

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) did you assess in 2014-2015? [Check all that apply]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |
| | a. |
| | b. |
| | c. |

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No (Go to **Q1.5**)
☐ 3. Don't know (Go to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.5. Did your program use the [Degree Qualification Profile](#) (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☒ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
☐ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is.
☐ 4. Don't know

Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)? Yes

<p>Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about EACH PLO you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs:</p> <p>The HRS B.A. programs' second learning goal is closely aligned with the BLG "Intellectual and Practical Skills":</p> <p>(PLG2) Intellectual and Communication Skills: Students majoring in Humanities & Religious Studies should be able to demonstrate analytical reading skills, critical thinking skills, and effective written and oral communication skills in order to facilitate clear understanding and articulation of subject matter in academic and professional pursuits.</p> <p>The first two PLOs linked to this goal address reading and critical thinking; the third and fourth address written communication, including use of appropriate reference sources (i.e., information literacy), and oral communication skills:</p> <p>(PLO2.3) Use appropriate structure, development, usage, and reference sources to write clear, purposeful, analytical prose.</p> <p>(PLO2.4) Present information orally in a persuasive, logical, and organized manner that draws effectively on relevant evidence.</p>	<p>Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?</p> <div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="margin-right: 10px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> <div> <p>1. Yes, for all PLOs</p> <p>2. Yes, but for some PLOs</p> <p>3. No rubrics for PLOs</p> <p>N/A, other (please specify)</p> </div> </div>
---	---

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO

<p>Q 2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):</p> <p>Information Competence (As noted in Q1.2, information competence is one component of our PLO 2.3 on Written Communication: "Use appropriate...reference sources...") As part of our reflecting on this assessment report, the Department will consider adjusting the list of PLOs to include Information Competence more explicitly.</p>	<p>Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted explicit standards of performance for this PLO?</p> <div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="margin-right: 10px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> <div> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. No</p> <p>3. Don't know</p> <p>4. N/A</p> </div> </div>
<p>Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: [V limit: 300]</p> <p>We have used the AAC&U Value Rubric for Information Literacy (Appendix 1); we also have used the departmental Term Paper Rubric developed for the HRS 190 series (Appendix 2).</p>	

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Other: |

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:

	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q
	(1) PLO	(2) Standards of Performance	
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	X		
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO			
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook			
4. In the university catalogue			
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters			
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities	X		
7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university	X		
8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents			
9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents			
10. Other, specify:			

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO in 2014-2015?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. Yes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. No (Skip to Q6) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. N/A (Skip to Q6) |

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO in 2015?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1. Yes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. No (Skip to Q6) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. N/A (Skip to Q6) |

<p>Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO?</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Q3.2A Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300 words]</p> <p>HRS 190D Fall 2014 (Senior Seminar in Humanities & Religious Studies: Death and Afterlife) term papers, of which six papers were reviewed by the three members of the assessment committee in order to determine scores per the Value Rubric. The Term Paper Rubric was applied by the instructor when assessing the students' papers.</p>	
<p>Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)</p>		
<p>Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.7)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7)</p>	<p>Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Key assignments from elective classes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 5. External performance assessments such as internship or other community based projects</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6. E-Portfolios</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other portfolios</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other measure. Specify:</p>	
<p>Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data. (See Information Literacy VALUE Rubric, attached as Appendix 1, and HRS 190D term paper assignment, attached as Appendix 2.)</p>		
<p>Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.5)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5. The VALUE rubric(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 7. Used other means. Specify:</p>		
<p>Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p>Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>	<p>Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>
<p>Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p>	

Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]? Random selection of 6 papers.		Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review? Assessment of this same PLO in our graduate program involved one seminar in which 6 students were enrolled. We opted to maintain a consistent count of 6 sample papers throughout our assessment of Information Competence in our three programs.	
Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? 12	Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate? 6	Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)			
Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know		Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply] <input type="checkbox"/> 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. College/Department/program student surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other, specify:	
Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?			
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.		Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?	
Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)			
Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know		Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures were used? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams <input type="checkbox"/> 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Other, specify:	
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.9) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)		Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:	
Q3D: Alignment and Quality			
Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the		Q3.9.1. Were ALL the assessment	

different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?	tools/measures/methods that were used good measure for the PLO?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. No	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. No
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know

Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment [Word limit: 600 for selected PLO])

See Appendix 3 (Information Literacy VALUE Rubric HRS 190D Term Paper Rubric scores).

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance the selected PLO?

