

---

# Assessment Plan Summary Report

---

Fall 2020

---

Department of Institutional  
Assessment and Research

---

# Fall 2020 Assessment Plan Summary Report

The 2019-2020 TKS 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 .....	7
IV.	Student Services, Success, and Retention .....	8
V.	Financial Condition and Management Review .....	10
VI.	Facilities and Equipment.....	11
VII.	Review and Sustainability of Assessment Plan.....	12
VIII.	Review of Strategic Planning Review Process.....	13

# 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 Associate 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. Core inventories (SES, GSS)
  - 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. All syllabi, including the Master Course Syllabus for all courses, are housed in Concourse for syllabus development ensuring consistency of school policies. We are working toward ensuring consistency of course learning outcomes based on the Master Course Syllabus
  - c. Indirect assessment of courses-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 2020 Assessment Day and selected course assignments from core curriculum fall and spring courses.
  - e. Aggregation and summary report writing -Fall 2020
2. Core Inventories
  - a. Student Experience Survey (SES) – March 2020
  - b. Graduating Student Survey (GSS)-June 2020
  - c. Graduate Job Placement Survey (GJPS) – N/A because of COVID-19
3. Aggregation and summary report writing for direct and indirect assessments in the annual Learning Outcomes Summary Report -August-September 2020

## 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 is

to use the reflection box at the bottom of each faculty member's class evaluation to assess the scores/comments and consider planning for improvements based on the feedback.

The CoursEval manager met with the CoursEval trainer over the summer to improve the functionality of CoursEval and to learn additional methods of reporting institutional results of CoursEval for the purpose of faculty development in the 2020-2021 academic year. The training will enable us to pull institution-wide data on the CoursEval learning outcome section and even to assign additional statements about degree programs and map courses to the program outcomes.

2. Concourse was adopted by all faculty in the fall. This enables standardization of correct institutional policies in all syllabi, enables better mapping to the correct program outcomes and institutional outcomes in the faculty view, and subsequently, enables more effective assessment of both direct and indirect learning outcomes.
3. The panelists who scored last year's (2019) Direct Assessment Day indicated through their comments that the sections of graduate papers failed to demonstrate strong writing, research, and analysis skills. Discussions began in the fall regarding the development of a research skills seminar for the master's level courses, a proposal was presented this summer, and the new seminar is scheduled to launch in January 2021.

In addition to the Assessment Day panelists, last year's DMin program review cited data as indicating a need to restructure and rename the four research courses in order to better help students achieve program outcome #4: "Assess ministry effectiveness by utilizing research methodologies and skills." Data on surveys analyzed during the program review showed that DMin students were insecure about utilizing research methodologies for their projects.

4. The Student Experience Survey (SES) and Graduating Student Survey (GSS) 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 4.39 (87.8%) on the SES SLO items and 4.39 (87.8%) on the GES SLO items indicate "successful" overall achievement in accomplishing institutional learning outcomes.**
5. Seminary Annual Assessment Projects (AAP):

Master of Organizational Leadership- The MOL committee analyzed survey data from the 2018 cohort, post residency survey data, and CoursEval results to make adjustments to two courses, including the residency course. Changes to LEAD 6301 include using a different secondary textbook, using videos of the program director's lectures, and increasing the levels of course interaction. Recommended improvements for the residency experience include more intentional pre-residency communication, more structure, and early morning prayer times.

Master of Divinity/Master of Practical Theology-The MDiv/MPT committee explored possible needed revision of language to the MDiv outcomes regarding the leadership language and recommended A more thorough analysis of program outcomes and course outcomes for the next MDiv/MPT program review. The aim is to strengthen outcome language addressing leadership that map to course outcomes for Renewal Theology & Leadership and other courses with leadership outcomes. They also reviewed the Capstone course and found that the current capstone paper does not address course outcome #4 and therefore the program needs to determine a new means of assessment for course outcome #4.

The DMin faculty undertook a program review in the 2019-2020 academic year and therefore did not complete an Annual Assessment Project.

