

---

# Assessment Plan Summary Report

---

Fall 2019

---

Department of Institutional  
Effectiveness

---

# Fall 2019 Assessment Plan Summary Report

The 2018-20189 Institutional Assessment Plan comprehensively assessed all areas of the institution covering the categories of Administration, Academic and Student Learning, Student Services, Finances, Facilities and Equipment, and Institutional Research and Planning. The following outline indicates the areas reviewed, evaluated, and reported. This annual summary ensures an on-going, integrative process that comprehensively evaluates institutional effectiveness.

I.	Learning Outcomes Assessment .....	3
II.	Summary of Program Reviews .....	6
III.	Publications and Policies .....	8
IV.	Student Services, Success, and Retention .....	9
V.	Financial Condition and Management Review .....	10
VI.	Facilities and Equipment.....	13
VII.	Review and Sustainability of Assessment Plan.....	14
VIII.	Review of Strategic Planning Review Process.....	15

# I. Learning Outcomes Assessment

The following section outlines the annual review and revision of the institution's course, program, and institution learning outcomes. This annual review provides a structure for identifying, suggesting, and implementing revisions based on an organized evaluation process.

## A. Initial Review Orientation

1. The Director of Assessment organizes and administrates indirect and direct student learning outcomes assessment. The assessment of learning outcomes at all levels with triangular methods assures that data is gathered to enable administrators and faculty to complete the assessment cycle of utilizing classroom and student input for improving courses, programs, and ultimately the institution.
2. Planning for learning outcomes assessment
  - a. Conducting core inventories
  - b. Direct assessment of course, program and institution learning outcomes
  - c. Indirect assessment of courses through student course evaluations at the end of each semester and in some cases, focus groups of individual programs
3. Review and Compilation of outcomes data

## B. Determine Review Schedule and timeline

1. Course outcomes
  - a. Faculty review and polish outcomes and for the Master Course Syllabus during scheduled program reviews.
  - b. Using the Master Course Syllabus for their course outcomes, faculty develop their syllabi. This year we launched Concourse for syllabus development ensuring consistency of school policies. We have developed a Master Course syllabus for each course and are working toward ensuring consistency of course learning outcomes based on the Master Course Syllabus.
  - c. Indirect assessment of course work-Course evaluations in December, May, and July for on ground courses and at the conclusions of each online session.
  - d. Direct assessment of course work-August 2019 Assessment Day
  - e. Aggregation and summary report writing-Fall 2019
2. Core Inventories
  - a. Entering Student Inventory (ESI) – October 2018
  - b. Student Experience Survey (SES) – April 2019
  - c. Faculty Satisfaction Inventory (FES) – April 2019
  - d. Graduating Survey (GS)-June 2019
  - e. Graduate Job Placement Survey (GJPS) – May 2019
  - f. Staff Survey (SS) –June 2019
3. Aggregation and summary report writing for direct and indirect assessments -September 2019

