Religious Studies Department
2011 Annual Assessment Update
September 15, 2011
Prepared by Telford Work, chair

I. Mission Statement, Program Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map, and Multi-Year Assessment Plan

Mission Statement
www.westmont.edu/_academics/departments/religious_studies/

Program Goals
www.westmont.edu/_academics/departments/religious_studies/ProgramGoals.html

These statements are unchanged from the prior year.

Program Learning Outcomes
www.westmont.edu/_academics/departments/religious_studies/ProgramGoals.html

See below, "PRC Response Action Items," for developments in this area, and appendix for our proposed revised PLOs.

Curriculum Map
The Curriculum Map was provided in Appendix S of our six-year report.

The Program Review Committee was concerned about how many courses were designated as Mastery courses, and especially on the effect this would have on our assessment requirements. We were unaware of that implication. The RS-180 capstone course and top-level language courses (for instance, GRK-102) are more realistic places for concentrated and comprehensive assessment for RS program goals.

A full revision of the curriculum map will need to follow approval of our revised PLOs.

Multi-Year Assessment Plan

II. Follow up on Action Items identified in previous reports.

The 2010 Six-Year Report identified the following next steps.

1. Implement and adjust the new major and minor structure, and pursue collaboration. This is underway, with several courses in 2010-2011 being offered for the first time in their new roles in the major. The department also developed new courses for the major to be taught for the first time in 2011-2012, for instance a collaborative interdisciplinary theology course with Liberal Studies.

2. Sustaining current results.

3. Clarify goals and outcomes for the major and GE and distinguish and relate goals and outcomes in standard ways. For the major, this effort is underway. For the GE, Maurice Lee assisted the PRC in developing one condensed SLO for the Biblical and Theological Canons GE category: "Know the content of, and understand interpretive approaches to, Christian scripture, Christian doctrine, and Christian history." We have since proposed a revision.

4. Improve assessment instruments and procedures for RS GE courses. The PLO for the Biblical and Theological Canons GE having been clarified and the College having adopted a twelve-year GE assessment schedule, the department is ready to revise assessment instruments to gather relevant information more helpfully and efficiently upon its finalization.

PRC Response Action Items

1. Revise and reduce major PLOs. These discussions happened between March and September 2011. Telford Work, department chair, maintains departmental meeting agendas and is in the best position to schedule discussion and oversee progress. In our six-year report, our department did not distinguish between Program Goals and Learning Outcomes. The Program Review Committee was concerned about us having ten outcomes, some of which they felt would be difficult to assess, and asked the department to focus on revising and reducing our Program Learning Outcomes. The department met with the DCEE and Provost in March 2011 to discuss the difference between goals and outcomes, and in later department meetings discussed the matter and developed a reduced, simplified, more measurable list of PLOs.

2. Align curriculum map to PLOs upon revising them. See "Next Steps" below.

3. Act upon assessment data. The 2010 six-year report found "consistently satisfactory progress and widespread satisfaction among RS majors," consistently high levels of faculty teaching, research, and institutional service (reflected in awards for faculty research and teaching in May 2011) despite heavy teaching loads, and considerable recent changes in the major, department, and contributions to the College's global distinctive and off-campus programs. In light of these findings, the department did not conclude that assessment results warranted changes, especially to a major and minor that had been restructured only two years earlier and is still being implemented. We had been advised several years ago when developing our assessment criteria that satisfactory results might call for maintaining rather than changing approaches, and pursued that direction in 2010-11. No additional issues arose during the year to make the department reconsider its decision.

4. Post mission statement, Program Goals, PLOs, Curriculum Map, and assessment plan on the RS website. Victoria Leon oversees and maintains the website; Telford Work coordinates changes with her. The mission statement, program goals, and our new major structure were placed on the website in spring and summer 2011. The others will be added as they are finalized (see "Next Steps" below).

The PRC also suggested revising the RS-180 capstone course rubric and inviting the DCEE to a department meeting. The latter meeting happened in fall 2010. The department can re-examine the capstone course rubric after PLOs are finalized (see "Next Steps" below).