The Information Literacy VALUE Rubric includes five categories of skills. Average scores for the categories ranged from a low of 1.8 to a high of 5.0 (out of a possible 5.0). Four of the five categories score 2.2 or 2.3. The category "Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically" scores relatively low at 1.8.

Our analysis of the data suggests that there is room for improvement in all five categories. The HRS 190D course already includes focused attention on planning, developing, and completing the term paper, but the data indicate that more should be done. These efforts need to be applied in all five versions of HRS 190 (there are currently five versions of this course with varying themes; one section of HRS 190 is required for all HRS majors). Means of improving student performance on this PLO can also be inculcated in the two other core courses for the Religious Studies concentration: HRS 108 (Approaches to Religious Studies) and HRS 198 (Seminar in Religious Studies), which is the program's capstone course.

Regarding the category "Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically," especially in the Internet age, rife with uncertainties about the nature of "texts" and so forth, it is crucial that we implement effective means of teaching sound approaches to identifying and critically examining source material. This can be done in virtually all HRS courses.

We also believe that it would be beneficial to employ a common term paper rubric for the HRS 190 seminars, perhaps also to be used in HRS 198. Most faculty already are using a common rubric in HRS 190. We plan to review and revise the rubric, paying careful attention to the Information Literacy and other relevant VALUE rubrics.

Four categories of the HRS 190D Term Paper Rubric are relevant for purposes of assessing Information Competence: Research, Thesis Development, Analysis, and Source Documentation (see Appendix 2 for the full rubric). Comparison of each paper's average score in these four categories with the corresponding averages in the Information Literacy Rubric scores shows quite close correspondence (paper #5 achieved the highest scores, paper #6 the second highest, and the other four papers as a group achieved relatively lower scores). Of much greater interest for our department is the challenge of devising rubric categories that will function effectively for purposes of both grading term papers and assessing pertinent PLOs, such as Information Competence (Written Communication is another obviously pertinent PLO). Major aspects of assignments such as the HRS 190D term paper are designed to enhance student achievement of certain PLOs, and so naturally means of assessing these PLOs ought to correlate precisely with means of assigning grades to the corresponding aspects of the term paper.

Q4.3. For **selected** PLO, the student performance:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Exceeded expectation/standard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Met expectation/standard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Partially met expectation/standard |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Did not meet expectation/standard |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5. No expectation or standard has been specified |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Don't know |

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2014-2015** and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No (Go to **Q6**)
☐ 3. Don't know (Go to **Q6**)

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

- ☒ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Don't know

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. **[Word limit: 300 words]**
(Please see response to Q4.2.)

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (**2013 - 2014**) been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum				X	
3. Improving advising and mentoring					X
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			X		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			X		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan		X			
7. Annual assessment reports	X				
8. Program review					X
9. Prospective student and family information					X
10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning					X
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification					X
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring					X
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					X
22. Recruitment of new students					X

23. Other Specify:

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

HRS 108 (Approaches to Religious Studies) is a core requirement for the Religious Studies concentration, and the primary learning experience that focuses on disciplinary theory and method. The Spring 2015 version of this course featured, in addition to the Focused Study (see below, on Oral Communication PLO), reading-response papers and midterm and final exams that explicitly incorporated emphasis on critical thinking, with careful attention to lessons learned from our 2013-2014 assessment project, including revision and application of the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric.

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Critical thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Information literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Written communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Oral communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Quantitative literacy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Inquiry and analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Creative thinking |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Reading |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Team work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Problem solving |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Civic knowledge and engagement |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Ethical reasoning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 15. Global learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Integrative and applied learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | a. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | b. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | c. |

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:

1. Information Literacy VALUE Rubric
2. HRS 190D Term Paper assignment
3. Scores per Information Literacy VALUE Rubric and per Term Paper Rubric for HRS 190D papers
4. HRS 108 Focused Study assignment
5. Oral Communication VALUE Rubric
6. Scores per Oral Communication VALUE Rubric for HRS 108 Focused Study reports

Program Information

P1. Program/Concentration Name(s):
HRS B.A. (Religious Studies Concentration)

P2. Program Director:
N/A

P1.1. Report Authors:
Jeffrey Brodd, Brad Nystrom, Harvey Stark

P2.1. Department Chair:
Brad Nystrom

P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College:
Department of Humanities & Religious Studies

P4. College:
Arts & Letters

P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See [Department Fact Book 2014](#) by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2014 enrollment: 50 (Fall 2013 enrollment; this is the most recent data provided by