C. Significant findings:

1. CourseEval is efficient, accessible to faculty, and provides an opportunity for faculty to review and report on the results. It has not been being used to its full advantage, however. Administrators review and use the results in planning and hiring adjuncts, but a step further that was implemented this year is for administrators to use CourseEval as a talking point of discussion with faculty during their supervisor or peer evaluation process.
2. Concourse was piloted in the spring and will be used by all faculty in the fall. This will enable standardization of correct institutional policies in all syllabi, will enable better mapping to the correct program outcomes and institutional outcomes in the faculty view, and subsequently, enable more effective assessment of both direct and indirect learning outcomes.
3. Our ATS Self-Study prompted the following improvements in regard to student learning outcomes:
  - We realized the need for a Seminary mission statement, so we started with a focus group of MDiv, MPT, and MOL students and alumni who diligently developed a mission statement. The statement went through all approvals with only minor edits.
  - We also needed to develop Seminary student learning outcomes, so a sub-committee of the Graduate Academic Council developed five student learning outcomes based on both the new mission statement and the PLOs of the four Seminary programs.
  - Finally, we also realized that the program student learning outcomes for the MPT and MDiv both needed some editing to align with the ATS emphasis on spiritual development. Those changes and designated courses for assessing each outcome were developed.
4. The results of the August pizza day revealed the achievement of at least the “successful” benchmark for all six of the papers. Qualitative responses of faculty, however, revealed that none of the sections of papers demonstrated strong writing, research, and analysis skills (these areas were not included on the rubrics). The SES results and the focus group results revealed the students also feel a lack in this area. Thus, discussions are underway regarding the development of a research skills class for the master’s level courses, while the DMin program plans to rework the curriculum for the Research 1 class to give a strong research foundation for students.
4. The SES and GES are on a 5-pt. Likert scale; the performance standard for the learning outcome assessment items on these two surveys is a total aggregate score of 4.0/80% (minimum score for “successful”) and 4.5/90% (minimum score for “excellent”). **The current scores of 4.4 (88%) on the SES SLO items and 4.3 (86%) on the GES SLO items indicate “successful” overall achievement in accomplishing institutional learning outcomes.**
5. As part of the special projects all four of the degrees requested a focus group to have student assess success of program learning outcomes and the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. The DMin and MOL degrees will be using this data and other learning outcomes data during their scheduled program reviews during the 2019-2020 program reviews.

One of the interesting things that came out of the spring 2019 MDiv focus group was the fact that since these students were graduates or graduating, their degree plans were the “old” curriculum, and the reasons they gave for low responses (3.5) to the first two outcomes affirmed the improvements that were made by the program review committee. Other responses of the student focus group also positively affirmed the curriculum changes that resulted from the 2016 program review. Their indirect assessment of the student learning outcomes was an aggregate 4.2 indicating “successful” achievement.

An important decision made as a result of the MPT focus group review and other MPT data was to strengthen the ministry emphasis of the MPT and allow students to choose courses that would help them personally with their specific ministry. Students now have the opportunity to choose courses that focus on their preferred area of ministry including the new Women in Ministry Leadership concentration, which starts in January 2020. Allowing students this option enables better alignment with the purpose of the program to provide “significant flexibility to enable the student to design his or her own program according to his or her particular ministry calling.”

## II. Program Reviews and Program Development- Bachelor of Biblical and Theological Studies, Bachelor of Biblical Counseling, and the Marriage and Family Therapy degrees

The following section outlines the scheduled program review for the Bachelor of Biblical and Theological Studies, Bachelor of Biblical Counseling, and Marriage and Family Therapy degrees. This review, as described in the TKU Assessment Plan, provides the structure for a comparability study, reviewing learning outcomes, assessing outcomes, assessing library holdings, mapping the curriculum, assessing IE data, developing a map for assessing each program outcome, and conducting a SWOT Analysis for programs under review.

### A. Review of the Bachelor of Biblical and Theological Studies

1. The program review committee was made up of the following members:
  - Dr. Boyd Luter, Program Director and Chair of the committee
  - Dr. Jonathan Frazier
  - Dr. David Rudolph, Director of MJS
  - Dr. Bobbi Stringer-Director of Assessment and Accreditation, Faculty
  - Tali Snow, MJS Coordinator
  - Megan Grondin-Registrar, consultant
2. Timeline:
  - a. Review process – Fall 2018
  - b. Recommendations to Undergraduate Academic Council – Spring 2019
  - c. Approval of Deans Committee and Executive Team-Spring 2019
  - d. Implementation of changes to curriculum-Fall 2019
  - e. Implementation of MJS recommendation to propose a BBMJS degree-August 2019
4. Significant findings and recommendations of the review:
  - a. The program objectives and outcomes needed to be updated for clearer and more effective assessment and marketing. One outcome added the phrase, “emphasis on Spirit-empowered and Messianic Jewish distinctive.”
  - b. The existing program was short on required Bible and Theology courses compared to other similar degrees. Thus, the committee recommended an Advanced Hermeneutics course, five course name changes, and three categories of 9 hours of Bible that could conceivably eventually lead to concentrations.
  - c. The committee also recommended make the MJS concentration a full degree: to propose it during the 2019-2020 academic year with the hope of implementing it in fall 2020.

