

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
Assessment Manual

Updated October 31, 2019

Table of Contents

Assessment Manual Purpose Statement	1
Introduction	1
Assessment Oversight Committee (AOC)	3
Our Mission	4
The Trustee Board and Assessment.....	4
Administrative Council and Assessment.....	5
Assessment in the Various Units of the Seminary	7
Staff Evaluation	10
Faculty Evaluation.....	12
Adjunct Faculty Evaluation	13
Our Degree Program Assessment.....	16
Leavell College General Education Competency Assessment	22

Manual Purpose Statement

The purpose of this manual is to provide a clear guide for the overall assessment process of New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. The manual contains appropriate description, instruction and forms for the assessment process for NOBTS as it pertains to each academic and administrative unit of the institution.

INTRODUCTION

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary is a private educational institution owned by the Southern Baptist Convention. Founded by the Southern Baptist Convention in 1917, the Seminary serves the needs of the denomination by training future ministers and denominational workers for its churches and other ministries.

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary and Leavell College's mission statement is to "prepare servants to walk with Christ, proclaim His truth, and fulfill His mission." The College and Seminary fulfills the mission by offering certificates as well as associate, baccalaureate, master, and doctoral degrees in various Christian studies disciplines including pastoral ministry, Christian education, theology and history, biblical studies, church music, and church and community ministries. Leavell College also offers general education courses as required by SACSCOC.

The main campus of the institution is located at 3939 Gentilly Boulevard, New Orleans LA 70126. In order to provide training to Baptist ministers already engaged in local ministry positions, the Seminary has established extension centers in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. The Seminary also has developed a distance education program that enables ministers anywhere in the world to receive training via an online format. The Seminary's enrollment is approximately 3,800 students, which is a combination of certificate, undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate students.

The admission policies of the Seminary are selective in nature. Admission is restricted to students who demonstrate a call from God, as well as the requisite educational requirements, and several other admission criteria. Some admission policies vary by degree. For admission requirements, see the Graduate Academic Catalog (page 181) and Leavell College Catalog (page 69).

Assessment is always a difficult task for institutions because most administrators and faculty members are occupied with so many duties. However, we realize the necessity of assessment for institutional improvement. Since 1996, the Seminary has assessed its administrative unit goals following a process in our *Institutional Effectiveness Annual Assessment (IEAA)* where we sought to close the loop on planning, measuring, assessing, and making improvements based on the assessments. With a desire to continuing to communicate and embrace a culture of assessment and improvement, NOBTS has revised

its unit assessment process to clarify outcomes, benchmarks, strategies, measures, analyses, actions and quality improvements. That process is explained below.

Although we have measured and evaluated our academic degree programs also, the Seminary has not done as well in years past closing the loop with degree program evaluation using student learning outcomes or with documentation of improvement in those areas. We have made significant progress in the last several years in building an institution-wide culture of assessment.

As an institution, we are continuing to make progress toward our desired culture of assessment in every area of evaluation, closing the loop, and demonstrating quality improvement on an ongoing basis. The Institutional Effectiveness Office and various other academic and administrative officers, as well as our faculty, have reviewed our processes, and we have implemented several changes in policy and action plans as is indicated below. In this process we have continued to move toward the desired culture of assessment that demonstrates improvement. We have tightened our process so that it will be simple, sustainable, and successful, and most importantly, that it will foster the desired culture of assessment.

One stimulus that has moved us toward a culture of assessment is a new committee formed by the administration and faculty to provide oversight and communication of the assessment process at NOBTS. The committee is made up of the Provost, Graduate and Undergraduate Academic Deans and Associate Academic Deans, plus graduate division chairs and an appointed faculty liaison from each graduate division and the Leavell College faculty. The committee gives oversight to the assessment activities of the graduate divisional faculty for graduate degrees and the Leavell College faculty for the undergraduate degrees.

This assessment manual is designed to show us exactly where we are and to help us conclude where we need to go. The assessment at every level and in every area must seek to answer the following questions:

- i. Where are we heading? (Our institutional Mission Statement and our administrative and academic unit Purpose statements)
- ii. What will it take to get there? (Developed goals: institutional goals, a Strategic Plan, and measureable goals for each administrative and academic unit plus student learning outcomes for each course and degree at both the graduate and undergraduate level)
- iii. How do we measure our progress? (Measureable tools for assessment)
- iv. What is the analysis of our measurements? (Systematic Assessment based on data)
- v. What adjustments do we make to our **programs** and **processes** to demonstrate ongoing quality improvement? (Plans and actions on assessments to demonstrate quality improvement)

Assessment Oversight Committee (AOC)

