It is recommended program assessment results be used to celebrate achievements of student learning as well as to identify potential areas for future curriculum improvement.

Please email this completed form as an attachment to Thatcherk@slu.edu

1. Degree Program(s) included in this report: MA in Theological Studies
2. Department: Theological Studies
3. School/Center/College: College of Arts & Sciences
4. Name(s): Rubén Rosario Rodríguez
5. Email: rosarir@slu.edu
6. Phone: 314-977-2855

Instructions: Please answer the following five questions to the best of your ability for each degree program offered within your department.

1. Summarize your assessment activities during the past year for each degree program and how this work relates to the established assessment plan (e.g. what program outcomes were assessed, faculty discussions, new survey design, data collection, revised assessment plans or learning outcomes, etc.). Please include how Madrid courses/program were involved.

For AY 2015–16, the MA Committee focused on the MARE track. Madrid was not involved.

Direct Assessment
The written and oral comprehensive exams provide students a means to demonstrate a basic level of competency to teach the various sub-disciplines of theology at the secondary school level.

- All MARE students take written comprehensive exams in the sub-discipline of Religious Education (2 questions) and two secondary specializations (1 question each) in a five-hour period, and upon passing the written exams undergo a 60-minute oral defense of their answers.
- In AY 2014–15, the department updated its written exam questions and required reading lists for each sub-discipline (Historical Theology, Scripture, Theological Ethics, Constructive Theology, and Religious Education).
- In 2012, the MA Committee developed rubrics for evaluating the written and oral exams. Every member of a student’s MA Comprehensive Exams Committee submits a completed evaluation of the written exam, while the chair of the committee submits a completed rubric for the oral defense recording all committee members’ scores and comments.

Indirect Assessment
- The Program Director interviewed all four graduating MARE students.
2. Describe specific **assessment findings** related to the **learning outcomes** assessed for each degree program, including any pertinent context surrounding the findings. Please include the **learning outcomes themselves.** *(e.g. Our goal was that 75% of students performed at the “proficient” level of competency in problem solving, using a new scoring rubric. 81% of students performed at the “proficient” level in problem solving, exceeding our expectations.)* Do not include student-level data. Data included in this report should be in aggregate. Please include how Madrid courses/program were involved.

Passing grades are ranked “Pass,” “High Pass,” and “Distinction.” Our goal is to have all of our graduating students pass their written and oral comprehensive exams, otherwise they cannot graduate. Should a student not pass his or her written exams, he or she cannot move to the oral portion. They then have six months within which to retake and pass the written exams. Failure to pass the written exams the second time leads to termination from the program.

- All four graduating students in AY2015-16 passed their comprehensive exams, one with “Distinction” and one with “High Pass.”
- Exam committee members concerning both the written exam and oral exams expressed concerns about the rubrics. The incoming graduate studies director has made revision of these rubrics a priority.
- Graduating students raised the concern that the method of course-level evaluation, which involves writing research papers, does not prepare students adequately for the final evaluation, which involves writing timed, closed book/closed notebook essays.

*Please attach any tables, graphics, or charts to the end of this report.*

3. Describe how assessment **feedback** has been provided to students, faculty, and staff. *(e.g. report for faculty, executive summary for the dean, web page for students, alumni newsletter, discussion with students in class or club event, etc.)*

**Direct Feedback**
- The annual review process provides direct feedback to students about their progress toward completion.
- The exit interviews provide specific feedback concerning the MARE program and the comprehensive exams for those students graduating in the MARE track.
- The MA program director generates a written report to share with the department chair and submit to the dean.

**Indirect Feedback**
- The MA program director disseminates to the MA Committee the assessment data gathered in both the annual review process and the exit interviews.
- The MA program director disseminates this data to the whole department.

4. In what ways have you **used assessment findings** to celebrate student achievements and/or to improve the curriculum this past year? *(e.g. prizes to students, hosting student parties, changes to curriculum, student projects, learning goals, assessment strategies, etc.)*
Our assessment raises the questions of whether to do the following:

- allow open-book examinations, and/or
- structure the examination as a series of integrative essays to write over the course of several days or a week.

5. Describe any changes to your assessment plans, or any challenges or educational experiences with the assessment process this past year that you would like to share.

- Faculty criticism of the rubrics indicates that the department ought to bring the rubrics into conformity with the stated learning outcomes.
- Faculty unfamiliarity with the procedures for administering written and oral comprehensive exams indicates that the department ought to train faculty concerning their duties as members of exam committees.

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