



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: Theology and Global Church Ministry

Academic Program Evaluated: Intercultural Studies
and 2018- 2019

Program Review Year: 2016-2017, 2017-2018,
and 2018- 2019

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2016-17	Year 2 Academic Year: 2017-18	Year 3 Academic Year: 2018-19	Year 4 Academic Year: 2019-20
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	Dr. Sandy Friesen Dr. Jeff Fulks Dr. Jeff Nelson	Dr. Sandy Friesen Dr. Mike Tenneson Mary Beth King Dr. Jeff Nelson Elizabeth Wolfe Jackie Garieary Dr. Chip Stanek	Dr. Sandy Friesen Dr. Brenda Adcock	
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: 2 Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: 5 Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: 1 Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:

Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	ICST 498 Practicum Evaluation	ICST 498 Practicum Evaluation-R2018 (revised 2018)	ICST 498 Practicum Evaluation-R2018	
<i>Additional Data:</i> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)	<p>An evaluation from the field mentor based on the four Program Learning Outcomes based on Best Practices for Intercultural Studies with the added component of Spiritual Formation and Biblical Knowledge.</p> <p>#1 Inter-Personal Relationships #2 Use of Knowledge and Skills #3 Professional Characteristics #4 Program/Agency Supervision</p>	<p>A revised evaluation from the field mentor based on the four Program Learning Outcomes based on Best Practices for Intercultural Studies with the added component of Spiritual Formation and Biblical Knowledge.</p> <p>#1 Inter-Personal Relationships: Competencies in Cross-cultural Communication #2 Use of Knowledge and Skills: Biblical Interpretation and Spiritual Formation/Research/Praxis #3 Professional Characteristics: Contextualization and Contemporary Issues #4 Program/Agency Supervision: competencies in Intercultural/Missiological History</p>	<p>An evaluation from the field mentor based on the four Program Learning Outcomes based on Best Practices for Intercultural Studies with the added component of Spiritual Formation and Biblical Knowledge.</p> <p>#1 Inter-Personal Relationships: Competencies in Cross-cultural Communication #2 Use of Knowledge and Skills: Biblical Interpretation and Spiritual Formation/Research/Praxis #3 Professional Characteristics: Contextualization and Contemporary Issues #4 Program/Agency Supervision: competencies in Intercultural/Missiological History</p>	

<p>Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)</p>	<p>Methodology: After the completion of 12/15 hours in the Intercultural Studies (ICST) program, students participate in a practicum individually designed based on their interest area. The on-sight supervisor of the practicum works with the student a minimum of 50 hours per credit hour (e.g. 3 credit hours equals 150 hours of participation). After the completion of the hours, the supervisor completes an evaluation of the student. See Appendix A</p> <p>Note: An important aspect of the Intercultural Studies program is to prepare missionaries for Assemblies of God World Missions (AGWM), the mission's arm of the General Council of the Assemblies of God. To that end, the ICST program is reviewed three times a year based on decisions made by the Executive Committee of AGWM. Sandy Friesen attends meetings (Special</p>	<p>Methodology: After the completion of 12/15 hours in the Intercultural Studies (ICST) program, students participate in a practicum individually designed based on their interest area. The on-sight supervisor of the practicum works with the student a minimum of 50 hours per credit hour (e.g. 3 credit hours equals 150 hours of participation). After the completion of the hours, the supervisor completes an evaluation of the student. Dr. Sandy Friesen and Dr. Jeff Nelson to more align with the Program Learning Outcomes revised the evaluation. See Appendix B</p> <p>Note: An important aspect of the Intercultural Studies program is to prepare missionaries for Assemblies of God World Missions (AGWM), the mission's arm of the General Council of the Assemblies of God. To that end, the ICST program is reviewed three times a year</p>	<p>Methodology: After the completion of 12/15 hours in the Intercultural Studies (ICST) program, students participate in a practicum individually designed based on their interest area. The on-sight supervisor of the practicum works with the student a minimum of 50 hours per credit hour (e.g. 3 credit hours equals 150 hours of participation). After the completion of the hours, the supervisor completes an evaluation of the student. Dr. Sandy Friesen and Dr. Jeff Nelson to more align with the Program Learning Outcomes revised the evaluation. See Appendix B</p> <p>Note: An important aspect of the Intercultural Studies program is to prepare missionaries for Assemblies of God World Missions (AGWM), the mission's arm of the General Council of the Assemblies of God. To that end, the ICST program is reviewed three times a year</p>	
---	--	---	---	--