### B. Review of the Bachelor of Biblical Counseling degree

1. The program review committee was made up of the following members:
  - Dr. Linda Hoover, Program Director, Chair
  - Dr. Cassie Reid, MMFT program director
  - Deanna Brown, program coordinator
  - Dr. Bobbi Stringer-Director of Assessment and Accreditation

2. Timeline
  - a. Review Process – Fall 2018
  - b. Report to the Undergraduate Academic Council- Spring 2019
  - c. Deans Committee and Executive Team approval-Spring 2019
  - d. Implementation of changes-Fall 2020
3. Significant findings of the review and subsequent changes
  - a. Add two concentrations (Church and Community Care Concentration and Pre-Professional Counseling Concentration).
  - b. Add Substance BIBC 43XX Abuse and Addiction course.
  - c. Allow students with a 3.5 gpa to apply for an accelerated program to take 12 graduate level (MMFT) courses that will count toward the MMFT degree.
  - d. Change the wording of Objective #2 and replace Outcome #5.
  - e. Establish direct and assessment points for degree program outcomes.

### C. Review of the Marriage and Family Therapy Degree

1. The program development committee was made up of the following members:
  - Dr. Cassie Reid—MMFT program director
  - Dr. Linda Hoover, BBC program director
  - Deanna Brown—MMFT program coordinator
  - Dr. Bobbi Stringer-Director of Assessment
2. Timeline
  - a. Review Process – Fall 2019
  - b. Report to the Graduate Academic Council- Spring 2019
  - c. Deans Committee and Executive Team approval-Spring 2019
  - d. Implementation of changes-Fall 2020
3. Significant findings of the preparation phase
  - a. Incorporate business of private practice concepts into Ethical and Legal Counseling Issues course.
  - b. Purchase test materials for students preparing to sit for state licensing exam.
    - a. Add a Pre-Practicum course to the degree plan.
    - b. Remove unnecessary course not seen in comparable programs (BIBC 5307 Current Trends in Counseling).
  - c. Allow students with a 3.5 gpa to apply for an accelerated program to take 12 graduate level (MMFT) courses that will count toward the MMFT degree.
  - d. Create course sequence schedule for accelerated program.
  - e. Increase Practicum sites by 30%.

### III. Assessment of Publications and Policies

The following section outlines the annual review and revision of the institutions Publications and Policies. This annual review provides a structure for identifying, suggesting, and implementing revisions based on an organized evaluation process.

#### A. Initial Review Orientation

1. This year's policy review involved all the university offices overseeing all policies. Each of the following departments was asked to review their appropriate policies on the institution p Drive:
  - Academic and Faculty
  - Human Relations
  - Operations
  - Marketing and Communications
  - Finance
  - Registrar
  - Advancement
  - Library Services
  - Admissions
  - Student Life and Student Recruitment
  - Financial Aid
  - Technology Policies
2. Determine the timeline for review and administrate the assigned publications and policies documents to the review committee.
  - a. Initial charge to university offices responsible for policies-July 2019
  - b. Departmental Administrative Input: August 2019
  - c. Review and Compilation: July-August 2019
  - d. Submission to Board for Review and Approval: September 2019
  - e. Updating on p drive: November and December 2019
  - f. Move to Intranet: January 2020

#### B. Review of the Publications and Policies

1. Review of policies-Due to the restructuring of the organization chart and subsequent title changes, most of the needed policy changes related to the Administrative Oversight and Policy Contact information. Several instances were discovered where the Academic Catalog had been changed without changing the verbiage in the parallel Policy; several areas documented new policies that had recently been developed.
2. Approval by appropriate administrators and, if necessary, the Board of Trustees.
3. Updated or developed policies turned in to the Division of Institutional Effectiveness.
4. Move policies from the p drive to the Intranet.