► *Assignment*

- (a) AOC: Provide faculty oversight of the institutional assessment process. Offer leadership to various institutional units in the assessment process to ensure the continued effectiveness of the institution in fulfillment of its mission. Attend ATS and SACSCOC meetings upon request.
- (b) Provost, Dean and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean and Associate Dean of Leavell College: Serve in an advisory role, guiding the AOC in the oversight of the institution's assessment process.
- (c) Graduate Division Chairs: Serve in an advisory role, guiding the AOC in the oversight of the institution's assessment process, and lead the assessment process of the respective division.
- (d) Graduate Division and Leavell College Assessment Liaisons: Support the assessment process of the respective division. This includes assisting in the collection and assessment of artifacts, serving on faculty juries, and communicating assessment policies to the division.
- (e) Institutional Effectiveness Staff: Provide leadership, research, and support for the assessment and accreditation process. Present recommendations to the AOC for approval by the faculty. Staff are non-voting members.

► *Membership*

Provost, Dean and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean and Associate Dean of Leavell College, Graduate Division Chairs, and the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) staff. In addition, one faculty member from each graduate division and Leavell College appointed by the respective discipline to serve a minimum of two years (terms will be staggered so that no more than two liaisons will rotate off at the end of the academic year). The IE director will serve as the chair of the AOC as long as the IE director is a faculty member and the committee is faculty driven.

Our Mission

The mission of New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary is to “prepare servants to walk with Christ, proclaim His truth, and fulfill His mission.” All units assess their activities in light of the institution's mission. Their work is to be conducted in connection with the mission statement of the institution. The Administrative Council is responsible for the assessment of the mission statement and making recommendations for changes to Trustee Board for approval.

The Trustee Board and Assessment

The Board of Trustees of the Seminary is responsible for annually evaluating its own work in its meetings and regularly assessing the performance of the President of the Seminary. The work of the Board and the President are assessed in each spring meeting. These evaluations are recorded in the minutes of the spring meetings of the Trustees. The process is contained in the Trustee Manual.

Administrative Council and Assessment

Annually, the Cabinet, under the leadership of the President, sets, evaluates, and makes needed changes to the long-term goals of the institution based on the institutional mission through the Strategic Plan for the Seminary. Each year in January, the Cabinet sets, evaluates, and makes needed adjustments to the strategic initiatives of the Seminary based on the institutional goals. These initiatives give the Seminary one- to five-year objectives to accomplish its mission and goals. Their assessments are documented in the Cabinet minutes. This Strategic Plan and its assessment are published in The NOBTS Ministry Training Cafeteria Report each spring. This metaphor illustrates the cafeteria of choices available to students in their training for knowledge and skills that enable them to accomplish the mission of the Seminary. The Strategic Plan is the big picture, long-term goals that set the course of the Seminary under the direction of the Board and the execution of the Administration.

The remainder of the Seminary family, including administrators, faculty, and staff, must be involved in assessment to develop and maintain the needed institution-wide culture of assessment. The President sets the pattern by evaluating the members of the Cabinet annually. His policy statement is as follows.

President's Policy Statement Evaluation of the Cabinet

Each year the President conducts a performance evaluation of members of the Cabinet. This review will normally take place between August 1 and September 30.

Questions

1. What were the most significant things you accomplished this year?
2. What were the most significant struggles you faced?
3. What will be your points of focus in the coming year?
4. What is your biggest dream for your area of the Seminary?
5. How do you feel your team is functioning?
6. What measurable change will you focus on in the next year?
7. How is your load wearing on you? and your family?
8. List 3 things you have seen improve as a result of assessment, analysis and change in your goals for the past year.

While the evaluation has not been formally consistent in recent years, evaluation has been done informally on a regular basis. In the fall of 2015 the President formalized the process and the written policy above was adopted. The formal evaluation of the Cabinet under this new policy was conducted in the fall 2015 semester and the process is now in place to be used for regular evaluation.

For other senior administrative officers, the policies are as follows:

Provost
Annual Senior Administrator Evaluation

Each year the Provost conducts a performance evaluation of senior members of his staff: This review normally takes place in the spring. The questions used in the evaluation are as follows.

- 1) What were the most significant things you accomplished this year?
- 2) What are some demonstrable areas of improvement?
- 3) What were the most significant struggles you faced?
- 4) What will be your points of focus in the coming year?
- 5) What is your biggest dream for your area of the seminary?
- 6) How do you feel your team is functioning?
- 7) How is your load wearing on you? Your family?
- 8) How can I best support and serve you and your team?

VP Business Affairs
Evaluation Policy for Senior Staff

Each year the VP Business conducts a performance evaluation of senior members of the Business Affairs Staff. This review normally takes place between January 15 and February 15. The questions used in the evaluation are as follows.

