

**Academic Audit - Self-Study
Academic Program Review (APR)**

For
College of Christian Ministries and Religion (CCMR)
Southeastern University

Prepared by Dr. Robert Houlihan, D.Min, Dean, CCMR
& Dr. Brian Kelly, Ph.D., Assistant Dean, CCMR

August 15th, 2012

Contents

Executive Summary.....3-4

Academic Self-Study.....5-21

 Introduction.....5-6

 Program Learning Outcomes.....6-10

 Curriculum Relevancy.....10-13

 Teaching and Learning Methods.....13-16

 Student Learning Assessments.....16-18

 Quality Assurance Methodologies.....18-19

 Summation.....19-21

Appendices

 2011-2012 Program Learning Outcomes for the CCMR.....A-1 – A-15

 Summary of Findings from Stakeholder Surveys - January 2012..... B-1 – B-9

 Enrollment Trends and Predictions report C-1 – C-8

Executive Summary
Academic Audit - Self-Study
Academic Program Review (APR)
 College of Christian Ministries and Religion (CCMR)
 Southeastern University

Statement of Purpose

The College of Christian Ministries and Religion exists for the purpose of preparing students for a “successful Christian life and ministry by integrating personal faith, biblical insight, Christian ethics, spiritual gifts, and ministerial skills within the parameters of [its] Pentecostal identity. [It] challenges students to impact their generation by effective communication of the Gospel in word and deed so they will advance the global kingdom of God.”¹

Due to the massive breadth of the comprehensive program review a reader can easily be inundated with the minutiae of this report. For the sake of brevity and clarity a summation of the most salient observations follows. These insights are not based on mere anecdotal opinion but represent a synopsis of numerous focus groups, stakeholder surveys, and an extensive review process involving significant and insightful input from diverse parties both on and off campus.²

- Student stakeholders (present and alumni) have made it abundantly clear that the faculty is by far the most important asset of the college. They consistently rank them at the top in all data for their spiritual character, academic integrity, and accessibility to the students.
- Additional faculty hires for the CCMR are essential to add to or enhance the quality of existing degree programs to increase enrollment and student retention rates.
- Students desire greater diversity in faculty personnel, course offerings, and scheduling.
- Students are in need of substantially more scholarship support in order to pursue their calling as religion majors.
- Students are in need of considerably more support in finding jobs related to their field when they graduate.
- Students desire the development of more purposeful community specifically for the CCMR majors.
- Students are concerned about the quality of the chapel programming at the university.
- Faculty of the college is in need of greater institutional support for research and publication development in the way of more release time and lighter faculty loads.
- An increase in budget allowances for professional development to cover faculty expenses is also needed.
- More purposeful interaction is needed between the CCMR faculty and the Student Development/Life department on the campus especially in regard to chapel programming.
- In order to implement an effective model of shared governance that gives faculty, students, and other key stakeholders (parents, alumni, local pastors, etc.) the voice they need to assure the academic integrity of the CCMR’s programs the following should be codified and complied with:
 - Academic program initiatives should originate with the CCMR faculty not administrative entities or outside innovators.

¹ *College of Christian Ministries & Religion Handbook* (Southeastern University, 2009), 6.

² Readers desiring more detail will find the more extensive 17 page Academic Audit Self-Study report and its Appendices following with supporting documentation for these conclusions.

- The motive for academic programs should be the mission and purpose of the CCMR, not market-driven impulses derived from anecdotal opinion rather than substantial demographic research.
- No new programs should be launched until there is adequate institutional support for such, including an adequate advertising budget, ubiquitous implementation into the university infrastructure campus-wide (catalog, course schedule, website, registrar modules, Moodle, etc.), comprehensive awareness and buy-in from the key players related to that program, and viral connection with prospective students both on and off-campus.
- Any new faculty or administrative hires within the CCMR should be thoroughly vetted and approved by the CCMR faculty before placement through a process of faculty proposing and approving a profile, advertisement on a national level before faculty vete and then suggest a candidate for hiring.
- Oversight for new initiatives or changes should begin within the program itself, to assist in the writing and posting of new initiatives or changes and to assure compliance with these across the university.
- A policy for establishing protocol for written submission of new change initiatives so that faculty are apprised a minimum of one week in advance of any proposed changes so they can adequately vete the proposal and provide quality input.

