

Assessment Map for Master of Arts in Church and Community Ministries

Terms Assessed: Spring 2020-Fall 2023

Program Learning Objective # 1: Students will demonstrate an understanding and application of biblical and foundational truths that are encountered in church and community ministries.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Guide students to understand the foundational principles of ministry and mission.

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: The capacity for critical and constructive theological reflection regarding content and processes of the areas of specialized ministry.

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> CCSW6360 Intro to SW-- Final Exam Rubric test question (Application) <i>Indirect Measures</i> Graduating Student Questionnaire (Q #18n)	DM#1 - New Benchmark IM#1 - 3.5 or above	DM#1 - General scores for exam recorded, but not for specific question/rubric. Reflection: IM#1- <table><tr><td>S22</td><td>3.5</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>F22</td><td>3.95</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>S23</td><td>4.2</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>F23</td><td>NG</td><td>3.88333</td></tr></table> Reflection: Fall 23 added questions to the GSQ that allow us to disaggregate by program. Therefore, data from Spring	S22	3.5		F22	3.95		S23	4.2		F23	NG	3.88333	New assessment artifact created FA 23 but failed to include in course first time. Will communicate to instructors and include moving forward.a
S22	3.5														
F22	3.95														
S23	4.2														
F23	NG	3.88333													

		2022 to Spring 2023 is general data for this degree. However, in Fall 2023 the data is specifically for the program.	
--	--	--	--

Program Learning Objective # 2: Students will be able to discern, implement, and assess social work concepts within a ministry setting.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Equip students to design, implement, and assess church and community ministry practices.

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: Skill in design, implementation, and assessment of ministry in these specialized areas.

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> CCSW6367 SW Practice w/ Individuals and Families-- Treatment Plan Rubric (Understanding)	DM#1 – New Benchmark: 80% or above IM#1 – New Benchmark: 3.5 or above	DM#1 – No data for this assessment cycle. Reflection: FA 2023, all NOBTS academic jury procedures were reviewed to find places for improvement, including the number of and quality of artifacts collected. This is a new artifact. Class with artifact has not been taught in this cycle.	• New benchmarks and criteria for success set. Track for entire cycle for next assessment.

Indirect Measures Student Course Evaluation (Q #2)		IM#1 - FA 2020 5.0 Reflection: This benchmark was exceeded under the previous course design. While the benchmark was exceeded. The course has not been taught for several years due to faculty changes. Moving forward this course will be on a 2 year cycle.	New program coordinator and a consistent cycle of the course being offered will allow better data for assessment.
---	--	--	---

Program Learning Objective #3: Students will demonstrate a comprehension of ministry leadership skills applicable within a local church or other Christian ministry setting.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Prepare students to lead within churches, mission agencies, or related Christian and community ministries.

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: An understanding and application of disciplines and skills within the specialized ministry area.

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 CCSW6364 Church and Community Ministries--	DM#1 - 90% average (3.5 or higher)		This is a newer benchmark that will

<i>Ministry Design Paper Rubric (Understanding)</i>		DM#1 – Inconsistent offering of course and faculty changes led to inconsistent data. FA 21 96.5% avg FA 23 No artifacts Reflection: FA 2023, all NOBTS academic juries procedures were reviewed to find places for improvement, including the number of and quality of artifacts collected. This is a new artifact. Class with artifact has not been taught in this cycle.	now have a full cycle moving forward to assess better data with more accuracy.																						
Indirect Measures <i>Student Course Evaluation (Q #6)</i>	IM#1 - 3.5 or above	IM#1 - <table><tr><td>Spring 2019</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>New Orleans</td><td>3.7</td></tr><tr><td>Fall 2019</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>New Orleans</td><td>5.0</td></tr><tr><td>Spring 2020</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Online</td><td>4.8</td></tr><tr><td>Spring 2021</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>New Orleans</td><td>4.0</td></tr><tr><td>Fall 2021</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FLEX</td><td>5.0</td></tr><tr><td>Fall 2023</td><td></td></tr></table>	Spring 2019		New Orleans	3.7	Fall 2019		New Orleans	5.0	Spring 2020		Online	4.8	Spring 2021		New Orleans	4.0	Fall 2021		FLEX	5.0	Fall 2023		Revise IM benchmark to 4.0 for next assessment cycle
Spring 2019																									
New Orleans	3.7																								
Fall 2019																									
New Orleans	5.0																								
Spring 2020																									
Online	4.8																								
Spring 2021																									
New Orleans	4.0																								
Fall 2021																									
FLEX	5.0																								
Fall 2023																									

		New Orleans 3.8 Reflection: While the benchmark was exceeded in all sections. Spring 2019 and Fall 2023 were outliers compared to the other sections of this course. There does seem to be a trend toward lower evaluations for in-person versus other sections of the course. Perhaps this is due to sample size or other factors.	
--	--	--	--

Executive Summary: Overall, this degree has relatively new benchmarks and criterion. For some of them, there needs to be a full cycle of data prior to quality assessment of the degree. There is a difference in student course evaluations between in-person sections and other sections. This is noted. The next cycle of assessment will provide more data and allow better quality and accurate assessment.