1. What were the most significant things you accomplished this year?
2. What were the most significant struggles you faced?
3. What will be your points of focus in the coming year?
4. What is your biggest dream for your area of the Seminary?
5. How do you feel your team is functioning?
6. What measurable change will you focus on in the next year?
7. How is your load wearing on you? and your family?
8. List 3 things you have seen improve as a result of assessment, analysis and change in your goals for the past year.

Vice President for Institutional Advancement Senior Staff Assessments

The Office for Institutional Advancement is responsible for assessments of the Development operation, the Alumni/CMR Office, and the PR Office.

Each year a Director assessment is completed. These are face-to-face meetings with a completed assessment form to review with the Directors of the Office of Institutional Development, the Public Relations Office, and the Alumni/CMR Office. Each Director's assessment form is designed with the senior staff member's duties in mind.

Should a Director be assessed as below average, the Director is given the opportunity to write comments and sign the assessment form. This becomes part of his or her personnel file. The Director is given an opportunity to correct the noted deficiencies.

A follow-up assessment is then scheduled and completed in 90 days to see if there are improvements. If the Director has made sufficient improvements, then the Director will next meet for the annual assessment.

If the Director is not making progress toward the needed improvements, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement may choose to give one more 90-day extension.

Dean of Students

Dean of Students employees are evaluated on an annual basis. This evaluation normally happens at the beginning of the fall semester (and academic year) in August- September per business office instruction. The Dean of Students evaluates senior staff and department directors, while the Associate Dean of Students evaluates support staff. The Recreation and Financial Aid Directors evaluate their support staff and submit evaluations to the Associate Dean of Students. The Dean and Associate Dean of Students review the evaluations and initiate any action deemed necessary to address or correct deficiencies.

Evaluation forms are available from the Business Office, and completed evaluations are submitted to the business office's Human Resource Officer.

Assessment in the Various Units of the Seminary

To assist in the development of our comprehensive assessment plan, the IE staff developed a Word template for use by our units in documenting their Quality Improvement Report. We began a training program in the fall of 2018 outlining how to complete the assessment via the Word template. This common template is used across our units in gathering, measuring, and analyzing data so that decisions can be made based on the data gathered.

The pattern for the process is as follows:

1. We begin with the mission statement. Each unit is encouraged to keep the mission at the forefront of their thinking and planning. This is what we have been called by God to do and charged by our denomination to accomplish. From this mission comes the purpose statements for all our units and the outcomes, strategies, measurements, benchmarks, and demonstrations of improvement.
2. From the mission statement comes a purpose statement for the academic, administrative, or program unit. These purpose statements describe why the units exist.
3. From the purpose statements come the outcomes for the unit to accomplish its purpose.
4. For each outcome, strategies are designed to accomplish the outcomes.
5. The strategies must be measurable and measured to gather appropriate data on how the strategy is working.
6. Benchmarks are set for the measurements based on our current situations so we can set and analyze goals for the future.
7. The result of the measurement must be analyzed with professional judgment.
8. The analysis will result in decisions for actions that lead to quality improvement.
9. The next step is periodic reassessment after a period of time to demonstrate change whether improvement or not.
10. The final step in the loop is determining what further action needs to be taken to continue the process of assessment and quality improvement, so the process is repeated.

The Assessment Plan requires the participation of all of the people on the team from Trustees to the smallest unit in the organization. Each academic and administrative unit of the Seminary, under the oversight of the various members of the Cabinet, is responsible for assessing prior year goals and making plans of action for improvements based on assessing, revising, or setting new goals for the coming year. Attention should be paid to measurable goals whose accomplishment promotes continual improvement in the administrative area.

The Assessment Team

- NOBTS Mission
- Trustees
- President*
 - Cabinet
- Provost*
 - Dean of the Libraries
 - Dean of Graduate Studies
 - † Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
 - † Associate Dean of Online Learning
 - † Associate Dean of ReDoc
 - † Associate Dean of ProDoc

- † Caskey Center
- † Academic Divisions
 - Biblical Studies
 - The Michael and Sara Moskau Institute of Archeology- Center for Archeological Research
 - H. Milton Haggard Center for New Testament Textual Studies
 - Theology & History
 - Institute for Christian Apologetics
 - Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry
 - Institute for Faith and the Public Square
 - Pastoral Ministries
 - Supervised Ministry & Mentoring Programs
 - Global Missions Center
 - Leavell Center for Evangelism & Church Health
 - Dean of Chapel
 - Church Music
 - Discipleship & Leadership Ministry
 - Youth Ministry Institute
 - Church & Community Ministries
 - Leeke-Magee Counseling Center
- Dean of Leavell College
- Extension Center System along with the Regional Deans
- Dean of Students*
- Vice President for Institutional Assessment*
 - Institutional Effectiveness
- Vice President of Business Affairs*
 - Business Office
 - Human Resources
 - Director of Facilities & Safety
 - Associate VP for Information Technology*
- Vice President of Institutional Advancement*
 - Alumni Relations
 - Church Minister Relations
- Vice President of Enrollment
 - Financial Aid
 - Registrar
 - Student Enlistment

*Cabinet members are evaluated annually by the President in their roles as Administrative Council Members.

