

Cornerstone University Annual Assessment Report

2008-09



Mishqelet Project

Traditional Age Undergraduate

Professional & Graduate Studies

Grand Rapids Theological Seminary

Asia Baptist Theological Seminary

Objectives of Assessment

1. To clearly articulate a set of curricular and co-curricular objectives to inform a student's
 - knowledge level of a given content area
 - skill level as appropriately defined
 - worldview formation leading to a set of values
2. To develop a well-defined strategy to achieve those objectives, including identifying and monitoring
 - trends in student profiles
 - trends in student learning
 - the instruments and methods used in assessing student learning
3. To offer verifiable evidence of the achievement of those goals by
 - the use of direct methods of assessment
 - the use of indirect methods of assessment
4. To provide a means of accountability to insure ongoing assessment
 - through appropriate organizational accountability processes
 - through meeting the guidelines of the Higher Learning Commission
 - through the development of campus ethos of assessment
5. To gather, interpret and use the evidence of assessment in the institutional decision-making processes of instructional program improvement, strategic planning and resource allocation
 - by implementing the University's strategic planning process
 - as guided by Chief Academic Officer, the Director of Assessment and the divisional chairs
 - used widely across all units of the campus community
6. To provide yearly and other regular reports to the campus community to
 - report the work of assessment
 - provide feedback for curricular and co-curricular development
 - inform logistic and strategic decision making
 - develop a campus ethos of assessment

Cornerstone University Annual Assessment Report 2008-09

Please find in these brief pages an update of our work of assessing the student learning taking place on the campus during the 2008-09 school year. As the iRep Office has done for the past several years, a sample of a few best practices are provided to not only give you a sense of what occurred during the past year, but also to prompt your thinking of how you might become a more active partner in the university's assessment project.

Alexander Astin (Assessment for Excellence, p. 254) suggests that one way to enhance the academic quality of a university is to consider a few basic questions:

How much and how well do our students learn?

How are we affecting their values and attitudes?

What kinds of citizens and what kinds of people do our students become?

Are our students becoming more humane and more concerned with the welfare of others?

Are they becoming more active and better-informed participants in the democratic process?

As the campus community increases its academic quality, the work of assessment is designed to assist faculty in this important institutional objective. In agreeing with Astin, "***I believe that the key to achieving institutional transcendence is in how we ultimately define our own excellence.....and one method of doing this it to rely on assessment***" (p. 254).

May the work of assessment provide us a yardstick by which we measure the university's growth and development in the days ahead.

Moving forward the Mishqelet Project

Tim Detwiler
Associate Provost



Celebrating Campus Achievement

The Office of Assessment is pleased to announce the individual receiving the “**Eagle Assessment Award**” for 2008-09. This award is presented to an individual or to a division who has modeled exemplary assessment practices for the campus community.



Michael Van Dyke, ENG 212 Course Coordinator

The 8th Eagle Assessment Award is presented to Michael Van Dyke for the following reasons:

- Identified objectives that are assessable
- Clear assessment plan
- Changes made based on assessment data
- Excellent ideas for modifying the correlation between what is expected to occur the first time a course is taught and where students actually are
- Thorough and thoughtful evaluation of course effectiveness for student learning

The Eagle Assessment Award was created to recognize divisions and individuals who are working diligently in the area of assessment. Every division is working through a variety of assessment issues and this award recognizes those people who are making unique or outstanding contributions to the campus assessment effort and in so doing are leading by showing excellence.

2008-09 Assessment – A Year In Review

In looking at the “next steps” section from the 2007-08 Annual Assessment Report, the following steps guided the campus community during past academic year:

1. All areas of the campus community must continue building the Mishqelet wall (objectives, assessment instruments, data-based decision-making) one stone at a time; continually over time. **(in process)**
2. The changing organizational structure must settle in and direct the rhythms of the campus work of assessment. **(in process)**
3. Faculty and staff development opportunities must be offered on a continual basis. **(more opportunities needed)**
4. Decision-making must be increasingly guided by the collection and use of data. **(in process)**
5. The campus community must hold each other accountable for the work of assessment as the motivating factors becomes more about internal quality and less about external HLC oversight. **(in process)**
6. In addition, a campus-wide assessment plan was created to break down the tasks into manageable segments for campus quality and in light of the upcoming HLC visit. **(completed)**

In Sum – Assessment remains a task that many divisions put on the back burner. Without commitment to assessment by each division, student learning and the academic programs will not fulfill their potential. While the initial investment is high, the return on investment is also high, and once the structure is stable, the maintenance required is well within the scope of normal educational practice.

