

BEXLEY SEABURY SEMINARY

Master of Divinity Assessment Plan

Program Goals and Learning Outcomes

The goals of the M.Div. program are linked to those enumerated for programs described under ATS masters-level degree standards: Religious Heritage, Cultural Context, Personal and Spiritual Formation, and Capacity for Ministerial and Public Leadership. The MDiv program Goals within these areas have been articulated by the faculty with special attention to the particular mission and vision of the Seminary. Specific competency-based and demonstrable learning outcomes are linked directly to the program goals. While the goals articulate what we would like students who complete the program to know, understand, and be able to do, the outcomes indicate how we will know if (and to the extent) the goals are being achieved.

Assessment Plan

An Assessment Committee consists the Assessment Coordinator, Academic Dean, and at least two faculty members appointed by the Academic Dean. However, the entire faculty is involved throughout the year in evidence-based assessment of student learning and program effectiveness. Assessment is based on a review of direct, indirect, qualitative, and quantitative evidence of student progress toward and achievement of the competencies reflected in the learning outcomes. **Attachment A**. When evidence regarding individual courses and individual student learning is aggregated and used as a lens for examining the program as a whole, it provides concrete evidence of the health of the program and its efficacy in meeting program goals and achieving desired learning outcomes.

The steps in the process by which this assessment process takes place, beginning at the course level, are as follows.

1. Syllabi:

Assessment criteria are built into the design of each course and are reflected in every syllabus. All syllabi are approved by our Assessment Coordinator for conformity with a template (**Attachment B**) which requires that course goals and learning outcomes be clearly stated in each syllabus, and that each course outcome be correlated (by number) with the curricular outcomes identified in the curriculum map. The syllabus must also indicate how each course outcome will be assessed, and must identify the instructor-identified artifact that is most likely to capture evidence regarding the curricular outcomes that the course is intended to advance. Faculty are encouraged to design a summative assignment that will result in the selected assessment artifact.

2. Assessment of Artifacts and Portfolios:

An artifact created by each degree-seeking student from every course taken is collected at the end of every semester and is deposited into the student's Portfolio, together with the curricular-level Universal Rubric (UR) for the MDiv program. **(Attachment C)** Using this rubric, the instructors score the artifact against the curricular outcomes that were identified in the curricular map and in the syllabus, as follows: *outstanding* (high proficiency), *satisfactory* (adequate proficiency), and *unsatisfactory* proficiency. If the artifact does not provide sufficient evidence upon which to make an assessment, the instructor so indicates. If curricular outcomes that are not on the curricular map are deemed by the instructor to be pertinent to that course, the instructor will score those outcomes as well. The rubric scores should reflect an assessment of proficiency that is expected of a graduate of the program, not a student's degree of proficiency expected in the course at their particular stage of the program. The Universal UR is not used for grading purposes.

Additionally, documents related to the students' field education seminars, field site experience; and such other materials that students choose to submit as evidence of their learning and competencies are deposited into the Portfolios. A summary of Portfolio contents, by whom they are deposited, and by what time they should be deposited is attached to this narrative. **(Attachment D)**

3. Course Evaluations:

Each semester, online student course evaluation surveys are distributed, collected, and summarized for review by the Academic Dean and the individual instructors. The surveys include a variety of evaluative criteria, such as the quality of teaching, and resources, use of learning technology, as well as the degree to which the course did or did not facilitate their learning and achievement of MDiv curricular goals.

4. Assessment Reports:

The Assessment Coordinator regularly prepares summary reports for Assessment Committee and faculty review. These reports include the following quantitative evidence that will contribute to the faculty's assessment of student learning, curricular effectiveness, and of the assessment process itself.

a) Course Assessment: (i) an aggregate of assessment artifact rubric scores reflecting outcome achievement in each course; and (ii) an aggregate of student survey scores for each course reflecting comparable outcome-related data and scores on other selected evaluative criteria. These reports are provided for faculty review twice a year following the Fall and Spring semesters.

b) Curricular Assessment: an aggregate of UR scores across all courses reflecting overall achievement on each curricular outcome. This report is provided for faculty review at the conclusion of every academic year during an Assessment Day in which all faculty participate.

c) Assessment of Individual Student Learning:

(i) an aggregate of individual students' Universal Rubric (UR) scores reflecting cumulative achievement among students on each curricular outcome. This report is provided to faculty at the annual Assessment Day.

(ii) an aggregate reflecting cumulative UR scores for each student on each outcome, at two pivotal points: prior to the Mid Program Review (MPR) and near the end of the final year for the Final Program Review (FPR). This report is deposited into the student's portfolio for review by faculty advisors for purposes of mid-program and final reviews.

5. The Comprehensive Mid-Program Review (MPR):¹

Why: The purpose of the MPR is to

- (1) provide an opportunity for the student to reflect on and self-evaluate their learning progress, competencies, and achievements;
- (2) allow the seminary to assess student progress toward achievement of competency-based program outcomes;
- (3) provide both quantitative and qualitative data that can inform individual remedial action as well as potential curricular revision and course design.

