



# Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

*"How are students learning?"*

**Instructions:** This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

**Department:** Core Curriculum

**Program Coordinator:** Robert Berg

**Academic Program Evaluated:** Christ Centered Theme (*Biblical Interpretation and Stewardship*)

**Program Review Year:** 2021

	<b>Year 1 Academic Year: 2017-18</b>	<b>Year 2 Academic Year: 2018-19</b>	<b>Year 3 Academic Year: 2019-20</b>	<b>Year 4 Academic Year:</b>
<b>Faculty members involved in this assessment process:</b> (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	Dr. Robert Berg, Professor of New Testament Dr. Mark Jenkins, Professor of Theology Dr. Gary Martindale, Professor of Theology Dr. Martin Mittelstadt, Professor of New Testament Mrs. Donna Trower, Assistant Professor of Intercultural Studies Dr. Steve Smallwood,	Dr. Robert Berg, Professor of New Testament Dr. Mark Jenkins, Professor of Theology Dr. Donald Johns, Professor of Biblical Studies Dr. William Griffin, Professor of Old Testament Dr. Gary Martindale, Professor of Theology Dr. Martin Mittelstadt,	Dr. Robert Berg, Professor of New Testament Dr. Mark Jenkins, Professor of Theology Dr. Gary Martindale, Professor of Theology Mrs. Desiree Rodgers, Adjunct Professor of Biblical Studies Dr. Steve Smallwood, Professor of Theology Mr. Mark Fabian, Assistant Professor of Biblical	

	<p>Professor of Theology Dr. Eveline Lewis, Professor of Business Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Natural and Applied Sciences Dr. Chip Stanek, Assistant Professor of Communication</p>	<p>Professor of New Testament Mrs. Desiree Rodgers, Adjunct Professor of Biblical Studies Dr. Steve Smallwood, Professor of Theology Mr. Mark Fabian, Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies Dr. Eveline Lewis, Professor of Business Mrs. Erica Harris, Assistant Professor of Biology Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology Dr. Jon Spence, Director of the Office of Student Success Dr. Chip Stanek, Assistant Professor of Communication</p>	<p>Studies Dr. Jeremy Harris, Associate Professor of Business Dr. Eveline Lewis, Professor of Business Dr. Saundra Ray, Associate Professor of Accounting Mrs. Erica Harris, Assistant Professor of Biology Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology Dr. Chip Stanek, Assistant Professor of Communication Mrs. Lacey Nunnally, Social Work Program Director Dr. Deborah Johnson, Professor of Psychology Dr. Diane Awbrey, Professor of English Dr. Brenda Adcock, Assistant Professor of Spanish</p>	
<p><b>Number of students in sample:</b> (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)</p>	902 Undergraduates	895 Undergraduates	675 Undergraduates	

<b>Instrument(s) used in assessment:</b> (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essays on Final Exam in THEO 320 Pentecost</li> <li>• Personal Story Assignment in THEO 320</li> <li>• Case Study on Budgeting in FIN 138 Personal Finance</li> <li>• Written Assignments in BIBL 360-370 courses</li> <li>• Assignment in BIBL 111</li> <li>• Exam Question in BIOL 101</li> <li>• Written assignment in Introduction to Literature</li> <li>• Assignment in Introduction to Film</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essays on Final Exam in THEO 320 Pentecost</li> <li>• Personal Story Assignment in THEO 320</li> <li>• Case Study on Budgeting in FIN 138 Personal Finance</li> <li>• Written Assignments in BIBL 360-370 courses</li> <li>• Assignment in BIBL 111 and 115</li> <li>• Exam Question in BIOL 101</li> <li>• Written assignment in Introduction to Literature</li> <li>• Assignment in Introduction to Film</li> <li>• Project in LEAD 220</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essays on Final Exam in THEO 320 Pentecost</li> <li>• Case Study on Budgeting in FIN 138 Personal Finance</li> <li>• Written Assignments in BIBL 360-370 courses</li> <li>• Exam Question in BIOL 101 and BIOL 123</li> <li>• Written assignment in Introduction to Literature</li> <li>• Assignment in Introduction to Film</li> <li>• Student self-reporting of physical activity in University Seminar</li> </ul>	
<b>Additional Data:</b> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<b>Methodology:</b> (Explain	Using the 4 point scale	Using the 4 point scale	Using the 4 point scale	