Best Practice – Core Course Evaluation

This best practice models a core coordinator using student-centered learning objectives, an assessment plan, and assessment data to make changes and evaluate the learning experience for students.

Writing in Culture (ENG 212) 2008 – 2009

ASSESSMENT PLAN	Learning Resources and Strategies	Evidence of Accomplishment	Validation/Assessment of Evidence (Criteria and Means for Evaluation)
Core Learning Objectives			
1. Engage in all spheres of knowledge as stewards of God’s truth, unfolding the empirical and logical matrix of God’s general revelation and utilizing critical thinking (analytical) skills to participate in culture-making and cultural analysis. (Cf. Worldview 3a)	Engagement in individual research activities and analytical tasks in the process of formulating a group response to a cultural text.	Integration of separate tasks in Group Response project.	Group members’ assessment of individual contributions (75% strongly positive)
2. Communicate effectively in oral, written, and symbolic forms, utilizing careful and charitable arguments as well as the use of technology to enhance communication, and confidently participating in meaningful public and interpersonal discourse as wisdom-seekers.	Organization of written arguments based on research, choice of rhetorical strategies, and peer interaction. Individual and group preparation for formal debate on a controversial cultural issue. Research of opposing sides.	Letter to Editor, Position paper, and Worldview in Culture Essays. Coordinated group essays and effective participation in formal debate.	Rubrics that focus in a progressive manner on students’ sophistication in use of argumentative techniques. Validation correlated with scores that remain consistent or improve. 80% of group scores at 85% or higher on rubric section: “analysis of opposing positions”.
3. Demonstrate leadership by enacting the biblical mandate of justice which carries across lines of social diversity and stratification and by serving as agents of mercy or restoration, thus connecting with the world’s deep needs. (cf. Leadership 1b)	Focus on local or West Michigan issues in a position paper, with the implicit goal of persuading others to take responsible action.	Use of research content to strengthen rhetorical effectiveness of essay.	80% of students conduct interviews with individuals who self-identify themselves as representing opposing positions.

<p>4. Evaluate specific theories of leadership within the larger context of the liberal arts by formulating the skills, traits, and values common to leaders.</p>	<p>Stress the need for taking responsibility for the development of honest and civic-minded argumentative positions.</p>	<p>Clear, well-informed, and charitably-stated thesis statements in argumentative essays.</p>	<p>80% of students receive consistent or improving scores in the “thesis” section of rubric when comparing <u>Position Paper to Worldview in Culture Essay</u></p>
<p>5. Evaluate assertions made in all areas of scholarship – identifying underlying assumptions, appraising assertions for logical consistency and biblical revelation, and demonstrating responsibility for intellectual interpretation.</p>	<p>Analyze the rhetorical strategies, logical consistency, and worldview aspects of arguments made by cultural critics.</p> <p>Showing accountability to a group in the process of formulating a collective response to an issue or text.</p>	<p>Formal Analysis Essay.</p> <p>Group Response to a Cultural Text.</p>	<p>Show consistency or improvement in relevant rubric sections when comparing <u>Formal Analysis Essay to Group Response papers</u></p> <p>Group members’ assessment of each others’ contributions (75% positive)</p>
<p>6. Identify the appropriate information needed for a given task by defining the research question, conducting an efficient search for information from multiple reference sources, and locating sources, both online and in print.</p>	<p>Interviewing local individuals in the process of formulating a position paper.</p> <p>Researching opposing positions on a controversial issue, as well as the history and social context underlying the controversy. Will require looking for current and archival sources.</p> <p>Conducting research for the purpose of exploring the complexity of an issue that has worldview implications.</p>	<p>Dialectical relationship between research question and search for sources in development of <u>Worldview in Culture Essay</u>, allowing each to fruitfully affect and refine the other.</p>	<p>Rubric sections for content and MLA remain consistent or improve from <u>Position Paper to Worldview in Culture Essay</u>.</p>
<p>7. Evaluate quantitative and qualitative information from various sources, interpreting and producing graphical, statistical, and other forms quantitative data utilizing proper problem-solving techniques; determining reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, and relevance; analyzing the claims of sources for bias, prejudice, and manipulation; and examining the author’s research methodology and/or information gathering.</p>	<p>Analysis of sources and research methodology used in a prominent cultural critique.</p> <p>Evaluation of sources during research process in development of argumentative essays.</p>	<p>Formal Analysis Essay and Group Response.</p>	<p>More than 50% of class improves scores in relevant rubric sections when comparing the two assignments.</p>

