I. Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Name of Department Chair or Program Director</th>
<th>Annual Report for Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA in Christian Apologetics</td>
<td>Craig Hazen, PhD</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. PLO Assessment Activity

List the Program Learning Outcome Assessed this Year

PLO 3: Argue effectively to: (a) correct misconceptions about historic Christianity; (b) answer the perennial problems’ that are offered to discredit Christianity intellectually; and (c) make the case proactively that it is reasonable to put one’s faith in Christ

Describe the student evidence collected to evaluate the outcome (e.g. the final research paper from BBST 465)

Final essays from CSAP 625MD, Philosophy of Religion, fall 2013 (Smith); & CSAP 691, In Defense of the Resurrection, Spr 2014 (McDowell)

Indicate the Number of Assignments Collected:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Indicate the Number of Collected Assignments Evaluated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAP 625, Philosophy of Religion</td>
<td>Number of Collected Assignments Collected &amp; Evaluated:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP 691, In Defense of the Resurrection</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If only some assignments were evaluated, please explain why, and the selection process

N/A

Evaluation Process (Please explain how the student evidence was evaluated. Please attach rubrics or other evaluation materials used)

I have attached rubric(s) used for evaluation: Yes (below)

Dr Smith, the professor of the Philosophy of Religion class, reviewed his essays on June 3, 2014, in light of the current 5 rubric criteria for CSAP 625MD (see below). He examined them in light of his (often extensive) comments he noted in e-copies of all papers, noting rubric scores for each of the 5 criteria. He recorded those in an Excel file that was used to originally track and calculate class grades. He added columns for these criteria, and then
prepared a chart based on average scores for each criterion.

Dr McDowell, the professor of the Resurrection class, reviewed his essays between approx. June 1 – 10, in light of his rubric for his class (see more below). He examined them in light of his (often extensive) comments.

**Summary of Results** *(Please include a description, using percentages and mean scores, of the major findings from the assessment activity. Data or charts may be attached – see appendix at end.)*

**Rubric criteria for CSAP 625 argumentative essay:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceeded expectations</th>
<th>Met expectations</th>
<th>Partially met expectations</th>
<th>Did not meet expectations</th>
<th>Avg. score for this criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cogency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the issue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style, grammar, &amp; mechanics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall average score for all criteria: 3.65, on a 1-4 point scale*

**Rubric criteria for CSAP 691 argumentative essay:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th># that exceeded expectations</th>
<th># that met expectations</th>
<th># that partially met expectations</th>
<th># that did not meet expectations</th>
<th>Avg. score for this criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source choice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall average score for all criteria: 3.63, on a 1-4 point scale*

**Methods Used for Sharing Assessment Information**

A faculty team met to discuss these results on July 29, 2014. Briefly describe the number of team members involved and the process/method of discussion.

In part, information was shared electronically in early June. But we discussed the above data & ideas on 7/29 in a conference call.

*Note: this is an essential part of the process and must be completed before moving forward with the remainder of the report.*
Conclusions
What did the data tell your faculty team about students’ attainment of the learning outcome?

CSAP 625: This sample set of papers demonstrated very strongly that overall they met the 5 criteria for this rubric. Although the “support” average score was lower than the others, it was not significantly lower. The term paper assignment especially addresses this PLO, and so I think the students strongly showed they (generally) exceeded each of these specific expectations (as defined by the rubric).

CSAP 691: Overall, the papers were fine in relation to this rubric, and their work meets the PLO.

Yet, it seems we are seeing that (on the whole) faculty need to give more feedback on the quality of argumentative writing in essay assignments, in order to see more improvement.

Identifying Changes to Result From Faculty Team’s Conclusions
The evidence suggested that we need to:

- Develop Rubrics (for all classes, esp. for PLOs 1 & 3)
- Revise Existing Rubric
- Revise the Assignment
- Implement a new pedagogy
- Implement new technology
- Provide models to students
- Identify courses earlier in program where students could further practice the skill
- Revise Curriculum Map
- Revise Course sequencing

Other – Please Specify: Training of teaching assistants (& adjuncts) to provide more extensive comments specifically on the quality of argumentative writing displayed in the assigned essay. This would include using the rubric (for a given class’s assignment) in Canvas.