Each unit of the seminary is assessed each year.

STAFF EVALUATION

The statement from the Employee Personnel Reference Guide describing the policy for staff evaluation is clear and concise.

Staff employee assessments are performed annually for all staff employee classifications. Department managers and employees will have the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the employee's job performance and/or training suggestions. Staff employee assessments are conducted for the purpose of continually advancing the mission of NOBTS and to foster the professional growth of each employee. The Human Resources Department will distribute the staff employee assessment form to department managers each year in April and is available to assist managers with any questions or concerns regarding the assessment process.

The instructions for the managers are as follows. Employee assessments are an annual process for each department. Each department manager will use the attached form to assess his/her employees, then he/she will return his/her assessments to the Human Resources Office by the end of May. Following are a few suggestions/comments concerning the process:

1. The managers will print and complete an assessment for each employee. After they have completed the assessment, they will meet with the employee to do a quick review of the assessment and provide the opportunity for him/her to add comments, then he/she will sign the assessment.
2. This process is an objective assessment of the employee. It should not take much time, but it will provide the manager and the employee with an overview of his/her job performance and the opportunity to express comments.
3. This assessment process is the beginning of what will eventually become a more detailed and subjective employee evaluation process. However, for now, this is a quick and easy way to objectively assess the employees and an opportunity to provide both the employee and manager the opportunity to express thoughts regarding performance and/or training opportunities.

**Staff Employee Assessment
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary**

Employee Name: _____ Job Title: _____

Department: _____ Supervisor/Evaluator: _____

1. Briefly describe the duties and responsibilities of the job.

2. Employee is present for each scheduled shift with the exception of excused absences. Yes No

3. Tasks are satisfactorily completed as assigned. Yes No

4. Supervisor's assistance with job tasks is requested when needed. Yes No

5. Respect is demonstrated for supervisor and other department team members. Yes No

6. Employee is responsive to the needs/requests of the "customer". Yes No

7. Job performance is in fulfillment of the mission of NOBTS. Yes No

8. Employee maintains confidentiality in areas where required. Yes No

9. Employee comments regarding areas of improvement or job training suggestions:

10. Supervisor comments regarding areas of improvement or job training suggestions:

Employee Signature: _____ Date: _____

Supervisor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Thank You!

FACULTY EVALUATION

As a part of the annual institutional planning and evaluation cycle, all Seminary faculty undergo an annual evaluation to identify areas of strength and weakness and set goals for improvement. The criteria for faculty evaluation include

- (a) personal discipleship
- (b) church, community, and denominational service
- (c) contributions to the life and work of NOBTS
- (d) scholarship and research
- (e) classroom effectiveness

The primary intent of the faculty evaluation process is to offer feedback and constructive suggestions for improvement; however, it is a factor in recommendations concerning tenure, step increases, and promotion in rank. The annual evaluation process consists of the following elements (the Faculty Evaluation Forms are included in the Faculty Manual Section 3.12 and Appendix 3-F).

Student Evaluation of Instruction

Students in all classes at all degree levels and in all delivery systems are asked to fill out an evaluation form online toward the end of each semester to provide input from the student on both the course and the instructional expertise of the faculty member. The evaluations and comments from each class are compiled and both the original evaluations and the summary compilation are collected by the Institutional Effectiveness office who will submit copies to the appropriate Division Chair, Dean, and the Provost. The student evaluation forms are one indirect assessment in evaluation of curriculum and of faculty instruction, and are a factor in consideration for tenure, step increases, and promotion in rank.

Direct Assessment of Faculty

The graduate and undergraduate deans provide to each faculty member Form 1, “Annual Update and Self-Evaluation,” each spring semester to allow faculty members to identify the professional development activities they made during the previous academic year and to evaluate their own performance the previous year. Form 2, “Division Chairperson’s Annual Review,” allows the faculty member to interact with the Division Chair's evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments during the year. At a prescribed time, usually in May, the Division Chairperson meets with each division faculty member for a confidential evaluation, reviewing and discussing forms 1 and 2. If the faculty member and Division Chairperson disagree significantly on an aspect of the evaluation, the faculty member has the opportunity to identify his or her point of disagreement in writing.