8. Incorporate new knowledge into a framework of scholarship: critically analyzing and connecting new knowledge to prior knowledge, demonstrating connections between disciplines, integrating research with original thought to accomplish a purpose, and communicating coherently using appropriate means, including contemporary technologies. (cf. Leadership 3c)	Using flexible research questions to guide research.	Use of diverse and multiple research sources in the course's main argumentative essays.	Consistency or improvement in "MLA" or "Research" sections of rubrics from <u>Position Paper</u> to <u>Worldview in Culture Essay</u>
9. Employ ethics rooted in a biblical worldview for accessing and using information, using technology responsibly in personal and communal contexts, applying legal and ethical guidelines, and citing sources in adherence with the appropriate documentation style.	Organizing research to avoid unintentional plagiarism and applying MLA or APA citation styles.	Careful and methodical integration of research into the different rhetorical paradigms employed in course assignments.	Lack of proven plagiarism, intentional or unintentional, in 95% of all students' <u>Worldview in Culture Essays</u>

Assessment Report

As seen in the areas in bold on the Assessment Plan, the focus of assessment for this academic year was on two main areas: research (including use of research questions and documentation styles) and on the development of effective and charitable argumentation skills.

In order to assess those areas, I urged the instructors of the course to use common rubrics for each essay assignment. For the most part this is what happened, although on a couple of occasions the instructors used their own rubrics or changed the common rubrics. Most often this was due to miscommunication on my part. There was certainly enough commonality to draw some general conclusions, however. Still, I will try to place more emphasis on the need for common rubrics next year.

Rubrics were used on four different essay assignments each semester (see attached rubrics).

- I. Position Paper (Fall 2008) / became Personal Response Paper (Spring 2009)
- II. Formal Analysis Essay (both semesters)
- III. Group Response Essay (both semesters)
- IV. Worldview in Culture Essay (both semesters)

My method of gaining generalizations from the assessment data supplied by the rubrics was to count the number of times an area of evaluation on the rubric received the lowest score in relation to the other graded areas of evaluation. Although various factors might affect the reliability of such a method for revealing areas for improvement (such as the inclinations of different professors to grade the same area differently), I thought that general patterns might still be discerned.

[Note: the column labeled “Validation/Assessment of Evidence” on the Assessment Plan and the rubrics will need to be modified for the coming year, as there was not a very good correlation between the two. In fact, it was almost impossible for me to track the relative achievement of learning objectives this year because of the differences between the rubrics for each assignment and the use of numerical values that did not correlate to the criteria on the assessment plan. Nevertheless, I think that the data provided by the rubrics provided a great deal of information for how this course should be assessed next year. In other words, this first year was devoted to learning what this course is all about. My plan is to make modifications in order that assessment be more focused and intentional next year; and I am optimistic about the possibility of doing a very effective assessment next year, since it will not be based on pure speculation as to what will actually happen in the course.]

Assessment Data

I. Position Paper/Personal Response Essay

For the Position Paper, students were asked to support a position on a controversial “local” issue. The rubric had five areas of evaluation: Thesis, Use of Sources, Organization of Argument, Analysis of Opposing Positions, and Grammar/Style. **“Use of Sources” was the weakest area in the largest number of essays, with “Organization of Argument” and “Analysis of Opposing Positions” tied for a close second. Grammar/Style seemed to be an area of strength in most papers. These areas of weakness were all relevant to the areas of assessment that we wanted to stress this year. Due to my sense that something needed to be done to help students with organizational problems, I adopted Gerald Graff’s book *They Say, I Say* for Spring Semester.**

