
Assessment Plan Summary Report

Fall 2019

Department of Institutional
Effectiveness

Fall 2019 Assessment Plan Summary Report

The 2018-2019 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	5
III.	Publications and Policies	6
IV.	Student Services, Success, and Retention	7
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 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 Seminary.
2. Planning for learning outcomes assessment
 - a. Conducting core inventories
 - b. Direct assessment of course, program and Seminary 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 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 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
 - f. Annual projects are determined in the fall, conducted during the academic year, and reported on in the summer.
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. The results of the August Assessment 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” achievement in accomplishing institutional learning outcomes.
5. As part of the special projects all four degrees requested a focus group to have students 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-

None of the four Seminary degrees were scheduled for a full program review this year, but Our ATS Self-Study prompted the following improvements in regard to program development:

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.
- D. The new assessment project for the MDiv and MPT programs also resulted in more specific distinction between the MDiv and MPT programs. An analysis of the curriculum of both programs resulted in the following conclusion: In order to focus on the ministry element and give students more flexibility, the decision was made (and approved) to give MPT students a choice of 3 of 5 courses instead of requiring all 5. This opens the door for students to focus on 9-12 hours in a specific area of ministry (see #5 under Learning Outcomes, Specific Findings on p. 4).
- E. Additionally, the results of the Assessment Day scoring of papers and two of the core inventories and the Doctoral Survey #3 indicated a need for providing additional help to students with research skills (see #3 under Learning Outcomes, Specific Findings on p. 4).

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 Institutional 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 2018 and spring 2019 graduates)

Degree Program	Enrollment FALL 2019	Retention Rate Fall 18-Fall 19	Degrees Conferred 2018-2019
Master of Practical Theology	62	56.1%	28
Master of Divinity	115	72.4%	23
Master of Organizational Leadership*	24	86.7%	0
Doctor of Ministry**	48	83%	0
TOTAL/AVERAGE	249	69%	51

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

**No doctoral students have graduated since the updated program began re-enrolling students in spring of 2017.

B. Trends: Total enrollment numbers for the Seminary have steadily increased since 2016. The MDiv and MPT enrollment numbers have declined, but the DMin and MOL have had enough increase to positively affect the overall total enrollment. Retention rates have remained somewhat constant except for 2017, which may in part be due to the loss of the Modesto branch campus. Degrees conferred have shown a significant increase since 2016. The discontinuation of certificates may be a contributing factor to this increase.

Graduation and Retention Data 2016-20												
	Enrollment				Retention Rate				Degrees Conferred			
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019	2016	2017	2018	2019
MDiv	130	121	120	115	76%	68%	74%	72%	16	16	19	23
MPT	75	75	78	62	75%	63%	69%	56%	11	14	12	28
MOL*	*	3	14	24	NA	N/A	66%	87%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
DMin**	5	12	23	48	0	0	75%	83%	0	2	0	N/A
Total	210	211	235	249	76%	66%	71%	75%	27	32	31	51

*The MOL degree began in 2017 and therefore will be graduating its first cohort in December 2019.

**We stopped enrolling students in the DMin program when we moved the main campus to Southlake in January 2014 and began in February 2017 enrolling the first cohort with the revised curriculum. The first graduates from that cohort will graduate in May 2020.

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 the only 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 have been taken on the graduate level and the doctoral level to respond to the writing and research support need.
6. Job placement numbers for some time have been a concern. See the chart below for Job Placement numbers known to the Seminary.

Job Placement Rates 2016-20				
	2016	2017	2018	2019
Master of Divinity	40%	40%	67%	31%
Master of Practical Theology			71%	60%
Master of Organ. Leadership	*	*	*	*
Doctor of Ministry	**	**	**	**
Total			69%	42%

**Our surveys in 2016 and 2017 were administered to all Seminary graduates and we did not filter them by program. The 2018 data was valid and reliable and had a high response rate (72%). Due to an accidental error in administration, however, the 2019 survey, while valid and reliable, was not given under the same circumstances as the 2018 survey and had a much lower response rate (46%).*

***The MOL degree began in 2017 and therefore will be graduating its first cohort in December 2019.*

****In order to review and update the curriculum, we stopped enrolling students in the DMin program when we moved the main campus to Southlake in January 2014 and began in February 2017 enrolling the first cohort with the revised curriculum. The first graduates from that cohort will be graduating in May 2020.*

Although our Graduating Student Inventory surveys (given in the summers of 2014-2018) have provided us a single Seminary graduate job placement number and the January 2019 Alumni Survey provided limited data on job placement, our data has not been robust. Emails, calls and conversations among our alumni and the Office of Advancement have provided context for where many of our graduates are active in their vocations. However, since we are now conducting our surveys in-house, we will have more control over them and have the ability to better assess monitoring the placement of our graduates.

For several years our Student Experience Surveys and Graduating Student Surveys have scored low in the area of Career Counseling and Job Placement. The Office of Student Engagement has developed workshops on career readiness, resume writing, interviewing skills, and access to potential employers, but we still have not reached the “successful” benchmark in these two areas on our student response surveys. Thus, a committee was formed in the summer of 2019 to explore the possibility of utilizing a digital networking process for our students such as Handshake. After investigating several possibilities, the committee decided on developing our own web template design customized with our brand. This job placement tool is directly connected to a feed from ChurchStaffing.com, while also affording local organizations a web site to post options for jobs, practicums and internships. This connection offers career networking opportunities for our Seminary students and recent graduates.

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 & 2nd 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.