P6. Program Type: [Select only one]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree

the 2014 <i>Fact Book</i>)				<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d) <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Other. Please specify:						
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 2 P7.1. List all the name(s): HRS B.A. (Humanities Concentration), HRS B.A. (Religious Studies Concentration) P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 2				Master Degree Program(s): P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 1 P8.1. List all the name(s): Humanities M.A. P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? 0						
Credential Program(s): P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 0 P9.1. List all the names:				Doctorate Program(s) P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0 P10.1. List all the name(s):						
When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed					X					
P12. Last updated					X					
								1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?								X		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?								X		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?								X		
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?								X		

Assessing Other Program Learning Outcomes (Optional)

If your program assessed PLOs not reported above, please summarize your assessment activities in the table below. If you completed part of the assessment process, but not the full process (for example, you revised a PLO and developed a new rubric for measuring it), then put N/A in any boxes that do not apply.

Report Assessment Activities on Additional PLOs Here

We assessed PLO2.4, Oral Communication. Please see also Appendices 4 (HRS 108 Focused Study assignment), 5 (Oral Communication VALUE Rubric), and 6 (Scores per Oral Communication VALUE Rubric for HRS 108 Focused Study reports).

Oral Communication

(PLO2.4) Present information orally in a persuasive, logical, and organized manner that draws effectively on relevant evidence.

This is the first time we have assessed this PLO; we have not yet established a standard of performance.

Oral Communication VALUE Rubric applied to HRS 108 (Spring 2015) students' Focused Study oral reports.

(See Appendix 6 for Rubric scores.)

The overall average score for three of the six students is below 2.0. Even without yet having established standards of performance, these scores seem unsatisfactorily low, especially for students in a core requirement for the concentration.

This aspect of our assessment project has alerted us to the fact that we do little in our HRS (Religious Studies) program to enhance student performance in Oral Communication. We must decide if indeed we regard this PLO as essential to our program's mission; and if so, we need to implement better means of helping student to achieve satisfactory mastery.

INFORMATION LITERACY VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - The National Forum on Information Literacy

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Determine the Extent of Information Needed	Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.	Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question.	Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.). Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research question.	Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis. Has difficulty determining key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question.
Access the Needed Information	Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources.	Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search.	Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources.	Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality.
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth	Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.	Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.	Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved.
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly one of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

APPENDIX 2: HRS 190D Term Paper

California State University, Sacramento

HRS 190D. Senior Seminar in Humanities & Religious Studies: Death and Afterlife

Fall 2014

Term Paper: Research and Writing, Peer Review, Rubric

Research and Writing

Both primary and secondary textual sources are to be considered. Incorporation of assigned course readings is permitted. Our Library and its website provides a wealth of information for conducting sound research, such as the Eureka Library Catalog:

<http://eureka.lib.csus.edu.proxy.lib.csus.edu/> and Database & Article searching:

<http://xerxes.calstate.edu/sacramento/> (with its helpful links for “Humanities” and “Religious Studies”).

The term paper needs to take full account of the Rubric (see below; see also “Notes on Rubric”). Source documentation is to comply with CMS (Chicago Manual of Style) or MLA, or ask the instructor if interested in using another style.

Avoid plagiarism; for the University’s policy see:

<http://library.csus.edu/content2.asp?pageID=353>).

And ask the instructor if you have questions or concerns on this important issue.

Peer review

The draft (two copies) of the paper is due by class time on **November 25**. One of the copies will go to the instructor, the other to the student doing the peer review. This draft needs to be at least 10 pages (typed, double-spaced) and must include a bibliography of at least 6 sources. One or two sources must consist of websites, to be accompanied by brief (app. 100-word) assessments of the validity of these Internet sources. It is permissible to include some notes to the reader indicating possible new directions or questions for the reviewer.

The peer review does not need to be extensive. One page of commentary (single-spaced) will be sufficient. Writing short comments or marks directly on the draft can be helpful, but longer comments are to be typed. If you wish to reference a specific point in the draft with a longer comment, write a number or a letter (circle it for clarity) at that point, and then number/letter your typed comments accordingly. There is no specific format required for this review; simply strive to express your observations and suggestions as clearly as possible. Be sure to pay close heed to the “Term Paper Rubric” and the accompanying “Notes on Rubric categories” (as they set forth the ideals for this entire paper project). Make use of these categories for organizing most of your feedback (it works well to list them as I’ve done here, with commentary pertaining to each). Unless you see some glaring mistakes, don’t be concerned with **Source documentation**, and leave the assessment of **General procedure** up to the instructor—but do recall that this final category is pertinent to the peer review task itself (“Be diligent and helpful in your review of your colleague’s draft,” as the Rubric instruction sheet points out). The peer review is due by the following class session, on **December 2**. The final draft of the paper is due at our final class session, on **December 16**.

HRS 190D Term Paper Rubric

	Seriously Flawed (D)	Adequate (C)	Proficient (B)	Advanced (A)
Research	Used minimal resources. Little or no use of research collections.	Used moderate number and variety of resources. Used research collections and categories.	Used wide number and variety of resources. Judicious use and incorporation of quotations important to the research.	Demonstrated unusual facility in using sources. Used exceptional research techniques.
Thesis development	Develops an incomplete or inaccurate thesis.	Develops a coherent thesis from collected research.	Applies innovative concepts derived from research materials to derive or develop thesis.	Examines research materials in a focused manner to present a defensible thesis.
Organization	Displays random or confusing organization.	Demonstrates adequate organization.	Demonstrates a clear and coherent organization.	Demonstrates coherent and rhetorically sophisticated organization. Makes effective connections between ideas.
Analysis	Illustrates a lack of an adequate level of analysis, such that thesis receives little support from information.	Illustrates adequate level of analysis, making occasional effective points supporting thesis with information.	Illustrates a good level of analysis, making many effective points supporting thesis with information.	Illustrates highly sophisticated level of analysis in approach to defending thesis and integrating information.
Contextual depth	Does not analyze topic within the broader context of Humanities/Religious Studies perspectives.	Analyzes topic within narrow context of H/RS perspectives.	Analyzes topic within the context of H/RS perspectives.	Analyzes and interprets research material with information drawn from other HRS courses, and analyzes topic within the context of H/RS perspectives.
Writing quality	Shows deficient control of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English. Errors impede understanding.	Displays adequate control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.	Displays consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.	Displays superior, consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.
Source documentation	Frequently neglects to cite sources appropriately or employs inconsistent documentation style in many instances.	Occasionally neglects to cite sources appropriately or employs inconsistent documentation style in several instances.	With only a few exceptions, cites sources appropriately and employs consistent documentation style.	Cites sources appropriately and employs consistent documentation style.
General procedure	Consistently late and/or haphazard.	Occasionally late and/or haphazard.	Late and/or haphazard with one or two phases of process.	Consistently on time and showing appropriate effort.

Notes on Rubric categories

Research

- At least some work with primary sources is essential for producing an effective term paper. Depending on the topic and especially if there is disciplinary focus on the Humanities, primary sources could include “texts” beyond the written (i.e., artwork, music, etc.).
- Likely there will prove to be an abundance of secondary source material available. Part of the challenge is to be selective.

Thesis development

- The paper should be constructed around a central idea or claim. This need not be “profound” or “radical”; but it should provide focus and enhance interest for the reader (and for the writer). Choosing the right thesis typically requires some amount of work with the material.
- Typically, development of one’s thesis comes later, after significant research: Interest > research > questions > research > thesis > (research) defense of thesis.
- A clear thesis statement belongs in the first or second paragraph (usually in the last sentence).

Organization

- The Rubric statements on Organization will hopefully prove self-explanatory as to the ideals; please ask the instructor if there is uncertainty.

Analysis

- The emphasis here is on making effective use of the information obtained through research, so that overall the thesis is strongly supported. This is not to imply that there should be no points at which information might argue against the thesis; including such a balanced point of view is laudable. On the whole, however, effective analysis will yield a strong defense of the thesis.

Contextual depth

- This category involves the issue of intended readership. Write to your colleagues in the class, all of whom are Humanities & Religious Studies majors or graduate students in related fields.
- It is acceptable to focus on either the Humanities context or on the Religious Studies context (hence the “H/RS” as opposed to “HRS”). This is especially pertinent when drawing upon the methodological approaches explored in HRS 105 or 108.

Writing quality

- (This should be clear enough from the Rubric; please don’t hesitate to ask if there is need of further clarification.)

Source documentation

- Plagiarism must be avoided (and so, if in doubt, be safe and cite source material). Sometimes it is helpful for the reader to be informed of a relevant source even if a citation is not mandated by the rules governing plagiarism.
- The “documentation style” can be CMS (Chicago Manual of Style) or MLA; be sure to be consistent.