Academic Audit - Self-Study Academic Program Review (APR)

Introduction

The College of Christian Ministries and Religion exists for the purpose of preparing students for a “successful Christian life and ministry by integrating personal faith, biblical insight, Christian ethics, spiritual gifts, and ministerial skills within the parameters of [it’s] Pentecostal identity. [It] challenge students to impact their generation by effective communication of the Gospel in word and deed so they will advance the global kingdom of God.”³

Furthermore, it seeks to prepare people in the following areas: Christian character, Right relationships, Balanced life, Simple lifestyle, Servant attitude, Understanding of the Scriptures, Ability to communicate truth, Good reputation, Maturity, Love for God and people.⁴

The college consists of a Dean, Assistant Dean, 17 full-time faculty, and 4 full-time support staff.⁵ It presently offers 4 majors: Church Ministries, Practical Theology, Interdisciplinary Studies, and Missional Ministries, along with 9 minors. The college also offers 2 graduate degrees: Master of Arts in Ministerial Leadership and Master of Arts in Theological Studies.⁶

The CCMR experienced a 13% decline in raw enrollment numbers from Fall 2006 ($n = 502$) to Spring 2012 ($n = 438$), but this is consistent with the University overall for the same time period. The % of actual total SEU enrollment in the CCMR, while seeing some vacillation through those reporting years, is the same now (18%) as it was in Fall of 2006 (18%), while the average over the whole 6 year reporting period is 15.4%.⁷

However, when comparing the % of CCMR graduates to SEU graduates overall there has been a significant decline from 34% ($n = 172$) of all SEU graduates in 2006-2007 school year to 17% of all SEU graduates in 2011-2012 ($n = 109$) with an overall average graduation rate during those years of 24%.⁸ It should be noted that in spite of the decrease in the number of religion graduates, the classes and professors in the college remain popular among students as the CCMR has by far the highest number of class sessions and highest average enrollment in those classes compared to other colleges at the university.⁹ There are many factors that could influence this beyond the control of the CCMR faculty and administration.¹⁰

³ *College of Christian Ministries & Religion Handbook* (Southeastern University, 2009), 6.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ “Faculty by Dept.” Southeastern University. <http://www.seu.edu/faculty/> (accessed May 31, 2012).

⁶ “College of Christian Ministries & Religion” Southeastern University. <http://www.seu.edu/religion/> (accessed May 31, 2012).

⁷ The averages were as low as 13% in fall 2009 (that fall a more stringent interview process was required of CCMR declaring majors which resulted in a marked decline in enrollment). This likely explains why the present graduation rates have dropped to only 17% in 2012. With present enrollment trends on the increase graduation rates should also commensurately increase in years ahead.

⁸ “CCMR Enrollment and Graduation Trends,” Data from Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Southeastern University.

⁹ Cf., p.3 of Appendix C, *Enrollment Trends and Predictions Report* under “Faculty- Student Ratio.” While this speaks to the popularity of CCMR classes it also indicative of a challenge as higher teacher to student ratios within the CCMR which can be directly related to decreases in student satisfaction, recruitment, and retention due to stress on faculty accessibility and student-faculty relationships.

¹⁰ For instance, pastor promotion of non-religion degrees for broader educational scope for potential hires, theology of “priesthood of all believers,” strong missional motivation of all students regardless of pursuit of

What follows are some of the most salient observations that can be derived from both quantitative and qualitative data concerning the program in five key areas of program evaluation: 1) program learning outcomes, 2) curriculum relevance, 3) teaching and learning methods, 4) student learning assessments, and 5) quality assurance methodologies.¹¹

This Academic Audit, as part of a larger Academic Program Review, has attempted, as far as expertise and resources would allow, to comply with the 30 objective standards spelled out by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation.¹²

I. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) –

A. **Undergrad.** The existing PLO's for the CCMR are as follows:

1. **Interpretation:** Church Ministries, Practical Theology, Interdisciplinary Studies and Missional Ministries majors will be able to interpret Scripture properly and articulate the results of that study in an understandable homily.
2. **Preaching:** Church Ministries and Practical Theology majors will be able to preach expository sermons in a clear and relevant way.
3. **Knowledge:** All Majors in the College of Christian Ministries and Religion will demonstrate a basic knowledge of the Bible and theology.
4. **Spirituality:** Graduates in the CCMR will show some improvement in both authentic spirituality and a faith-infused World View (cf., Institutional Goals) by showing an increase in both their “awareness of God” and “quality of relationship with God.”
5. **Integration:** Graduates in the CCMR will demonstrate ability to integrate personal faith, biblical insight, Christian ethics, spiritual gifts, and ministerial skills in their personal life and ministry context.

B. **Undergrad Measures.**¹³ The college utilizes both qualitative and quantitative measures for evaluating the PLO's. Pre and posttest assessment and self-report measures have been developed and implemented to gauge growth of all declared religion majors on the 5 designated outcomes. These are:

1. A basic *Bible Knowledge Exam* which is administered upon entrance (pre-test) in the first semester of study and upon graduation from the program (post-test) to determine levels of basic knowledge of the Bible and theology.
2. A *Spiritual Assessment Inventory* is also employed at the beginning (pre) and end (post) of the program of study to help measure increases in both “awareness of God” and “quality of relationship with God” as aspects of authentic spirituality and faith-infused worldview.

ordination, financial pressures on students to be “bi-vocational,” lack of adequate scholarship support for preparation for a field that is traditionally low paying, etc.

¹¹ These areas are mandated in Section 5 of the *Academic Program Review Handbook* (Southeastern University, 2011), 6.

¹² For a complete list of the standards see Blaine Worthen, James Sanders, and Jody Fitzpatrick. *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines, 2nd ed.* (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1997), 442-445 or for most current rendition of these standards see Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation home page, <http://www.jcsee.org/> (accessed May 31, 2012).