For the Personal Response Essay, students were basically asked to do the same thing as in the Position Paper (I changed the name to stress the personal nature of argumentation, in alliance with the emphasis in the Graff text). The rubric had four areas of evaluation: Thesis, Support of Thesis, Organization/Use of MLA Documentation, and Grammar/Style. **“Support of Thesis” and “Organization/Use of MLA Documentation” were by far the weakest areas across all sections, verifying for me that students lacked the most skills in the areas of research, integration of sources into essay, and organization.**

II. Formal Analysis Essay

For the Formal Analysis Essay, students were asked to analyze Bill McKibben's book, *Deep Economy*. The rubric had five areas of evaluation: Thesis, Summary of Text, Analysis of Argument, Worldview Implications, and Grammar/Style. **"Analysis of Argument" was by far the weakest area across all sections, with "Grammar/Style" coming in second. My guess as to why scores in the latter were lower for this essay was that the subject matter was more difficult to write about.**

III. Group Response Essay

For the Group Response Essay, the students were placed into groups of 3-5 and asked to write a single, unified, analytical response to a documentary on a controversial issue that was viewed in class. The rubric had six areas of evaluation: Thesis, History/Context, Pro Side, Con Side, Conclusion, and Grammar/Style. **For various reasons, instructors ended up using wildly different rubrics for this particular assignment. Still, it seemed that supporting a thesis, using quality sources, and effectively organizing an argument were still the weakest areas across all sections.**

IV. Worldview in Culture Essay

For the Worldview in Culture Essay, students were asked to write about how they would integrate a Christian worldview into their prospective careers. This was more of a personal/reflective essay, although students were required to integrate 3-4 sources. The rubric had four areas of evaluation: Content, Organization, Thoughtfulness, and Grammar/Style. **"Grammar/Style" was by far the weakest area, although this primarily based on my own sections, since the other instructors did not use (or did not turn in to me) rubrics. My own speculation as to why writing mechanics were not as strong on this paper would center on the fact that I stressed the personal (rather than analytical) nature of this essay, and thus possibly gave the students the idea that it could be more loosely written. Also, it was written at the end of the semester, when other pressures were taking a lot of the students' energy.**

V. Ad hoc evaluations

Professor Stevens and I took it upon ourselves at the end of Spring Semester to ask the students to complete course assessments that we constructed on our own. We did this in order to get a better sense of what was working and what was not working in the course. In my sections, the students expressed a generally favorable view of the McKibben and Graff texts, while they did not like the Group Response Essay. In Stevens' sections there were generally unfavorable views of both the McKibben book and the Group Response

Essay. Stevens' students were very grateful for his incredibly detailed responses to their essays, however.

Despite the students' general distaste for the group response essay (most did not like the fact that they had to depend on others' for their grade), I want it to remain as a part of the course since it enables us to reflect on the Civitas values of citizenship and working together towards a common goal. We just need to approach it differently, so that students gain a better sense of the rewards of working as a group.

Potential Changes in Course Structure and Assessment

- ❖ Insist upon the use of common rubrics across sections.
- ❖ Correlate "Validation" column on assessment plan with the numerical matrices used on the rubrics. For example, the rubric sections often employ ratings of 1-20, while the assessment plan uses per cents.
- ❖ Focus the class even more intentionally on improving students' skills in four areas: finding quality research sources, effectively integrating sources into essays, organizing arguments, and analyzing difficult texts. Using the Graff text more effectively will help in the latter two three areas.
- ❖ Emphasize more the positive aspects of group work, possibly by placing less focus on the final product and more on the process of getting there. For example, one or two rubric items could relate to group cooperation and efficiency.
- ❖ Teach more about plagiarism, but within the context of teaching about the effective integration of sources. There was anecdotal evidence of a lot of unintentional plagiarism going on. The classes are too large to track down everything, but if we improve students' skill in the overall use of sources, it is likely that a lot of this careless type of plagiarism will go away.
- ❖ Be more intentional about teaching methods of textual analysis. Free-ranging discussions are not enough. Most students need very specific instructions on methods of textual analysis (what types of questions to ask of the text, etc.) so that they are not totally dependent upon the instructor's interpretation. I will research methods/texts in this area over the summer.

Best Practice – Divisional Review of Internships

The following report models how one division evaluated internships to ensure that students were learning necessary skills.