Summary reports of the results of the Division Chair interviews are forwarded to the appropriate Dean and to the Provost for their use in recommendations and decisions on promotion and tenure, etc. Rank promotion and tenure recommendations utilize this information but are a separate process done in December or January in anticipation of Trustee approval in April. Rank promotion is initiated by the recommendation of the Division Chair, with the agreement of the Dean and Provost. Tenure recommendations originate from the Division Chair in consultation with all the tenured members of the division, making a joint recommendation. With the agreement of the Dean and Provost, the tenure recommendation is presented to the Trustees for approval. In cases in which rank or tenure is not recommended, specific targets are set for the faculty member to achieve during the coming academic year. If the faculty member reaches those targets, the rank promotion or tenure recommendation is presented to the Trustees; if not, the faculty member has a year to seek other employment. See the Faculty Manual Section 3.12 for the policy in full and the forms.

ADJUNCT FACULTY EVALUATION

The process and the forms used for evaluation of NOBTS adjunct faculty members is located on pages 30-32 of the revised Adjunct Faculty Manual (Revised 08/11/2015). The statement of process is as follows:

The Associate Provost will distribute the appropriate forms to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Associate Dean of Leavell College, Regional Associate Deans, and Director of Prison Programs. Each of the Regional Associate Deans and the deans on campus will ensure that every adjunct is evaluated with this form with the process below. Adjuncts will be evaluated at least once in an academic year when they teach.

1. A peer evaluator sits in on the class for at least one hour of teaching and fills out the attached form.
2. The peer evaluator discusses the completed form with the adjunct and gives him or her a copy if desired.
3. The original of the completed form for graduate adjuncts in all sites and delivery systems is sent to the Regional Dean of or another Dean as appropriate. For undergraduate adjuncts, the original of the completed form is sent to the Office of Associate Dean of Leavell College. These original forms are placed in the original files of the adjuncts as appropriate. The Graduate and Undergraduate Deans have the original files on campus for the adjunct faculty.
4. Online adjunct instructors complete a self-evaluation form (see Appendix G). The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, who has “grader” or “instructor” status to all online NOBTS graduate courses, communicates with online adjuncts regarding the self-evaluation form. The completed self-evaluation form is maintained in the online adjunct instructor’s personnel file.

(Adjunct Faculty Manual, p. 5)

Adjunct Instructor Peer Evaluation Form Instructor's

Name _____ Term of Instruction _____ Location _____

Format of Instruction _____ Evaluator's name _____

Supply a ranking: 1-Strongly agree/ 2-Agree/ 3-Neutral/ 4- Disagree/ 5- Strongly disagree

The instructor explained difficult concepts in an understandable way. ____

When applicable or feasible, the instructor related the course material to contemporary ministry situations or issues. ____

The instructor seems to have a broad knowledge of the course subject. ____

The instructor demonstrated a respectful, caring attitude toward students. ____

The instructor used instructional methods and /or delivery systems that facilitated learning. ____

The instructor taught in a manner consistent with the seminary's doctrinal confession. ____

The instructor was well prepared and managed the class well. ____

Adjunct Professor's response: I concur/disagree with the peer evaluation above. Explain below if necessary.

Adjunct Professor's signature: _____ Date: _____

Policy Decision and Process

Dr. Thomas Strong (Dean of Leavell College), Dr. Mike Edens (Graduate Dean, NOBTS), and Dr. Norris Grubbs (Associate Provost, NOBTS) met on October 2, 2015 to consider adjunct evaluation and ways to approve how the seminary is currently doing this. After assessing the current process, they decided to develop a form that could be used in every program of the seminary to evaluate adjuncts. They adopted the following process to ensure completion of this evaluation. This will be in addition to course evaluations, which help evaluate adjuncts as well.

1. A peer evaluator sits in on the class for at least one hour of teaching and fills out the attached form.
2. The peer evaluator discusses the completed form with the adjunct and gives the adjunct a copy if desired.
3. A copy of the completed form is sent to the Regional Dean or Dean as appropriate to be placed in the teaching file of the adjunct.

Drs. Edens and Strong developed the form after the meeting on Oct. 2, 2015. Dr. Grubbs was charged with making sure Drs. Barlow, Lemke, and Dukes would approve the process and form as well.

OUR DEGREE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

NOBTS has adopted the following procedure to ensure that students are achieving basic goals in their degree program and to assure the strengthening of a culture of assessment for our Seminary. The process is overseen by the Assessment Oversight Committee. The purpose of the assessment of the degrees is to evaluate the effectiveness of the degree programs and recommend degree revisions or other changes that need to be made to ensure the students achieve the program student learning outcomes.

