

Assessment Map for BA in Teaching and Learning

Terms Assessed: SP23-FA23

Jury Members: Dr. Brooke Osborn (PC), Dr. Jeff Farmer, Dr. Sandy Vandercook

Date of Jury: May 14, 2024

Student Learning Outcome #1: *Biblical Interpretation—The graduate will interpret and communicate the Bible accurately.*

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: *Devotion (mission statement); Proclamation (mission statement)*

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable): *n/a*

Measures (means of program assessment)	Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)	Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester	Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)
<i>Direct Measures</i> Final exegesis paper collected from <i>Interpreting the Bible</i> , <i>Introduction to Preaching</i> , and <i>Introduction to Teaching</i> and assessed with Leavell College Biblical Interpretation Rubric, using the composite score as the metric.	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark. The composite score on the rubric will serve as the metric.	Aggregate: 3.12 <i>Interpreting the Bible:</i> 3.08 SP23 Aggregate: 3.08 NOLA: 2.75 FLEX: 3.4 FA23 Aggregate: 3.57 NOLA: 3.55 FLEX: 3.40 KTI: 3.81 KTI FLEX: 3.5 <i>Intro to Teaching:</i> SP23: NOLA: not assessed HAR: not assessed FA23: 2.7 NOLA: 2.81 FLEX: 2.6	New Benchmark: 3.25 aggregate across courses AP: Program Coordinator of Biblical Studies (Jeff Audirsch) also responsible for oversight of <i>Int Bible</i> measure. He will revise the assignment instructions for the Exegesis Paper to focus more on historical context, <u>due May 2024</u> . AP: Leavell College Associate Dean (Tommy Doughty) will verify and send reminders to collector of <i>Teaching</i> artifacts to avoid missing data, <u>beginning Summer 2024</u> .

<u>Indirect Measures</u> Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for <i>Interpreting the Bible</i>, <i>Introduction to Preaching</i>, and <i>Introduction to Teaching</i>.	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	<i>Intro to Preaching</i>:3.57 SP23: 3.44 SPAN: 3.44 FA23: 3.7 NOLA: 3.7 Aggregate: 4.86, 4.76, 4.74 (4.79) <i>Int Bible</i>: 4.9, 4.85, 4.9 (4.88) SP23:4.9, 4.8, 4.9 (avg. 4.83) NOLA/FLEX: 4.9, 4.8, 4.9 FA23: 4.95, 4.9, 4.9 (4.92) NOLA/FLEX: 4.9, 4.8, 4.8 KTI/KTI FLEX: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 <i>Intro Teach</i>:4.88, 4.88, 4.83 (4.86) SP23: 4.75, 4.75, 4.65 (4.72) Hardee: 4.5, 4.5, 4.3 (4.43) NOLA: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) FA23: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) NOLA/FLEX: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0)	<u>Summary/Reflection/Discussion:</u> Sp23 <i>Interpreting the Bible</i> scores on campus anomalously low (same instructor as that semester's FLEX section which was normal). Overall, Dr. Audirsch noted weakness on historical context in details on <i>Interpreting</i> scores. Missing some artifacts for a full semester. Satisfied with course evaluations as PC oversees <i>Int Bible</i> as well. New BM: 4.25 aggregate across courses
--	---	--	--

		<i>Intro Preach</i>: 4.8, 4.55, 4.5 (4.62) SP23: 4.9, 4.7, 4.7 (4.77) SPAN: 4.9, 4.7, 4.7 (4.77) FA23: 4.7, 4.4, 4.3 (4.47) NOLA/FLEX: 4.7, 4.4, 4.3 (4.47) <u>Summary/Reflection/Discussion</u>: Sp23 <i>Interpreting the Bible</i> scores on campus anomalously low (same instructor as that semester's FLEX section which was normal). Overall, Dr. Audirsch noted weakness on historical context in details on <i>Interpreting</i> scores. Missing some artifacts for a full semester. Satisfied with course evaluations as PC oversees <i>Int Bible</i> as well.	
--	--	---	--

Student Learning Outcome #2: Theological and Historical Interpretation—The graduate will interpret and communicate theological and historical truth accurately.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Proclamation (mission statement)