III. 2010-11 Focus

Annual report guidelines call for a report regarding each SLO scheduled for attention in 2010-11. However, the PRC (and later Tatiana Nazarenko) focused our attention first on **revised SLOs** for the major and for Biblical and Theological Canons courses. These efforts bore fruit in summer 2011 with revised SLOs agreed upon by the department in September. Actual student work and focus group findings from the 2010-11 capstone course are ready for the department to analyze once the PRC reviews them and the department revises its rubric accordingly. In greater detail, these data are:

> *Final written assignments from all students (N=~20) in the spring RS-180 capstone course, analyzed according to the RS outcomes rubric. The rubric has not been shown to students in advance.*
> *A concluding focus group conversation and surveys (N=~20) with all spring capstone course students and other graduating RS majors as they are available.*

The 10-page final written assignment for these students asked them to write "an 'epistle,' in the spirit of the New Testament genre, calling a specific church congregation or denomination to more sustained and serious ecumenical involvement. The epistle should support its case with scriptural, theological, historical, and missional reasons, in a persuasive and sophisticated form."

Our departmental benchmark has been "B level" (fourth of our rubric's five levels of student performance) average scores, with 80% of students performing at that level or higher, for outcomes according to the rubric. We may articulate our benchmark differently after SLOs are finalized and a rubric revised to suit it.

The department also focused in spring 2011 on a single SLO for the GE "Biblical and Theological Canons" course and ILOs for what replaced the "Christian Orientation" learning standard. We proposed these in the spring, received comments and critique in the summer, and proposed revisions in September.

Interpretation of assessment data awaits completion of the earlier steps in the assessment cycle already discussed.

The department is still '**closing the loop**' on the prior assessment cycle (described in our last six-year report) in implementing and stabilizing the new major and minor and implementing the Biblical Languages minor that was passed in fall 2010. One major cascading effect of those changes has been differences in enrollment in 'RS elective' courses versus 'major core' courses. With all faculty now having returned from 2010-11 leave and off-campus programs, departmental discussion of how best to respond to these changing enrollment levels is scheduled for fall 2011. In one additional development: in spring 2011, the department allocated one hour per week of direct student support for courses for each faculty member. Several faculty took advantage of this provision.

IV. Next Steps

    A. **Align curriculum map to revised PLOs.** This will be done after revised PLOs are accepted, presumably fall 2011. This semester is an ideal time to complete this, since all RS faculty are present for the only semester between (at least) fall 2009 and fall 2013. This area falls under the responsibilities of the chair.

    B. **Post** PLOs, Curriculum Map, and Assessment Plan on the RS website. These will be posted after finalized, presumably fall 2011-spring 2012. Department secretary Victoria Leon is responsible.

    C. **Reconsider assessment rubric** for the RS-180 capstone course. The department can do this after PLOs are finalized, presumably fall 2011-spring 2012. Responsibility falls to the chair to facilitate, though individual faculty have formulated sections of the current rubric and may share the task of revision the same way.

    D. **Reconsider current Multi-Year Assessment Plan.** Our assessment strategy has been to embed assessment in the RS-180 capstone course, and examine all major outcomes each year. We have been encouraged to specify only certain outcomes for analysis in certain years. After revised outcomes are approved and finalized, the department can revisit its strategy to see whether we want to change our approach.

    E. **Establish benchmarks and assess/interpret student work from spring 2011 capstone course.** These actions await adoption of revised outcomes and a revised rubric, but can be done by spring 2012. Charlie Farhadian and Maurice Lee, that course's teachers, will take responsibility; the whole department will then review and discuss the information.

    F. **Review enrollments** for upper-division courses to discern patterns and arrive at possible responses. Discussions should happen before 2012-13 courses are due. Fall 2011 is the best time as we will have all faculty present, but our schedule is already rather full.

    G. **Develop assessment instruments** for the RS GE SLO and ILOs, upon their possible further revision, acceptance by the PRC, and finalization. The chair will take responsibility for this process, coordinating with the DCEE and following her assessment schedule.

V. Appendices
    A. Last year's response from the PRC.
    B. Rubrics used to evaluate the data.
       (For 'prompts or instruments used to collect data,' see above, "2010-11 Focus.")
    C. Proposed revised RS GE SLO, RS-related ILOs, and RS Major SLOs.
    D. Multi-year assessment plan.

VI. Prepare for your Six-Year Program Review Report
Workload information, departmental meeting agendas, evidence of work with other areas of the college, and student data have all been archived as requested.