the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)	EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee. See below under "Improvements Made" concerning revisions made in methodology.	
<b>Data:</b> (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)				
<b>Results of Assessment:</b> (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)	Competency on outcomes assessed. Scores in Biblical Interpretation reflected the weakest scores overall, barely exceeding competency.	Competency on outcomes assessed. Scores in Biblical Interpretation reflected the weakest scores overall, barely exceeding competency, just as they did in 2017-18. Study of the data suggests that an issue is in the different standards being used in different contexts. Scores in exegesis were higher in sections of BIBL 115, a core course for all students, than they were in upper division BIBL	Scores for the two general education goals in the Christ-Centered theme, Biblical Interpretation and Stewardship, surpassed competency. Outcome #1, Biblical Interpretation: 3.54. Outcome #2, Stewardship: 3.66	

		courses, one of which was for majors in the Theology Dept.		
<b>Strengths:</b> (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	--Particular strength is seen in Integration of Learning and Life, although the data is limited this year.	--The highest scores were in I3A Participation in Health and Fitness, with all 132 students scoring a 4 out of 4. These scores are suspiciously and uniformly high, and they warrant an evaluation of the standards being used.	--High scores are seen in the integration of learning and life. --Highest scores (3.96) seen in the participation in health and fitness. Ironically, the Core Curriculum Committee determined that the criteria being used for evaluating this outcome were entirely inadequate. See below on areas in need of improvement.	
<b>Areas in need of improvement:</b> (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	-- Scores in Biblical Interpretation reflected the weakest scores overall, barely exceeding competency. --Overall, data on Biblical Interpretation needs to be broadened considerably.	--As in 2017-18, scores in biblical exegesis reflected the weakest scores overall, barely exceeding competency. --Although the number of students being assessed in the biblical exegesis area has improved, faculty involvement still needs attention.	--The Core Curriculum Committee found that the assessment of "health and fitness," a contributing element to the Stewardship general education outcome in the Christ-Centered Theme, was entirely inadequate. The data (as noted in the 2017-18 SLAR, 4.0 out of 4.0 for all 132 students, and on this year's SLAR, 3.96 out of 4.0) has been abnormally high. Scores have been based on self-	

			reporting by students in the first term University Seminar. Expectations were minimal. The Committee decided that student activity and the data based on it were an inadequate way of evaluating the stated outcome: "Participate in health and fitness activities and explain their importance in maintaining a strong intellectual, emotional, and spiritual life." What students were doing and what the University was assessing in no way measured learning that would be the basis for healthy conduct in the long-term.	
<b>Plans for improvement:</b> (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.	-- Pursue wider data submission by faculty year in Biblical Interpretation and review scores next to see if direct attention is required: Program Coordinator.	---- Pursue wider data submission by faculty year in Biblical Interpretation and review scores next to see if direct attention is required. Scores remained relatively low, and we need broader faculty involvement: Program Coordinator.	--The Core Curriculum Committee, with the approval of the University Academic Council, voted to add a required one-credit course, EXER 101, to the general education requirements for graduation. For many years, Evangel for many years had a two-credit	

			curricular requirement of physical activity for graduation. In 2011, that academic requirement was dropped with the hope that students in other ways would be encouraged to be physically active. A series of approaches in the following years have all proved insufficient.	
<b>Improvements made:</b> (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.	N/A	--Though the number of students involved was comparable to 2017-18, we involved more faculty in assessment this year.	In the fall of 2019, the Core Curriculum Committee decided that the EU20 goals that the University had used were not actually “general education outcomes,” but rather “institutional learning goals.” The Committee, following advice gained from participation in the “Assessing General Education” Workshop in Detroit in September, 2019 by representatives of the University, identified eight general education outcomes, two under each of the headings of the four	

