



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: AGTS

Academic Program Evaluated: Doctor of Ministry

Program Review Year: FA18-SU19

	Year 1 Academic Year:	Year 2 Academic Year:	Year 3 Academic Year:	Year 4 Academic Year:
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	Deborah Gill, Ph.D. Lois Olena, D.Min. Ava Oleson, D.Min. Douglas Oss, Ph.D. Jim Rion, D.Min. Cheryl Taylor., D.Min. Carolyn Tennant, Ph.D. Randy Walls, D.Min.	John Battaglia, D.Min. Michael Jaffe, D.Min. Paul Lewis, Ph.D. Chris McGough, M.A. Lois Olena, D.Min. Doug Oss, Ph.D. Jim Rion, D.Min. Brandon Schmidly, Ph.D. Steve Smallwood, D.Min. Carolyn Tennant, Ph.D. J.P. Vick, D.Min., Ph.D. Randy C. Walls, D.Min.		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were	Graduate: 112	Graduate: 93	Graduate:	Graduate:

used in the assessment report.)				
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	Core One Reflection Papers Other Core Research Papers Elective Course Research Papers Outside reader rubrics	Core One Reflection Papers Other Core Research Papers Elective Course Research Papers Outside reader rubrics		
<i>Additional Data:</i> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)				
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)	Based upon a standard that doctoral level students demonstrate mastery of a particular learning objective when they perform at the 90 percentile or higher; student work, using the instruments above, was reviewed by the DMin Committee	Based upon a standard that doctoral level students demonstrate mastery of a particular learning objective when they perform at the 90 percentile or higher; student work, using the instruments above, was reviewed by the PTH Committee		
Results of Assessment: (List the findings in summary format as narrative.)	The data shows that students performed at mastery level or higher in every course	The data shows that students performed at mastery level or higher in every course		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show data results. Do not include the actual data.)	Excel spreadsheets were used to demonstrate the levels of student performance for each PLO associated with each course. No other charts or graphs were used to review the data.	Excel spreadsheets were used to demonstrate the levels of student performance for each PLO associated with each course. No other charts or graphs were used to review the data.		
Strengths: (From the	With the implementation of	The research and writing		

findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	the improvement plan from the 2016 report, students have reached mastery or above levels of performance in the preparation of their project prospectus and in their biblical/theological research.	skills of the AGTS DMin students continues to meet or exceed the mastery performance level.		
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	None.	None		

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

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

--	--

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

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

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

--	--	--

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

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