Division of Teacher Education 2008 – 2009

1. The Cooperating Teacher Program Evaluations were conducted. The overall feedback remains positive.

Percentage breakdown per question category:

Questions	5	4	3	2	1
1. To train teachers who are instruments to intentionally invest in the lives of their students.	80	20			
2. To train teachers as scholars who practice a healthy and systematic curiosity about all areas of knowledge, particularly in his or her subject area(s) and the knowledge base for effective instruction.	60	40			
3. To train teachers as designers who integrate knowledge of student's cultural, physical, and intellectual differences to create effective lessons and curriculums.	50	50			
4. To train teachers as managers who implement policy and manage human and physical resources to enable every student to learn in a safe and stimulating educational environment.	40	40	20		
5. To train teachers as instructors who apply the knowledge base for teaching to ensure the learning success of all students.	80	20			
6. To train teachers as evaluators who know how to follow student progress using authentic student assessment enabling each one to achieve maximum intellectual and personal growth.	33	33	33		
7. To train teachers as professionals who demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and the maintenance of ethical standards.	100				

2. The **Student Teaching Grading Rubric** was approved and will be utilized beginning in the Fall 2009 semester.

3. **Student Teacher Program Evaluation.**

We utilized our updated evaluation. Secondly, we added a question relating to the MTTC so that we will be able to ascertain what we may need to add or stress through our program so that our students will be more successful. Finally, a few additional questions were added to fully reflect the Seven Standards of Teaching that our department assessments are centered upon.

General Results: Our graduating teachers see a need for a greater focus in special education courses and discipline strategies. Overall, our graduates are pleased with the educational training they've received through CU.

Specific Results:

ALL STUDENTS SUMMARY

Using the 5 point scale below, rate the degree to which you believe your *Cornerstone University* courses have prepared you for teaching. **Underline the question relates to knowledge gained at another institution, circle the O.**

5=Agree, 4=Somewhat agree, 3=Ambivalent, 2=Somewhat disagree, 1=Disagree

5 4 3 2

1 O

1. I am prepared to write effective lesson plans .	17	6				
2. I am prepared to write effective unit plans .	16	5	1	1		
3. I understand strategies for classroom management .	14	6	2	1		
4. I am prepared to meet the needs of special needs students .	6	11	2	4		

5. I am prepared to interact with students and teachers on a professional level.	21		2			
6. I am prepared to integrate multicultural perspectives in lessons.	17	5	1			
7. I am prepared to apply the knowledge base for teaching to ensure the learning success of all students.	18	4	1			
8. I am prepared to assess student progress.	17	6				
9. I am prepared to teach the content in my major area(s).	17	2				
10. I am prepared to teach the content in my minor area(s).	11	4	2	2		
11. I am able to use many reading and writing strategies .	14	7	2			
12. The EDU courses gave me the opportunity to consider the implications of educational theory and philosophy as they interact with biblical principles .	17	3	3			
13. The EDU courses encouraged me to become a lifelong learner .	15	6	2			
14. Overall, I feel prepared to enter into the teaching profession.	17	4	2			

Rate the following based on your student teaching experience:

1. My students would describe me as an open, caring, and helpful teacher.	19	4				
2. My university supervisor was supportive .	20	2			1	
3. My university supervisor offered useful feedback on my teaching and planning.	18	4	1			
4. I could apply most of what I learned in my education classes to my student teaching experience.	12	9	1	1		

Best Practice – A macro-divisional assessment practice

This best practice illustrates how a division plans for large scale assessment work.

Professional and Graduate Studies 2008-09

During 2008-2009, the Professional and Graduate Studies Assessment Committee focused on the following assessment goals:

- Evaluate demographic/enrollment report.
- Evaluate opportunities for professional development.
- Evaluation of BSML and Online BSML Program*
- Evaluate leadership program objective
- Create and distribute an Alumni Survey and examine results.

Each of these assessment pieces was evaluated during the 2008-09 academic year. For the sake of brevity, only the BSML program review* is laid out in this document in detail. However, if you would like to look at the other assessment evaluations, they are available on Odyssey.

Bachelor of Science in Ministry Leadership (BSML) Program Review

A comprehensive review of the BSML onground and blended programs was conducted by a team of faculty and administration. Direct assessment of data was also conducted. Results of the evaluation included a number of issues and recommended changes.