			<p>University learning themes. 2019-2020 is thus the first year in which assessment is narrowed from the EU20 to the revised general education outcome goals. Because of this honing of the outcomes assessed, the number of students involved is smaller than in 2017-19.</p> <p>Under the Christ-Centered Theme, there are now two general education outcomes: (1) Biblical Interpretation, and (2) Stewardship. The former is comprised of data from EU20 elements Biblical Interpretation and Integrational Philosophy. The latter is comprised of data from EU20 elements Christian Stewardship and Health &amp; Fitness.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--





# Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

*“How are students learning?”*

**Instructions:** This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to “Program Review Year” and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

**Department:** Core Curriculum

**Program Coordinator:** Dr. Robert Berg

**Academic Program Evaluated:** Exploratory Theme (*Critical Reasoning and Quantitative Reasoning*)

**Program Review Year:** 2021

	<b>Year 1 Academic Year: 2017-18</b>	<b>Year 2 Academic Year: 2018-19</b>	<b>Year 3 Academic Year: 2019-20</b>	<b>Year 4 Academic Year:</b>
<b>Faculty members involved in this assessment process:</b> (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	Dr. Natasha Devore, Associate Professor of Biology Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology Mrs. Joy Parker, Adjunct Professor of Science Dr. Don Tosh, Professor of Mathematics Mrs. Dianne Twigger, Assistant Professor of Mathematics	Dr. Natasha Devore, Associate Professor of Biology Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology Mrs. Joy Parker, Adjunct Professor of Mathematics Dr. Don Tosh, Professor of Mathematics Mrs. Dianne Twigger, Assistant Professor of Mathematics	Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology Mrs. Joy Parker, Adjunct Professor of Mathematics Dr. Don Tosh, Professor of Mathematics Mrs. Dianne Twigger, Assistant Professor of Mathematics Mr. Douglas Mitcham, Associate Professor of Computer Science	

	Dr. Brandon Schmidly, Professor of Philosophy Mrs. Barbara Howard, Associate Professor of English Mrs. Dara Brannan, Assistant Professor of English	Dr. Brandon Schmidly, Professor of Philosophy Dr. Diane Awbrey, Professor of English Dr. Luke Gibbs, Associate Professor of English Mrs. Barbara Howard, Associate Professor of English Mrs. Dara Brannan, Assistant Professor of English Dr. Brenda Adcock, Assistant Professor of Spanish Dr. Heather Kelly, Professor of Psychology	Dr. Brandon Schmidly, Professor of Philosophy Dr. Calvin Pincombe, Professor of Philosophy Dr. Cameron Pace, Professor of Communication Mrs. Barbara Howard, Associate Professor of English Mrs. Dara Brannan, Assistant Professor of English	
<b>Number of students in sample:</b> (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)	322 Undergraduates	565 Undergraduates	276 Undergraduates	
<b>Instrument(s) used in assessment:</b> (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion Board in MATH 210 Statistics</li> <li>• Quiz on data sets in MATH 210</li> <li>• Elements of three exams in MATH 129</li> <li>• BIOL 101 LAB on natural selection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion Board in MATH 210 Statistics</li> <li>• Quiz on data sets in MATH 210</li> <li>• Elements of three exams in MATH 129</li> <li>• BIOL 101 LAB on natural selection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion Board in MATH 210 Statistics</li> <li>• Quiz on data sets in MATH 210</li> <li>• Elements of three exams in MATH 129</li> <li>• BIOL 101 LAB on natural selection</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written assignments in ENGL 111 and COMM 205</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written assignments in ENGL 111 and COMM 205</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written assignments in ENGL 111</li> <li>Assignments and exam questions in PHIL courses</li> </ul>	
<b>Additional Data:</b> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<b>Methodology:</b> (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	
<b>Data:</b> (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)				
<b>Results of Assessment:</b> (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)	Competency on outcomes assessed.	Competency on outcomes assessed.	Competency on outcomes assessed. Outcome #1. Critical Reasoning: 3.54 Outcome #2, Quantitative Reasoning: 3.11	
<b>Strengths:</b> (From the	--Scores are highest in the	--In contrast to 2017-18,	--Of the two outcomes,	

findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	Critical Reasoning, but the number of students is quite limited.	scores in Recognition of Arguments are relatively low. More students from more classes are included in the data this year, and this highlights the fact that the high scores in 2017-18 in this area were dependent on input from one faculty member in one class. The lower scores this year are more representative.	scores in Critical Reasoning are higher, at 3.54.	
<b>Areas in need of improvement:</b> (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	--There are no areas that call for improvement, though data is limited.	--The variation in the scores noted above suggests the need data from more faculty and more courses to ensure that the data is truly representative of the student population.	--Of the two outcomes, Quantitative Reasoning scores are lower, at 3.11. A minority of the courses providing data represent scores that are below competency. This suggests that the Core Curriculum Committee should review scores in coming years to determine if there are any patterns that need to be addressed.	
<b>Plans for improvement:</b> (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the	--Pursue broader assessment in all areas, involving more faculty: Program Coordinator.	--Pursue broader assessment in all areas, involving more faculty: Program Coordinator.	--Related to the revision and narrowing of general education goals in 2019-2020, it was in this Exploratory Theme that there was the greatest drop in the number of	

changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.			students assessed compared to previous years. Assessment in these two outcomes, particularly Critical Reasoning, must be broadened in the coming years: Program Coordinator.	
<b>Improvements made:</b> (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.	N/A		--In the fall of 2019, the Core Curriculum Committee decided that the EU20 goals that the University had used were not actually “general education outcomes,” but rather “institutional learning goals.” The Committee, following advice gained from participation in the “Assessing General Education” Workshop in Detroit in September, 2019 by representatives of the University, identified eight general education outcomes, two under the headings of each of the four University learning themes. 2019-2020 is thus the first year in which assessment is	

			<p>narrowed from the EU20 to the revised general education outcome goals. Because of this honing of the outcomes assessed, the number of students involved is smaller than in 2017-19.</p> <p>One of the original EU20 goals, entitled Research and Analysis, was used in 2017-28 and 2018-19 to assess basic mathematical competency. Under the revised general education outcomes, there is now a new category following standard models, entitled Quantitative Reasoning, with the following description: "Use mathematical, computational, or statistical methods to draw quantitative conclusions."</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



# Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

*“How are students learning?”*

**Instructions:** This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to “Program Review Year” and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

**Department:** Core Curriculum

**Program Coordinator:** Dr. Robert Berg

**Academic Program Evaluated:** Global Theme (*Written and Oral Communication and Cultural Competence*)

**Program Review Year:** 2021

	<b>Year 1 Academic Year: 2017-18</b>	<b>Year 2 Academic Year: 2018-19</b>	<b>Year 3 Academic Year: 2019-20</b>	<b>Year 4 Academic Year:</b>
<b>Faculty members involved in this assessment process:</b> (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	Mrs. Melinda Booze, Assistant Professor of Communication Dr. Cameron Pace, Professor of Communication Dr. Chip Stanek, Associate Professor of Communication Mrs. Dara Brannan, Assistant Professor of English Mrs. LaDonna Friesen,	Mrs. Melinda Booze, Assistant Professor of Communication Dr. Cameron Pace, Professor of Communication Dr. Chip Stanek, Associate Professor of Communication Mrs. Dara Brannan, Assistant Professor of English Mrs. LaDonna Friesen,	Mrs. Melinda Booze, Assistant Professor of Communication Dr. Cameron Pace, Professor of Communication Dr. Chip Stanek, Associate Professor of Communication Mrs. Dara Brannan, Assistant Professor of English Mrs. LaDonna Friesen,	

