SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Undergraduate major	Department: Theological Studies
Degree or Certificate Level: B.A.	College/School: CAS
Date (Month/Year): Sept/2022	Primary Assessment Contact: Daniel Smith; Lori Baron
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 2021-2022	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2020	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Learning Objective #3:
"Analyze entanglements of global movements and personal identities with religions, cultures, and interreligious relations in the past and present."

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

THEO 2710 Religions of the World, all taught in person on main campus.
Artifacts: LeBoeuf – film analysis paper; reading journal; short paper
Mack – paper on personal identities; movie analysis paper; group presentation

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

THEO 2710 course instructors Dr. Anjeanette LeBoeuf and Dr. April Mack used the rubric for Learning Outcome #3 to evaluate two artifacts in their classes. See attached rubric.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Only face-to-face modality results were studied. Both instructors had a high degree of success in addressing the various facets of the learning outcome. Artifacts included film analysis papers, reading journals, and group presentations that explored personal identities, global religious figures, and religious movements past and present. Only 0-4% of students failed to meet expectations in any given class. Instructors noted that those who failed to meet expectations did so because of (a) poor time management or (b) lack of English language proficiency.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

This course is well designed to meet Learning Outcome #3. The course has been submitted to the new core and is awaiting approval. Instructors have the flexibility within the course design to structure the class around the learning outcome as they choose and to select readings, films, assignments, and exams that meet the learning outcome in a variety of ways. Those students who struggled to meet the learning outcome in its three criteria did so because of reasons that are outside the control of the department and represent larger struggles among the student population or a particular segment of it (namely, international students). Overall, we can be confident that all of our majors and minors, given the requirement that they take this course, will have achieved this learning outcome by the time of their conclusion in our program.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Sept. 7 Department of Theological Studies meeting.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies	• Course content • Teaching techniques • Improvements in technology • Prerequisites	• Course sequence • New courses • Deletion of courses • Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	• Student learning outcomes • Artifacts of student learning • Evaluation process	• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics) • Data collection methods • Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

Based upon instructor feedback on students who failed to meet course objectives, we suggest the following:

1. Having discussions on a level beyond our department about language proficiency issues, perhaps designating certain courses around students with language issues, taught by professors who are experienced with language proficiency.
2. Introducing time management information into the syllabus and making sure instructors address the amount of time necessary to complete weekly work early in the semester.
3. Co-sponsoring public events with non-Christian religious organizations and/or promoting events sponsored by campus religious organizations on our social media platforms as a way to enhance the delivery of this program learning outcome in a co-curricular way.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

Because the program learning outcome is overwhelmingly being achieved in THEO 2710, no changes are being made to the course design or to the undergraduate program.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

2021 was the first year we collected and analyzed assessment data in several years. Instructor comments focused on an issue that had been addressed in 2020 with the restructured major.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

N/A

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

Some students did not have enough background in systematic theology and methodology in the study of religion to excel at a high level in the Capstone course and beyond.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

Next year we will assess the progress in the courses (THEO 3430/35) designed to fill the gap in last year's assessment (THEO 4960).

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

For instructors of THEO 2710 in Year 2 of the DTS Assessment Plan

The following chart is from the DTS Assessment Plan and focuses on PLO (Program Learning Outcome) #3:

PLO	Measures of Assessment	Review Process
3. Analyze entanglements of global movements and personal identities with religions, cultures, and interreligious relations in the past and present.	**Direct Measures:** This outcome will be assessed in the required THEO 2710 course. Specifically, the artifact(s) produced in the course will enable instructors to determine how well individual students meet this outcome. Two (2) randomly selected instructors will assess the work against a standard rubric designed by the department's Undergraduate Studies Committee. The instructors will be asked to identify the artifact(s) utilized for their assessment and to assess the extent to which students failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations. **Indirect Measures:** Majors will be asked to evaluate how well they accomplished this learning outcome in an exit survey and interview in the spring semester of their senior year. The undergraduate studies coordinator will tabulate survey results and keep notes of related comments in interviews.	Learning outcome #3 will be assessed in Year 2 in a three-year assessment cycle and the data will be reviewed by the department's Undergraduate Studies Committee. The committee will discuss the data and identify areas of success and areas for improvement. The program coordinator will communicate recommendations for curriculum, pedagogy, and/or assessment revisions to the program faculty in a manner that allows for appropriate implementation. Reviews of the impact of any such program changes will also be conducted the year after the changes are made, and the records of those reviews will be maintained by the program coordinator.

Direct Measures: Rubrics for Instructor Assessment of Student Achievement of PLOs

Learning Objective #3:
"Analyze entanglements of global movements and personal identities with religions, cultures, and interreligious relations in the past and present."

Rubric to be filled out by two (2) instructors teaching THEO 2710 annually.

Assignment serving as basis for evaluation: Artifact to be available for submission to University Assessment Office for purposes of assessment of the SLU Core (for SLO 5 and 7).

Number of students in class: _____

	Percentage (%) of Students Who...		
Standard	**Failed to Meet Expectations**	**Met Expectations**	**Exceeded Expectations**
1. In the assignment, students were able to demonstrate introductory literacy in the teachings, practices, and cultures of a range of religious traditions in global, diasporic, and historical context(s).			
2. In the assignment, students were able to identify and evaluate the construction of "world religion(s)" as a category through colonial and imperial contexts.			
3. In the artifact, students demonstrated understanding of religion and social identity in relation to circumstances of race, gender, nationality, sexuality, locality, geography, and/or class.			

Open-Ended Questions:

1. Among students who exceeded expectations, what do you think were the key drivers of, or factors in, their success?
2. Among students who failed to meet expectations, what do you think were the main obstacles to their success?

3. (Optional) If you as an instructor have ideas about how these standards can better be met in this course or within the major and minor in Theological Studies as a whole, please share them here.