Direct Assessment

Program Retention:

Since inception there were five online cohorts in the BSML program. Retention rate for the cohorts were as follows:

Cohort	Students	Drops	Adds	Ending#	Retention	Comp. Date
OLML01	15	7		8	53%	12/07
OLML02	19	5		14	74%	6/08
OLML03	14	6		8	57%	12/08
OLML04	9	4		5	56%	9/09
OLML05	13	3		10	77%	2/10

Outcomes Expected:

Review Cycle	Objectives	Curriculum Correlation	Method and Expected Outcomes
4	1. To summarize foundational biblical and theological truth.	REL238 REL233 CMI433 CMI442	When a representative sample of Personal Doctrinal Statements are reviewed in the Portfolio, 85% of the students will be able to summarize the foundational biblical and theological truths.
1	2. To articulate the essential components of the Christian worldview.	BUS401	When a representative sample of the Ethical Creed papers are reviewed in the Portfolio, 85% of the students will demonstrate proficiency in articulating one's Christian worldview.

Review Cycle	Objectives	Curriculum Correlation	Method and Expected Outcomes
3	3. To translate Christian values and ethics into ministry/leadership situations.	BUS401 CMI442	When a representative sample of the Ethical Creed papers are reviewed in the Portfolio, 85% of the students will demonstrate the ability to translate Christian values and ethics in ministry/leadership situations.
4	4. To solve practical situations/problems individually and in teams using theoretical knowledge, critical thinking and reasoning skills.	CMI432 MGT315	Portfolio assignment TBD
3	5. To outline leadership principles and skills conducive to a ministry environment.	CMI312 CMI331 CMI432 CMI442	When a representative sample of the Personal Philosophy of Leadership papers are reviewed in the Portfolio, 85% of the students will demonstrate the ability to integrate leadership principles and skills in a ministry environment.
4	6. To apply analytical skills required to perform basic ministry research including literature review, information search techniques, and report writing.	CMI442	Portfolio explained above.
5	8. To analyze the organizational structure, challenges and interpersonal dynamics of the not-for-profit organization.	MGT316	Portfolio assignment will be written into this new course.
4	9. To integrate interpersonal and intrapersonal components of ministry - administration, team building, equipping, shepherding and personnel management.	CMI442	Portfolio explained above.

Results:

Objective #1: To summarize foundational biblical and theological truths.

Assessment Results: No assessment data was collected during this cycle (3).

Objective #2: To articulate the essential components of the Christian worldview.

Assessment Results: A representative sample of five (5) Ethical Creed papers from cohort OLML04 were selected for review. All (100%) of the students demonstrated proficiency in articulating one's Christian worldview.

Objective #3: To translate Christian values and ethics into ministry/leadership situations

Assessment Results: A representative sample of five (5) Ethical Creed student papers from cohort OLML04 were reviewed. All (100%) of the students demonstrated the ability to translate Christian values and ethics in ministry/leadership situations.

Objective #4: To solve practical situations/problems individually and in teams using theoretical knowledge, critical thinking and reasoning skills.

Assessment Results: No assessment data was collected during this cycle (3).

Objective #5: To outline leadership principles and skills conducive to a ministry environment.

Assessment Results: A representative sample of ten (10) Personal Philosophy of Leadership student papers from CMI 331/OLML04 were reviewed. Ninety percent (90%) of the students demonstrated the ability to integrate leadership principles and skills in a ministry environment.

Objective #6: To apply analytical skills required to perform basic ministry research including literature review, information search techniques, and report writing.

Assessment Results: No assessment data was collected during this cycle (3).

Objective #7: To communicate effectively both in oral and written forms.

Assessment Results: No assessment data was collected during this cycle (3).

Recommendations:

1. Continue to use the Ethical Creed paper as a measurement tool for assessing Christian worldview.
2. Continue to use the Personal Philosophy of Leadership student papers as one of the measurement tools for assessing a student's ability to understand and implement leadership principles into a leadership setting.
3. Restructure or Eliminate the Ministry Portfolio requirement - the Ministry Portfolio, a personal and program assessment tool to help identify benchmarks and effectiveness of the ministry leadership curriculum, has not worked as effectively as originally planned. It has been proposed that a team of BSML faculty and staff revisit the requirements and spread them throughout the courses.
4. Reduce the number of program learning objectives – there are currently seven (7) program objectives. It was suggested that some of the objectives could be combined. A team of key faculty and staff will review and make the necessary changes to the objectives.
5. PLT Teams – weight given to PLT assignments seems to be inappropriately high. It was suggested that we reconsider the role of PLT's and how much weight is given to PLT assignment and projects.
6. Overlapping in Course Content – a number of courses, including REL 228 (Principles of Biblical Studies), REL 226 (Inductive Study of Ephesians) and REL 238 (Christian Doctrine), appear to have overlapping content. It was suggested that as each course be reviewed for content and repetition in relationship to other courses in the program.

