<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Curriculum Mapping</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</em></td>
<td><em>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</em></td>
<td><em>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</em></td>
<td><em>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and &quot;close the loop&quot; to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Students will explain the theological operations of retrieval and appropriation.  
   - **THEO 5400**  
   - 1. Students will write a term paper that the course instructor will evaluate using a rubric that the MA Program Committee (MAPC) has developed and approved.

2. Students will interpret a theological text within the historical, cultural, and  
   - **THEO 5X00**  
   - 2. For each course, students will write a term paper that the course instructor will evaluate using a rubric that the MAPC  

2. See: (1), above.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will explain the relevance of a traditional theological text to contemporary culture.</td>
<td>3. THEO 5820</td>
<td>3. Students will submit an integration paper. The instructor will evaluate this paper using a rubric that the MAPC has developed and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students will describe the development of specific theological traditions.</td>
<td>4. THEO 5950</td>
<td>4. Students will pass a written examination based upon reading lists and questions that the MAPC has developed in consultation with the faculty. Students also will pass an oral examination administered and evaluated by the three faculty members who comprise the students’ Comprehensive Exams Committee. Faculty will evaluate these examinations using department-approved rubrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students will discuss disputed issues in Catholic religious education.</td>
<td>5. THEO 5810; THEO 5820</td>
<td>5. For each course, students will write a term paper that the course instructor will evaluate using a rubric that the MAPC has developed and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students will prepare a curriculum vitae, personal statement, and teaching portfolio.</td>
<td>6. THEO 5820; on-site supervision</td>
<td>6. The SLU Faculty Internship supervisor evaluates the materials according to a rubric that the MAPC developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **It is not recommended** to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.
The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences expects annual assessment reports on July 1 of each year. Working backward from that date each year, we propose the following timeline:

- Spring 2016: work with the University Assessment Coordinator to finalize the MA Assessment Plan; establish the AC
- August 2016: AC gathers assessment results from Spring 2016 courses and presents them in aggregate to department
- AY2016/17: address outcomes 1 and 2, according to the steps outlined in the Use of Assessment Data column, above
- AY2017/18: address outcomes 3 and 4
- AY2018/19: address outcomes 5 and 6

The AC will update the Major Assessment Plan as needed and send updated versions to both the Dean’s office and the University Assessment Coordinator.

2. Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?

Instructors teaching any courses listed in the Curriculum Mapping column (above) send grades to the AC at the end of the semester. Any communications that the AC has with the Chair it copies to the Chair of Humanities, Division of Humanities, SLU-Madrid. The AC schedules Skype meetings with SLU-Madrid faculty as with Frost faculty.

3. The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:

a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)

The AC will review and revise this plan on an ongoing basis, with a formal review scheduled for the end of the academic year.

b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.

The department did not include students in the development of this assessment plan. However, the instructor of THEO 5200 will present the plan to the seminar in the second part of the fall semester to elicit feedback. The instructor will meet with the AC to share this feedback, which the AC will determine how best to incorporate into the assessment plan.

c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?

- 2014–15 Undergraduate and MA Assessment Plans, Department of Theology, Spring Hill College, Mobile, AL
- Spring 2008 Master of Theological Studies Program Review, St. Norbert College, De Pere, WI
- March 26, 2014, Assessment Plans, Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY
d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel

The Department intends to dedicate the three program directors (undergraduate, MA, and PhD) to the AC and to appoint a chair to coordinate the assessment effort as her or his only departmental service responsibility. That program chair will hold the position for a four-year cycle. At the end of the year, the AC will meet with the chair to evaluate the manageability of both the AC and the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel.
### Program Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Curriculum Mapping</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</td>
<td>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</td>
<td>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and &quot;close the loop&quot; to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will explain how theologians retrieve and appropriate their sources.</td>
<td>1. THEO 5200, THEO 5400</td>
<td>1. For each course, students will write a term paper that the course instructor will evaluate using a rubric that the MA Program Committee (MAPC) has developed and approved.</td>
<td>1. Instructors present grades individually to students and in aggregate to the MAPC at the end of the particular courses in which the students earn the grades. The MAPC compiles an analysis of this data to present to the department at the beginning of each semester. The Assessment Committee (AC) then studies the data, making recommendations that it presents to the department at the year-end meeting in May. The department decides whether and how to rework the documents, final versions of which the department will approve for the instructors to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students will interpret a theological text within its historical, cultural, and</td>
<td>2. THEO 5X00</td>
<td>2. For each course, students will write a term paper that the course instructor will evaluate using a rubric that the MA Program Committee (MAPC) has developed and approved.</td>
<td>2. See: (1), above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ecclesial contexts.</td>
<td>rubric that the MAPC has developed and approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will propose an original research project explaining the relevance of a traditional theological text to contemporary culture.</td>
<td>3. THEO 5990: Essay Guidance</td>
<td>3. Students will submit a thesis proposal. Both (a) the student’s Thesis Committee, consisting of the student’s Thesis Director and two or more other faculty members, chosen by the Program Director in consultation with the student, and (b) the MAPC will evaluate this proposal using a rubric that the Committee has developed and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students will demonstrate that they know and can use the methodologies current in academic theology.</td>
<td>4. THEO 5200; THEO 5400</td>
<td>4. Direct Measure: Students will write a thesis under the supervision of the Thesis Director. The Thesis Committee will evaluate the thesis according to a rubric that the MA Committee has developed and approved. The student then will make a public oral defense of the thesis before the Thesis Committee, which will evaluate that defense according to a rubric that the MA Committee has developed and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administer to the student a written annual performance evaluation, developed and approved by the MA Committee; (c) the MA Program Director will conduct an exit interview of all graduating MA students; (d) MA students will receive acceptance into a PhD program.

5. Students pursuing either the Constructive Theology (CT) or the Theological Ethics (TE) track will translate into English a passage from a theological text written in either a modern or a classical language. Students pursuing the Historical Theology (HT) track will translate a total of two passages from two separate theological texts, one written in a modern language and another written in a classical language.

5. The MA Program Director will select a passage or passages according to the student’s track and following criteria that the MA Committee has determined and specified on the Language Exam Rubric. The Director then will give this passage or these passages to the student, who will select one or more for translation.

5. Students demonstrate their performance of the learning outcome by translating the passage to the satisfaction of an expert reader whom the MA Program Director chooses and who evaluates the translation according to a rubric developed by the MA Committee.

5. See: (1), above.

1. It is not recommended to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.

The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences expects annual assessment reports on July 1 of each year. Working backward from that date each year, we propose the following timeline:
• Spring 2016: work with the University Assessment Coordinator to finalize the MA Assessment Plan; establish the AC
• August 2016: AC gathers assessment results from Spring 2016 courses and presents them in aggregate to department
• AY2016/17: address outcomes 1 and 2, according to the steps outlined in the Use of Assessment Data column, above
• AY2017/18: address outcomes 3 and 4
• AY2018/19: address outcome 5

The AC will update the Major Assessment Plan as needed and send updated versions to both the Dean’s office and the University Assessment Coordinator.

2. Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?

Instructors teaching any courses listed in the Curriculum Mapping column (above) send grades to the AC at the end of the semester. Any communications that the AC has with the Chair it copies to the Chair of Humanities, Division of Humanities, SLU-Madrid. The AC schedules Skype meetings with SLU-Madrid faculty as with Frost faculty.

3. The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:

   a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)

The AC will review and revise this plan on an ongoing basis, with a formal review scheduled for the end of the academic year.

   b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.

The department did not include students in the development of this assessment plan. However, the instructor of THEO 5200 will present the plan to the seminar in the second part of the fall semester to elicit feedback. The instructor will meet with the AC to share this feedback, which the AC will determine how best to incorporate into the assessment plan.

   c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?

• 2014–15 Undergraduate and MA Assessment Plans, Department of Theology, Spring Hill College, Mobile, AL
• Spring 2008 Master of Theological Studies Program Review, St. Norbert College, De Pere, WI
• March 26, 2014, Assessment Plans, Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY

   d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel
The Department intends to dedicate the three program directors (undergraduate, MA, and PhD) to the AC and to appoint a chair to coordinate the assessment effort as her or his only departmental service responsibility. That program chair will hold the position for a four-year cycle. At the end of the year, the AC will meet with the chair to evaluate the manageability of both the AC and the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel.