ORU

Ministry & Leadership (BA)

Program Review 2018-2021

Section 4: Description of the annual program review process that program faculty members use to evaluate the results of the evidence to develop program improvements.

For each of the following questions:

➢ *Place any key documents that you reference in the folder with this document. Key documents may include:*
   o Meeting agenda (Dept., College, Assessment Day/Week, etc.)
   o Meeting minutes (Dept., College, Assessment Day/Week, etc.)
   o Annual accreditation reports (i.e. ABET, ACBSP, CAEP, NASM, ATS, CCNE, CSWE, etc.).
➢ *Describe who's involved.* Please make reference to faculty, instructional, and other staff members involved in the processes and methodologies to assess student learning
➢ *Describe when and how often.* Please describe the frequency of your activities

1. What is the *annual process and activities that contribute towards continuous improvement?* Examples may include:
   • Department/College meetings
   • Assessment Day/Week activities
   • Annual accreditation reports
   • External community stakeholder advisory board
   • Other initiatives

2. What process do you use to *implement your recommendations?*

3. How do you "close-the-feedback loop" and *review the effects of your changes*?

ORU

Section 4: Program Assessment Process Description

The ORU Department of Undergraduate Theology faculty members evaluate the Ministry and Leadership (ML) program and its six concentrations through a variety of means. Faculty have established a systematic process of assessing degree plans sheets, programs outcome effectiveness, examine student numbers and performance, propose and approve changes, and implement changes to the program through monthly department faculty meetings, the UG theology curriculum committee, and departmental assessment days. At the University level assessment data reports are delivered at the end of the Fall and Spring semesters with time given to evaluate programs before the next semester begins. As an Undergrad Dept. we have begun to take further steps in the assessment of our programs. In addition to the university assessment days, the faculty meet at the beginning of each semester for a departmental assessment day to evaluate the five programs in the department in light of broader quantitative and qualitative data to facilitate continuous improvement throughout the program (see UG Faculty Mtg 2021 08 17 Assessment Day Minutes).

For the Ministry & Leadership (ML) program and its six concentrations, the faculty have created curriculum maps for each concentration to align ML learning outcomes with coursework. For example, see ML CHAC curriculum map. In light of these maps, faculty members determined that Senior paper, the capstone project required for the ML degree program, offered the best evidence of learning across the program at a mastery level. The faculty evaluate the average artifact outcomes and the criterion line outcomes data from the Whole Person Assessment (WPA) artifact rubric in Desire2Learn (D2L) from the THE 499 Senior Paper course (see THE 499 ML CHAC Senior Paper Spring 2018). These rubrics align with ML program outcomes. While the Senior Paper course does address all three program outcomes, only the Church Administration concentration artifact rubric includes all three. The rest of the concentrations only include Program Outcome 1 and 2 in the rubric (see ML-EVOC Program Artifact Rubric). Faculty are aware that more data for Outcome 3 would be beneficial. At our Departmental Assessment Day in January, faculty will re-evaluate and determine whether criterion lines for Outcome 3 should be included in the rubric for the other concentrations. Another option is to add a Whole Person Assessment artifact for CHRM 398-Ministry Practicum to assess how well students are meeting Outcome 3, which concerns the application of Christian theology in life and concentration specific contexts. We will also consider adding additional collection points to strengthen data such as Whole Person artifact data from our majors from developmental courses: BIB 222 Introduction to Old Testament and BIB 261 Introduction to New Testament. These are general education requirements specific to our majors.

At the January meeting faculty will also evaluate the numeric data from the program outcomes, artifact outcomes, criterion outcomes, and whole person outcomes from General education courses taken by our department majors. They will note average data values for each concentration that are below 3.0 and create actions plans to address concerns with low student

scores. Our recent data sets from 2018-2021 (as seen above) indicate some possible concern with student work as communicated from our criterion line data from the Senior Paper artifact for ML 1A Style and Format scores for both residential (2.81 in 2018-2019 and 2.97 in 2020-2021) and online (2.82 in 2020-2021). This area of improvement is an ongoing challenge with student coursework. This will likely be identified as an area of concern where faculty implement changes to make improvement. Since the online ministry and leadership program mirrors the residential, this data and evaluation process helps UG theology faculty also maintain oversight of the online Ministry and Leadership program outcomes and student performance within its coursework.

Program and course adjustments also come through University wide initiatives and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). These stimulate changes in a program to add a component to a degree program or to coursework. For example, our Fall 2021 assessment day worked on aligning program outcomes to the new University outcomes (see Assessment Day minutes Fall 2021). These outcomes are currently being integrated into our Spring syllabi for both residential and online courses.

Additionally, informal and formal feedback from student opinion surveys, alumni, employers, Graduate School of Theology and Ministry advisory Board, alumni job and graduate placement, and a faculty member's personal and professional network provide another means for program evaluation. For example, the closure of Ministry and Leadership: Church Administration degree and renaming of its replacement: Church Leadership to Church Operations (starting in Fall 2022) came through this process (see below).

Faculty professional development in the areas of teaching excellence and maintaining expertise in the field of study provides another means of continuous improvement. The former seeks to equip faculty with creative ways to improve student learning, which the University encourages through the Teaching Excellence Framework and promotion process. Faculty development workshops are offered each semester to residential faculty and monthly to online faculty. Faculty expertise informs the content and skill sets needed for student success in and beyond the program. These skill sets are evaluated through a collegial and collaborative process among UG theology faculty. Thus, faculty observations often play an important role in our assessment and change process.

Formal Assessment Process:
1. Develop an assessment plan with the relevant artifact(s) that will be used to collect data for each student outcome.
2. Collect the data by faculty members from the courses with artifacts in Desire2Learn (D2L).
3. Collect additional data through the various means as indicated above.
4. Evaluate the data (qualitative *and* quantitative) through our semesterly assessment day.
   a. Review previous changes and their possible impact on data results.
   b. Evaluate data for program improvement.

c. Identify 1-2 areas of concern, in which to implement changes for ML program improvement.
d. Propose changes.
e. Implement curriculum change or coursework adjustment to address area of concern from data using measurable goals with a specific timeline.
f. Revise the communication-measurement tool(s) for the changes. This is often a rubric, check-list, or curriculum exemplar.
g. Discuss and review the changes we're making as we implement them as a team. Discussing what we're doing and what's working and not working as we're doing it helps create momentum and strengthen the changes. We informally measure the effect of our changes as we deliver them through assignments and low-stakes assessments.
h. Formally measure the impact of the change after the implementation cycle is complete.
i. Re-evaluate periodically.