## Program-Level Continuous Improvement Process (CI-Process) Basics

| Program Basics | **Program Name: State formal program name from list of ADHE- or UCA-recognized programs.**<br><br>Religious Studies BA |
| --- | --- |
| | **Program Purpose: State WHY this program exists. The purpose should support the University, College, and Department mission statements, but it should NOT be a reiteration of those statements.**<br><br>The program will provide a comprehensive and clear exposure to the variety of religious expressions world-wide, a critical understanding of personal, social, and cultural dimensions of religion, and a thorough preparation for students who wish to pursue graduate or professional study. |

| Program Goals (Typically programs have 2-4 goals) | **Goal 1: Program goals state the faculty's broad expectations of the knowledge, skills, or abilities held by program completers.**<br>Students will demonstrate critical analysis skills applied to a variety of religions expressions as a complex personal, social and cultural phenomena. |
| --- | --- |
| | **Goal 2:** Students will demonstrate a critically nuanced understanding of the study of religions. |
| | **Goal 3:** |
| | **Goal 4:** |
| | **Goal 5:** |
| | **Goal 6:** |
| | **Goal 7:** |
| | **Goal 8:** |

**Program-Level Continuous Improvement Process (CI-Process) Plan**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Closing the Loop Process** | **Data Collection** | **Who & How: Indicate who will collect the data and how data will be collected**. Each time RELG 3301 is taught, the faculty member teaching the course will collect data from the majors enrolled in in the class. |
| | | **Timeline: Indicate when the data will be collected.** During the final week of the semester each time RELG 3301 is taught. |
| | **Data Analysis** | **Who: Indicate who, by name or position, is responsible for organizing the data and performing an initial analysis of the data to determine the extent to which the benchmarks for the tested student learning outcomes were achieved.** The department assessment director, the director of religious studies and the chair of the department. |
| | | **Timeline: Indicate when the data will be analyzed.** By June 1. |
| | **Data Dissemination** | **Who & How: Indicate who will share data with relevant faculty and how data will be shared.** The department assessment director, the director of religious studies, and the chair of the department will distribute the data to the faculty of the department and will charge appropriate department committees to discuss possible curricular and/or pedagogical changes. |
| | | **Timeline: Indicate when the data will be shared.** At first department meeting in the fall semester. |
| | **Resulting Actions** | **How: Indicate how the Program Director will formally share results and present desired program changes with the Responsible Authority.** The results of the data analysis and the resulting actions will be delivered to the University Director of Assessment by January 1. |
| | | **Timeline: Indicate when the data and faculty feedback will be shared.** By the end of November. |
| | **Re-assessment/ Evaluation** | **How: Indicate how the desired program changes will be put into place and what data will be collected following the changes. If process for collecting and analyzing data is different than what is stated above, indicate how it will be different here.** The impact of these changes will be assessed in the first semester following the implementation of these changes. The data related to these changes will then be disseminated and analyzed according to the procedure outlined above. |
| | | **Timeline: Indicate when the data will be collected following these changes.** Following year when the data has been collected and analyzed. |

# CI-Process Student Learning Outcome Information Sheet
*Repeat table as needed for each Student Learning Outcome*

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="8" style="writing-mode: vertical;"><strong>Student Learning Outcome</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcome</strong></td>
<td><strong>A Student Learning Outcomes is a specific and measurable indicator of student progress toward a program goal(s):</strong> Students will demonstrate critical analysis skills as applied to religion as a complex socio-cultural phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related Program Goal(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>State the program goal addressed by this Student Learning Outcome. A "SLO" may address a single goal or multiple goals.</strong><br><br>Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Activity</strong></td>
<td><strong>State the activity that will be directly assessed for the above Student Learning Outcome.</strong> RELG 3301 Final Paper (10-12 page paper presenting and evaluating a theory, methodology and/or theorist of religion) will be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Method</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explain how the quality of the above activity will be assessed.</strong> According to Critical Thinking Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td><strong>State the performance expectation for the above activity, and some justification for that expectation.</strong> _____% of students will score an acceptable grade on the Critical Thinking Rubric. (This is a new assessment and benchmarks have not yet been established.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td><strong>State whom will be assessed using the above activity AND where it will occur.</strong> All Religious Studies Majors enrolled in RELG 3301 every time this course is offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td><strong>State when AND how frequently the above activity will be assessed.</strong> Every time RELG 3301 is taught (currently once a year).</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="3" style="writing-mode: vertical;"><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provide a short summary of the results of the above activity AND the date these results were compiled.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong></td>
<td>☐ Exceeded ☐ Met ☐ Did Not Meet …. <strong>The benchmark for this activity (stated above).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td><strong>Authority Responsible for Analysis: Provide the position of the person responsible for the program.</strong></td>
</tr>
</table>