¹³ Copies of the instruments are available for viewing at <http://sites.seu.edu/ccmr-apr/>.

3. A standardized rubric entitled the *Final Interpretive Project Grade Sheet* for all Hermeneutics students has been developed and employed to assess student's ability to interpret Scripture. Samples of papers from these classes are kept to provide some qualitative data for review as well.
 4. To assess student's ability to preach an expository message a *Homiletics I Evaluation Rubric* is being used to assess the final sermon of all students in that class. In addition, samples of sermon outlines are preserved to provide further qualitative data for this outcome assessment.
 5. Finally, a *Final Internship Evaluation – Field Supervisor's Report*, as well as a *Student Evaluation of the Internship* are collected for each student upon completion of their Ministerial Internship course to assess their ability to integrate the Pentecostal faith into their personal life and ministry context.
 6. An additional rubric is planned for helping assess this last outcome as well for the near future. It will involve an assessment of the final paper for a capstone class on Faith Integration to be required of all graduates in the semester before graduation.
 7. Alumni and potential Employers are also polled through online surveys on an intermittent basis to gain feedback from these constituencies. The most recent was completed in Fall 2011 for the purpose of this comprehensive program review. It is anticipated that this would be done every 3 years, or at the most, no more than 5 year intervals henceforth.
- C. **Graduate – M.A.M.L.** The PLO's for the Master of Arts in Ministerial Leadership are as follows – Graduates in the program will:
1. **Integration:** Integrate the practice of leadership with biblically informed values, which include self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, initiative, empathy, and service toward others.
 2. **Collaboration:** Demonstrate collaborative and effective problem-solving skills using multidisciplinary approaches, which deal with conflict management, building bonds, and facilitating teamwork and collaboration.
 3. **Application:** Apply acquired multidisciplinary concepts, skills, and principles to actual leadership situations, which will include accurate self-assessment, self-confidence, and the spiritual and emotional development of others.
 4. **Analysis/Synthesis:** Analyze and synthesize knowledge of leadership theories, human development theories, and communication theories, which will include inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, encouraging the heart, and modeling the way for others so that they are not afraid to challenge the process when necessary.
 5. **Research:** Research contemporary issues in organizational leadership to provide practical solutions, communicate results through clear, concise, and appropriate media, which will raise levels of organizational awareness and inform methods for greater effectiveness.
- D. **Graduate M.A.M.L. Measures.** The CCMR faculty approved 5 specific outcomes for those who graduate from its Masters in Ministerial Leadership program:

1. A *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) and an *Emotional Appraisal Instrument* (EAI) are administered in the first course upon entrance into the program (pre-test). Post-test scores from these same instruments are gathered upon completion of all the course work by the student. These measures help assess the student's improvement over the course of study in the first 4 outcomes stated above.
2. The final outcome is evaluated through the use of a *Thesis Grading Rubric* completed by the Thesis Advisor and other readers, including the Dean of the College.
3. An *Exit Interview Survey* is also administered online before exiting the program to gather both qualitative and quantitative responses from students regarding their experience of the M.A.M.L. program overall.
4. Students are provided an overview of the results of all these assessments through an *Exit Interview* with the program coordinator or faculty advisor to help them with outcomes 1, 3 & 4 above as well.
5. Furthermore an *Alumni Survey* has been developed, but is only administered intermittently at this point, to those who graduated from program at least 2 years previous to the data being collected. This instrument attempts to assess the student's perceptions of the program's ability to help them achieve all 5 of the stated program outcomes upon completion of the degree and application of what was learned in their chosen field of employment.

E. Graduate – M.A.T.S. Graduates in the MA program in Theological Studies will

1. **Advanced Theological Understanding:** Have a comprehensive level of understanding of the systematic, historical, biblical, ethical, and practical theologies for the purpose of preparing students for further doctoral level theological reflection and articulation and/or teaching at an undergraduate level in the academic field of theology.
2. **Theological Integration:** Demonstrate the ability to draw from various theologies from a Pentecostal perspective and to interact critically with affirming and opposing theoretical constructs.
3. **Academic Contribution:** Contribute to the general knowledge and theological insight in the field by producing a master's thesis and developing the necessary skills to successfully complete doctoral studies if so desired.

F. Graduate – M.A.T.S. Measures.

1. A *M.A.T.S Theological Knowledge Exam* is administered as a pre-test upon entrance and again as post-test before exiting, to assess basic cognitive aspects of student learning in the program.
2. Questions on the *Exit Interview Survey* assess how well students feel they are prepared for doctoral level studies and/or their intentions to do such studies.
3. A *Curriculum Plan Grading Rubric* is used in the Methods of Biblical Preaching/Teaching course to assess student's ability to prepare a curriculum plan and present the material to their peers.