	Assistant Professor of English Dr. Luke Gibbs, Associate Professor of English Mrs. Jennifer Morrison, Assistant Professor English Mrs. Barbara Howard, Assistant Professor of English Dr. Nathan Nelson, Professor of English Mrs. Brenda Adcock, Assistant Professor of Spanish Mr. Michael Buesking, Associate Professor of Art Dr. Vickie Wisdom, Associate Professor of Theatre Dr. Kevin Hawkins, Associate Professor of Music Dr. Mark Bowdidge, Adjunct Professor of Music Dr. Heather Kelly, Professor of Psychology Dr. William Griffin, Professor of Theology Dr. Mark Jenkins, Professor of Theology Mrs. Desiree Rodgers,	Assistant Professor of English Dr. Luke Gibbs, Associate Professor of English Mrs. Jennifer Morrison, Assistant Professor English Mrs. Barbara Howard, Assistant Professor of English Dr. Nathan Nelson, Professor of English Mrs. Brenda Adcock, Assistant Professor of Spanish Mr. Michael Buesking, Associate Professor of Art Dr. Vickie Wisdom, Associate Professor of Theatre Dr. Kevin Hawkins, Associate Professor of Music Dr. Mark Bowdidge, Adjunct Professor of Music Dr. Heather Kelly, Professor of Psychology Dr. William Griffin, Professor of Theology Dr. Mark Jenkins, Professor of Theology Mrs. Desiree Rodgers,	Assistant Professor of English Dr. Luke Gibbs, Associate Professor of English Mrs. Jennifer Morrison, Assistant Professor English Mrs. Barbara Howard, Assistant Professor of English Dr. Nathan Nelson, Professor of English Mrs. Brenda Adcock, Assistant Professor of Spanish Mr. Michael Buesking, Associate Professor of Art Dr. Mark Bowdidge, Adjunct Professor of Music Dr. William Griffin, Professor of Theology Dr. Mark Jenkins, Professor of Theology Dr. Gary Martindale, Professor of Biblical Studies Dr. Vincent Medina, Professor of Old Testament Mrs. Desiree Rodgers, Adjunct Professor of Theology	
--	--	--	--	--



	<p>Adjunct Professor of Theology</p> <p>Mrs. Donna Trower, Assistant Professor of Intercultural Studies</p> <p>Mrs. Erica Harris, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology</p>	<p>Adjunct Professor of Theology</p> <p>Dr. Lattis Campbell, Missionary in Residence</p> <p>Mrs. Erica Harris, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Robert Bartels, Associate Professor of Social Science</p> <p>Mr. Stephen Houseknecht, Director of Academic Support</p>	<p>Mr. Mark Fabian, Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies</p> <p>Dr. Lattis Campbell, Missionary in Residence</p> <p>Mrs. Wendy Brown, Adjunct Professor of Intercultural Studies</p> <p>Mrs. Erica Harris, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Jonathan LeCureux, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mr. Nicholas Hestand, Adjunct Professor of Chemistry</p> <p>Mr. Jerry Owens, Associate Professor of Economics</p> <p>Dr. Robert Bartels, Associate Professor of Social Science</p>	
<p><b>Number of students in sample:</b> (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)</p>	921 Undergraduates	998 Undergraduates	999 Undergraduates	
<p><b>Instrument(s) used in assessment:</b> (List the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Evangel University Writing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Evangel University Writing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Final Exam in ENGL 111</li> </ul>	

exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	Proficiency Exam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy Speech and Final Paper in COMM 205</li> <li>• Writing Assignments in ENGL courses</li> <li>• Assignment in BIBL 115</li> <li>• Major Project in ICST 350 Global Connections</li> <li>• Assignment in COMF 220</li> </ul>	Proficiency Exam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy Speech and Final Paper in COMM 205</li> <li>• Writing Assignments in ENGL courses</li> <li>• Assignment in BIBL 115</li> <li>• Major Project in ICST 350 Global Connections</li> <li>• Assignment in COMF 220</li> <li>• Venn Diagram assignment in MUSC 252</li> <li>• Final Exam Question in ART 102 &amp; 103</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy Speech and Final Paper in COMM 205</li> <li>• Writing Assignments in ENGL courses</li> <li>• Assignments in BIBL 115</li> <li>• Major Project in ICST 350 Global Connections</li> <li>• Assignment in COMF 220</li> <li>• Venn Diagram assignment in MUSC 252</li> <li>• Final Exam Question in ART 102 &amp; 103</li> <li>• Group presentation in BIOL 101 Lab</li> <li>• Oral participation and diet analysis project in BIOL 123</li> <li>• Written assignment in ECON 212 &amp; 213</li> </ul>	
<b>Additional Data:</b> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<b>Methodology:</b> (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis)	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors	

process.)	score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	
<b>Data:</b> (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not include the raw data.)				
<b>Results of Assessment:</b> (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)	Competency on outcomes assessed. The Global Connections program is particularly strong and far-reaching. The lowest scores are in the structure and development of effective forms of communication.	Competency on outcomes assessed with two exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of historical issues in a new context; and</li> <li>• Knowledge of nations and regions of the world</li> </ul> Given that the number of students reflected in both of these areas was quite limited, the significance of these low scores is questionable.	Competency on outcomes assessed. Outcome #1, Written and Oral Communication: 3.32. Outcome #2, Cultural Competence: 3.55. Scores noted in two areas of concern in 2018-19 rose above competency level, but will be evaluated in coming years to determine if any action is called for.	
<b>Strengths:</b> (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	--Scores are especially strong in awareness of others' worldviews and in the importance and demonstration of service	--Strongest scores are in students' respect for the perspectives of others.	--Relatively high scores are seen in awareness of and respect for the perspectives of others.	

	to others.			
<b>Areas in need of improvement:</b> (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	--Relatively lower scores are seen in the structure and development of effective forms of communication, and in recognizing healthy relationships.	--Scores were below competence level in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of historical issues in a new context; and</li> <li>• Knowledge of nations and regions of the world</li> </ul> Scores in these areas reflect a small number of students, however.	--Both areas in which scores rose above competency from 2018-19 to 2019-20 need to be watched in coming years to confirm the pattern of improvement.	
<b>Plans for improvement:</b> (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.	--Review future data on the two areas of weakness noted and evaluate whether action is called for.	-- Review future data on the two areas of weakness noted and evaluate whether action is called for.	--Perform the ongoing review of the two areas noted above to confirm this year's improvement in scores. In both of these areas, the number of students continued to be low. Participation of faculty in assessment is needed in these areas.	
<b>Improvements made:</b> (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.	N/A	--Both the areas with relatively low scores in the 2017-18 report showed notable improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scores in the structure and development of effective forms of</li> </ul>	--The two areas identified in the 2018-19 report with scores below competency reflected improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of historical issues in a new context</li> </ul> scores rose from	

		<p>communication went from 3.04 to 3.24.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Scores in the recognition of healthy relationships rose from 3.00 to 3.58.</li></ul> <p>Considering the relatively low number of students reflected in both years, it will be wise to monitor scores in these areas in the coming years to determine whether any actions are called for.</p>	<p>2.69 to 3.09</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge of nations and regions of the world scores rose from 2.52 to 3.26</li></ul> <p>--In the fall of 2019, the Core Curriculum Committee decided that the EU20 goals that the University had used were not actually “general education outcomes,” but rather “institutional learning goals.” The Committee, following advice gained from participation in the “Assessing General Education” Workshop in Detroit in September, 2019 by representatives of the University, identified eight general education outcomes, two under each of the headings of the four University learning themes. 2019-2020 is thus the first year in which assessment is narrowed from the EU20 to the revised general education</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