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable): n/a

Measures (means of program assessment)	Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)	Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester	Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)
Direct Measures Theological Reflection #2 from <i>Christian Doctrine</i> assessed with the Leavell College Theological and Historical Interpretation Rubric.	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark. The composite score on the rubric will serve as the metric.	Aggregate: 3.11 SP23 Aggregate: 2.83 ONL: 3.33 BHAM: 2.97 ORL: 2.19 MCIW: did not submit FA23 Aggregate: 3.39 NOLA: 3.43 FLEX: 3.33 SPAN: 3.42	New BM: 3.25 aggregate AP: As collector of <i>Doctrine</i> measure, Dr. Doughty will communicate to instructors the importance to prepare students for historical aspect of reflections. <u>Beginning Fall 2024</u>, Dr. Doughty will supply instructors with his assignment overview video which includes historical resources and strategies.
Indirect Measures Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for <i>Christian Doctrine</i>.	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	Aggregate: 4.81, 4.63, 4.73 (4.73) SP23: 4.8, 4.5, 4.7 (4.2) ONL: 5.0, 4.9, 4.8 (4.9) BHAM: 4.3, 4.3, 4.0 (4.2) ORL: 5.0, 4.5, 5.0 (4.8) MCIW: 4.8, 4.4, 4.8 (4.7) FA23: 4.9, 4.85, 4.9 (4.89) NOLA/FLEX: 5.0, 4.9, 5.0 (4.97) SPAN: 4.8, 4.8, 4.8 (4.8)	New BM: 4.5

		<u>Summary/Reflection/Discussion:</u> <i>Doctrine</i> scores lower. Dr. Doughty affirmed Dr. Audirsch's concern on <i>Interpreting the Bible</i> with a parallel observation that interaction with historical truth lacking (detail of <i>Christian Doctrine</i> rubric scores). Campus course evaluations higher, which makes sense as consistent instructor (Dr. Doughty) is responsible for <i>Doctrine</i> measure.	
--	--	--	--

Student Learning Outcome #3: Competency in Chosen Field—The graduate will demonstrate mastery in Teaching and Learning.
Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Servanthood (mission statement), Mission (mission statement)
Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable): n/a

Measures (means of program assessment)	Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)	Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester	Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)
Direct Measures <i>Senior Seminar</i> paper using composite score of Senior Seminar Rubric	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	Senior Seminar Aggregate: 2.99 SP23 Aggregate: 2.65 NOLA: 2.75 ONL: 2.56 ANG: 2.92 PARCH: 2.0 LCIW: 2.69 HAR: 2.97 FA23 Aggregate: 3.33 NOLA: 3.63 ONL: 2.9	New BM: 3.25 AP: disaggregate Senior Seminar papers by major as well as by section and semester. The on-campus lead teacher for Senior Seminar will disaggregate by major in all future semesters so that the results being reported reflect only papers written by students in the major.
<i>Teaching Practicum</i> final project using composite score of Teaching Practicum project rubric.	This is a new measure, so we have no benchmark.	The class has not been taught for this cycle. It was first taught Spring 2024 and will be offered every semester.	Projected BM: 75% of students will score 85 or higher on project rubric AP: As the PC oversees this practicum course, she will work with students each term to focus their final projects on topics relevant to the school setting in which they have been placed.

_____ Indirect Measures Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for <i>Senior Seminar</i> and <i>LCEM 4361</i>*	_____ This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	_____ Aggregate: Senior Seminar Aggregate: SP23 Aggregate: 4.81 NOLA: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) ONL: 4.7, 4.6, 4.3 (4.53) ANG: 5.0, 4.9, 5.0 (4.97) PARCH: not submitted LCIW: 4.9, 4.8, 4.8 (4.83) HAR: 4.9, 4.7, 4.8 (4.7) FA23: NOLA: ONL:	New BM: 4.5 composite score across all course sections.
---	--	---	---

**This major is new as of 2023-2024, and several of the new courses in the major have yet to be developed. The goal is to have syllabi for the new courses created and approved in Spring 2024.*

Executive Summary

This program is the newest one in the college. The first set of data will probably reflect the low number of students in the major as the major is brand new. We feel the program serves a need and should help students who desire to pursue alternative teacher certification through iTeach. We anticipate the program to grow quickly as it meets a need in our student body. The signature assignment for this course, the final project in Teaching Practicum, will provide students with talking points when they interview for teaching position. Students will be able to discuss research they've done on a current issue in teaching and learning along with offering suggestions for dealing with the issue.