Decision:

The committee decided to refer the program's recommendations back to the BSML committee that reviewed the program for further review and specific recommendations.

Best Practice – Seamless Learning Environment

This best practice was selected to illustrate the point of making decisions based on collected assessment information.

**Spiritual Formation—Health Services
2008-09**

Assessment Efforts:

Spring Semester Comprehensive Health Services Survey
Post-Care Evaluations
Review of utilization reports available in Neusoft

Assessment Driven Decisions:

Based on the responses to the Semester Survey and conversations with parents at Family Orientation days we will be adding a communication piece to be sent out in September that explains the services available to students under the student insurance program to parents and students. According to the survey and conversations, parents and student do not understand the insurance program

Based on the responses to the Semester Survey we will no longer send out our insurance brochure to new students as part of the acceptance packet, but will direct student to the website for copies of the brochure. According to the survey, students are not reading the brochure.

Based on the responses to the Semester Survey we will be adding health services contact information to the emergency information on the back of the residence hall room doors and no longer be sending out the “health services bookmark,” as according to the survey, students do not use or remember receiving it.

Based on utilization reports and survey responses we will seek to limit “walk-in” appointments and maximize scheduled appointments to increase the number of patients seen by mid-level providers and to allow us to better treat each student. Our utilization data showed that we are only seeing an average of 1.25 students per hour which is well below the maximum of 4 an hour. The survey data also shows that students who walk-in have a worse customer service experience.

Based on the responses to the Semester Survey we will be moving the medical staff’s licenses and ACHA certifications from a wall near the break room to the main lobby. We will also add professional biographies and copies of their degrees to the wall as well. This will be done to address the fact that our students do not believe that our health services staff are qualified.

Summary

The introduction of the new core curriculum has allowed several faculty members a clean slate from which to begin the work of course level assessment. Some excellent work has been done in this area, and should serve as a model for all of Cornerstone’s assessment efforts.

As we continue the campus assessment initiative, here are few “next steps” for the campus community and the resultant goals for 2008-09:

1. All divisions (not simply academic divisions) must finalize divisional mission statements and objectives that are in line with the new Cornerstone University mission statement. This will give programs and courses both a standard to follow and a structure to uphold.
2. Assessment data must be gathered and used in decision-making in all areas of the University.
3. A faculty development program must continue to be developed and progressively implemented.
4. The campus community must hold each other accountable for the work of assessment as the motivating factors becomes more about internal quality and less about external HLC oversight.



Mishqelet Project Notes

Personal/Professional Next Steps

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

5.



Divisional Next Steps

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

To be receptive to change, members must understand their role in the fulfillment of a larger purpose and see how change will better enable them to accomplish organizational goals.

(Leading Organizations Through Transition, Deetz, et al., p. 154)

Campus Assessment Information

For more information regarding the work of assessment for the 2008-09 academic year, please consult the following Odyssey website for:

- specific divisional reports and filings
- specific course reports and filings
- results of campus-wide macro- assessment data
- the reporting forms used to guide the yearly activity
- minutes and activities of the Assessment Committee

To access the Odyssey Assessment Website:

1. Go the <http://odyssey.cornerstone.edu> or follow the link on the Eagle's Nest
2. Upon entering the Odyssey website, locate "CU Assessment"
3. Under the general CU Assessment course, you will find material on many areas of assessment at Cornerstone University. The Annual Assessment Reports from each division may be found under the Assessment Reports tab in the Divisional Assessment Reports folder.

In addition, the following website is useful in seeing how the university posts its Assessment work to the world via the internet.

www.cornerstone.edu/academics/assessment

Assessing Towards Quality



Cornerstone
UNIVERSITY®