General procedure

- Stay on schedule as per due dates.
- Commit an appropriate amount of effort to producing an initial statement of paper topic(s), a preliminary bibliography, and a draft.
- Be diligent and helpful in your review of your colleague’s draft.

APPENDIX 3: Rubric scores

HRS 190D, Fall 2014: Information Literacy per VALUE Rubric

Paper #	1	2	3	4	5	6	AVERAGE
Determine the Extent of Information Needed	1.8	2.3	1.8	1.8	3.3	2.3	2.3
Access the Needed Information	1.7	2.2	1.8	1.8	3.2	2.7	2.2
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.8	1.7	1.8
Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.2	3.2	2.3	2.3
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	1.7	2.0	1.8	2.2	3.0	2.5	2.2
AVERAGE SCORE	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.9	3.1	2.3	2.2

HRS 190D, Fall 2014: Term Paper Rubric scores

Paper #	1	2	3	4	5	6	AVERAGE
Research	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	14.0	13.0	12.5
Thesis development	11.0	11.5	11.0	12.0	14.0	12.5	12.0
Analysis	11.0	12.0	11.0	11.0	9.0	11.0	10.8
Source documentation	13.5	11.0	13.0	10.0	15.0	14.0	12.8
AVERAGE SCORE	11.9	11.6	11.8	11.3	13.0	12.6	12.0

APPENDIX 4: HRS 108 Focused Study

Approaches to Religious Studies

Spring 2015

Directives for Focused Studies

Each student is to choose from among the following list of relatively brief works, which have been selected to align with the assigned course readings. During the course period in which the assigned reading is discussed, the student will assist the professor in leading the discussion, contributing at the minimum these two things:

1. A brief statement on the content of the additional reading, and how it affected your reading of the assigned material.
2. A discussion question pertinent to the assigned reading (not only the additional reading) to ask the class. (I.e., a question that the entire class will be able to answer without having read the additional reading.)

As a follow-up to the class experience, the student is to hand in a written summary of the focused study of approximately 2 pages (600–750 words). The summary will be due by the following class session, and will be posted on SacCT in PDF format (and so please submit an electronic version, either in Word or in PDF). By the end of class on Monday, February 9, all students are to have submitted their choices, including first and second alternate choices (i.e., a total of three). Every attempt will be made to assign students their preferred choices. A finalized schedule for the term will then be issued in class. Focused studies will begin as early as February 16.

Focused study date/topic/reading options (all texts except for #6 and #25 are accessible via our Library)

Mon 2/16 William James. Pals, *Nine Theories*, ch. 6 (185–226)

1. Daniel L. Pals, *Introducing Religion*, ch. 6: “William James: The Testimony of Religious Experience”
2. David M. Wulff, *Psychology of Religion*, ch. 10: “William James and His Legacy” (pp. 467-518)

Mon 2/22 Rudolf Otto. Pals, *Introducing Religion*, second part of ch. 7 (222–235)

3. Lynn Poland, “The Idea of the Holy and the History of the Sublime,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 72, No. 2 (April, 1992), pp. 175-197
4. Robert F. Streetman, “Some Later Thoughts of Otto on the Holy,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (September, 1980), pp. 365-384

Wed 2/24 Karl Marx. Pals, *Nine Theories*, ch. 4 (113–142)

5. Daniel L. Pals, *Introducing Religion*, ch. 5: “Karl Marx: Religion as Agent of Economic Oppression”
6. Murray N. Rothbard, “Karl Marx as Religious Eschatologist” (<http://mises.org/daily/3769>)

Wed 3/4 Carl Jung. Wulff, excerpt from “C. G. Jung and the Analytical Tradition” (SacCT)

7. David M. Wulff, *Psychology of Religion*, second part of ch. 9: “C. G. Jung and the Analytical Tradition” (pp. 434-466)
8. Carl Gustav Jung, “Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious,” in *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, pp. 358-407

Mon 3/9 Émile Durkheim. Pals, *Nine Theories*, ch. 3 (81–112)

9. Daniel L. Pals, *Introducing Religion*, ch. 4: “Emile Durkheim: The Social as Sacred”
10. Eric J. Sharpe, “Totemism and Magic,” ch. 9 in *Comparative Religion: A History*

Wed 3/11 Max Weber. Pals, *Nine Theories*, ch. 5 (143-184)

11. Daniel L. Pals, *Introducing Religion*, ch. 8: “Max Weber: Religion and Culture Interwoven”
12. David D. Laitin, “Review: Religion, Political Culture, and the Weberian Tradition,” *World Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (July 1978), pp. 563-592

Wed 4/1 Peter Berger. Berger, *The Sacred Canopy*, chs. 3 and 4 (53–101)

13. Peter Berger, “Appendix I: Sociological Definitions of Religion” and “Appendix II: Sociological and

- Theological Perspectives,” in *The Sacred Canopy*
14. R. X. Kline III, “Sheltering under the Sacred Canopy: Peter Berger and Xunzi,” *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Summer 2001), pp. 261-282
- Mon 4/6 Mircea Eliade. Pals, *Nine Theories*, first part of ch. 7 (227-246), and Pals, *Introducing Religion*, first part of ch. 9 (271-297)
15. Eric J. Sharpe, “Religion and the Unconscious,” ch. 9 in *Comparative Religion: A History*
 16. Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, “To Create a New Universe: Mircea Eliade on Modern Art,” *Cross Currents* Volume 33, No. 4 (1983), pp. 408-419
- Mon 4/13 E. E. Evans-Pritchard. Pals, *Nine Theories*, ch. 8 (263-292)
17. Daniel L. Pals, *Introducing Religion*, ch. 10: “E. E. Evans-Pritchard: Primitive Religion and Modern Theories”
 18. Matthew Engelke, “The Problem of Belief: Evans-Pritchard and Victor Turner on ‘The Inner Life’,” *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 18, No. 6 (December 2002), pp. 3-8
- Wed 4/15 Clifford Geertz. Pals, *Nine Theories*, ch. 9 (293-324)
19. Daniel L. Pals, *Introducing Religion*, ch. 11: “Clifford Geertz: Religion as World-View and Ethic”
 20. Talal Asad, “The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category,” ch.1 in *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*
- Mon 4/20 Proudfoot, “Philosophy: Philosophy of Religion,” and Hick, “The Conflicting Truth Claims of Different Religions” (SacCT)
21. Norman Malcolm, “Anselm’s Ontological Arguments,” *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (January 1960), pp. 41-62
 22. David Ray Griffin, “Process Philosophy of Religion,” *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, Vol. 50, No. 1/3 (December 2001), pp. 131-151
- Wed 4/22 Buchanan, “Women’s Studies” (SacCT)
23. Thomas F. Mathews, “Christ Chameleon,” ch. 5 in *The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art*
 24. Carol P. Christ, “‘A Different World’: The Challenge of the Work of Marija Gimubtas to the Dominant World-View of Western Cultures,” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Fall 1996), pp. 53-66
- Wed 4/29 Wilson, “Forgiveness as a Complex Adaptation,” and Walsh, “The Psychological Health of Shamans” (SacCT)
25. David Sloan Wilson, “The View from Evolutionary Biology,” ch. 1 in *Darwin’s Cathedral: Evolution, Religion, and the Nature of Society*
 26. Michael James Winkelman, “Shamans and other ‘Magico-Religious’ Healers: A Cross-Cultural Study of Their Origins, Nature, and Social Transformations,” *Ethos*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (September 1990), pp. 308-352
- Mon 5/4 Boyer, “What Is the Origin?” (SacCT)
27. Robert Wuthnow, “Cognition and Religion,” *Sociology of Religion*, Vol. 68, No. 4 (Winter 2007), pp. 341-360
 28. Reiss, Michael J., “The Relationship between Evolutionary Biology and Religion,” *Evolution*, Vol. 63, No. 7 (July 2009), pp. 1934-1941
- Wed 5/6 Bruce Lincoln, *Holy Terrors*, chs. 1 (and Appendix A), 2 (and Appendices B and C), and 3 (and Appendix D) (1-50 and 97-111; read the appendices with their correlative chapters)
29. Margo Kitts, “The Last Night: Ritualized Violence and the Last Instructions of 9/11,” *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 90, No. 3 (July 2010), pp. 283-312
 30. Mark Juergensmeyer, “Terror and God” and “Islam’s ‘Neglected Duty’,” chs. 1 and 4 in *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

APPENDIX 6: HRS 108 Oral Communication rubric scores

HRS 108 (Approaches to Religious Studies): Oral Communication per VALUE Rubric

Study #	Organizaton	Language	Delivery	Supporting	Central Mess.	AVE.
1	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.6
2	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.8
3	2.0	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.9
4	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.9
5	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.5
6	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
AVE.	2.5	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.2	