Semester and/or academic year for which the data applies: _____

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Analysis** | **Authority Analysis** | **Date of Analysis: Provide the date on which Responsible Authority reviewed data**<br><br>**Comments: Provide comments about data from Responsible Authority** |
| | **Department/ Area/ Program Faculty** | **Presented to Program Faculty by: Provide position of person responsible for sharing results with relevant faculty.**<br>*Example:*<br><br>**Date of Presentation: Provide the date on which presentation to faculty was conducted.**<br>*Example:*<br><br>**Comments: Provide comments about the data from the relevant faculty**<br>*Example:* |
| | **Conclusion** | ☐ Continue to assess next assessment period ☐ Rotate out of assessment (to be assessed again:                    ) ☐ Curricular change<br><br>☐ Pedagogic change ☐ Assessment Process change ☐ Benchmark change ☐ Other: _____ |
| **Closing the Loop** | **Assessment Data-Driven Change** | **Planned Implementation Date: Provide date on which change(s) will be made based on data for this SLO.** |
| | **Acknowledgement** | **Provide signature of Department Chair acknowledging above results.**<br><br>Date |
| | **Acknowledgement** | **Provide signature of College committee chairperson or College Dean acknowledging above results.**<br><br>Date |

*

**CI-Process Student Learning Outcome Information Sheet**

*Repeat table as needed for <u>each</u> Student Learning Outcome*

Semester and/or academic year for which the data applies: _____

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Student Learning Outcome** (vertical label) | **Student Learning Outcome** | Students will write a paper that demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the study of religions as a personal, social and cultural phenomenon. |
| | **Related Program Goal(s)** | **State the program goal addressed by this Student Learning Outcome. A "SLO" may address a single goal or multiple goals.**<br><br>Goal 2 |
| | **Assessment Activity** | **State the activity that will be directly assessed for the above Student Learning Outcome.** RELG 3301 Final Paper (10-12 page paper presenting and evaluating a theory, methodology and/or theorist of religion) will be assessed. |
| | **Assessment Method** | **Explain how the quality of the above activity will be assessed.** According to Paper/Writing Evaluation Rubric. |
| | **Benchmark** | **State the performance expectation for the above activity, and some justification for that expectation.** _____% of students will score an acceptable grade on the Paper/Writing Evaluation Rubric. (This is a new assessment and benchmarks have not yet been established.) |
| | **Location** | **State whom will be assessed using the above activity AND where it will occur.** All Religious Studies Majors enrolled in RELG 3301 every time the course is offered. |
| | **Frequency** | **State when AND how frequently the above activity will be assessed.** Each time RELG 3301 is taught (currently once a year). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Observations** (vertical label) | **Data Summary** | **Provide a short summary of the results of the above activity AND the date these results were compiled.** |
| | **Result** | ☐ Exceeded ☐ Met ☐ Did Not Meet …. **The benchmark for this activity (stated above).** |
| | **Responsible Authority**<br><br>**Analysis** | **Authority Responsible for Analysis: Provide the position of the person responsible for the program.**<br><br>**Date of Analysis: Provide the date on which Responsible Authority reviewed data** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | **Comments: Provide comments about data from Responsible Authority** |
| **Analysis** | **Department/ Area/ Program Faculty** | **Presented to Program Faculty by: Provide position of person responsible for sharing results with relevant faculty.** <br><br> *Example:* <br><br><br> **Date of Presentation: Provide the date on which presentation to faculty was conducted.** <br><br> *Example:* <br><br><br><br> **Comments: Provide comments about the data from the relevant faculty** <br><br> *Example:* |
| | **Conclusion** | ☐ Continue to assess next assessment period  ☐ Rotate out of assessment (to be assessed again:                    )  ☐ Curricular change <br><br><br> ☐ Pedagogic change  ☐ Assessment Process change  ☐ Benchmark change  ☐ Other: _____ |
| **Closing the Loop** | **Assessment Data-Driven Change** | **Planned Implementation Date: Provide date on which change(s) will be made based on data for this SLO.** |
| | **Acknowledgement** | **Provide signature of Department Chair acknowledging above results.** <br><br>       Date |
| | **Acknowledgement** | **Provide signature of College committee chairperson or College Dean acknowledging above results.** <br><br>       Date |