#### C. Final Steps in the process

1. Update Employee Handbook, Academic Catalog, and Faculty Handbook to reflect newly adopted policies on the internal institution server (P Drive), and eventually on the Intranet.

## IV. Assessment of Enrollment Management (Student Services, Admissions, Success, Student Life & Retention)

The following section outlines the annual evaluation process for assessing student success and retention. This annual evaluation provides a structure for determining necessary data both for annual reporting and for implementing improvements for increased effectiveness based on data-driven decision-making leading to improved student success and retention.

- A. Initial Review Orientation- The Director of Assessment and Director of Information Management organize and administrate an annual Student Success and Retention Review. Compilation of Institutional Effectiveness Data by Degree Program includes the following:
- Fall enrollment in each program
  - Retention Rates (unique student, Fall-to-Fall enrollment, excluding graduates leaving the program and excluding new fall enrollees)
  - Degrees conferred (including December 2018 and spring 2019 graduates)

Degree Program	Enrollment FALL 2019	Retention Rate Fall 18-Fall 19	Average Retention Rate	Degrees Conferred
Certificate Programs	0	100%*		4
Associates Programs				
Christian Ministries	20	70.6%	69.6%	5
Worship Leadership	15	66.7%		9
Bachelors Programs				
Biblical & Theological Studies	71	56.3%	63.6%	16
Biblical Counseling	82	61.7%		3
Christian Ministries	38	59.1%		9
Cross-Cultural Ministry	6	88.9%		8
Intercultural Studies**	7			0
General Christian Studies	41	59.5%		12
Media Arts   Bach	4	66.7%		0
Worship Leadership   Bach	30	86.4%		7
Music & Worship   Bach	3	100%		0
Graduate Programs				
Master of Practical Theology	62	56.1%	68.3%	28
Master of Divinity	115	72.4%		23
Master of Marriage & Family Therapy	44	68.2%		8
Master of Spiritual Leadership**	24	86.7%		0
Post-Graduate Programs				
Doctor of Ministry	48	82.6%	82.6%	0
Undeclared	1			
<b>TOTAL*</b>	610	66.9%	66.9%	132

\*Student is still enrolled in the university; the student changed from a certificate to associates.

\*\* Indicates new program and/or program name change. There have not been any graduates yet from this program.

\*\*\*Excludes undeclared.

➤ Trends		
PERIOD	STUDENTS	CREDIT HOURS
Summer 2013	213	860
Fall 2013	601	3,565
Winter 2014*	610	3,749
Spring 2014	592	3,390
Summer 2014	255	1,046
Fall 2014**	691	6,192
Spring 2015	709	6,285
Summer 2015	173	886
Fall 2015	767	6,894
Spring 2016	752	6,860
Summer 2016	177	814
Fall 2016***	717	6,557
Spring 2017	672	6,193
Summer 2017	182	917
Fall 2017	686	6,145
Spring 2018	650	5,820
Summer 2018	264	1,136
Fall 2018	654	5,922
Spring 2019	610	5,310
Summer 2019	227	978
Fall 2019	610	5,300

\*Effective Winter 2014, TKU Main Campus operations moved to Southlake, Texas.

\*\*Effective Fall 2014, TKU instituted a change from quarter to semester hours.

\*\*\*Fall 2016 enrollment reflects the closing of Modesto branch campus and two teaching sites.

NOTE: In the fall of 2012, Southlake had 172 students; in the fall of 201 Southlake has 393 students.

B. Review of Core Inventory Assessment findings: The five TKU core inventories have contributed data resulting in the following important steps to improve retention and student success and alumni relations.