4. An *Alumni Survey* will be administered to all graduates between their 3rd and 5th year after graduation to obtain student ratings on their abilities to complete doctoral studies and/or teach theology at an undergraduate level.
5. A *Thesis Grading Rubric* assessing this outcome is compiled for all students completing the Thesis Project for the program.
6. A *Program Outcome Assessment* will be completed by the supervising Faculty member who will specifically address this outcome for all students completing the Directed Reading or Individual Study courses in lieu of the Thesis component.
7. Copies of the bound *Thesis/Project Paper* are available for review by assessing faculty.
8. An *Oral Defense* of the Thesis project will be administered and no less than 3 readers will assess the presentation and approve or disapprove of the granting of the degree as a result.

G. Evaluative Process for Reviewing Assessments of the CCMR PLO's.

1. Longitudinal databases are maintained that track each individual declared religion major and/or graduate student through their time with the college.
2. Data on each of the above measures is compiled and year-to-year trend analyses are presented on an annual basis, usually at the outset of the fall semester during the annual faculty seminar for the college. The CCMR faculty is tasked to discover and discuss specific interventions appropriate to each outcome (cf., Appendix A for the latest rendition of the CCMR Program Learning Outcomes 2011-2012).

H. Strengths.

1. The quantity and validity of the measures used to evaluate the PLO's for the undergrad and graduate programs are more than adequate.
2. The process for feedback to the Graduate students concerning these outcomes with the Exit Interview and its content is more than most such programs provide in similar institutions.
3. Both graduate and undergraduate students are given adequate opportunities to provide feedback to the CCMR administration and faculty regarding the quality of the programs.
4. Faculty is given opportunity to speak into the process and provide suggestions for improvement at regular intervals, at least annually.
5. The present administration is open to feedback and suggestions for improvement.

I. Weaknesses.

1. No clear path is delineated between faculty decisions and actually budgetary processes.
2. A consistent process for implementing suggestions for improvement from faculty in order to functionally impact the curriculum relevancy issues (i.e., intended learning outcomes, curriculum maps, course offerings and scheduling) has not been implemented.

3. The size of the sampling frames for some of the instruments could be considerably larger.

J. Recommendations for Improvement.

1. Assessments processes are presently performed by a faculty member of the CCMR and should be the responsibility of full or part-time personnel hired for this purpose either through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, or someone within the CCMR staff, to provide oversight and ensure that data is consistently gathered and analyzed to militate against gaps in the data.
2. A standing committee adequately resourced within the CCMR be established to oversight and assess the PLO's and make suggestions to the faculty concerning Assessments, Curriculum Relevancy, and other pertinent issues germane to assuring continuity between assessment and implementation (to bring initiatives, resolutions, etc. to the CCMR faculty as a whole).
3. The university as a whole should establish a process for assuring student participation in the various assessment measures to increase sample size for the data gathered – this could be done by making such assessments mandatory through an Assessment Hold placed on student accounts before they are allowed to register for the next semester's classes or other such incentives to assure more complete student participation in the process.
4. The university should establish a functional budget process for input from faculty regarding program initiatives and changes.

II. Curriculum Relevancy

A. Administrative Processes.

1. **Overall Program Review:** In anticipation of this APR commissioned by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness on behalf of the Leadership Team of the university, the CCMR faculty set about a comprehensive revamping of their degree offerings in Fall of 2011 for the following reasons:
 - a. For many years concern was voiced that three of the majors (Interdisciplinary Studies, Church Ministries, and Practical Theology) were basically the same with variation of only one or 2 courses between them.
 - b. Students, through a number of venues, had voiced a desire for more diversity and relevance in course offerings.
 - c. The curriculum remained essentially unchanged over the last decades while cultural changes within and without the church world its serves are significant.
 - d. Furthermore, credible program review is based on existing purpose or mission statements for the institution in question, but each particular major lacked this kind of specificity, especially in regard to collaboratively determined Intended Learning Outcomes and Purpose Statements for each major in the college.

2. Process for making curricular changes.

- a. As a result of the mandate from the Dean of the CCMR to take a close look at the undergrad curriculum as offered, a number of sub-committees pertaining to potential and existing specific majors were appointed:
 - (i) Ministerial Leadership
 - (ii) Missional Ministries
 - (iii) Interdisciplinary Studies
 - (iv) Youth Ministries
 - (v) It was determined early on by a Theological Studies committee that this undergrad major should be subsumed within the Interdisciplinary Studies major and the committee decided to focus solely on the graduate programs.
- b. All CCMR faculty were asked to input their opinions and best advice through and online discussion format called SharePoint.
 - (i) This enabled all faculty, regarding their sub-committee assignments, to weigh in on key decisions being made throughout the process.
 - (ii) Input from all key stakeholders, on and off campus (alumni, potential employers, denominational officials, existing students, and administrative stakeholders), was compiled and made available there for faculty review.
- c. A CCMR Program Review Committee was appointed by the Dean of the College to review all the curriculum subcommittees' recommendations and to prepare and approve a Strategic Initiative for Curricular Change to be presented and approved by the CCMR faculty as a whole in the Fall Faculty Seminar. This committee provided oversight for:
 - (i) Changes to be made to existing majors.
 - (ii) Implementation of new majors for the college.
 - (iii) Determining extent of curricular integration between course Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO) and the PLO's for the college.
 - (iv) A complete curriculum map for each major helps to provide a rubric for these determinations.
 - (v) Determining extent and process for extra-curricular integration between the academic programs (e.g., syllabus requirements) and Student Development/Life activities and purposes.