As a result of the training by the IE Team, the Assessment Oversight Committee, and the faculty over the last two years, we learned that we did not have an appropriate system for assessing our degree programs using student learning outcomes. While much assessment has been done through the years, and while some programs, like our Master of Divinity have been revised (2010) and some new academic and professional master degrees have been added to the curriculum or improved, the process of assessment and decision making for those programs was not properly documented nor have improvements been demonstrated in a systematic way. In addition, the assessment was largely done on the New Orleans campus and not sufficiently disaggregated among our off-campus sites and our online program.

As a result of our process of assessment, in the Fall of 2014 and the Spring of 2015 we designed and implemented a plan for the selection of artifacts, sampling, and processes that enable us to do a regular and systematic assessment of the accomplishment of student outcomes in academic programs in all delivery systems and locations. The seminary uses a multi-discipline faculty jury system to identify strengths in the programs, processes that should be sustained, and weaknesses that must be improved. More importantly, the plan is sustainable so that ongoing evaluation and analysis are anticipated and a culture of assessment is being developed

Policy Statement on Embedded Assignments

The graduate divisions and the Leavell College Faculty on campus, in the extension centers, and in our on-line programs should follow the procedure below for all embedded assignments.

1. Embedded assignments should be collected each semester. For sampling purposes, the division should select one semester prior to the scheduled degree program assessment according to the assessment cycle and sample that semester's embedded assignments.
2. Develop in each selected course an embedded assignment that demonstrates how students have achieved the student learning outcomes in the respective course. *All sections of the courses should use the same embedded assignment and the same evaluation rubric.*

3. Clearly delineate in the syllabus and communicate to the students the assignments and the assessment rubric that demonstrates the student accomplishments. Gather the data from random samples of the embedded assignments and evaluate the data utilizing the rubric to assess the assignment as described in the IE Assessment Manual. Provide the sampling of assignments, and the graded rubrics to the respective Division Chairs/Dean of Leavell College.
4. The Division Chairs/Dean of Leavell College designate a lead teacher for the course and give the assignments and rubrics to the lead teacher for review.

Clarified Sampling Size System to Assess Embedded Assignments

Goals – The desired outcomes of the clarified sampling system are the following:

- Increase consistency in sampling across divisions.
- Produce results that more accurately reflect student learning outcomes, and are not skewed because of “outliers.”
- Produce results that are a sufficient sample to be statistically relevant, as has been discussed multiple times in AOC and degree program juries.
- Avoid overwork by faculty members who assess the embedded assignments.

The Proposal – In short, it is to reduce the percentage of papers sampled in a “stand alone” class from 30 percent to 25 percent, and to continue assessing 2 additional papers per “section” for a “stackable” class.

- A “stand alone” class is a course taught in a single setting and delivery system. An example would be each single section taught on campus, or in a single-section online or extension center class. For a stand alone class, the sample would be reduced from 30 percent to 25 percent, with a maximum of 15.
 - Examples: For a single-section campus-based class with 25 students, the sample size would be 6. Larger classes would have proportionally larger samples until the enrollment is 60, at which the 15 maximum sample is reached.
- A “stackable” class is one basic class, being taught by the same teacher in the same semester, but has several “sections” in that one overall class. Examples of “stackable” classes are –
 - Multiple site CIV sections added to a campus-based course.
 - Multiple sections in a NOLA2U or NOLA2U Flex course.
 - Multiple sections within one online class.

In stackable classes, 20 percent would be assessed from the largest class, up to a maximum of 15. After that, 3 papers would be graded from each additional section.

- Examples: A multisite CIV class has 20 campus students and 25 students scattered at 3 additional CIV locations. The sample would be 4 papers from the campus and 2 additional papers per CIV section, for a total of 10.
- A multisection online class would have 25 percent of the first class (6 of 25), and 2 each from each additional section.

- A NOLA2U or NOLA2UFlex class would have 25 percent from the campus class and 2 from the online students (unless more students are online, in which case the above would be reversed, i.e., 25 percent of the online class plus 2 students from the campus class).
- The minimum for each class would be 25 percent of the main class, until it reaches the maximum, plus 2 from each additional section of stackable classes.
- The maximum for each class would be 15 papers, plus 2 from each additional section. The enrollment would have to reach 60 students to reach the maximum sample.
- Outliers can skew the results in a comparatively small sample. At the discretion of the faculty jury, an “outlier” score that deviates more than 2 points different (higher or lower) on the Likert scale from the baseline or benchmark may be discarded in the interest of more representative assessments. However, if there are multiple outliers either higher or lower, the faculty jury might decide to count the apparent outliers in order to note the overall range.

Drafted: May 15, 2018
Adopted: February 18, 2019

Juried Evaluation of Courses

1. Juries should be conducted during the first two days of the final exam week during the spring semester. Read the artifacts for the each embedded assignment.
2. Discuss and evaluate the embedded assignment and rubric samples.
3. Discuss and evaluate the student performance in light of the student learning outcomes.
4. Recommend program changes from the assessment.
5. Document the discussion and decisions of the Divisions/Leavell College Faculty through minutes of the meetings.
6. Note improvements from previous the assessment.
7. Provide copies of the assignments and the meeting minutes to the IE office immediately following the jury meeting.

We have now evaluated all of our degree programs using the plan, except for the recently approved degrees, and they are included in the calendar below that sets a schedule for a biennial evaluation of all degree programs.

**Calendar for Program Evaluation New
Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
Degree Program Assessment Cycle**

2020/2023/2026

MA (Biblical
Archaeology) MA
(Biblical Studies)
MA (Cross-Cultural
Studies) MA (Theology)
MA in Pastoral Ministry
Master of Theological
Studies BACMin
BA Music with an Emphasis in Worship

2021/2024/2027

MDiv
MA (Apologetics)
MA in Christian
Apologetics MA in
Christian Education MA
in Discipleship
MA in Missiology
MA in Worship
Ministries MMCM

2022/2025/2028

PhD
DMin
DEdMin
EdD
DMA
MA in Counseling
MA in Church and Community Ministries

Adopted 4/1/2019

Here is our process:

1. In our Master of Divinity degree, we correlated the seven competencies, which were used in our previous QEP, with the four program goals delineated by the Association of Theological Schools. All of our degree programs are theological in nature at both the graduate and undergraduate level. The purpose of this correlation is to demonstrate the connection of the Master of Divinity and our other theological degrees to the outcomes expected by ATS and our other accrediting agencies. The MDiv is our main graduate degree program with the largest enrollment of students. Its core is the pattern for all our graduate degrees and students from all degree programs take at least some of its courses. Also, the BACM degree in our undergraduate program is patterned on our Master of Divinity.
2. From these four ATS goals we have revised NOBTS program goals for the Master of Divinity, our core graduate degree, *and all other degrees*.
3. The next step has been to develop student learning outcomes from the program goals.
4. We selected various artifacts as measures that would fit our assessment of the MDiv program and would measure the outcomes of students in the degree program. Three courses from our core were selected that can be used in multiple ways to assess, analyze, and demonstrate the student learning outcomes for the MDiv. The courses are samples from our core that relate to the goals and student learning outcomes. For the MDiv we chose the following. Systematic Theology 1 is a first or second year level course that helps to measure the theological heritage that is a basic part of all our programs. Intermediate Greek is the second course in the series of Greek study. It is an exegesis-based course that demonstrates how students can perform in translation, exegesis, and the articulation of an interpretation of the biblical text. Preaching Practicum and its sister course Teaching Practicum are performance-based courses that can demonstrate the student outcomes of articulation of the message of the text and the ability to perform other ministry skills.
5. Other degree programs use appropriate artifacts as noted below in the assessment goal and student learning outcomes sheets.
6. The next step was to develop rubrics to be used by multi-disciplinary faculty juries to measure the goals and outcomes, using their collective professional judgment. These rubrics have been applied to samples from all our sites and delivery systems where these courses are taught.
7. The analysis of these goals and student learning outcomes has been done using the professional judgment of multi-disciplinary juries from our faculty who have evaluated the performance in the sample artifacts from our disaggregated samples. The faculty juries write an analytical report on the assessment to demonstrate both weaknesses that need to be improved in the programs and strengths that need to be sustained. Recommendations are made to the appropriate division or faculty committee.
8. Improvements or the lack of improvements are noted for each program.

9. A second evaluation measure is an indirect use of a student survey that samples all of our sites and formats each year. The survey is administered by the Dean of Students' Office.
10. A third evaluation is the indirect measure of our student evaluations for courses and instructors administered each semester by the IE Office.
11. A fourth evaluation measure is a regular pre- and post-test that is given to all incoming students at the beginning of the Seminary work and at the time of graduation.
12. A fifth measure is to interview a disaggregated sample of graduates in person at each spring graduation to assess the graduates' perception of the accomplishment of student outcomes and the professional judgment of student skills by a multi-disciplinary faculty jury.
13. From these analyses have come action plans for improvement that can be reevaluated in the next round of assessment to demonstrate improvement. The MDiv is offered in all graduate academic divisions. Therefore, the Assessment Oversight Committee is responsible for the assessment of the MDiv, using Graduate and Undergraduate Deans, Associate Deans, Graduate Division Chairs, and graduate faculty members for the juries as needed.
14. The BACM and the BA in Music with an Emphasis on Worship degrees are located in Leavell College, and Leavell College faculty is responsible for the assessment of those degrees.
15. The Master of Arts degrees, both professional and academic, are seated in a specific graduate academic division. The divisions where the Master of Arts degrees are located are responsible for assessing those degrees.
16. The doctoral degrees are assessed by the professional doctoral faculty committee or the research doctoral faculty committee as appropriate.

The assessment of the degrees seated in Leavell College, divisions, or faculty doctoral committees have a similar but different methodology for assessment. The beginning of the assessment process is in the LC faculty or divisions/committees with embedded assignment and other artifact assessment. After that evaluation, a report is written and brought to the multi-discipline faculty juries for their evaluation. A summary report is drawn up in the jury as is the case with the MDiv.

The purpose of this list is to demonstrate the assessment and planning actions that the Seminary has engaged in to reflect the plan in place for ongoing assessment and action for improvement, resulting in a new culture of assessment throughout the Seminary.

LEAVELL COLLEGE GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT

Leavell College has identified four general education competencies as follows:

1. Critical Thinking – Students will develop the ability to recognize, analyze, critique, and synthesize arguments.
2. Oral Communication – Students will develop and deliver oral presentations clearly and effectively across a variety of contexts.
3. Written Communication – Students will communicate effectively in writing across a variety of contexts.
4. Quantitative Reasoning – Students will apply logical and analytical reasoning to the solution of real-world problems.

In addition to program assessment, the Leavell College General Education Committee (a subset of members of the Leavell College trustee-elected faculty) assesses these four general education competencies of the students and makes recommendations to the Leavell College faculty based on results of the assessment.

Below is the *General Education Assessment Map*, which outlines the direct and indirect measures used in assessing the four general education competencies.

Leavell College
 General Education Assessment Map
 Revised 3/27/17

General Education Outcome/Competency	Where Taught	Where/How Assessed
<p>Critical Thinking: Students will develop the ability to recognize, analyze, critique, and synthesize arguments.</p>	<p>Introduced BSCM 1300, BSCM 2350, BSCM 2310, LSCM 1310, LSCM 2310</p> <p>Reinforced BSCM 2321, BSCM 2322, PMCM 3300, THCM 2300</p> <p>Mastered Any 3000- or 4000-level Interpretation Course, LSCM 4300</p>	<p>Direct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMCM 3300 final paper assessed with LCPR • LSCM 4300 senior thesis assessed with LCPR • ETS Proficiency Profile (taken during semester of graduation) <p>Indirect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Satisfaction Survey

General Education Outcome/Competency	Where Taught	Where/How Assessed
<p>Oral Communication: Students will develop and deliver oral presentations clearly and effectively across a variety of contexts.</p>	<p>Introduced CECM 2310, PMCM 2370</p> <p>Reinforced PMCM 2300, CECM 2350</p> <p>Mastered LSCM 4300</p>	<p>Direct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CECM 2350 oral presentation (assessed with LCOPR) • PMCM 2300 oral presentation (assessed with LCOPR) • LSCM 4300 thesis defense (assessed with LCOPR) <p>Indirect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Satisfaction Survey

General Education Outcome/Competency	Where Taught	Where/How Assessed
<p>Written Communication: Students will communicate effectively in writing across a variety of contexts.</p>	<p>Introduced BSCM 1300, CECM 1300, LSCM 1310, PCCM 2370</p> <p>Reinforced LSCM 2310, PMCM 3330, THCM 2300</p> <p>Mastered LSCM 4300</p>	<p>Direct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSCM 2310 final paper assessed with LCPR • LSCM 4300 senior thesis assessed with LCPR • ETS Proficiency Profile (semester of graduation) <p>Indirect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Satisfaction Survey
<p>Quantitative Reasoning: Students will apply logical and analytical reasoning to the solution of real-world problems</p>	<p>Introduced LSCM 1325, LSCM 1326, LSCM 1327</p> <p>Reinforced LSCM 3360, LSCM 3361</p>	<p>Direct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ETS Proficiency Profile (semester of graduation) <p>Indirect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Satisfaction Survey

*LCPR = Leavell College Project Rubric

**LCOPR = Leavell College Oral Presentation Rubric

***Will be determined after assessing results from the Spring 2017 Student Satisfaction Survey

1. At the end of each semester, the Leavell College General Education Committee assesses the general education competencies as outlined in the above General Education Assessment Map.
2. The Leavell College General Education Committee presents their assessment to the full Leavell College faculty, noting their findings and recommendations for improvements.
3. The full Leavell College faculty votes on the recommendations for improvements suggested by the Leavell College General Education Committee.
4. The Leavell College General Education Committee follows up on these recommendations, providing the faculty with a status update during the Leavell College faculty meeting.
5. In May of each year, the Leavell College General Education Committee reviews the recommendations for improvement and the progress made in implementing these recommendations. This process will continue until the recommendation has been fully implemented and reassessed.