disorganized, unrelated way.		Presentation demonstrates some grasp of organization, with a discernible theme and supporting details		Presentation is clearly organized with effective introduction and conclusion. Each segment relates to the others according to a carefully planned framework.
	1	2	3	4	5

Delivery	**Poor**		**Acceptable**		**Excellent**
	Unnecessary pauses, filler words. Problems with voice control, eye contact, or posture. Incorrect or inappropriate language.		Presenter appears proficient with language, vocal and physical expression. Notes and visuals used as needed.		Smooth, effective delivery. Good voice control, eye contact, and confident physical demeanor. .
	1	2	3	4	5

Timing	Poor		Acceptable		Excellent

Presenter appears unpracticed. Struggles to fill time, or must be cut off well before concluding.

1	2	3	4	5

Presentation is given in the required 8-10 minutes, without either rushing or stretching time to finish.

Presentation is tailored to an effective use of the 8-10 minutes allotted.

Scripture	Poor			Excellent	
			Acceptable		
1	2	3		4	5

Audience

1   2   3   4   5

Total points _____/30