Program Review Committee

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 27, 2011

To: Telford Work/ Department of Religious Studies

From: Program Review Committee

Re: 2010 Six-Year Program Review Report

Thank you for submitting and revising your Six-Year Program Review Report. The Program Review Committee appreciated your time and efforts put into preparing and improving this report.

Judging from the report, your department has made several commendable strides in program review over the past years by

a) developing and adopting a new, more concrete set of Program Goals and Program Learning Outcomes
b) developing a Curriculum Map
c) using both direct and indirect methods for assessing student learning

We are pleased to see that all faculty members are engaged in assessment and have the opportunity to evaluate their assessment efforts and articulate their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the results of their action. Keep up doing a good job!

The response to your Six-Year Program Review Report aims to affirm that you have achieved during the six-year assessment cycle and discuss the sustainability of your current and future assessment efforts. The following comments about your work are intended to strengthen your future work and help your department to assess student learning in a more effective and efficient way.

The following body of the response is tailored directly to specific sections of your report and relevant appendices.

Mission Statement

Your mission statement as presented in opening sentence of the 2.A section (p. 3) is clear and concise. We would encourage your department to post this mission on the departmental website.

Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

We are pleased to learn that the department has developed new Program Goals, including Hermeneutic Competence, Theological Judgment and Ecclesial Engagement, and Program Learning Outcomes, which describe in concrete terms what program goals mean. We would appreciate some clarification regarding your Program Learning Outcomes as presented on p. 2 and pp. 8-9.

In the box "What do the Learning Goals mean?" in your Table on p. 2 you have listed one PLO for each Program Goal. However, on pp. 8-9 there are three outcomes for Hermeneutic Competence,

four for Theological Judgment, and three for Ecclesial Engagement with the total number of 10 outcomes. Several of these outcomes are difficult to assess.

Specifically, the **Hermeneutic Competence** program learning outcome, "Our students will be able to apply a range of skills in the interpretation of biblical and other religious literature" appears to imply all three outcomes that follow it including close reading of primary sources, displaying judicious use of scholarly resources, and appropriating a range of critical methodologies drawn on insights across relevant disciplines. Is it important for the department to augment the aforementioned outcome by three subsequent sub-outcomes (p. 8)?

As far as **Theological Judgment PLO** is concerned, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that it may be difficult to measure students' understanding [of fundamental claims and logic of the Christian faith] as well as their appreciation [of Christian theological traditions]. Have you already discussed the assessment tools to be utilized for measuring this outcome?

We also wonder whether all four sub-outcomes which follow this Program Learning Outcome (p.8) are required to elaborate its meaning. The forth sub-outcome, "[t]hey will be acquainted with, and increasingly formed in, the practices that Christian theology serves …" implies a value-added judgment which involves comparing two measurements that establish baseline and final performance.

Concerning the **Ecclesial Engagement PLO** which reads "our graduates will be marked by a passionate commitment to the Christian Church and its mission," we would like to know what behaviors graduates should demonstrate for faculty to be confident that they are passionately committed. Furthermore, stating that the students will increasingly recognize connections between personal faith, scholarly inquiry, and the shared life of God's people you suggest that the department is going to utilize value-added judgment again. Is it the way you want to design your assessment of student learning in relation to this outcome?

The program Review committee is concerned that your program has ten Program Learning Outcomes to measure within a six year learning cycle, which, in the committee's opinion, is too ambitious for a department of your size. The PRC wants your assessment activities be meaningful and manageable rather than onerous.

Please note, that there is a difference between *what you teach and what you measure.* You do not need to assess skills and competences simply because you teach them. However, you have to asses ALL the outcomes you have developed.

Assessment of Outcomes

The PRC would like to commend you on using both, qualitative and quantitative data for "closing the loop" and improving student learning.

The good news which we would like to communicate to your department is that a Program Learning Outcome should only be assessed at the "mastery" level, after students have completed several courses and developed mastery over this outcome through time. Therefore, it is important to identify where exactly the learning outcome is introduced, developed and mastered. By "mastery" we understand the highest expected level of proficiency (mastery) which can be attained by all undergraduate students completing the course/program. Understandably, it is not possible to have every single outcome or even the majority of them mastered in every single course offered by the department. Typically, students attain this level of mastery in senior seminars and capstone courses.

We also have several questions concerning your Curriculum Map. According to this map, you have a number of courses where students master a specific outcome. We wonder whether this presentation is accurate enough. Given that the assessment data for major programs should be collected only from the courses where the outcomes are mastered we are concerned that you are setting yourselves up to collect and interpret a massive body of data if your Curriculum Map reflects student learning adequately.