3. Curriculum Content.

- a. Delivery. The CCMR offers its courses in a number of delivery venues:
 - (i) Traditional face to face
 - (ii) Evening
 - (iii) Online
 - (iv) Extended Education sites off campus (being developed)
- b. Sequencing. Course sequencing is presented in Degree Audit forms to the students for their class scheduling. However, unless the course has a pre-requisite, essentially students are able to schedule the classes as they so desire.
- c. Scheduling. Course offerings are determined by a Faculty member of the CCMR who schedules the classes, with feedback from the faculty, early in the

previous semester based on his estimation of what is essential to fulfill the various Degree Audits. Because of large faculty course loads within the CCMR only a limited number of courses can be offered.¹⁴

B. Faculty Assignments.

1. Procedure for full-time faculty hires have been somewhat inconsistent over the last number of years. Some appointments were made by administrators outside the college. Other times hires have been made by appointment of the Dean with input from Faculty members of the college as to competency and collegiality of the candidate. In the most recent hire, an ad hoc committee was appointed to look at candidate profiles and then provided a rank of choices to the Dean for his consideration. Final decision for such hires remains with the Dean of the College in collaboration with the university's provost and Leadership Team.
2. Adjunct faculty assignments are made by appointment by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member responsible for course scheduling.
3. In addition, all employees must meet criteria established by the Office of Human Resources for the university.

C. Strengths

1. The development of new majors for the CCMR will be a decided improvement to eliminate the redundancy in the degree offerings.
2. The diversity of venues for course offerings allows the college to attract students from a wide variety of sources to fulfill its mission.
3. The use of staff for course scheduling advising frees full-time faculty from this responsibility and provides a consistency in that process.
4. The process for faculty assignment of classes is streamlined when the same person has this responsibility from year to year.
5. Faculty is given some opportunity to input into the process of faculty hiring by the Dean.

D. Weaknesses

1. The use of staff for course scheduling means students have a limited amount of interaction with faculty on a face-to-face basis concerning the pursuit of their degree.
2. The processes for faculty hires have not always been consistent. Some hires were made with faculty input but others were made without adequate collaboration between faculty and administration, which made some appointments by fiat.
3. The process for faculty involvement in curriculum decisions is truncated and left to one meeting a year.
4. Student input into curricular decisions is functionally non-existent.
5. Certain degree offerings appear to be driven by administrative fiat rather than clear linkage to the mission and purpose of the college.

¹⁴ Readers are referred to the *Enrollment Trends and Predictions* report in Appendix C for a thorough-going analysis of the course-loads and faculty hiring needs at this juncture.

6. Adequate resources for the implementation of new programs (support personnel, advertising, internal promotion/communication, faculty hires, etc.) have not always been appropriately allocated.
7. The ethnic and gender diversity of the faculty of the CCMR does not reflect the diversity of the university as a whole.¹⁵
8. There is inadequate or nominal oversight of the online courses and the process for online delivery of curriculum.

E. Recommendations for Improvement.

1. Better communication needs to be established between the admissions office and the CCMR for the purpose of assuring adequate promotion of any new programs implemented by the school.
2. New initiatives and programs should not be launched until adequate resources are allocated.
3. Appropriate financial support (new faculty hires, advertising, support personnel) needs to be in place to assure that new programs are adequately resourced before they are implemented.
4. A clear and consistent process for faculty input into the hiring process of new faculty within the CCMR needs to be established and maintained.
5. A clear and consistent process for faculty oversight of faculty hires, curriculum content, and course delivery needs to be established concerning any distance learning or extended education venues to assure quality control of all courses offered by the college.
6. A university-wide process of faculty assessment of all delivery systems (evening, weekend and online) needs to be developed.
7. An oversight committee within the CCMR should be appointed to oversee curriculum development and delivery of all courses for the college.

III. Teaching and Learning Methods

A. **Assessment** -Primary means of assessment of faculty is done through the use of three primary measures:

1. Dean Feedback.
 - a. Faculty complete a *Professional Activities Contract* (PAC) in the fall of each year that asks for each faculty to affirm their intentions for that school year in 7 key areas. At the end of the Spring semester of that school year they submit a *Professional Activities Report* (PAR), whereby they list the Course and Activities they were involved in as well as a Professional Performance Self-Assessment. This self-report evaluation documents actual faculty performance regarding their achievements in regard to those intentions. The 7 key areas they report on are:
 - (i) Teaching Effectiveness

¹⁵ According to the 2011-12 Fact Book, SEU student body was 56%, CCMR faculty only 18% ($n = 3$). The student body was 65.4% white, 13.4% Hispanic, and 10.3% Black; of the 17 full time faculty in the CCMR there are no Hispanics and one black.

