

## Program Level Student Learning Outcomes “Snapshot”

### MA (Biblical Studies) May 13, 2020 Jury for the period 2018-2019

NOBTS Goals:	PLSLOs (MABS Cur Map)	Measurements Each measurement needs to correspond to a specific goal	Baseline	May 2020 Assessments	Change +/-; Suggested New Benchmark
1. Equip students to understand and gain ability to articulate biblical, theological, and historical truths.	1.Students will demonstrate their understanding and ability to interpret and communicate accurately biblical, theological, and historical truth.	<b>Direct Assessment Measures:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Master’s Thesis</li> <li>● Embedded Assignments                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Intermediate Hebrew</li> <li>○ Systematic Theology</li> <li>○ History of Christianity</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>Indirect Assessment Measures:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Student Exit Interviews</li> <li>● Faculty Rubric Eval/Thesis</li> </ul>	3.5  new, 3.0 3.2 3.35  3.5 3.5	2.4  3.1 3.25 3.32  3.33 2.40	-1.10 / _3.5_  .01/ 3.00 +.05/ <u>3.20</u> -.03/ <u>3.35</u>  -0.17/ _3.5_ -1.10/ _3.5_
2. Challenge students to grow in spiritual and moral integrity through the study and practice of the biblical text and spiritual and ethical heritage.	2.Students will demonstrate spiritual, moral, and ethical maturity through their studies and relational experiences in the program.	<b>Direct Assessment Measures:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Master’s Thesis</li> <li>● Embedded Assignments                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Systematic Theology</li> <li>○ History of Christianity</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>Indirect Assessment Measures:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Student Exit Interviews</li> <li>● Faculty Rubric Eval/Thesis</li> </ul>	3.5  3.2 3.35  3.5 3.5	2.4  3.25 3.32  3.33 2.4	-1.10/ _3.5_  +.05/ 3.2 -.03/ 3.35  -.017/ _3.5_ -1.10/ _3.5_
3.Train students in effective research and writing skills in Biblical Studies.	3.Students will demonstrate improved skills in research and writing in Biblical Studies.	<b>Direct Assessment Measures:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Master’s Thesis</li> <li>● Intermediate Hebrew</li> <li>● Faculty Rubric Eval/Thesis</li> </ul> <b>Indirect Assessment Measures:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Student Exit Interviews</li> <li>● Faculty Rubric Eval/Thesis</li> </ul>	3.5 3.0 (3.5)  3.5 3.5	2.67 2.86 2.67  3.33 2.4	-0.83/ _3.5_ -0.14/ 3.0 -0.83/ _3.5_  -0.017/ _3.5_ -1.10/ _3.5_

NOTE: Intermediate Hebrew is a new measure introduced to replace Intermediate Greek; 3.0 outcome benchmark is established via the jury meetings on 5/13/2020.

## Master of Arts (Biblical Studies) PLSLOs Assessed with Action Plan Recommendations of the May 13, 2020, Jury

***Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate their understanding and ability to interpret and communicate accurately biblical, theological, and historical truth.***

*ATS Degree Program Goal D.1.2 – The goals an institution adopts for these degree programs should include the attainment of a survey knowledge of various theological disciplines, or focused knowledge in a specific discipline, or interdisciplinary knowledge. Achievement of student learning outcomes for these degrees shall contribute to meeting these programmatic goals.*

Measures	Base line	Results from 2018	Results from 2020	Im prove ment	New Bench mark	Action Plan steps to Achieve the New Benchmark
<b><i>Direct Measures</i></b>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master’s Thesis</li> <li>• Embedded Assignments:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Int. Hebrew</li> <li>○ Systematic Theology 1</li> <li>○ History of Christianity: Reformation-Modern</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.5</li> <li>• 3.2</li> <li>3.0</li> <li>• 3.35</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.87</li> <li>• 3.49</li> <li>new</li> <li>• 3.08</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.4</li> <li>3.25</li> <li>new</li> <li>3.32</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-1.10</li> <li>+0.05</li> <li>new</li> <li>-0.02</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.5</li> <li>3.0</li> <li>3.20</li> <li>3.35</li> </ul>	Recommendation:  Outlier dropped this from 75%, esp. with a small sample size.. No AP needed.
<b><i>Indirect Measure</i></b>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Exit Interviews</li> <li>• Faculty Grading Rubric</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.5</li> <li>• 3.5</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.33</li> <li>2.4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-0.17</li> <li>-1.10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.5</li> <li>3.5</li> </ul>	One outlier lowered this score, esp. with a small sample size. Combined with the mentoring phase for those writing during seminars or the research course, we should see improvement.  Lowered by an outlier; 75% otherwise, and within outcome expectations.

MA(BS) student performance appears to have dropped in most areas of direct measurement, in and out of the division. Within the division, one outlier caused this drop. If so, the stats would be 75%, which is the target goal. In that case, the major artifact would support no action, despite a small drop from the previous jury. Examples are provided from the thesis projects.

Student Interview(s) results below, p. 22: requested three innovations: (1) add a presentation opportunity; (2) provide better technology training for use of BB; and (3) stress the need for and use more often Logos or Accordance for academic engagement. This will be presented to the Division by next Fall. Student #3 repeatedly indicated the lack of mentoring throughout the entire MA process as a perceived unmet need. This need, he accentuated as being the most problematic during the writing phase. I will present this to the division for more thought.

We are revising this PLSLO for the next cycle. See narrative on pp. 5-6.

**Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will demonstrate spiritual, moral, and ethical maturity through their studies and relational experiences in the program.**

*ATS Degree Program Goal D.1.2 – The goals an institution adopts for these degree programs should include the attainment of a survey knowledge of various theological disciplines, or focused knowledge in a specific discipline, or interdisciplinary knowledge. Achievement of student learning outcomes for these degrees shall contribute to meeting these programmatic goals.*

Measures	Baseline	Results from 2020	Improve ment	New Bench mark	Action Plan Steps to Achieve the New Benchmark
<b>Direct Measures</b>					
• Master’s Thesis	• 3.5	2.4	-1.10	3.5	Lower due to an outlier, esp. with a small sample size.. This outcome is being completely removed, as of 6/1/2020.
<b>Indirect Measure</b>					
• Student Exit Interviews	• 3.5	3.33	-0.17	3.5	One outlier lowered this score. Combined with the mentoring phase for those writing during seminars or the research course, we should see improvement.

These more subjective assessments have been changed at the request of the Office of IE. The Division of Biblical Studies will implement the new PLSLO (see page 4-5 above) as of 6/1/2020.

**Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will demonstrate improved skills in research and writing in Biblical Studies.**

ATS Degree Program Goal D.1.2 – The goals an institution adopts for these degree programs should include the attainment of a survey knowledge of various theological disciplines, or focused knowledge in a specific discipline, or interdisciplinary knowledge. Achievement of student learning outcomes for these degrees shall contribute to meeting these programmatic goals.

Measures	Baseline	Results from 2018	Improve ment	New Bench mark	Action Plan Steps to Achieve the New Benchmark
<i>Direct Measures</i>					
• Master’s Thesis	• 3.5	2.67	-0.83	3.5	Recommendation: Lower due to an outlier that gave a skewed result, esp. with a small sample size; 100% otherwise.
<i>Indirect Measure</i>					
• Student Exit Interviews	• 3.5	3.33	-0.17	3.5	One outlier lowered this score. Combined with the mentoring phase for those writing during seminars or the research course, we should see improvement. Combined with our “better” mentoring process for the final writing phase (see below).

MA(BS) student performance appears to have dropped in most areas of direct measurement, in and out of the division. Within the division, one outlier caused this drop. If so, the stats would be 100% and, thus, would support no action. Examples of the theses are provided in the initial link to the folder. Each member of the committee has linked to that folder.

The student exit interviews were not implemented and replaced by the mentoring procedures, as explained elsewhere. Faculty Grading Rubric Evaluations indicate various levels of performance, mostly at the targeted levels once the outlier is removed.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]