It is our understanding that the department has been collecting valuable data and that the faculty members are being engaged in on-going conversations about student learning. We recommend that in your next reports you should state more explicitly how you implement your assessment results.

What specific changes in pedagogy, curriculum, student support, faculty support or resource allocation have you made? Remember that the focus of assessment is implementation.

It also appears that the department tends to collect course grading data which is not identical to assessment data. Grades do indicate something about student learning but at a level too broad for meaningful assessment. They do not provide any information about which learning outcomes are being mastered and which require faculty attention. For this reason, the PRC recommends disentangling grading from assessment in relation to the identified SLOs in future assessment activities.

It is laudable that Profs. Reeder and Lee have developed the rubric to evaluate students' competencies in this field in RS -180 Capstone Course (appendix 8.F). In our opinion, the rubric needs further clarification and truncation. It would be easier to collect the data by using fewer variables. We would recommend replacing "A-work," B-work" categories by performance indicators, such as "exemplary," "good" and "needs improvements."

General Education

We appreciated your department contribution to General Education assessment by administering pre- and post-test in RS 001, RS010, and RS020. We are pleased to learn that the results of the Doctrine pre- and post - tests have led to pedagogical changes in Prof. Lee's and Work's courses.

The committee wonders why according to your Curriculum Map, in RS010: Life and Literature of New Testament students are introduced to Theological Judgment: Faithful Interpretation and Theological Judgment Faith and Learning outcomes; however, in RS 010: Life and Literature of Old Testament they are expected to demonstrate mastery in relation to the same outcomes. Why does such a discrepancy exist between two introductory courses in the student attainment results?

Long-Term Vision

The PRC commends your department on your accomplishments and applauds your intentions to strengthen off-campus offerings, sharpen students' critical thinking in major cases and expose students to deeper and more sustained interdisciplinary thinking. Has the department considered pairing RS courses with courses taught by faculty from other departments or inviting guest lecturers to your classes on a regular basis?

Report Organization

Your report follows the Six-Year Program Review Report Template and includes all the required appendices but the Multi-Year Assessment Plan.

Organization of the Departmental PR Archives.

Your 2010 Annual Assessment Report follows file naming conventions and is easy to access.

Assessment Resources

Using this opportunity, we would like to remind you that the Program Review Committee continues developing assessment resources which are posted on the Educational Effectiveness Resources site at the Provost website.

Conclusion

Based on our review of your report and assessment activities conducted by the Department of Religious Studies in 2004-2010 academic years, the PRC asks you to focus on the following items in this academic year and report on their progress in your 2011 Annual Assessment Update Report:

➢ revise your Program Learning Outcomes and reduce them in number.

➢ make sure that your curriculum is aligned with your Program Learning Outcomes upon refining them (Curriculum Map).

➢ act upon the assessment data you have already collected. The end of assessment is action.

➢ post your mission statement, Program Goals and Program Learning Outcomes Curriculum Map, Multi-Year assessment Plan on the departmental website.

We also recommend that your department

- ➢ revise the RS-180 Capstone course rubric
- ➢ invite the Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness to your departmental meeting to discuss your assessment activities and multi-year assessment plan.

We commend you again on making notable strides in your assessment activities over the past years. The Program Review Committee looks forward to the ongoing work of your department, and the ways that your work with assessment will lead to student success and accomplishments. Please let us know how we can assist you in your assessment work.