- (ii) Advising Effectiveness
 - (iii) Scholarship
 - (iv) Service to Students
 - (v) Service to the University
 - (vi) Service to the Community-at-Large
 - (vii) Service to the Faith Community
 - (viii) A final Goals and Assessment grid is completed by the respondent rating their level of attainment regarding their performance goals for that year as well as their beliefs about the assessment process.
- b. The Dean of the College meets with each faculty member individually at the end of the spring semester to discuss the results of the PAR and provide suggestions for improvement or further feedback.
2. Student Course Evaluations which assess a number of key areas pertaining to each individual course.
 - a. These evaluations ask students to assess each course on the basis of:
 - (i) Student's involvement – 4 areas are surveyed
 - (ii) Instructor performance – 11 areas are surveyed
 - (iii) The course content & requirements – 14 areas are surveyed
 - (iv) In addition 3 open-ended qualitative questions are asked at the end
 - b. The evaluation provides mean scores for these areas as well as a global means for the entire evaluation.
 3. Faculty are assessed annually on an aggregate of all course evaluations and a list provided to the Dean for perusal and feedback.
 - a. Faculty can be ranked in comparison to others in the college and against the college, semesters and university-wide means scores on 13 key areas.
 - b. Reports are generated for face-to-face delivery and online courses separately.
 - c. Aggregate data on Student self-ratings and Methods of Instruction for the entire college are also compiled in this report.
 4. Peer Evaluation.
 - a. Faculty are encouraged to arrange for another faculty member to do an in-class evaluation at least once a year to be a part of their PAR - however this is completed on a voluntary basis only and not required by the Dean.
 - b. Faculty that are eligible for and apply for advancement in rank will likely obtain the peer evaluation to add to their Advancement Portfolio if so desired.

B. Faculty Discussion of Learning Processes.

1. Each monthly faculty meeting throughout the school year a different faculty member brings a book review on the latest literature in their area of interest to promote among the faculty to keep them apprised of the most salient literature in their field.
2. Some discussion of teaching and learning processes is conducted on a sporadic basis in college faculty meetings (likely due to the intense nature of the college

faculty meetings, 17 full-time faculty in attendance and packed agenda), but mostly this is done informally in faculty fellowship over lunch or other informal gatherings.

3. Curriculum coherence is maintained, without violating academic freedom in the classroom, by voluntary faculty compliance to assure the ILO's are maintained in each syllabus and carried out with the course requirements therein.

C. Support and/or Exposure to Best Practices, Research, and Scholarship.

1. Best practices sessions are scheduled on a bi-weekly basis throughout the school year for faculty to attend with in-house faculty presenters primarily. This provides a venue for faculty to present their research on best practices as well as learn from their peers about the best practices in effective college teaching.
2. Faculties in the college are given some financial resources to promote academic development.
 - a. An annual development stipend (\$500) is given to faculty who present papers at professional academic conferences (Society for Pentecostal Studies, etc.) to offset expenses incurred.
 - b. A limited number of faculty have received support from the university for the pursuit of advanced terminal degrees.
 - c. Some faculty are given release time, if it is self-funded, to pursue research and publication in their field.
 - d. Some of the senior tenured faculty have been granted sabbaticals for the purpose of research and publication in their field.¹⁶
3. An annual award (not monetary) is given to faculty who publish: a dissertation, book, book chapter, or article which was published by a commercial or university press (not self-published books), by the Dean of the Steelman Library.
4. A limited number of faculty are invited to present recent research findings, presentations, and publications throughout the year at a Faculty Research and Scholarship Colloquium sponsored by the university as a means of sharing their scholarship with their peers at the university.
5. At least annually the CCMR sponsors an Academic Symposium in which visiting scholars in the field are invited to the university to share their latest research and/or publications. Time is provided for the CCMR faculty to interact with these visiting scholars on a more personnel basis when they are on campus.

D. Strengths.

1. A committee is in place to recognize faculty for their ongoing scholarship.
2. Venues are provided for the presentation of recent scholarship across the university.
3. The university provides some financial support and recognition for faculty who are contributing research and publications to their field at least on an intermittent basis.

¹⁶ This has resulted in the publication of at least one book, *God's Empowered People: A Pentecostal Theology of the Laity* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2010, by Steven Fettke.

4. Faculty is given regular opportunities to hear from their peers in regard to recent teaching and/or scholarly developments in their field.

E. Weaknesses.

1. Financial support for ongoing scholarship in the way of release time, additional stipends is minimal and not adequate to actually cover the expenses involved in travel, lodging, etc. for scholarly presentations.
2. Scheduling and promotion of the Academic Symposiums and visiting scholars has not resulted in impressive student or faculty attendance outside the CCMR faculty.
3. Support for ongoing scholarship (research and publication in the field) is limited to those who are able to find outside funding for release time, travel, research, etc.
4. Some students are in dire need of remedial support in regard to research and writing skills.

