Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

Department: Bible and Theology

Academic Program Evaluated: MATS (Master of Arts in Theological Studies)   **Program Review Year: 2018-19**

	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.)	Berg, Robert, Ph.D. Buchanan, Alaine, Ph.D. Cotton, Roger, Th.D. Fabian, Mark, M.A. Gill, Deborah, Ph.D. Griffin, William, Ph.D. Haltom, Fred, Ph.D. Hernando, James, Ph.D. Jenkins, Mark, Ph.D. Johns, Don, Ph.D. Lewis, Paul, Ph.D. Martindale, Gary, Ph.D. Medina, Vince, Ph.D. Mittelstadt, Martin, Ph.D. Morrison, Daniel, Ph.D. Nunnally, Wave, Ph.D.			

	Railey, James, D.Th. Rance, DeLonn, Ph.D. Schmidly, Brandon, Ph.D. Self, Charles, Ph.D.			
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)	Graduate: According to the AGTS Records Office 30 MATS students were enrolled and took classes during the 2018-19 Academic Year.	Graduate:	Graduate:	Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	Quantitative data came from a variety of Core Course assignments (mostly summative), assessments, and the thesis (the capstone project of the Theological Studies Seminar).			
Additional Data: (List any additional information/ data that informed this report.)	The Committee has data from its previous year's MATS Program Assessment for the 2017-18 academic year: i.e., FA17, SP18 and SU18 semesters.			
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)	Based upon a standard that graduate-level students demonstrate mastery of a particular learning objective when they perform at 84 percentile or higher, instructors of Core Courses connected MATS Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and their rubrics to significant summative assignments and assessments.			

- A score of 3 is equivalent to outcome **mastery**. - A score of 4 indicates the student has exceeded mastery; 2 indicates partial achievement of the outcome; 1 indicates no achievement of the outcome; 0 indicates no attempt at the outcome. As Core Course instructors graded these assignments and assessments in Course Commons, they evaluated achievement of Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), and they also evaluated the level of achievement of the respective PLOs. At the end of each semester, data is drawn from Course Commons for a mini-SLAR in order to do any mid-year trajectory tweaking that may be warranted. At the end of the academic year, data from Course Commons for all three terms is collected into various tables (by semester, course, semester, and PLO, and then into a cumulative table) and a graph.	

Results of Assessment: (List the findings in summary format as narrative.)	For FA18 the **average** PLO score for MATS students was 3.02; for SP18 3.08; and for SU19 2.50. (Note: SU19 data was from only one class with a small MATS enrollment and deviates from other trends. More granular study is needed here.)			
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show data results. Do not include the actual data.)	See the Excel spreadsheets; MATS Curriculum Map, and PLOs attached.			
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	Average PLO scores demonstrate that for **five of the eight** PLOs, MATS students consistently (this year and last—excluding SU19 data) achieved or exceeded **mastery**. These PLOs relate to 1. Mission of God 5. Issues/People of BTH 6. Pentecostalism 7. Critical Methods 8. Ministry Application			
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	Though the actual numbers fluctuate a bit, averages for the following PLOs were consistently below mastery: 2. Bridging Horizons 3. Extracting Biblical Tchg 4. Constructg Bib Responses			

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
Add PLO 7 to Theological Research & Writing on Curriculum Map and **revise the course**.	1. Fall 2018 - Curriculum Map 2. Spring 2019 Course revision.	1. BTH Committee 2. Theological Research & Writing instructor, Dr. Daniel Morrison > (Dr. Lewis will follow up.)
Help students better **construct an interpretive paradigm** (PLO 2, Horizons) and use **critical methods** (PLO 7) in Hermeneutics, Theological Research & Writing, and Theological Studies Seminar.	3. Spring 2019 Enhance respective Core Courses.	Respective Instructors: 3A. Hermeneutics: Dr. James Hernando and successor/s. 3B. Theological Studies Seminar: Various (Dr. Lewis will follow up.)

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.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Add PLO 7 to Theological Research & Writing on Curriculum Map and revise the course.	1. Fall 2018 - √ Curriculum Map Changed. 2A. Spring 2019 √ Core Course revised. 2B. Summer 2019 √ Revised again.	1. BTH Committee 2. Theo Res & Writing Instructors: Dr. Daniel Morrison Dr. Alaine Buchanan (Dr. Lewis will follow up.)
Help students better **construct an interpretive paradigm** (PLO	3. Spring 2019 > Enhance respective	Respective Instructors: 3A. Hermeneutics:

2, Horizons) and use **critical methods** (PLO 7) in Hermeneutics, Theological Research & Writing, and Theological Studies Seminar.	Core Courses. PLOs 2, 3, and 4 scores went up!	Dr. James Hernando, Dr. Vince Medina 3B. Theological Studies Seminar: Various Instructors (Dr. Lewis will follow up.)
Department discussion continues on improving **research depth** and **academic form**, especially among OLC students.	4. AGTS convened an Academic Writing Standards Committee for several months, agreed on a style, and have been building resources: templates, samples, etc.	4. Dr. Gill led this committee.

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
1. Focus on Academic Writing.	1. Resource faculty and students with Academic Writing Tools in BTH Committee meetings and website revisions.	1A. Dr. Gill will include this in BTH Committee agendas. 1B. Dr. Lewis will help update website with new tools.
2. This academic year (2019-20) is the Academic Program Review of the MATS in the cycle.	2. This process will give the Department an opportunity to look carefully at many elements throughout the year in BTH Committee meetings.	2. Dr. Gill will include APR in BTH Committee agendas.
3. Investigate the enrollment shift (A) and compare PLO scores of residential and online students (B).	3. Fall 2019	3A. Dr. Gill will request enrollment information Information from Records Office 3B. Draw the Residential vs. OLC data and

Do a more granular study on specific questions arising from the data (C).		3C. Draw more granular data with Dr. Walls' help.
4. Based upon what we discover, strategize closing the loop/s.	4. Spring 2020	4. Since BTH offers the Core Courses for all AGTS master degree programs, our department will meet with the PTH Committee, which is conducting their APR on the M.Div. this year.

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