Assessment Map for BA in Worship Ministry

Terms Assessed: SP23-FA23
Jury Members: Nate Jernigan (PC), Sandy Vandercook, Michael Wang
Date of Jury: June 4, 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)**
Direct Measures Final exegesis paper collected from *Interpreting the Bible, Introduction to Preaching,* and *Introduction to Teaching* 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** *Interpreting the Bible*: 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 *Intro to Teaching*: 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 *Int Bible* measure. He will revise the assignment instructions for the Exegesis Paper to focus more on historical context, due May 2024. **AP:** Leavell College Associate Dean (Tommy Doughty) will verify and send reminders to collector of *Teaching* artifacts

		*Intro to Preaching:*3.57 SP23: 3.44 SPAN: 3.44 FA23: 3.7 NOLA: 3.7	to avoid missing data, <u>beginning Summer 2024</u>.
_____ ***Indirect Measures*** Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for *Interpreting the Bible, Introduction to Preaching,* and *Introduction to Teaching*.	_____ This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	_____ **Aggregate: 4.86, 4.76, 4.74 (4.79)** *Int Bible*: 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 *Intro Teach:*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) *Intro Preach:* 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 *Interpreting the Bible* scores on campus anomalously low (same instructor as that semester's FLEX section which was normal).	**New BM: 4.25 aggregate across courses**

		Overall, Dr. Audirsch noted weakness on historical context in details on *Interpreting* scores. Missing some artifacts for a full semester. Satisfied with course evaluations 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 *Christian Doctrine* assessed with the Leavell College Theological and Historical Interpretation Rubric. _____ ***Indirect Measures*** Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for *Christian Doctrine*	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark. The composite score on the rubric will serve as the metric. _____ This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	Total Aggregate: **3.11** SP23 Aggregate: 2.83 ONL: 3.33 BHAM: 2.97 ORL: 2.19 MCIW: -- FA23 Aggregate: 3.39 NOLA: 3.43 FLEX: 3.33 ONL: 3.42 _____ Total Aggregate: 4.8, 4.55, 4.7 (4.68) 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: 4.8, 4.6, 4.7 (4.7) NOLA: 5.0, 4.9, 5.0 (4.97) FLEX: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) ONL: 4.8, 4.8, 4.8 (4.8)	**New BM: 3.25 aggregate** **AP:** As collector of *Doctrine* 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. **New BM: 4.5**

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

Student Learning Outcome #3: *Competency in Chosen Field—The graduate will demonstrate mastery in Worship Ministry.*
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 *Senior Seminar* 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 SS BM: 3.25 aggregate**
Worship Planning Portfolio using composite score of Worship Planning rubric.	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	***Worship Planning*** FA23 Aggregate: 3.21 NOLA: 3.25 FLEX: 3.14	**New WP BM: 3.0 aggregate**
_____	_____	_____	
Indirect Measures Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for *Senior Seminar* and *LCME1310.*	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	***Senior Seminar* Aggregate: 4.75** SP23 Aggregate: 4.81 NOLA: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) ONL: 4.7, 4.6, 4.3 (4.53)	**New BM: 4.5 across all courses**

		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: 4.67 NOLA: 5.0, 4.8, 4.9 (4.9) ONL:4.5, 4.5, 4.0 (4.33) ***Worship Planning* Aggregate: 4.93** FA23 NO/FL 5.0, 4.8, 5.0 (4.93) <u>Summary/Reflection/Discussion</u>: *Senior Seminar:* All *Senior Seminar* scores for the direct measure are lower than expected. *Worship Planning:* This embedded assignment is a new measure but it is a solid measure for students in this major. Based on individual scores for students, some students perhaps didn't take enough time to think about the various liturgies they created. Additionally, some students did not use the technology (Planning Center) to its fullest advantage. The scores for the two course sections are comparable. High course evaluation scores show that the adjunct teaching the course	Action Plans for *Worship Planning*: 1. When the course is taught next (FA25—it's on a two-year rotation), the PC, who will teach the course, will emphasize to students the importance of reflecting on the liturgies as a means of assessing them. 2. When the course is taught next, the PC, who will teach the course, will spend at least one class period demonstrating the functionality of the various technologies available to worship planners. 3. The PC will ensure students are aware of the four areas of the assessment rubric so they understand the program emphases.

		seems to have had good rapport with students.	

Executive Summary This assessment grid represents the first time this major has been assessed. In general, the PC believes the signature embedded assignment (the portfolio for *Worship Planning*) to work well as it allows students to synthesize what they've learned about planning and leading worship. Looking forward, he is considering adding other measures to assess musicality and music competency. Doing so will align this degree with the BA in Music. This first assessment provided positive data for a baseline measure for the signature embedded assignment.