New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary Summary of Juried Reviews

Degree Program: DEdMin Date: 5/10/17

Faculty Jury: Campus: New Orleans

Dr. Randy Stone Dr. Lloyd Harsch Dr. Mike Edens Dr. Hal Stewart Dr Harold Mosley Dr. Bo Rice

The following questions should be answered by each jury after completing your rubrics. These answers will guide the Academic Dean's Council as it considers what curricular improvements may need to be proposed to the faculty.

1. If not obvious from the rubric or other juries, please note specific **strengths to be sustained** in the degree program as a whole (and/or curriculum) found by the jury related to SLOs.

Generally met baseline scores, however the likert scores in some area were lower. To speculate on such low sample data may prove irresponsible. Continue collection of all graduates. Continuing progress toward excellence in program and student service from leaders and administrative assistance. Addition of Project Coordinator continues to reap positive results in student completion and achievement. Successful navigation between 6th and 8th edition of Turabian as standard style guide.

- If not obvious from the rubric or other juries, please note specific weaknesses to be improved in the degree program as a whole (and/or curriculum) found by the jury related to SLOs.
 - Noticeable difference between the December Graduation and May Graduation scores.
 - Scores from Ministry Models (proposal) and Further Implementation (report) are significantly lower than other items in the final report.
- 3. Please note any recommended or proposed curricular improvements needed related to SLOs.
 - Respond to difference in Fall and Spring scores (see "A" in previous notation) Need to determine any causation. Possibilities to consider are ratio of students to involved faculty. Do we see a difference in evaluation between inexperienced and experienced faculty, especially those that serve as mentors? Are reports submitted following the Holiday break subpar compared to reports submitted after summer?
 - Emphasis on Chapter 5 in both documents. Include more direction and details in the Project Design Workshop for students. Expand the information and recommended content for Chapter 5 (Further Implementation) in the Project Handbook. Currently only one modest paragraph exists.
- 4. Please note any **recommendations or improvements for the process.** (Revision of rubric, reconsideration of SLOs, reconsideration of artifact used, etc.)
 - Disaggregate the scores for each of the subcomponents calculated to determine the overall scores for each goal. This will assist jury in discovering trends and recommending areas of potential improvement.
 - Investigate lower overall scores from May graduates.
 - Increase emphasis on chapter of Implementation in Project during Project Design Workshop (Goal 3).
 - Recalculate baselines for next assessment period.
 - Add indirect measure using data from the Graduate Survey performed by the Registrar's
 office.

New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary Degree Review Rubric Summary

Degree Reviewed:	DEdMin	Date:	May 10, 2017

Jury of Professors: H. Stewart, B. Rice, M. Edens, H. Mosley, L. Harsh, R. Stone

Program Goal	Level of Student Achievement Toward Program Goal					Additional Comments
Program Goal 1:	O Did not meet	0	0	0	O Exceeds	Average Score 2.80 of 4.0 Is poor score indicator of sample size vs student performance?
Program Goal 2:	O Did not meet	0	0	0	O Exceeds	Average Score 3.17 of 4.0
Program Goal 3:	O Did not meet	0	0	0	O Exceeds	Average Score 2.0 of 4.0 Further Implementation needs greater emphasis or instruction.
Program Goal 4:	O Did not meet	0	0	0	O Exceeds	Average Score 3.0 of 4.0
Program Goal 5:	O Did not me	O eet	0	0	O Exceeds	Average Score 3.67 of 4.0

Date: <u>5/</u>	10/17	
Name:	Harold Mosk	2

Degree Reviewed: DEMin

This is a summary review of the identified degree. Please indicate your professional judgment whether the identified degree allows the students to accomplish the SLOs of the degree. This summary is to be based upon your analysis of the program report of the assessment of the artifacts.

Program Goal	Lev			ent Achi rogram	evement Goal	Additional Comments
Program Goal 1:	O Did not meet	0	⊕	0	O Exceeds	For all of those Av Trocks, The small number of steedart
Program Goal 2:	O Did not meet	0	0		é Exceeds	Can Stew evaluation
Program Goal 3:	O Did not meet	0	•	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 4:	O Did not meet	0	0	•	O Exceeds	

45

Exceeds

Date: <u>5/1</u>	<u>0/17</u>		
Name:	Lloyd	Harson	

Degree Reviewed: <u>DEMin</u>

Program Goal	Le	S13(5) - 17 - 1	Stude ard Pr		hievement n Goal	Additional Comments
Program Goal 1:	O Did not meet	0	•	0	O Exceeds	separate scores for each element of direct mensures. Add indirect measures
Program Goal 2:	O Did not meet	0	0	•	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 3:	O Did not meet	0	(3)	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 4:	O Did not meet	0	0	0	O Exceeds	
G09 5	0	0	*	6	0	

Date: 5/10/17

Name: Michael & Edans

Degree Reviewed: DEMin

Program Goal	Le		Stude		ievement Goal	Additional Comments
Program Goal 1:	O Did not meet	0	×	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 2:	O Did not meet	0	· o	×	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 3:	O Did not meet	W.	(b)	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 4:	O Did not meet	0	0	*	O Exceeds	
(5)					Actions	Ò

Date: <u>5/10</u>	<u>)/17</u>		
Name:	BoT	Pice	

Degree Reviewed: <u>DEMin</u>

Program Goal	Level of Student Achievement Toward Program Goal					Additional Comments
Program Goal 1:	O Did not meet	0	0	•	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 2:	O Did not meet	0	0	0	● Exceeds	
Program Goal 3:	O Did not meet	0	•	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 4:	O Did not meet	0	0	•	O Exceeds	•
Pr. Coul 5:	0	0	0	0	•	

Date: <u>5/1</u>	0/17	
	III Chant	
Name:	Mar 21 amou	

Degree Reviewed: DEMin

Program Goal	Level of Student Achievement Toward Program Goal					Additional Comments
Program Goal 1:	O Did not meet	0	0	Ø.	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 2:	O Did not meet	0	0	Ø	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 3:	O Did not meet	0	0	Ø	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 4:	O Did not meet	0	0	×	O Exceeds	
Program God 5	0	0	0	×	0	

Date: <u>5/</u>	<u>10/17</u>		
Name:	Pardy	STORE	

Degree Reviewed: DEMin

This is a summary review of the identified degree. Please indicate your professional judgment whether the identified degree allows the students to accomplish the SLOs of the degree. This summary is to be based upon your analysis of the program report of the assessment of the artifacts.

Program Goal	Level of Student Achievement Toward Program Goal					Additional Comments
Program Goal 1:	O Did not meet	0	0	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 2:	O Did not meet	0	©	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 3:	O Did not meet	@	0	0	O Exceeds	
Program Goal 4:	O Did not meet	0	0	@	O Exceeds	

Gl 3