RS Department Assessment

	'A' work	'B' work	'C' work	'D' work	'F' work
Hermeneutical competence					
Close reading skills	Recognizes the interpretive questions and their relative significance. References genre, literary and historical contexts, and relevant, significant intertextual references. References text's intended and real audiences, and accounts for presuppositions.	Recognizes significant questions for interpretation. Notes influence of genre and context. Draws on contemporary texts and history. Shows awareness of audience, prior knowledge, bias, and presuppositions.	Use of some relevant texts recognizes some questions for interpretation. Identifies genre. Pays some attention to context. Mentions text's audience and personal bias or presuppositions.	Uses few relevant texts. Notes few important points of interpretation. Genre not fully explored. Context and contemporary texts rarely used. Little attention paid to audience. Interpretation guided by presuppositions of the reader.	Texts are insignificant or irrelevant to the argument, and moreover are poorly interpreted, failing to reference genre, literary and historical context, or the questions of audience and reader.
Critical methodologies	Critical appropriation of relevant methodologies and insights of relevant disciplines.	Influenced by relevant methodology and disciplinary perspectives.	References methodology, outside disciplines, or ideologies as guides for interpretation.	Unreflective choice of methodology or disciplinary perspective which is inadequate for interpretation.	Does not attempt to use an established methodology for interpretation.
Theological judgment					
Faithful interpretation	Research practices and results display critical comprehension of the logic, parameters, and significance of orthodox, catholic Christian belief, using it as a fertilizer rather than as a weedkiller.	Research practices and results show active, interested awareness of and adherence to orthodox, catholic Christian belief.	Research practices and results recognize the existence of orthodox, catholic Christian belief, but more as a constrictively, heteronomously imposed straitjacket than an internal principle driving inquiry forward.	Research practices and results show no interest in referring to or interacting with orthodox, catholic Christian belief.	Research practices and results display unreflective, uninformed ignorance of or opposition to orthodox, catholic Christian belief.
Context	Theological interests influence the direction and shape of the inquiry in a way that is critical (theology asks hard questions), relevant (theology makes a difference), and illuminating (theology leads to real insight).	Theological interests constitute intelligently used starting points, reference points, or integration points for substantial portions or aspects of the inquiry.	Theological interests may be specified or implied, but tend either to be pasted post hoc onto the inquiry or simply to predetermine the conclusions reached, with minimal substantive interaction.	The theological dimension is incoherent, disconnected, superfluous, or devoid of insight; what it means to think theologically is deeply misunderstood.	No connection with theology is made or attempted.
Ecclesial engagement					
Faith and learning	Interpretation serves personal faith, scholarly inquiry, and the shared life of God's people in the world, past and present particularly well.	Sustained, interested reflection on the significance of the study for Christian faith and life.	Shows some realization of the implications of the argument for the life of the church. May see tension between intellectual inquiry and faith.	Little reflection on the spiritual significance of the research. Few or misguided attempts to connect intellectual inquiry and faith.	No significant attempt or reliable ability to recognize or reflect on the connections of faith with academic work.

Spiritual discipline	Evidences spiritual discipline of theological reflection, Christ-like compassion, participation in Christian community, and robust engagement in the public square.	Shows clear interest in theological reflection, Christ-like compassion, Christian community, and engagement in the public square.	Shows some degree of theological reflection, Christian virtue, and public engagement.	Shows little interest or skill in theological reflection, Christian virtues, or public engagement.	Shows clear disinterest in or misunderstanding of theological reflection, Christian virtue, or public engagement.
General skills					
Argument	Clear, critical, analytical, logical, and persuasive argument avoids rabbit trails. Recognizes potential weaknesses and critiques.	Logical argument based on relevant lines of questioning. Supports argument with good evidence.	Some progression in argument, but also some reliance on irrelevant or weak evidence. Flaws do not compromise overall argument.	Little progression; illogical argument, with many irrelevant details and only weak supporting evidence.	Utter chaos. Argument is in-credible and does not persuade. Multiple irrelevant details or arguments are posed.
Scholarly resources	Judiciously, critically, and generously engages with a wide range of scholarly resources. Thoroughly and appropriately credits sources in notes and bibliography.	Uses scholarly resources adequately and critically. Credits sources in appropriate notes and bibliography.	Uses insufficient scholarly resources. Relies on quotations from sources (rather than critical appropriation of sources). Citation is sufficient.	Scholarly resources used injudiciously or inaccurately. Sources are largely incorporated uncritically. Citation is sufficient.	Uses no sources, or a few insufficient sources uncritically. Citation is spotty at best.
Presentation	Free of grammatical and spelling errors. Orderly. Logical. Neat and well laid-out.	Mostly free of grammatical or spelling errors. Paper is laid out and organized well.	A distracting level of errors. Presentation is messy or confused.	Many errors. Paper is not well organized.	A mess. Multiple errors of every kind.

Current SLOs and ILOs, critiques, and proposed revisions (9/13/2011):

RS GE SLO

CURRENT: *Students will know the content of, and understand interpretive approaches to, Christian scripture, Christian doctrine, and Christian history.*

PROPOSED: *Students will demonstrate literacy in Christian scripture and Christian doctrine.*

(Rationale: "Biblical and theological literacy" is the college catalog's language for what the Biblical and Theological Canons courses accomplish.)