1. This year with the administration of the Student Experience Survey, we began conducting our core inventories in-house. This will provide us the ability to filter results by programs for program directors to have program-specific data in their decision-making.
2. On the Entering Student Inventory students indicated high levels of effectiveness related to the admissions process (91%) and the new Student orientation procedures (92%) These services should be maintained at these levels for continuing performance.
3. The organization and administration of the practicums improved from 3.3 on a 5 pt. scale to 3.8 this year (4.6 for undergraduate Southlake), indicating affirmation for designating a point

person, Danny Hageman, to be the practicum liaison to oversee practicums on the Gateway side.

4. The addition of two Student Success workshops on job seeking skills was a step in the right direction, but the SES and GSS indicated a need for more help with job placement and career counseling (2.8 on a scale of 5). A team effort has gone into the development of a job web site for students and potential practicum supervisors and employers. This web site is customized with our brand and will afford local organizations a web site to post options for jobs, practicums, and internships for our students and graduates. This will launch late fall or early spring semester.
  
5. The GSI -On the 17 areas of personal growth, all but one (ability to evangelize) met the “successful” or better score (4.0+ on a 5 pt. scale), and that one that did not meet the “successful” benchmark was 3.9. On their responses to academic resources, eight were in the “successful” range, but “Writing and research support” received a 3.9, and “Adequacy of library collection” received a 3.6. Steps are being taken on the graduate level and the doctoral level to respond to the writing and research support need.

## V. Evaluation of Financial Condition and Management

The following section outlines the annual evaluation of the financial condition and management. This annual evaluation provides a structure for determining necessary data both for annual reporting and for implementing improvements for increased effectiveness based on data-driven decision-making.

### A. Annual Financial Review

1. Accurate and timely financial reports were provided to the President, governing board, and other designated persons.
2. On-going financial management and oversight was maintained through the CFO and Financial Controller which included Board review of quarterly financial statements.
3. A certified external audit of the financial statements along with management letter is prepared each year, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and federal guidelines.
4. External Audits are annually conducted.
  - a. The last fiscal year-end audit demonstrated a recent history of financial stability.
  - b. Audit is prepared using the "net asset" model of accounting consistent with the policies and procedures provided by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) in its document, Audit and Accounting Guide: Not-for-Profit Organizations: June 1, 1996, or any later enacted version.
  - c. The audit demonstrates adequate finances to support the institutional mission and programs.
5. Current and long-range financial plans reflect positive cash flows and positive budget outcomes, and are realistic.
6. The institution has a segregated contingency line of credit equal to at least 10% of operational budget.
7. Training for and implementation of new budgeting process tied departmental budgets to goals and initiatives and requires monthly reviews with oversights. This year we digitalized the development of budget planning documents and the assessment of planning documents.
8. Accountability meetings occurred with VP to document budget variances including both over spending and under spending.
9. Departments were required to provide corrective actions plans if budget variances existed in any one line item over \$2,000 of over budget spend.

## VI. Evaluation of Facilities and Operations

The following section outlines the annual review and evaluation process for assessing facilities and operations. This annual evaluation provides a structure for determining necessary data both for annual reporting and for implementing improvements for increased effectiveness based on data-driven decision-making. The review was conducted by the Associate Director of Building and Operations.

### A. Annual Documentation Review and Revision (separate documents)

1. 2019 Campus Safety and Security Report Reviewed, Updated, and Completed.
2. Facilities policies were updated and implemented.

### B. Identified Areas of completion in the review of the 2018-19 Institutional Assessment Findings:

1. Facilities was outsourced for janitorial services to enhance our University experience.
2. Accomplished operational projects planned and unplanned such as the library transition and stayed within budget
3. Operations spearhead the cafe renewal along with a major renovation of the first-floor paint & furnishing.

### C. Identified Areas for completion in the review of the 2018-19 Core Institutional Assessment Findings:

1. Projects such as the Library transition & first-floor renovation allowed our team to create margins and begin creating cycles for daily Operations. This helps with projects such phase II of the library & 2<sup>nd</sup> floor renovation.

