

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
Assessment Manual

Revised: February 21, 2022

Table of Contents

Assessment Manual Purpose Statement	1
Introduction	1
Assessment Oversight Committee (AOC)	2
Our Mission	3
The Trustee Board and Assessment	4
The Cabinet and Assessment	4
Assessment in the Various Units of the Seminary	6
Staff Evaluation	9
Faculty Evaluation	11
Adjunct Faculty Evaluation	13
Our Degree Program Assessment	18
Leavell College General Education Competency Assessment	25

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 3,000 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. The entrance requirements are listed in the Catalog.

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 *Quality Improvement Report* (previously known as the *Institutional Effectiveness Annual Assessment*) in which we sought to close the loop on planning, measuring, assessing, and making improvements based on the assessments. With a desire to continue 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.

The Seminary has made significant progress in the last several years in building an institution-wide culture of assessment. As an institution, we continue 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 indicated below. Through this process, we have continued to move toward the desired culture of assessment that demonstrates improvement. We have tightened our process so that it is simple, sustainable, and successful, and most importantly, that fosters the desired culture of assessment.

One stimulus that has moved us toward a culture of assessment is the forming of a new committee in 2017, established by the administration and faculty to provide oversight and communication of the assessment process at NOBTS. The committee, known as the Assessment Oversight Committee (AOC) consists of the Provost, Graduate and Undergraduate Academic Deans and Associate Academic Deans, Divisional Associate Deans, 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 understand 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 NOBTS, 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) Divisional Associate Deans: 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 NOBTS, Dean and Associate Dean of Leavell College, Divisional Associate Deans, 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 and Leavell College 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 Cabinet is responsible for the assessment of the mission statement and making recommendations for changes to the 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.

The Cabinet 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. The Cabinet looks at the Strategic Plan regularly, typically in January and August. 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 June 1 and July 31.

Questions

1. What were the most significant projects you and/or your team accomplished this year?
2. What were the most significant struggles you and/or your team faced this year?
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 for Business Administration
Evaluation Policy for Senior Staff

Each year the VP for Business Administration conducts a performance evaluation of senior members of the Business Administration 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. How do you feel your team is functioning?
5. What measurable change will you focus on in the next year?
6. How is your workload wearing on you? and your family?
7. 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 Institutional Advancement Office.

Each year a Director assessment is completed. These are face-to-face meetings with a completed assessment form to review with the Director of Donor Relations, the Director of Development

Public Relations Office, and the Director of Development Services. 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 Director of Student Services evaluates support staff. The Recreation Coordinator evaluates his/her support staff and submits evaluations to the Director of Student Services. The Dean of Students and the Director of Student Services 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 (QIR)

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. During the fall of 2018, the IE developed a training program outlining how to complete the unit 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 results of the measurement are analyzed with professional judgment.
8. The analysis results 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.

Each unit of the seminary is assessed each year.

QIR Contributors

President's Office

Office of Institutional Strategy
Alumni Relations
Church-Minister Relations

Provost's Office

Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Graduate Dean's Office (NOBTS)
Academic Divisions
Division of Biblical Studies
Division of Church Ministry
Division of Counseling
Division of Theological and Historical Studies
Academic Programs
Research Doctoral Program
Professional Doctoral Program
Extension Center System
Online Learning Center
Prison Programs
Accelerated Programs

Mentoring Programs
Supervised Ministry

Research Centers and Institutes

Adrian Rogers Center for Expository Preaching
Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry
Caskey Center for Church Excellence
Center of Archeological Research
Center for New Testament Textual Studies
Global Missions Center
Institute for Christian Apologetics
Institute for Faith and the Public Square
Leavell Center for Evangelism and Church Health
Leeke Magee Christian Counseling Center
Youth Ministry Institute

Undergraduate Dean's Office (Leavell College)

Academic Services

Dean of Students
Library
Media Services

Enrollment Management

Admissions
Registrar
Student Success
Financial Aid
Communications

Business Affairs

Human Resources
Business Office
Clinic
Early Learning Center
Post Office
Providence Guest House Facilities and Safety
Information Technology Center

Institutional Advancement Office

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) instruction and student engagement
- (d) faculty development

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

Each spring, the Divisional Associate Dean or Leavell College Dean will meet with each faculty member for a confidential evaluation, reviewing and discussing the self-evaluation report. If the faculty member and Divisional Associate Dean/Dean disagree on an aspect of the evaluation, the faculty member has the opportunity to identify his or her point of disagreement in writing.

For graduate faculty, the annual evaluation process will be led by the Divisional Associate Dean under the supervision of the Dean of Graduate Studies. The forms for annual evaluation will be distributed directly to each faculty member from the Office of Graduate Studies annually in the spring semester. The Divisional Associate Dean will schedule an appointment to discuss each professor's evaluation privately with the faculty member. The Divisional Associate Dean and faculty member will complete the divisional evaluation form. The Divisional Associate Dean, upon completion of all evaluations will schedule an appointment with the Dean of Graduate Studies to discuss his personal and all division faculty members' evaluations. All divisions will complete this process by the spring graduation exercise. The Dean of Graduate Studies will summarize the evaluations noting achievements and challenges for a document

which is shared with NOBTS Administration. The completed annual faculty evaluation forms will be stored electronically in the Institutional Effectiveness Office.

For Leavell College faculty, the annual evaluation process will be led by the Dean of Leavell College. The forms for annual evaluation will be distributed by the Leavell College office annually in the spring semester. The Dean will schedule an appointment to discuss each professor's evaluation privately with the faculty member. The Dean of Leavell College will summarize the evaluations noting achievements and challenges for a document which is shared with NOBTS Administration. The completed annual faculty evaluation forms will be stored electronically in the Institutional Effectiveness Office. See the Faculty Manual Section 3.12 for the full policy and Appendix 3-F for the forms.

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. At any stage in the process, should the tenure process be stopped due to a negative recommendation, the Provost, Dean, and Divisional Associate Dean shall decide whether the problem areas can be corrected and further review of the candidate is feasible. If the Provost, Dean, and Divisional Associate Dean elect to conduct further review, it will normally be scheduled one year later. Earlier reviews may be conducted at the discretion of the Provost. The Divisional Associate Dean shall hold a formal meeting with the faculty member to discuss the decision and appropriate actions. All recommendations and remedial actions required of the faculty member shall be put in writing. A faculty member who does not receive tenure may, at the discretion of the President, (1) be terminated as a Seminary employee or (2) be given contract status, either option effective at the end of the academic period in which the decision is reached. See Faculty Manual Sections 6.1 and 6.2 for full policies.

ADJUNCT FACULTY EVALUATION

The process and the forms used for evaluation of NOBTS and Leavell College adjunct faculty members is located on page 4 and Appendices G-H of the *Graduate Adjunct Faculty Manual* or pages 7, 15-18 of the *Leavell College Adjunct Faculty Manual*. The statement of process is as follows:

The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, the Associate Dean of Leavell College, and the Regional Associate Deans will ensure that every adjunct is evaluated with the appropriate form using the process below. Adjuncts will be evaluated at least once in an academic year in which 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 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. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies or the Leavell College Associate Dean 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 Instructor Peer Evaluation Form

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary/Leavell College

(Revised 07/2017)

Instructor's name _____ Course _____

Term of Instruction _____ Location _____

Format of Instruction _____ Evaluator _____

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 seemed to have a broad knowledge of the course subject.

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

_____ The instructor used instructional methods that facilitated learning.

_____ The instructor used instructional methods appropriate to the course delivery system (whether Internet, classroom, CIV, or workshop).

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

_____ The instructor was well prepared for the class.

_____ The instructor managed the class well.

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

Adjunct Professor's signature: _____

Date: _____

Online Adjunct Self-Evaluation

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary/Leavell College

(Revised 07/2017)

Name: _____

Course taught: _____

Semester and Year: _____

Thank you for your assistance with teaching online for NOBTS/Leavell College. Please take a few moments to answer the following questions. These questions are meant to provide you an opportunity to reflect upon your teaching and to provide continued assistance to us as we evaluate our online courses.

1. Describe your general approach to teaching this online course (practice of logging in, grading papers, responding to discussion boards, etc).
2. How would you describe your interaction with the students?
3. Have you experienced any difficulties teaching the online course?
4. What do you believe to be the strengths/weaknesses of online teaching? Of this course in particular?
5. Given the course you are teaching, what would you like to see done differently if you could change it?
6. What is your perception of the support you receive from NOBTS that enables you to teach this course?

We would like to follow up with you by speaking with you personally. When would be a good time for a faculty member to call and to speak with you about your experience teaching this course?

What is the best number to call?

[Instructions: For graduate courses, please return the completed form to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. For Leavell College courses, return to the Associate Dean of Leavell College.]

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.

List of Evaluators

- 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.

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.

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 are to follow the procedure below for all embedded assignments.

1. Embedded assignments are to 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 the measure to which students have achieved the respective student learning outcomes. *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 *NOBTS 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 during the degree program juries.
- Create a sustainable process that avoids overwork by faculty members who assess the embedded assignments.

The Process – Following is the sampling process to be followed when assessing programs:

- **Stand-Alone Class**

A “stand-alone” class is a course taught in a single setting and delivery system. Stand-alone classes include (1) a single section of a course taught on campus, (2) a single-section online, or (3) an extension center class. The sample size for a stand-alone class is 25 percent of the total number of students enrolled in the class, with a maximum of 15 artifacts (i.e., embedded assignments).

For instance: For a single-section campus-based class with 20 students, the sample size is 5. Larger classes would have proportionally larger samples until the enrollment is 60, at which the 15 maximum sample is reached.

- **Stackable Class**

A “stackable” class is one basic class taught by the same professor in the same semester, but has several “sections” in that one overall class. Examples of “stackable” classes:

- 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, 25 percent is assessed from the largest class, up to a maximum of 15. After that, a minimum of 3 papers are assessed from each additional section.

Examples:

- **Setting:** A multisite CIV class with 20 campus students and 25 students scattered at 3 additional CIV locations.
Sampling: The sample consists of 5 assessed artifacts from the campus class offering (25 percent) and a minimum of 3 additional assessed artifacts per CIV section.
- **Setting:** A multi-section online class with 25 students in one section and 15 students enrolled in additional online sections.
Sampling: The sample consists of 6 assessed artifacts from the online class with the 25 students (25 percent of the section with the largest enrollment) and a minimum of 3 assessed artifacts from each additional online section.

- Setting: A NOLA2U or NOLA2UFlex class
 - Sampling: The sample consists of 25 percent from the campus class and a minimum of 3 assessed artifacts from the online students (unless more students are online, in which case the above is reversed, i.e., 25 percent of the online class plus a minimum of 3 assessed artifacts from the campus class).
- The minimum sample size:
 - Stand-alone classes: 25 percent of the main class, until the sample reaches the maximum of 15.
 - Stackable classes: 25 percent of the class with the largest enrollment plus a minimum of 3 artifacts from each additional section of stackable classes.
- The maximum sample size for each class is 15 artifacts, plus a minimum of 3 artifacts 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 by more than 1 point (higher or lower) on the Likert scale from the baseline or benchmark may be discarded in the interest of a more representative sample and assessment. 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.

Updated: September 24, 2021
Adopted: September 27, 2021

Juried Evaluation of Courses

1. Juries should be conducted final exam week during the spring semester.
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 the previous 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.

We jury our degree programs on a three-year cycle, as noted below.

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

2020-2021 Academic Year

2020/2023/2026

MA (Biblical Archeology)
MA (Biblical Studies)
MA (Cross-Cultural Studies)
MA (Theology)
MA in Pastoral Ministry
Master of Theological Studies
Bachelor of Arts

2021/2024/2027

MDiv*
MA (Apologetics)
MA in Christian Apologetics
MA in Christian Education
MA in Discipleship
MA in Missiology
MMCM
General Education

2022/2025/2028

PhD
DMin
DEdMin
EdD
DMA
MA in Counseling
MA in Church and Community Ministries
MA in Worship Ministries
Associate of Arts

Adopted 8/31/2020

*AOC approved postponing review until 2022, as degree is currently being revised.

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

Beginning with the 2021-2022 Academic Year

2020/2023/2026

MA (Biblical Archeology)
MA (Biblical Studies)
MA (Cross-Cultural Studies)
MA (Theology)
MA in Ministry Leadership
MA in Ministry to Women
MA in Pastoral Ministry
Master of Theological Studies
Bachelor of Arts

2021/2024/2027

MDiv
MA (Apologetics)
MA in Christian Apologetics
MA in Christian Education
MA in Church Planting
MA in Discipleship
MA in Missiology
MMCM
General Education

2022/2025/2028

PhD
ThM
DMin
DEdMin
EdD
DMA
MA (Philosophy)
MA in Counseling
MA in Church and Community Ministries
MA in Worship Ministries
Associate of Arts

Recommendation: 1/19/2022
Approved by AOC: 1/24/2022

Following is the process:

1. In our Master of Divinity (MDiv) 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 (ATS). 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 MDiv 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 BA core curriculum is patterned after our Master of Divinity.
2. Revise NOBTS program goals from the ATS goals for the MDiv, our core graduate degree, and all other degrees.
3. Develop student learning outcomes from the program goals.
4. Select various artifacts as measures that 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 BA 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 LC, 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 assignments 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.

These competencies more specifically address the purposes of the general education program at Leavell College. They also support the mission of Leavell College and the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.

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 LCCF 1310</p> <p>Reinforced LCCF 2340 LCCM 2370</p> <p>Mastered Any 3000- or 4000- level Interpretation Course, LCBS 4300</p>	<p>Direct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LCCM 2370 final paper assessed with LCPR ● LCGE 4310 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 LCEM 2360 LCPM 2380</p> <p>Reinforced PMCM 2300, CECM 2350</p> <p>Mastered LCGE 4310</p>	<p>Direct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LCEM 2360 oral presentation (assessed with LCOPR) ● LCPM 2380 oral presentation (assessed with LCOPR) ● LCGE 4310 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 LCEM 1360</p> <p>Reinforced LCCF 2340</p> <p>Mastered LSCM 4300</p>	<p>Direct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LCGE 2312 final paper assessed with LCPR ● LCGE 4310 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 LCGE 1370 LCGE 1372 LCGE 1374</p> <p>Reinforced</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.