



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: Master of Divinity

Program Review Year: FA18-SU19

	Year 1 Academic Year:	Year 2 Academic Year:	Year 3 Academic Year:	Year 4 Academic Year:
<p>Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)</p>	<p>John Battaglia, D.Min. Roger Cotton, Th.D. Deborah Gill, Ph.D. Tim Hager, D.Min. James Hernando, Ph.D. David Hillis, D.Min. Michael Jaffe, D.Min. Anita Koeshall, Ph.D. Paul Lewis, Ph.D. Chris McGough, M.A. Daniel Morrison, Ph.D. Lois Olena, D.Min. James Railey, D.Th. DeLonn Rance, Ph.D. Valerie Rance, Ph.D.</p>			

	Brandon Schmidly, D.Min. Charles Self, Ph.D. Steve Smallwood, D.Min. J.P. Vick, D.Min. Randy C. Walls, D.Min.			
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)	Graduate: 44	Graduate:	Graduate:	Graduate:
Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	Course Projects Essays Exams Research Projects Sermons Summative Projects			
<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.)	The curriculum map for the MDiv program identifies the program learning outcomes (PLO) for each course. Each course is set up in the EU Learning Management System (LMS), Canvas, with a rubric for summative or formative assignment in that course as noted in the "instrument(s) use in			

	assessment” space above. The LMS collates this data into a sortable spreadsheet which identifies the level of student performance in each PLO associated with the course.			
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 with only a few exceptions (see “areas of improvement” below).			
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.			
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	AGTS MDiv students are performing at mastery or above levels in almost every course in the program curriculum			
Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	Student performance in BNT 530 NT Introduction and BIB 532 Hermeneutics were below mastery level at 2.375 (partial knowledge or			

	<p>demonstration) and 1.5 (little to no knowledge or demonstration) respectively. These two courses were part of the improvement plan noted in the 17-18 assessment report. The PTH Committee did a granular look at the individual student performance level and found that each course had low enrollments of MDiv students. In each class, the very poor performance of one or two students skewed the course averages to a less than mastery level. The committee thus feels that the current data may not demonstrate a reliable assessment of normal student learning. The recommendation is that the PTH committee coordinator, in consultation with the BTH committee coordinator, continue monitoring student performance in these two courses in order</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	to determine what, if any, curriculum changes are warranted.			
--	--	--	--	--

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
Monitoring of BNT 530 & BIB 532 from 17-18 year data.	18-19 assessment report date	PTH Committee Coordinator
Ongoing PTH monitoring to include BTH committee input	19-20 academic year	PTH Committee Coordinator BHT Committee Coordinator

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
No changes to BNT 530 or BIB 532 in light of 18-19 data review	Continuing review of courses for 19-20 academic year

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