	<p>Executive Committee Meetings) that enable her to be made aware of the latest changes, initiatives, and enterprises of the organization. She has been a part of that committee for 14 years. Program changes are made based on best practices that are current and timely for the organization, for example, Safety and Security has become a central focus of the missions organization, therefore a unit was added to the Team Building class ICST 335, to address those issues.</p>	<p>based on decisions made by the Executive Committee of AGWM. Sandy Friesen attends meetings (Special Executive Committee Meetings) that enable her to be made aware of the latest changes, initiatives, and enterprises of the organization. She has been a part of that committee for 14 years. Program changes are made based on best practices that are current and timely for the organization, for example, Safety and Security has become a central focus of the missions organization, therefore a unit was added to the Team Building class ICST 335, to address those issues.</p>	<p>based on decisions made by the Executive Committee of AGWM. Sandy Friesen attends meetings (Special Executive Committee Meetings) that enable her to be made aware of the latest changes, initiatives, and enterprises of the organization. She has been a part of that committee for 14 years. Program changes are made based on best practices that are current and timely for the organization, for example, Safety and Security has become a central focus of the missions organization, therefore a unit was added to the Team Building class ICST 335, to address those issues.</p>	
<p>Results of Assessment: (List the findings in summary format as narrative.)</p>	<p>The overall average for the ICST 498 Practicum Evaluation for the class was as follows: 5/5 with 4 being the desired outcome.</p> <p>For PLO #1 Inter-Personal Relationships (getting along with others in a cross-</p>	<p>The overall average for the ICST 498 Practicum Evaluation Revised for the class was as follows: 4.475/5 with 4 being the desired outcome.</p> <p>For PLO #1 Inter-Personal Relationships (getting along</p>	<p>The overall average for the ICST 498 Practicum Evaluation Revised for the class was as follows: 5/5 with 4 being the desired outcome.</p> <p>For PLO #1 Inter-Personal Relationships (getting along</p>	