			<p>outcome goals. Because of this honing of the outcomes assessed, the number of students involved is smaller than in 2017-19. Under the Global Theme, there are now two general education outcomes: (1) Written and Oral Communication, and (2) Cultural Competence. The former is comprised of data from EU20 element Effective Communication. The latter is comprised of data from EU20 elements Historical Inquiry, Global Cultures, and Worldview Awareness.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



# Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

*“How are students learning?”*

**Instructions:** This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to “Program Review Year” and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

**Department:** Core Curriculum

**Program Coordinator:** Dr. Robert Berg

**Academic Program Evaluated:** Integrational Theme (*Literary and Artistic Appreciation and Scientific Literacy*)

**Program Review Year:** 2021

	<b>Year 1 Academic Year: 2017-18</b>	<b>Year 2 Academic Year: 2018-19</b>	<b>Year 3 Academic Year: 2019-20</b>	<b>Year 4 Academic Year:</b>
<b>Faculty members involved in this assessment process:</b> (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	Dr. Robert Berg, Professor of New Testament Dr. Mark Jenkins, Professor of Theology Mr. Michael Buesking, Associate Professor of Art Mr. David Bigelow, Instructor of Art Mrs. LaDonna Friesen, Assistant Professor of English Mr. Mark Bowdidge, Adjunct Professor of	Dr. Robert Berg, Professor of New Testament Mr. Michael Buesking, Associate Professor of Art Mr. David Bigelow, Instructor of Art Dr. Diane Awbrey, Professor of English Mrs. LaDonna Friesen, Assistant Professor of English Dr. Luke Gibbs, Associate Professor English	Dr. Robert Berg, Professor of New Testament Mr. Michael Buesking, Associate Professor of Art Mr. David Bigelow, Instructor of Art Dr. Diane Awbrey, Professor of English Mrs. LaDonna Friesen, Assistant Professor of English Dr. Luke Gibbs, Associate Professor English	

	<p>Music</p> <p>Dr. Cameron Pace, Professor of Communication</p> <p>Dr. Chip Stanek, Associate Professor of Communication</p> <p>Dr. Kelly Sutherland, Professor of Education</p> <p>Dr. Jon Spence, Director of Office of Student Success</p> <p>Dr. Matthew Devore, Associate Professor of Chemistry</p> <p>Mrs. Erica Harris, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Michael Tenneson, Professor of Biology</p>	<p>Mr. Mark Bowdidge, Adjunct Professor of Music</p> <p>Dr. Cameron Pace, Professor of Communication</p> <p>Dr. Chip Stanek, Associate Professor of Communication</p> <p>Dr. Kelly Sutherland, Professor of Education</p> <p>Associate Professor of Chemistry</p> <p>Dr. Jason Streubel, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Erica Harris, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Michael Tenneson, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Michael Tenneson, Professor of Biology</p>	<p>Mr. Mark Bowdidge, Adjunct Professor of Music</p> <p>Dr. Cameron Pace, Professor of Communication</p> <p>Dr. Chip Stanek, Associate Professor of Chemistry</p> <p>Dr. Jason Streubel, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Erica Harris, Associate Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mrs. Julie Mayne, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Michael Tenneson, Professor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Jonathan LeCureux, Assistant Professor of Biology</p> <p>Mr. Dustin Cox, Adjunct Instructor of Biology</p> <p>Dr. Brandon Schmidly, Professor of Philosophy</p>	
<p><b>Number of students in sample:</b> (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)</p>	501 Undergraduates	710 Undergraduates	732 Undergraduates	
<p><b>Instrument(s) used in</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major Essay in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major Essay in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major Essay in</li> </ul>	