F. Suggestions for Improvement.

1. A regular budgetary line item be established to help fund research and publication by the CCMR faculty.
2. Funds be solicited from donors who would support the scholarly development of the CCMR faculty to promote ongoing scholarship among the faculty.
3. The CCMR develop a better system for promoting the symposiums and workshops they sponsor among their student constituency.
4. A system for identifying students within the CCMR in need of remedial support for research and writing skills needs to be implemented (either through formal assessment, faculty referral, or some other functional means for doing so).
5. Better communication and accountability between the ACE lab and CCMR faculty needs to be promoted.

IV. Student Learning Assessments.

- A. Process for Assessment.** For a review of the outcome measures please see the various measures listed in the Program Learning Outcomes (cf., I, B, D, and F above).
1. These measures are tabulated on an annual basis and delivered to the CCMR faculty for review during their annual Faculty Orientation in the Fall of the year.¹⁷
 2. Recommendations for changes or interventions for the program overall are initiated by the faculty member who oversees the assessments for the CCMR and the individual faculty as they see appropriate. These recommendations are approved and amended by vote of the CCMR faculty as a whole for implementation.
 3. Student performance for both undergrad and graduates students is evaluated annually from longitudinal data gathered from their outset in the program through to graduation or exit.

¹⁷ The most recent *CCMR Program Learning Outcomes* with recommendations is available as an appendix to this document (cf., Appendix A).

4. Some alumni data gathering is presently completed on a sporadic *ad hoc* basis – generally based on administrative mandate.
5. New programs and/or initiatives are also initiated and/or brought to the CCMR faculty as a whole for enactment.

B. Impact on budgetary processes.

1. Budgetary decisions rest solely with the Dean and his office, faculty are generally not included in these discussions.
2. *Pro forma* budgetary forecasts are required for all new programs through the business and finance department.
3. Data based on specific FTE enrollment, advertising expenditures, and other promotional outlays are not shared collaboratively with the faculty and remain the domain of the administrative department who supervises those personnel and budgets.

C. Credibility of the Assessment Process.

1. The assessment plan for the programs are based on the best practices of comparable colleges of religion and met with approval by the regional accreditation agency the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) based on their recent visit (2011) where no recommendations for change regarding such were received.
2. Students are relatively silent, with little or no negative feedback, about the assessment process indicating tacit approval at least on their behalf.

D. Strengths.

1. Faculty are involved in the outcomes assessment process with an annual review.
2. Faculty are primarily responsible for new program initiatives and curricular changes.
3. The extensive longitudinal data has proved helpful in evaluating long term trends concerning individual student performances rather than large cohort comparisons which have so many potential confounds that it makes specific correction difficult and arbitrary at best.

E. Weaknesses.

1. Many crucial budgetary decisions have been made by upper-level administration, beyond the Dean's purview, with minimal input from the CCMR faculty or its representatives.
2. Oversight of the assessment process is left to one individual faculty member and the Dean.

F. Recommendations for Improvement.

1. A committee should be established within the CCMR to oversight the Student Outcomes Assessment procedures that could make recommendations to the CCMR faculty as a whole.

2. A resolution or initiative should be enacted that would assure faculty input (through representative(s) or the Dean) into the budgetary decision process for the college.

V. Quality Assurance Methodologies

A. **Strategic implementation/integration** – the following questions need to be addressed before ratification of this document by the CCMR – PRC.

1. The existing process for assessing performance and improving program effectiveness seems to be adequate. Are we organized to ensure that our mutual departmental objectives and priorities are implemented consistently?
2. Presently, the CCMR administration (Dean and Assistant Dean) are tasked with oversight concerning delivery of academic program content (e.g., continuity of content delivered with PLO's and ILO's in each specific course syllabus). How do we assure ourselves that content is delivered as intended?
3. The establishment and maintenance of the longitudinal database to track student performance on key outcomes assessments is laudatory as it enables evaluation on a case by case individual student basis as well as semester to semester or year to year cohorts.
4. The process for feedback from faculty at the college's faculty meetings by presentation, acceptance, and/or suggestions for improvement into the overall program is sufficient if appropriate amounts of time are given for this purpose.

B. Strengths

1. The ability to track student's individual, as well as cohort performance throughout their time in the CCMR is to be commended.
2. The commitment to gain poignant faculty feedback into the process is significant.
3. The commitment by faculty to the ongoing improvement of the CCMR programs for the benefit of students is also a notable strength, for without this "grassroots" involvement, no significant observations can be made or acted upon.

C. Weaknesses

1. A better process for gaining faculty involvement and feedback concerning key initiatives for implementation in the CCMR programs is needed.
2. Students, parents, employers, and other important stakeholders need to be more formally involved in the process of assessment and recommendations for change within the CCMR program.
3. Many external pressures and initiatives come from external stakeholders that are outside the formal review processes. The faculty, who have to implement these on the ground, need to be consulted and approve any substantial change to the program.
4. Clear communication between the full-time faculty who make major decisions for the program, university administration, and external stakeholders has not always been the case in program decisioning.