	<p>cultural setting) (5/5) For PLO #2 Use of Knowledge and Skills (evaluate cross-cultural needs, task, systems and be able to develop effective plans) 5/5</p> <p>For PLO #3 Professional Characteristics (deals with integrity, professionalism, confidentiality, managing work load and overall leadership/follower characteristics) 5/5</p> <p>For PLO #4 Program/Agency Supervision (getting along with supervisors, organization/s, and/or nationals)(5/5</p>	<p>with others in a cross-cultural setting) (4.65/5) For PLO #2 Use of Knowledge and Skills (evaluate cross-cultural needs, task, systems and be able to develop effective plans) (4.33/5)</p> <p>For PLO #3 Professional Characteristics (deals with integrity, professionalism, confidentiality, managing work load and overall leadership/follower characteristics) (4.56/5)</p> <p>For PLO #4 Program/Agency Supervision (getting along with supervisors, organization/s, and/or nationals) (4.37/5)</p>	<p>with others in a cross-cultural setting) (5/5) For PLO #2 Use of Knowledge and Skills (evaluate cross-cultural needs, task, systems and be able to develop effective plans) (5/5)</p> <p>For PLO #3 Professional Characteristics (deals with integrity, professionalism, confidentiality, managing work load and overall leadership/follower characteristics) (5/5)</p> <p>For PLO #4 Program/Agency Supervision (getting along with supervisors, organization/s, and/or nationals) (5/5)</p>																																																																																																							
<p>Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show data results. Do not include the actual data.)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Student</th> <th>Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication</th> <th>Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making</th> <th>Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills</th> <th>Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction</th> <th>Supervisor/Co- worker</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1001</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Samuel Miles</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robert Vandrom 1701</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Student	Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication	Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making	Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills	Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction	Supervisor/Co- worker	1001						Samuel Miles	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	Robert Vandrom 1701	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	Average	5	5	5	5	5	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Student</th> <th>Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication</th> <th>Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making</th> <th>Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills</th> <th>Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction</th> <th>Supervisor/Co- worker</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1001</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Major Andrew</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Smith</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robert Vandrom</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>4.8</td> <td>4.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Student	Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication	Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making	Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills	Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction	Supervisor/Co- worker	1001						Major Andrew	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	John Smith	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	Robert Vandrom	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	Average	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Student</th> <th>Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication</th> <th>Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making</th> <th>Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills</th> <th>Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction</th> <th>Supervisor/Co- worker</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1001</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Major Andrew</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Smith</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robert Vandrom</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>Dr. Jeff Nelson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Student	Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication	Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making	Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills	Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction	Supervisor/Co- worker	1001						Major Andrew	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	John Smith	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	Robert Vandrom	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson	Average	5	5	5	5	5	
Student	Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication	Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making	Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills	Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction	Supervisor/Co- worker																																																																																																					
1001																																																																																																										
Samuel Miles	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
Robert Vandrom 1701	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
Average	5	5	5	5	5																																																																																																					
Student	Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication	Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making	Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills	Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction	Supervisor/Co- worker																																																																																																					
1001																																																																																																										
Major Andrew	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
John Smith	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
Robert Vandrom	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
Average	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8																																																																																																					
Student	Section #1 Ethical Behavior and Communication	Section #2 Ethical Knowledge and Skills: Moral Reasoning and Ethical Decision Making	Section #3 Professional Characteristics and Leadership Skills	Section #4 Program/Agency Supervision and Cross-Cultural Interaction	Supervisor/Co- worker																																																																																																					
1001																																																																																																										
Major Andrew	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
John Smith	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
Robert Vandrom	5	5	5	5	Dr. Jeff Nelson																																																																																																					
Average	5	5	5	5	5																																																																																																					
<p>Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic</p>	<p>All other areas of the program were satisfactory as their scores all reflect the</p>	<p>All other areas of the program were satisfactory as their scores all reflect the</p>	<p>All other areas of the program were satisfactory as their scores all reflect the</p>																																																																																																							

program.)	target score of “4” being met or exceeded.	target score of “4” being met or exceeded.	target score of “4” being met or exceeded.	
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	The area of weakness this year was in the actual areas that the mentors were being ask to evaluate. After a review the PLOs and the evaluation question, the team realized that they were not aligned. After review and considerations, Dr. Sandy Friesen and Dr. Jeff Nelson revised the evaluation to reflect the PLOs.	Two of the five mentors stated left a number of the areas evaluated as a “0” meaning “ not applicable ”. The questions not addressed on Megan Andersen were, 12, 21,29, 30, and 32. The questions answered not applicable for Becca Brining were 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25,, 27, 28, 31, 38, the other students, Bri Eller, Aaliyah Kindt and Stephen Lupo had not such responses. Choosing “not applicable” does not effectively evaluate the students’ learning.	Although there were four students in the practicum class for the summer of 2019, three have not received their evaluations from their mentors. Delays have to do with “forgetting to email the documents”.	

Year 1:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
1. Review of questions on the evaluation. 2. Review of the PLOs 3. Feedback from the Mentors (on the field)	1. Review June 2017 2. Rewrite Sept 2017 3. Implement Summer 2018	Dr. Sandy Friesen

4. 4. Rewrite of the evaluation questions.		
--	--	--

Year 1:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date
1. Review of questions on the evaluation. 2. Review of the PLOs 3. Feedback from the Mentors (on the field) 4. 4. Rewrite of the evaluation questions.	1. Review June 2017 2. Rewrite Sept 2017 3. Implement Summer 2018 (Complete)

Year 2:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Meet with field mentors to address ways that the not applicable questions can be addressed.	Sept 2018	Dr. Sandy Friesen

Year 2:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date
Met with mentors who were likely to have mentee in the future. Since students choose their practicum location, some sites are used multiple times and others are never revisited.	Summer 2019

Year 3:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Connect with each mentor and explain the importance of sending the evaluation in a timely manner.2. Provide a reminder at the end of the experience that signals the mentor that it is time to email the evaluation.	Each Aug of each year (when practicums are completed.	Dr. Sandy Friesen

Year 3:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date
In Progress	Currently

Year 4:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person

Year 4:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date