<b>assessment:</b> (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	HUMN 240 Culture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exam Question in BIOL 101</li> <li>• LAB #6 in BIOL 101</li> <li>• Essays in ENGL courses</li> <li>• Assignment in MUSC 252 World Music</li> <li>• Student paper in COMF 220 Intro. to Film</li> <li>• Final Exam Essay in ART 103</li> </ul>	HUMN 240 Culture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exam Question in BIOL 101</li> <li>• LAB #6 in BIOL 101</li> <li>• Essays in ENGL courses</li> <li>• Assignment in MUSC 252 World Music</li> <li>• Student paper in COMF 220 Intro. to Film</li> <li>• Final Exam Essay in ART 103</li> <li>• Project in BIOL 343</li> </ul>	HUMN 240 Culture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exam Question in BIOL 101</li> <li>• LAB reports in BIOL 101</li> <li>• Discussion articles in BIOL 123</li> <li>• Essays in ENGL courses</li> <li>• Assignment in MUSC 252 World Music</li> <li>• Student paper in COMF 220 Intro. to Film</li> <li>• Final Exam Essay in ART 103</li> <li>• Project in BIOL 343</li> </ul>	
<b>Additional Data:</b> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)				
<b>Methodology:</b> (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	Using the 4 point scale EU20 rubrics, assessors score student work on the instrument listed above in Course Commons. The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee.	
<b>Data:</b> (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show PLO data results. Do not				

<b>include the raw data.)</b>				
<b>Results of Assessment:</b> (What evidence exists that the program helps students achieve learning outcomes? What changes have been made since the last APR to ensure that outcomes are achieved and what changes will be made to the program following this APR? What have you learned from assessing the changes?)	Competency on all outcomes with the exception of the integration of science and faith measured in BIOL 101.	Competency on all outcomes with the exception of the Analysis of Artistic Expression, which is barely below, at 2.98.	Competency on both outcomes. Outcome #1: Literary and Artistic Appreciation: 3.42 Outcome #2, Scientific Literacy: 3.66	
<b>Strengths:</b> (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	--No areas stood out as particularly strong relative to others.	-- No areas stood out as particularly strong relative to others.	--Literary and Artistic Expression, at 3.42, and Scientific Literacy, at 3.66, both reflected strong scores.	
<b>Areas in need of improvement:</b> (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	--The scores in the integration of science and faith were below competency, though barely, with one section of BIOL 101 pulling down the average.	--The scores in the Analysis of Artistic Expression was notably low, falling below competency.	--As noted under Strengths, there are no areas that clearly call for improvement.	
<b>Plans for improvement:</b> (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.) *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.	--Carefully observe future data on the integration of science and faith to see if there is enough of a pattern requiring action.	-- Carefully observe future data on the Analysis of Artistic Expression to see if there is enough of a pattern requiring action.	N/A	
<b>Improvements made:</b> (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual		--Scores this year in the integration of science and	--Scores in the Analysis of Artistic Expression	

<p><b>implementation.)</b>          *If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>faith are considerably better than in 2017-18. The higher scores do not result from any action taken other than improving the participation of faculty in assessment.</p>	<p>improved from 2.98 in 2018-19 to 3.26 this year. The higher scores appear to be the result of both a larger number of courses reporting and an improvement in some of the same courses.          -- The Core Coordinator compiles data that is evaluated by the Core Curriculum Committee. In the fall of 2019, the Core Curriculum Committee decided that the EU20 goals that the University had used were not actually “general education outcomes,” but rather “institutional learning goals.” The Committee, following advice gained from participation in the “Assessing General Education” Workshop in Detroit in September, 2019 by representatives of the University, identified eight general education outcomes, two under each of the headings of the four</p>	
--	------------	--	--	--

			<p>University learning themes. 2019-2020 is thus the first year in which assessment is narrowed from the EU20 to the revised general education outcome goals. Because of this honing of the outcomes assessed, the number of students involved is smaller than in 2017-19. Under the Integrational Theme, there are now two general education outcomes: (1) Literary and Artistic Appreciation, and (2) Scientific Literacy. The former is comprised of data from EU20 elements Reading &amp; Imagination, and Artistic Expression. The latter is comprised of data from the EU20 element Science &amp; Faith</p>	
--	--	--	---	--