Who: Students qualify for a MPR conference with the advisor when they have completed approximately half of their degree credits, and when they have completed one semester of field education, as well as their foundational courses in Bible (substantially), Systematic Theology, Church History, Preaching, and Anglican Liturgy and Music: Development & Theology. Most students will also have taken at least one course in Congregational Development and at least three courses in Formation prior to the MPR conference.

When: The MPR will take place in the Spring semester in which the student is taking the second semester of the Field Education Seminar (FE-3).

What: At the end of FE-2, in preparation for the conference, MPR-eligible students will be asked to complete and provide to the advisor the mid-program self-assessment survey. **(Attachment E)** The survey requires the students to score their themselves on the MDiv learning outcomes. The survey also asks students to identify papers or other artifacts from their coursework or field work that they believe will best demonstrate their level of achievement on curricular outcomes. Students will submit to their advisor (or upload to their portfolios) copies of these documents and artifacts (other than the

¹ If a student's diocese has not been provided with a canonically required Candidacy Report prior to the MPR conference, advisors are encouraged to request the student's canonical self-evaluation prior to the conference and to include a discussion of same as part of the conference.

specifically “assessment artifact” identified in course syllabi, which already should be in their portfolios) for review and discussion during the MPR conference.

How: The advisor will review the portfolio contents, self-assessment survey, and additional documents and artifacts submitted by the student and have a conversation with the student regarding their level of achievement on the learning outcomes. The advisor will then record areas of agreement or disagreement on the assessment criteria, and add comments and/or illustrative anecdotal information to the survey document, which will serve as the final MPR report. The final MPR report and any additional documents and artifacts provided by the student will be submitted by the advisor to the Assessment Coordinator for deposit into the student’s Portfolio.

6. The Final Program Review (FPR):

The purpose of the Final Program Review is to gather evidence of the degree to which a student who is about to graduate has achieved desired program learning outcomes. A Final Program Review will take place in the Spring semester when the student is in the final semester of Field Education and is expected to graduate (FE-5 for full-time students). The process and procedures are the same as that described above for the MPR, except that the survey instrument is modified to apply to a graduating student. **(Attachment F)**

7. Comprehensive Review of the MDiv Program:

A comprehensive assessment of the MDiv program will take place *at a minimum* of every three years during an annual Faculty Assessment Day. In preparation for this review, the Assessment Coordinator will provide the faculty with summaries of the data gathered within an assessment cycle that is not to exceed three years. Data regarding graduation, retention, and employment rates (gathered from IPEDS and/or ATS institutional reports) will also be provided to the faculty at this time.

In preparation for a Faculty Assessment Day during which a comprehensive review of the MDiv program will take place, the faculty will undertake a review of selected student Portfolios which will include MPR and FPR reports, all artifacts collected to date, and exit questionnaires completed by graduating students **(Attachment G)**.

Minutes of the faculty discussion will include observations, conclusions or insights drawn from identifiable evidence, and any decisions made. The minutes will constitute the faculty’s Comprehensive MDiv Review Report.

8. Closing the Loop:

Faculty discussion of all of the above, at regular meetings and annually at Faculty Assessment Days will inform any course or curricular improvements that may be indicated, as well as improvements in the assessment process itself.

The Faculty Assessment Committee will be appointed by the Academic Dean, for limited terms, normally of one year, for purposes of collaborating with the Academic

Dean and Assessment Coordinator in the ongoing work of planning, improving, and implementing assessment strategies and initiatives. One or more faculty members may be asked to serve for two years as new members are appointed to the committee.

MDiv Portfolio contents

Document	Evidence Type	Submitted By (and deposited by Assessment Coordinator)	Due Date
All Course Artifacts and URs -- includes artifacts for all CTS courses	Direct	Students to advisor and assessment coordinator	Prior to Mid Program Review (MPR), Final Program Review (FPR), or any other time
CPE Supervisor Reports	Direct	ES-R to Registrar and Assessment Coordinator	Within one month from end of unit
Field Ed Site and Course Documents			
Initial Learning Agreement and any updates	Benchmark	Contextual Ed Faculty	During FE-1 (required to register for FE-2)
FE 2-3 and 4-5 self and site supervisor's competency evaluations with FE faculty comments	Indirect	Contextual Ed Faculty	Due Jan. 15 th and June 15 th from supervisor's; and when grades are due from faculty (must be available for portfolio distribution prior to Assessment Day).
Sermons (as of Spring 2020): in addition to artifact from Preaching course, 1 or 2 of student's choice (written, audio or video)	Direct (written, audio or video)	Student— at least one from FE-5	Prior to FPR
MPR and FPR Reports			
Final MPR Report	Direct and Indirect	Advisor	April 30 th
Final FPR Report	Direct and Indirect	Advisor	April 30 th (required to graduate)
Academic Office Documents			

Summary/Aggregate of Students' UR scores	Direct	Assessment Coordinator	March 15 th
Canonical Candidacy Review	Direct and Indirect	Academic Dean (on server and in students' hard files)	When submitted to Bishop
Optional documents or artifacts	Direct and/or Indirect	Student	When submitted
Exit Survey	Indirect	Assessment Coordinator	From April 15 th to no later than May 12 th ; end of November if all courses have been completed (required to graduate)