

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): Masters Programs (MTS and MARE)
Department: Theological Studies
College/School: College of Arts and Sciences
Date: June 22, 2018
Primary Assessment Contact: Mary Dunn

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

1: Graduate students will demonstrate knowledge of the broad outlines of Christian scripture, Christian history, and the major theological developments in the tradition, as well as core terms, categories, and exempla that frame theological and religious studies.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

In order to assess this outcome, we evaluate the following sets of data (Madrid has not MTS/MARE):

1. student coursework
2. annual reviews of our MTS and MARE students
3. research paper (optional)
4. exit interview

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

As part of our annual review process, faculty meet together as a group to discuss each individual student's progress in the program. One of the categories of evaluation in the annual review process considers students' performance in coursework. The student's mentor and a second reader evaluate the research paper. The Director of Graduate Studies receives and examines the exit interviews provided by graduating students.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

All of our MTS and MARE students were evaluated by faculty in the course of their annual reviews as meeting expectations in the category of coursework. Data collected from exit interviews, however, suggested that students felt DTS did well educating students about the broad outlines of Christian history and scripture, but less well educating students about major theological developments in the tradition. Two of our four graduating MTS students expressed desire for more courses in systematics.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Both the MTS and MARE programs include a number of elective options, which do permit students to take those courses of greatest interest to them. So, while we don't recommend any structural changes to the

programs based on this year's assessment, we do think we need to be conscientious about offering more courses in systematic theology each semester to meet student demand.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

This is the first time we've assessed this learning outcome.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.