## II. Program Reviews and Program Development- Doctor of Ministry

The following section outlines the scheduled program review for the Doctor of Ministry. The program 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.

### Review of the Doctor of Ministry degree

1. The program review committee was a sub-committee of the DMin Committee made up of the following members:
  - Dr. Dan Call, DMin Program Director, Chair
  - Dr. David Rudolph, Director of Messianic Jewish Studies
  - Dr. Jon Huntzinger, Distinguished Professor of Bible and Theology
  - Dr. Frank Markow, Master of Organizational Leadership Director
  - Dr. Robb Brewer, Coordinator of Doctoral Projects
  - Allen Gutierrez, Coordinator of Graduate Studies
  - Dr. Bobbi Stringer-Director of Assessment and Accreditation
2. Timeline
  - a. Review Process – Fall 2019-Spring 2020
  - b. Report to the Graduate Academic Council- Spring 2020
  - c. Deans Committee and Executive Team approval-Spring 2020
  - d. Implementation of changes-Summer 2020 and Fall 2020
3. Significant findings of the review and subsequent changes are as follows:
  - a. Development of a two-year plan for a special emphasis and by a third year launch a new permanent concentration
  - b. Development in the fall 2020 of a four-year marketing plan
  - c. Intentional meetings with Gateway personnel and implementation of opportunities to partner with them in teaching and support.
  - d. Development of an intentional plan to improve alumni relations and opportunities for them to participate in events, partner with Advancement, and even in some cases, teach for us.
  - e. Address curriculum issues: systematic solution for bridgework, continued discussion of possible online cohorts, renaming of several course names, reworking content and names of the 8 research courses.

### 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-January 2020
  - b. Departmental Administrative Input: Spring 2020
  - c. Review and Compilation: June 2020
  - d. Submission to Board for Review and Approval: May 2020
  - e. Move to Intranet: August 2020

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

1. Review of policies-Due to the restructuring of the organization chart and subsequent title changes, many 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 or slight edits in the policy or procedures needed editing (Student Life, Library Services, Academics, Faculty, and Advancement); several areas documented new policies that had recently been developed (Operations, Admissions, and Finance.)
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.

#### C. Final Steps in the process

1. Update Employee Handbook, Academic Catalog, and Faculty Handbook to reflect newly adopted policies on the Intranet.
2. Move policies from the p drive to the Human Resources page on the Staff 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, providing a structure for determining necessary data both for annual reporting and for implementing improvements based on data-driven decision-making leading to improved student success and retention.

- A. Initial Review Orientation- The Associate Director of Assessment and Associate Director of Research 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 2019 and spring 2020 graduates)

Degree Program	Enrollment FALL 2020	Retention Rate Fall 19-Fall 20	Average Retention Rate	Degrees Conferred
<b>Graduate Programs</b>				
Master of Practical Theology	93	76.5%	<b>78.5%</b>	12
Master of Divinity	116	74.5%		13
Master of Spiritual Leadership	29	84.6%		11
<b>Doctoral Program</b>				
Doctor of Ministry	62	79.2%	<b>79.2%</b>	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>300</b>		<b>78.9%</b>	<b>36</b>

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

Enrollment by Program					
Program	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Doctor of Ministry	5	12	21	38	52
Doctor of Ministry cMJS	n/a	n/a	2	10	10
Master of Divinity	100	77	74	65	68
Master of Divinity cMJS	30	42	47	50	44
Master of Divinity cWIML	-	-	-	-	4
Master of Practical Theology	69	61	65	49	63
Master of Practical Theology cMJS	4	12	14	13	23
Master of Practical Theology cWIML	-	-	-	-	7
Master of Organizational Leadership	n/a	3	15	24	24
Master of Organizational Leadership cWIML	-	-	-	-	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>300</b>



- B. Enrollment Management departments continually look at to improve retention and student success. (NOTE: All core surveys are rated on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest score.)
1. On the Entering Student Inventory (ESS) students indicated that the admissions administrative staff support was in the “successful” range (86.4%), but less than the “successful” range for financial aid services (66.8%). In an effort to improve the financial aid admissions process, the Financial Aid Office revamped the process for new incoming students by simplifying the matrices and adding DocuSign to the form, backing up dates for scholarship decisions to allow students to plan before the term starts, and simplifying other steps in the application process.
  2. “I know there is personal counseling made readily available to students” went up from last year’s 3.29 to 3.87 on this year’s Student Experience Survey (SES), but it still is below the “successful” threshold (4.0), and online students weren’t receiving any help from us for counseling. COVID, however, made everything go online. This forced us to find ways to provide online counseling for our on-ground students which then made it possible for us to also provide that online counseling for any online students within Texas. This was a huge move forward for TKU as we developed a plan to use our MMFT practicum students for online counseling.
  3. According to the SES, the organization and administration of the practicums and “I received adequate feedback and mentorship during my practicum remained steady at 4.04. and 4.08 respectively. “The practicum provided valuable learning and growth experiences” was 4.19, and the overall score for all three items relative to practicums was 4.10, which is in the “successful” range. Having a Gateway liaison to oversee on ground practicums at the Gateway site and the addition of new practicum sites such as the chaplaincy practicum at Baylor Grapevine are steps that have been taken to improve the Practicum experience for students.
  4. Based on several years of low scores on job placement services on both the SES and the Graduating Student Survey (GSS). Student Life has been working on 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. Students will be able to post their resume and a portfolio to their profiles so that employers can view their credentials and skills. The web site was piloted in the spring and will launch this fall.
  6. Although the Library Services section saw an increase in total scoring on the SES from 3.71 (below “successful”) to 3.97 (almost to the “successful” range) for the same questions, and on the Graduating Student Survey (GSS) the DMin program reworked and renamed the research courses to better prepare students to research and write their projects. These were launched in the summer 2020.
  7. Although attendance at chapel went up slightly, it still is below the “successful” range on the SES. In an effort to provide more accountability to students in their chapel attendance, we installed a new monitoring system to track Southlake student attendance. Additionally, because of COVID, Campus Ministries had a surplus of funding, so they invested it in technology for capturing and streaming content online, opening up a chapel experience for our online students and enabling us to be able to track their attendance, as well. This new capability allows us the opportunity to offer The Blessed Life Scholarship, which includes 80% chapel attendance as one of the criteria for receiving it. It is hoped that the new online streaming improvements and online attendance monitoring will add incentive to chapel attendance for Seminary students.
  8. As a result of graduate focus group and feedback from the monthly graduate dinner (One Table), Student Life plans to establish a graduate committee to help direct graduate activities.

## 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 Directional Leadership Team, Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees, 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

### B. External Audits that are annually conducted

1. The last fiscal year-end audit demonstrated a recent history of financial stability.
2. 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.
3. The audit demonstrates adequate finances to support the institutional mission and programs.

### C. Status of cash flows, budget, and line of credit

1. Current and long-range financial plans reflect positive cash flows and positive budget outcomes and are realistic.
2. The institution has a segregated contingency line of credit equal to at least 10% of operational budget.

### D. Budget process

1. Training for and implementation of new budgeting process tied departmental goals to the strategic plan and aligned budget according. Departmental goals and budget are reviewed regularly with oversight. The VP of Business Administration and CFO reviews departmental budgets on a quarterly basis and provides reporting back to the executive oversight including notations of budget variances including both overspending and under spending.
2. The budget managers complete a digital planning assessment survey twice a year. These responses are reviewed by leadership.
3. 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.

1. 2020 Campus Safety and Security Report Reviewed, Updated, and Completed.
2. Facilities procedures were updated and implemented.
3. Concealed Carry policy created and approved.
4. Job descriptions were reviewed and updated to meet operational needs.

### B. Identified Areas of completion in the review of the 2019-20 Institutional Assessment Findings:

1. Major renovation of furniture located at first impression areas on campus.
2. Renovation of our conference rooms.
3. Renovation of the Student Success Center.
4. Successfully execute a multi-phase plan for main campus paint renovations.
5. Hosted 3 blood drive in partnership with Gateway Church and Carter Bloodcare
6. Implementation and use of tablets for facilities team.
7. Provided space for a study area for students.
8. Prayer room established for students, staff, & guest.
9. COVID-19 Return guide.