RS-related ILOs

CURRENT: *Graduates of Westmont college will …*
know the content of the Bible and the central doctrines of the Christian faith and be able to relate this to other fields of inquiry [Christian understanding] *…*
demonstrate commitment to Christian service [Christian practices/affections].

PROPOSED: *Graduates of Westmont College will …*
demonstrate literacy in biblical and orthodox Christian faith …
demonstrate faithfulness in Christian service.

(Rationale: The first item is consistent with the RS GE SLO. The second better reflects the old Christian Orientation learning standard, using language from the College's newly adopted mission statement.)

RS Major SLOs

CURRENT:

Hermeneutical competence
Our graduates will be able to apply a range of skills in the interpretation of biblical and other religious literature.

- o They will employ close reading skills with regard to primary sources: observation; inquiry; attention to genre, context, intertextuality, and literary influence; awareness of their own assumptions and cultural biases; awareness of audience(s) and effect on readers.
- o They will display judicious use of scholarly resources (e.g., language tools, commentaries, monographs, journals, dictionaries, encyclopedias, electronic databases, library holdings, inter-library loan, web-based tools). They will acknowledge dependence and influence through appropriate notes and bibliography.
- o They will appropriate a range of critical methodologies (e.g., historical, literary, textual, rhetorical, socio-cultural), draw on insights across the range of relevant disciplines (e.g., linguistics; anthropology; sociology; philosophy; archaeology), and recognize the insights and pitfalls of various ideological approaches (e.g., post-colonial, feminist, Marxist).

Theological judgment
Our graduates will understand the fundamental claims and logic of the Christian faith, appreciate the development of Christian theological traditions over time, and be able to think theologically.

- o They will faithfully interpret texts including the Bible and other primary sources in the worldwide Christian tradition.

- o They will fairly evaluate the theological claims of secondary sources and current voices within and outside the Christian tradition.
- o They will thoughtfully address intellectual and practical issues involving both narrowly theological matters and concerns in other disciplines.
- o They will be acquainted with, and increasingly formed in, the practices that Christian theology serves including worship, fellowship, mission, study (especially of the Bible), and ethical conduct.

Ecclesial engagement
Our graduates will be marked by a passionate commitment to the Christian church and its mission.

- o They will increasingly recognize connections between personal faith, scholarly inquiry, and the shared life of God's people in the world past and present.
- o They will sense no conflict between rigorous intellectual inquiry, faithful service, and passionate worship.
- o They will establish lifelong disciplines marked by theological reflection, Christ-like compassion, and robust engagement in the public square.

PROPOSED:

We preserve the current language, but rename it "RS Major Goals."

RS MAJOR OUTCOMES: Our graduates will …

… apply a range of recognized skills in the interpretation of biblical and other religious literature.

… reason according to the logic of the Christian faith.

… participate in Christian life and mission with passionate ecclesial commitment.

Our RS Major Goals describe what these might entail.

(Rationale: While preserving the substance of our goals, the revision reduces the number of outcomes from ten to three, uses assessment-friendlier verbs, and specifies in non-binding ways the kinds of skills, features, and practices that could express these outcomes.)

RS Department
MULTI-YEAR PLAN

Outcomes	2010 -11	2011 -12	2012 -13	2013 -14	2014 -15	2015 -16	Means of Assessment, Benchmark	Who is in charge?	How the loop will be closed /has been closed?
All outcomes are assessed each year through a common assignment, focus group, and rubric.		X	X	X	X	X	Final projects in RS-180 capstone course and final focus group. Benchmark is average performance at 4th of 5 performance standards described in the rubric, with 80% of students at that level or higher.	RS-180 teachers develop assignment and apply rubric; chair facilitates tabulation and discussion.	In 2010-11, the department reformulated SLOs on recommendataion of PRC's response to its 2010 six-year report.
GE Projects									
Revise Biblical and Theological Canons SLO and Christian Understanding ILOs.	X							Chair facilitated.	
Develop instruments for the above SLOs and ILO.		X						Chair coordinates departmental involvement.	
Assess outcomes for these according to GE Multi-Year Assessment Plan.			X				To be determined in the previous step.	Chair coordinates departmental involvement.	

Comments/Reflections: