Assessment Map for Doctor of Educational Ministry

Terms Assessed: Spring 2024- Fall 2025

Student Learning Outcome #1: Students will communicate an understanding of biblical and theological concepts undergirding teaching, educational leadership or ministry leadership.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Enable Students to think critically about biblical and theological concepts undergirding education or educational ministry.

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: Advanced understanding and competency in theological disciplines.

Measures (means of program assessment)	**Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)**	**Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester**	**Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)**
Direct Measures (at least one) 1. Assessment of Chapter 4 (Doctrinal Foundations) of the **Project in Ministry** Proposal 2. Assessment of the Theological Reflections section of the *Project in Ministry* Report	Previous Measure: 3.32/4.0	***Target:*** *Met/****UnMet*** Spring 2024: 2.83/4.0 Fall 2024: 3.34/4.0 Spring 2025: 3.0/4.0 Fall 2025: 3.42/4.0 Total: 3.15/4.0	Integrating the Doctrinal Foundations as a part of faculty training and training for Project Mentors. As well as emphasizing doctrinal foundations in PDWS8203. New Benchmark for Direct Measure: 3.2/4.0
Indirect Measures (at least one) 1. Exit Interview- Doctrinal Foundation/ Theological Reflection	3.6/4.0	Indirect Measure: ***Met/Unmet*** Spring 2024: 2.66/4.0 Fall 2024: 3.67/4.0 Spring 2025: 3.33/4.0 Total: 3.22/4.0	New Benchmark for Indirect Measure: 3.3/4.0

		Reflection on Results: Indirect and direct measures were unmet necessitating the need for more effective training of faculty and project mentors with doctrinal integration in projects and proposals. Greater emphasis on theological integration will be placed in Project in Ministry Design workshops.	

Student Learning Outcome #2: Students will demonstrate an understanding of selected behavioral and social sciences foundational for teaching, educational leadership or ministry leadership.
Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Guide students to integrate behavioral and social sciences in the practice of educational ministry.
Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: Advanced understanding and competency in behavioral sciences and social sciences.

Measures (means of program assessment)	**Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)**	**Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester**	**Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)**
Direct Measures (at least one) 1. Evaluation of Chapter 1 (Ministry Setting and Need) of the Project in Ministry Proposal	Previous Measure: 3.5/4.0	***Target: Met****/UnMet* Spring 2024: 2.66/4.0 Fall 2024: 3.34/4.0 Spring 2025: 4.0/4.0 Fall 2025: 3.67/4.0	New Benchmark for Direct Measure: 3.55/4.0 We will continue to encourage the students to develop this chapter during the project and

2. Evaluation of Lesson Plans/Strategy Sessions Plans in the Project in Ministry Report		Total: 3.5/4.0	ministry design workshop. An expert is a part of the evaluation of the lesson plans which strengthens the overall project.
Indirect Measures (at least one) 1. Exit Interview- Ministry Context and Implementation Report (Assessment Rubric)	3.6/4.0	Indirect Measure: *Met/**Unmet*** Spring 2024: 2.42/4.0 Fall 2024: 3.50/4.0 Fall 2025: 2.33/4.0 Total: 2.75/4.0 ***Reflection on Results:*** Direct measures were met demonstrating progress in understanding of selected behavioral and social sciences foundational for teaching, educational leadership or ministry leadership. The indirect measure was unmet. To remedy it, we will encourage the students to develop this chapter during the project and ministry design workshop. Emphasizing the role of an expert will strengthen the overall project.	New Benchmark for Indirect Measure: 2.8/4.0

Student Learning Outcome #3: Students will exhibit an ability to apply research methods necessary for the written ministry project.
Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Guide students to develop educational ministry research methodologies.
Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: Advanced understanding and competency in research methodologies.

Measures (means of program assessment)	**Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)**	**Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester**	**Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)**
Direct Measures (at least one) 1. Evaluation of Chapters 5 & 6 (Alternative Programs; Ministry Resources) of the *Project in Ministry* Proposal 2. Evaluation of Project Goals and Evaluations section of the *Project in Ministry* Report	Previous Measure: 3.3/4.0	***Target: Met****/UnMet* Spring 2024: 3.25/4.0 Fall 2024: 3.29/4.0 Spring 2025: 3.0/4.0 Fall 2025: 3.67/4.0 Total: 3.3/4.0	New Benchmark for Direct Measure: 3.35/4.0 The project mentors will be encouraged to help their students in the discovery of alternative programs and ministry resources as they design their project.
Indirect Measures (at least one) 1. Exit Interview- Research Methods and Goal Achievement (Assessment Rubric)	3.3/4.0	Indirect Measure: ***Met***/UnMet Spring 2024: 3.0 Fall 2024: 3.0/4.0 Spring 2025: 3.50/4.0 Fall 2025: 3.50/4.0 Total: 3.37/4.0 ***Reflection on Results:*** The direct and indirect measures were met exhibiting a growing ability to apply research	New Benchmark for Indirect Measure: 3.35/4.0

		methods necessary for the written ministry project.	

Executive Summary: The DEdMin program assessed three SLOs (biblical/theological understanding, behavioral/social science foundations, and research methods) using direct measures (chapter/proposal evaluations) and indirect measures (exit interviews) across Spring 2024–Fall 2025. SLO #1 (theological concepts) fell short on both direct (3.15/4.0 vs. 3.32 target) and indirect (3.22/4.0 vs. 3.6 target) measures, pointing to a need for stronger doctrinal integration in faculty and mentor training. SLO #2 (behavioral/social sciences) was mixed — direct measures were met (3.5/4.0 vs. 3.6 target) but indirect measures were not (2.75/4.0), prompting plans to have students develop the ministry context chapter more fully with expert input during the Project in Ministry Design workshop. SLO #3 (research methods) was the strongest area, with both direct (3.3/4.0) and indirect (3.37/4.0) measures met, reflecting growing student competency. In response, the program is resetting several benchmarks for next cycle and emphasizing earlier, more structured mentor and faculty support during project design rather than only at evaluation.