Assessment Map for Master of Arts in Missiology

Terms Assessed: Fall 2021-Fall 2023

Program Learning Objective # 1: Students will demonstrate an understanding and application of biblical and foundational principles of mission.
Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Guide students to understand the foundational principles of mission.
Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: The capacity for critical and constructive theological reflection regarding content and processes of the areas of specialized ministry.

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 **MISS5304Theology and Philosophy of Mission**--Mission Theology Paper Rubric (understanding) ***Indirect Measures*** Graduating Student Questionnaire (Q #18l)	DM#1 - New Benchmark (80% or above) IM#1 - 3.5 or above	DM#1 - FA23 81.5% **Reflection:** Students achieved over 80% benchmark. Recorded a 0 for a student who did not submit the final paper. This brought the overall percentage down. IM#1- S22 3.5 F22 3.6 S23 4.1 F23 NG 3.7333	• It is too early to assess benchmark for criteria success based upon 1 semester of data for direct measurement. Continue with this benchmark for the next assessment to give a full cycle of benchmark criteria. • New IM benchmark and criteria for success set. Track for entire cycle for next assessment.

		Reflection: Fall 23 added questions to the GSQ that allow us to disaggregate by program. Therefore, data from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023 is general data for this degree. However, in Fall 2023 the data is specifically for the program.	

Program Learning Objective # 2: Students will be able to design, implement, and assess a Global Christian Plan for leading and participating in missions.
Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Equip students to design and assess a framework for personal and corporate development of mission practices.
Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: Skill in design, implementation, and assessment of ministry in these specialized areas.

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 **MISS5330Christian Missions** -- Global Christian Plan Rubric (Application) ***Indirect Measures***	DM#1 – New Benchmark IM#1 - 3.5 or above	DM#1 – No students completed this measure. No data for this assessment cycle. **Reflection:** • FA 2023, all NOBTS academic jury procedures were reviewed to find places	• Set new benchmark at 80% or above • Utilize the DM and benchmark for criteria for success for the next assessment. This will entail the program coordinator alerting MISS5330 instructors

Student Course Evaluation Question #6		for improvement, including the number of and quality of artifacts collected. This is a new artifact. Class with artifact has not been taught in this cycle. **Spring 2021** FLEX 4.6 Mentoring 4.8 Semester Overall 4.7 **Fall 2021** Mentoring 4.5 New Orleans 4.6 Semester Overall 4.6 **Spring 2022** New Orleans 4.7 Online 4.5 Semester Overall 4.6 **Fall 2022** Mentoring 4.4 New Orleans 4.6 Semester Overall 4.5 **Spring 2023**	of the artifact to include in this course. • Revise Indirect Measure benchmark for criteria for success to reflect 4.1 for next assessment.

		Birmingham 5.0 Clinton-Hybrid 5.0 Mentoring 4.6 New Orleans 5.0 Semester Overall 4.9 **Fall 2023** Mentoring 4.1 New Orleans 4.7 Semester Overall 4.4 Course Overall 4.6 **Reflection:** • Students achieved well above the 3.5 benchmark criteria for success. • While all results are above benchmark, Mentoring sections rate consistently lower. The nature of the course and online instruction could be the cause of this lower mark. • Fall 2022 and 2023 were lowest overall ratings, but still above the 3.5 benchmark.	

Program Learning Objective # 3: Students will demonstrate a comprehension of ministry leadership skills applicable within a local church or other Christian mission setting.
Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Prepare students to lead within churches, mission agencies, or related Christian mission organizations.
Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals: An understanding and application of disciplines and skills within the specialized ministry area.

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 **CHPL5380 Principles of Church Planting/MISS5346 International Church Planting**--Church Planting Prospectus Rubric (Understanding/Application) ***Indirect Measures*** Graduating Student Questionnaire (Q #18g)	DM#1 - New Benchmark IM#1 - 3.5 or above	DM#1 – No students completed this measure. No data for this assessment cycle. **Reflection:** FA 2023, all NOBTS academic jury procedures were reviewed to find places for improvement, including the number of and quality of artifacts collected. This is a new artifact. Classes with artifact have not been taught in this cycle. IM#1- S22 4.4 F22 4.5 S23 4.3 F23 NG 4.4	• Set new benchmark at 80% or above • Utilize the DM and benchmark for criteria for success for the next assessment. This will entail the program coordinator alerting CHPL5380 instructors of the artifact to include in this course. • Revise Indirect Measure benchmark for criteria for success to reflect 4.0 for next assessment.

Executive Summary: This degree has relatively new benchmarks and criterion. For some of them, there needs to be a full cycle of data prior to quality assessment of the degree. There is some note of a difference in performance between mentoring sections of a course compared to other sections. This is noted. The next cycle of assessment will provide more data and allow better quality and accurate assessment.