## VII. Review and Sustainability of Assessment Plan

The following section outlines the sustainability process for the annual review and revision of the Assessment Plan as well as the continual Implementation and Effectiveness of the Assessment Processes. The Plan provides a structure for positively navigating changes in institutional resources and priorities.

### A. Annual Review of the Assessment Plan

#### 1. Assessment Instruments

- a. This year we made a change in the instruments used for indirect data gathering from students, faculty, and staff. We transitioned the Faculty Experience Survey (FES), the Staff Survey (SS), the Student Experience Survey (SES), the Graduating Student Survey (GSS) from using a consultant for the surveys to using our Department of Institutional Research for administering and reporting the data. This was done in order to filter the surveys more specifically and to bring the institutional data collection process to a higher level by drilling down into the data for more effective data informed decision making.
- b. The schedule for program reviews was changed from a three-year cycle to a four-year cycle. The decision was also made to move the semester of review from fall to spring, so that any program changes would have ample time to be approved (including Board approval, if necessary) in the fall, prepared for the catalog in the spring, and then implemented in the following fall.
- c. The creation of a program outcomes assessment chart was added to the program review template, and an annual assessment project for Seminary programs was also added.

#### 2. Application, Analysis and Reporting

- a. Summary reporting included recommendations based on the analysis of collected data that reflect accepted best practices. The reporting on the core inventories now can be filtered and sent to each department and program director for better decision making.
- b. Recommendations for modifications, adjustments, revisions, and other changes in programs and curriculum formulated were based on assessment findings of institutional effectiveness data, institutional assessment data, review of program outcomes, comparability studies, and SWAT analysis.
- c. Assessment findings were presented to primary stakeholders through meetings, digital reports, and on the web site. This year for the first time the budget planning documents were digital along with the assessment reports from each budget manager.
- d. Findings regarding performance evaluation were reviewed by the department heads and utilized in current budgetary planning objectives, metrics, and timelines.

#### 3. Annual Review and Implementation of Assessment

- a. Assessment findings and recommendations were reviewed by key administrators and faculty.
- b. Changes were identified, summarized, and documented in the Assessment Plan Summary Report and the Assessment Tracking Report.
- c. Assessment findings and implemented changes were linked to planning and budgeting categories and objectives.
- d. On-going support was provided for the participants and consumers of the institutional assessment process through the Departments of Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research.

### C. Sustainability of Institutional Assessment

- a. The annual institutional Assessment Plan along with instrumentation is in place to insure the continuity, management, implementation, and on-going effectiveness of the Assessment evaluation and reporting process.
- b. The administration and faculty are engaged in the assessment process.

## VIII. Review of Annual Strategic Planning Review Process

The following outline indicates the process for the annual review and revision of the Strategic Plan. This annual review ensures an on-going, data-driven process that comprehensively evaluates institutional effectiveness and integrates institutional assessment and benchmarking data for effective decision-making.

- A. The StratOps team returned in the early fall to meet with the newly appointed TKU president and his Directional Leadership Team facilitating further planning in the areas of mission and core values, university culture, and the top four initiatives. As a result of these StratOps meetings of analysis and in conjunction with previous student, faculty, and staff discussions, the university unveiled the new “Core 4” in the latter fall. These core values are *Rooted, United, Empowered, and Transformed*.
- B. In January 2019 the Vice-President of business Administration continued the process of improving the budgetary arm of the strategic planning by providing additional training for the budget managers and by moving the budget planning process and the year-end budget assessment process into an online format.
- D. Throughout the year, research, goal setting, and budgeting was conducted in each area of the institution, historical data was gathered and separated for analysis, satisfaction surveys were conducted, and statistical data was compiled for trends analysis. Strengths and weaknesses were then identified, which resulted in the formulation of the institutional initiatives, goals, evaluation metrics, and success indicators. The four institutional initiatives at the core of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan are *Culture, Innovation, Academic Excellence, and Strategic Growth*.

Recommendations including supporting documentation, assessment findings, and budget/costing considerations were incorporated into the Strategic Plan that was ultimately approved by in October.