### C. Identified Areas for completion in the review of the 2019-20Core Institutional Assessment Findings:

1. Utilization of staff & student surveys.
2. Operations helpdesk tickets.

## 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 marked the in-house development, administration, and reporting of all of the core instruments used for indirect data gathering from students, faculty, and staff. Last year we transitioned the Faculty Experience Survey (FES), the Staff Survey (SS), the Student Experience Survey (SES), and the Graduating Student Survey (GSS), and this year we included the Entering Student Survey (ESS).
  - b. Improvements were made to each of the core instruments.
2. Application, Analysis and Reporting
  - a. Because of our Self-Study and association with ATS, we now are publishing a Seminary version of the summary reports of the ESS, SES, FES, and GSS.
  - b. Recommendations for modifications, adjustments, revisions, and other changes in curriculums and new program development 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. Last year for the first time the budget planning documents were digital along with the assessment reports from each budget manager. The assessment reports revealed a need to adapt the language to invite results of all data informed decision making and not just those improvements relating to budgets.
  - 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 administrators and faculty.
  - b. Changes were identified, summarized, and documented in the 2020-2021 Assessment Plan Summary Report and the Fall 2020 Institutional Assessment Tracking and Implementation Report.
  - c. Assessment findings and implemented changes were linked to planning and budgeting goals and initiatives.
  - 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.

### B. Sustainability of Institutional Assessment

1. The annual institutional Assessment Plan along with instrumentation is in place to ensure the continuity, management, implementation, and on-going effectiveness of the Assessment evaluation and reporting process.
2. The administration and faculty are engaged in the assessment process.
3. The organizational chart has been adapted and the Department of Institutional Effectiveness has been restructured to include the following: a Director of Institutional Assessment and Research who oversees the Associate Director of Institutional Assessment, the Associate Director of Institutional Research, the Research Analyst, and the Accreditation Liaison.

## 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. Last year departmental leaders contributed to the development of the three year 2019-2023 Strategic Plan with four major goals and numerous initiatives for each goal. This year a ten-year Strategic Planning process made up of three, three-year cycles was implemented.
  1. The new plan includes two separate cycles: a review and assessment of the goals reviewed and a planning process for developing the next three-year plan.
  2. The new plan involves input from all affected constituencies: student government, alumni, faculty, staff, and the Board.
  3. The new plan involves commissioning a Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) to lead the process of developing the new three-year plan
  4. Additionally, throughout the year, research, goal setting, and budgeting is conducted in each department of the institution, historical data was gathered and separated for analysis, satisfaction surveys were conducted, and statistical data was compiled for trends analysis.
- B. With the new Strategic Plan development process a new Strategic Planning Schedule was developed wherein the monitoring of the old plan overlaps with the development of the new, upcoming plan.
  1. The Monitoring of the current plan has the following steps:
    - a. Appointment of the SPC.
    - b. Review of the Strategic Plan goals and initiatives.
    - c. Review of the Strategic Plan metrics and timelines.
    - d. Evaluation of the progress made on goals and initiatives.
    - e. Review previous SWOT and conduct a current SWOT Analysis incorporating assessment and benchmarking data.
    - f. Present Summary findings including findings and recommendations.
    - g. Develop and present Strategic Plan Update Report
  2. The Strategic Planning process for the new three-year report
    - a. Determine the schedule.
    - b. Involve the constituents in forum discussions (faculty, staff, student government, alumni, community).
    - c. SPC uses feedback from constituent groups to develop and formulate goals and initiatives.
    - d. Submit to leadership.
    - e. Finalize Strategic Plan.
    - f. Develop Implementation Plan
    - g. Board approval of Strategic Plan
    - h. Roll-out Strategic Plan to budget managers for use in developing departmental goals.
- C. Monitoring (reviewing) the first year of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan
  1. The Directional Leadership Team (DLT) used a wide variety of metrics to review the first year of the plan and found TKU is on course and making progress with the initiatives and goals.