Please describe the changes and/or improvement planned as a result of your analysis.

In addition, one of our assessments from our experience is that we need to revise somewhat our program learning objectives in terms of better measurement and feedback. We also plan to be meeting on the morning of 8/19/14 to further address this question.

___No changes (while this would be unlikely, in rare cases where multiple cycles of assessment have already occurred, this might occur)

Please Explain:
Implementing the Proposed Change

Describe the change that will be implemented:

1. Faculty already have been developing rubrics for all classes, using existing ones as templates.
2. See description given above for getting more feedback on essays using rubrics (most likely in Canvas).

When will the change be implemented? In time for fall 2014 term’s classes

How will the change be implemented? Each faculty member will devise rubrics for classes, and then upload them into Canvas (unless using another means for essay feedback).

III. PLO Assessment Plan for Next Academic Year (2014-2015)

All of the items in Section III are about the assessment activity the department/program plans to complete during the next academic year.

List the Program Learning Outcome(s) to be assessed

# 2: Display and practice Christ-like character, so as to present and defend the gospel in a winsome manner and gracious spirit

Describe the student evidence to be collected for assessment

(a) written assignments (e.g., term papers) that demonstrate an irenic spirit (direct evidence)
(b) in-class discussions (electronic and/or in-person) that demonstrate Christ-like qualities (direct evidence from in-class discussions); and
(c) impressions from interactions, such as in-person (indirect)

This will require developing an instrument with a rubric, which we need to do right away.

Term evidence will be collected: (Note: experience indicates it is often best to assess in fall, and complete the analysis in spring)

Fall 2014 & Spring 2015 (if student evidence is collected in Spring 2015, the analysis may need to be completed in Fall 2015.)

In part, this is due to the year-long format of many modular courses. Final papers are completed in the fall.

IV. Follow Up on PLO Assessment and Programmatic Changes from Previous Year (2012-13)

List the Program Learning Outcome Assessed in 2012-13
PLO 1:
What we indicated:
1. The rubric will need to be revised to represent a bit more broadly the learning outcomes of the program.
2. We will need to monitor essay quality (control in particular) at our upcoming review of fall 2013 essays (which represents the end of these year-long modular classes; see “conclusions,” # 3 above).

Describe the student evidence that was collected for assessment
Essays from CSAP 626MD (ethics, fall 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What curricular change was implemented?</th>
<th>Was new data collected after this change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regarding # 1, instead of implementing one across-the-board rubric for all classes to be used for the review of achievement of PLOs 1 &amp; 3, we use different rubrics (by instructor) for each class. Yet, they all focus (in ways appropriate to the various subject matters and professors) on meeting the criteria for PLOs # 1 &amp; 3.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding # 2, on essay “control,” we used CSAP 625 in particular, for which control was a specifically designated rubric item. This set of essays (which was much smaller - about 11 compared to 32) did much better on average (3.72) than the sample set for 2012-13 (Ethics, CSAP 626), for which the “control” score averaged 3.35. This is .37 better, which is a large variation on 1-4 point scale. Why were they much better? It might be because students that typically take 625 are in their 2nd year (or later) of the program, whereas Ethics students usually are in their first year. Thus, this year’s sample set has had more time to develop in their writing abilities, including in this aspect. (Note: the same instructor taught both classes.)

Has there been any observable impact on teaching or learning? If so, describe.
Perhaps (for CSAP 625) only in terms of what I described above, for # 2 (on “control” of essays). That is tied to the same rubric as was used for CSAP 626.

If no data was collected, when will new data be collected and evaluated?
I think we can use the data for 625 quite well, since it measures (by its rubric) essay control.

Note: We focused on similar writing-related issues in our July 2014 meeting, which has led to specific changes to implement.
Appendix: Charts of average rubric scores by criteria

CSAP 625 Results by Its Rubric

CSAP 691 Results by Its Rubric