Semester and/or academic year for which the data applies: _____

| CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SKILL** | **Inadequate**<br><br>**1** | **Needs Improvement**<br><br>**2** | **Acceptable**<br><br>**3** | **Proficient**<br><br>**4** | |
| Identification and summary of the problem/question at issue. | Does not identify the problem/questions. | The main problem/question is identified but summary is unclear, confusing, or does not exist. | The main problem/question is identified. | The main problem/question is identified as well as any implanted, implicit, or secondary problems/questions are identified and summarized in a clear and concise manner. | |
| Assessment of the quality of supporting information, evidence or argumentation. | Does not provide an assessment of supporting information, evidence, or argumentation. | Information or argumentation is taken from sources without any interpretation or assessment. There is no distinguishing between fact and opinion. Viewpoints from experts are taken as fact without question. | Information or argumentation is selected and assessed but only the minimum required. There is not enough to develop an in depth analysis. Viewpoints from experts are taken mainly as fact, but with some questioning. Student does distinguish between fact and opinion. | Information or argumentation is thoroughly assessed and evaluated. Questions the viewpoints of experts. Provides new information for consideration. Questions precision, accuracy, relevance of the evidence. Identifies possible bias. Identifies possible cause and effect and/or possible consequences. Creates a comprehensive synthesis or analysis. | |
| Presentation of student's own perspective, thesis/hypothesis, or position. | No specific position, thesis, or perspective is offered. | Student position is vague and unclear. Different sides of the issue are not included. No justification provided for student's position. | Student position is clearly defined but only a little support for that position is provided. Different sides of the issue are included but not analyzed. | Student's position is clearly defined, well supported, and includes a discussion about its strengths and weaknesses. Different sides of the issue are clearly defined with analysis of these positions in relation to the students'. The student will draw from outside sources and experiences to develop their position. | |
| Conclusions, implications, and consequences. | No conclusions are provided. | Suggests a conclusion but it is unclear or simplistic in nature. The student does not tie the conclusion to the information discussed. | A clear conclusion is presented but is tied to the information discussed in an unclear or inconsistent manner. Only one or two consequences or implications are included. | A clear conclusion is presented and discussed along with implications and consequences of that conclusion. Student considers all relevant assumptions, data, supporting evidence, information, argumentation and context. Student reflects upon their own conclusion with logic and objectivity. | |

**Paper/Writing Evaluation Rubric**

|  | 4:Proficient | 3: Acceptable | 2: Needs Improvement | 1: Inadequate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Argument** | Clear and explicit argument, sustained throughout paper | Has argument, but not sustained throughout, or not clearly stated. | Argument not explicit, or is hard to find. Argument simplistic; Argument reflects poor analysis. | No argument given. |
| **Evidence** | Primary source evidence supports the argument; quantity of citations sufficient; evidence is analyzed; demonstrates mastery of sources. Paper clearly situates itself within a recognized approach to the study of religion. | Use of evidence is adequate but not outstanding; examples may not have sufficient analysis or clear relation to thesis statement. Relation to an approach to religious studies may not be clear. | Inadequate use of primary source evidence; only a few citations from primary sources; little to no analysis of primary sources; not enough specific examples to support the argument. Inadequate context with no clear sense of approach or how topic relates to that academic approach. | No primary source evidence. Misunderstanding of primary source evidence. No connection of evidence to argument. No academic context or awareness of approach to religious studies in paper. |
| **Development** | Argument is developed. Paragraphs throughout paper have main ideas related to argument. Paper presents logical flow of ideas and sound organization. | Uneven development of main ideas that support the argument. Analysis lacks depth. Some breakdowns in organization and flow of ideas. | Argument poorly developed. Paragraphs throughout paper lack main ideas related to the argument. Poor analysis. Major breakdowns in organization and flow of ideas. | No development of argument or analysis of sources. Organization confusing; ideas disconnected. Paper generally lacks supporting main ideas that relate to the argument. |
| **Writing** | Clear and mature writing. Free from grammatical and stylistic errors. Correct footnote citation style. | Solid writing with some flaws. Some problems with grammar, style, or footnotes. | Basic and simplistic writing. Major portions of paper contain grammar and style errors. Mistakes are distracting. | Paper is riddled with errors of grammar and style. Writing is poor and incoherent. Obvious failure to proofread or revise. |