D. Recommendations for Improvement.

1. Policies should be enacted within the CCMR that would require the following regarding significant program improvements or changes:
 - a. All new initiatives, course scheduling or content changes, etc. should be distributed in writing a minimum of one week in advance of any major decisions to implement or change.
 - b. Clear and accurate resolutions should be presented to the faculty for enactment of any major changes or initiatives.
 - c. Clear and accurate minutes reflecting the discussion and resolution of any changes or initiatives should be kept for each meeting and distributed to all concerned parties.
 - d. Adequate oversight to ensure university wide implementation of all new initiatives or changes needs to be in place (specifically, notice should be given to Curriculum Committee, the Registrar, those in charge of promotion and web-posting, etc.).
2. A commitment by the university's administration to linking budget allocations to the requests coming from within the individual college's initiatives needs to be obtained and maintained with adequate oversight to see to it that decisions for new initiatives, program changes and promotion come from the college itself rather than outside decisions that are not linked to genuine outcome assessment or critical review by the faculty within the CCMR.
3. Faculty need to be sensitive to the outside "political" and economic pressures that the university administration must deal with in order to satisfy external stakeholders who have a vested interest in the program's outcomes (e.g., denominational officials, employers, parents, local pastors, etc.).

VI. Summation. Due to the massive depth and breadth of this undertaking a reader can easily be inundated with the minutiae of this report. For the sake of brevity and clarity a summation of the most salient observations follows.

A. Students.

1. Student stakeholders (present and alumni) have made it abundantly clear that the faculty are by far the most important asset of the college. They consistently rank them at the top in all data for their spiritual character, academic integrity, and accessibility to the students.
2. Students desire greater diversity in course offerings and scheduling.
3. Students are in need of substantially more scholarship support in order to pursue their calling as religion majors.
4. Students are in need of considerably more support in finding jobs related to their field when they graduate.
5. Students desire the development of more purposeful community specifically for the CCMR majors in the way of better communication from the administration, social events for them specifically, and greater institutional support (copiers, printers, vending machines, etc.) for their immediate needs.

6. Students are concerned about the quality of the chapel programming at the university and desire greater oversight or input from the CCMR faculty in this regard.

B. Faculty.

1. Faculty of the college are in need of greater institutional support for:
 - a. Research and publication development in the way of more release time and lighter faculty loads.
 - b. An increase in budget allowances for professional development to cover faculty expenses for travel for participation and attendance at professional conferences, workshops, and symposiums.
 - c. More faculty hires to add to or enhance the quality of existing degree programs to increase enrollment and student retention rates.
 - d. Adequate resources for the development of online curriculum for extended education delivery if this venue is to be expanded with academic integrity (i.e., professional recording and production of their course content, cutting-edge technology for delivery, finances for course development and ongoing oversight).
2. Greater faculty involvement in establishing hiring profiles and candidacy for key faculty and administrative hires within the CCMR.
3. Faculty desire to have more of a voice in the actual decision-making processes regarding new program initiatives, budgetary allocations, and curriculum delivery.
4. A system to enable CCMR peer-to-peer evaluation of teaching methods, course content, and outcomes needs to be implemented to foster a system of greater personal accountability and increased professionalism among the faculty.
5. More purposeful interaction is needed between the CCMR faculty and the Student Development/Life department on the campus especially in regard to chapel programming.

C. Institutional.

1. In order to implement an effective model of shared governance that gives faculty, students, and other key stakeholders (parents, alumni, local pastors, etc.) the voice they need to assure the academic integrity of the CCMR's programs the following should be codified and complied with:
 - a. Academic program initiatives should originate with the CCMR faculty not administrative entities or outside innovators.
 - b. The motive for academic programs should be the mission and purpose of the CCMR, not market-driven impulses derived from anecdotal opinion rather than substantial demographic research.
 - c. Any new programs should not be launched until there is adequate institutional support for such, including an adequate advertising budget, ubiquitous implementation into the university infrastructure campus-wide (catalog, course schedule, website, registrar modules, Moodle, etc.), comprehensive

awareness and buy-in from the entire university, and viral connection with prospective students both on and off-campus.

- d. Any new faculty or administrative hires within the CCMR should be thoroughly vetted and approved by the CCMR faculty before placement.
2. Campus-wide initiatives that involve spiritual or ministry development of students should be consistently communicated to the CCMR faculty for their personal involvement and support.
3. CCMR faculty should have a major voice in chapel programming overall and specifically for at least one chapel a week.
4. Within the CCMR committees should be established to provide the following:
 - a. Candidate profile and hiring recommendations for any future faculty or administrative hires within the college.
 - b. Oversight for the Outcomes Assessment process to assure adequate linkage between the actual outcomes and potential program changes in curriculum, course offerings, etc.
 - c. Networking between students, CCMR faculty, denominational officials and other significant stakeholders that specifically ministers to the needs of the student for greater community within the CCMR.
 - d. Oversight for new initiatives or changes within the program itself, to assist in the writing and posting of new initiatives or changes and to assure compliance with these across the university.
 - e. A policy for establishing protocol for written submission of new change initiatives so that faculty are apprised a minimum of one week in advance of any proposed changes so they can adequately vet the proposal and provide quality input.