

2016 FALL SEMESTER COURSE EVALUATION REPORT

2016 Fall semester Course Evaluation and Outcome Assessment was carried out under the supervision of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness by the Office of Academic Affairs on November 26 as pre-scheduled and announced by the faculty committee with guideline instructions and official form prepared and approved at the Faculty/Staff committee meeting.

The form of the survey and the list of questionnaire have not been amended since the last course evaluation for Fall 2015; thus improvement in all academic areas were expected to be assessed in data comparison.

As in the approach previous evaluations were instructed and carried out, each faculty was instructed to hand out the form to each student at the beginning of their "Second-to-last" class for the semester, and a representing student was nominated and elected to collect the course assessment forms from students to seal and return the package to the Office of Academic Affairs immediately after the class.

Interpretation and translation service was provided in order for students to fully understand each questionnaire, and in order to insure thorough insight of the assessment result, the Director of Planning and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness were suggested to participate in the assessment outcome production process.

The purpose of the outcome assessment is to improve course contents, program curriculum, and instructor performance. General data was compared with the previous one for collecting information for improvement.

The assessment data is comprised of 4 separate sections of the following:

- (1) Self-Assessment
- (2) Instructor Evaluation
- (3) Course Evaluation
- (4) General Comments and Suggestions

Each student is asked to mark and respond to each question, and the Office of Academic Affairs performed assessment data compilation by adding all students' answer and provide average for each question to a percentage for comprehension. For each category the following questions were asked to each student to grade from 1 to 5 (5 being the highest) and the Office of Academic Affairs may retrieve general assessment from students per question, per class, and per faculty.

After this report is drafted, the outcome will be analyzed and discussed with each faculty for his/her improvement in performing lectures and educational assistance to students. The data will be incorporated into the assessment planning and program assessment; however, Reformed University understands that the outcome of this assessment is not the only barometer of the faculty performance that may lead to faculty employment decision or it may not serve as the only input for program improvement.

GENERAL STATISTICS

For Spring 2016 semester, Reformed University offered total of eight classes, which constituted 4 classes for each degree programs of BATS and M.Div.

For all courses offered in Fall 2016, no identical course had been offered in previous terms to be available for comparison; thus, significant comparison for improvement may not be assessed; however, faculty performance can be visible as some faculties have taught in both semesters. The information for faculty improvement will be discussed with each faculty member as the report be forwarded to President for his review and approval for publication.

The validity of the evaluation outcome depends on the sampling size and the participants' willingness and intention to reflect individual opinion to institutional operation and planning; however, 2016 Fall semester course evaluation did not involve enough number of student sampling, though enlarged compared with the previous term; thus it is the Office of Academic Affairs' responsibility to accept the outcomes in general term, and advises the institution leadership to be careful in formulating improvement plan strictly based on the evaluation.

The Office of Academic Affairs has incorporated all relevant aspects of the 2016 Fall Semester course evaluation and its student responses, and found the following points of issues and areas of improvement which may be applied to strategic planning and course modification and development process to ensure student learning outcome as its priority.

Individual faculty evaluation outcome is shared and discussed with the appropriate faculty member for privacy and appropriate action plan is strongly mutually reached prior to the first day of Spring semester in 2017 after the general report may be presented to the Faculty/Staff meeting for overall consensus from all constituencies of the institution.

Previously Addressed Assessment Outcomes (2016 Spring Semester):

Based on the outcomes of 2016 Student Course Evaluation data, the Office of Academic Affairs moved to suggest the areas of improvement as follows:

- Students are generally satisfied with course contents and curriculum.
- Students demand higher instructor / instruction quality.

The Office of Academic Affairs recommended faculty improvement opportunities for immediate results. Through those pre-planned and well-organized faculty improvement including teaching pedagogy, instructor integrity, abidance to institutional policies and regulations, student assessment, and all the other aspects of quality education.

Therefore, the Office of Academic Affairs recommended institutional action plan to increase learning resources for research opportunities for faculty members and better facility and equipment to incorporate various teaching tools and methods to achieve higher level of course learning objectives.

Improvements and actions made in response to Assessment Outcomes

(During 2016 Fall Semester):

Faculty development efforts made during 2016 fall semester:

Reformed University Academic Affairs took an initiative to increase faculty development activities and efforts as follows:

- 1) Librarian Professional Development through registering the Annual conference (January 2017)
- 2) Curriculum Development efforts through program evaluation by each department to revise the academic curriculum to meet current trends and student demands
- 3) Faculty development through participating various webinars offered by CHEA and other professional societies
- 4) Personal development subsidized through allocating annual subsidy budget for mission and professional activities
- 5) Communicating with faculties the assessment outcomes for action plans

Higher linkage between course material with the real life ministry:

Office of Academic Affairs, based on the previous course evaluation outcomes, encouraged all instructors to use practical examples and discussion pedagogy to reflect practical ministries to classroom teaching. Understanding the distance between the theory and practice, all instructors are advised to utilize personal experience and case studies published from professional journals. As Reformed University Library has been empowered by various E-book resources and Proquest which allow students and faculties to unlimited access toward all religious publications on approximately 290 various professional journals and publications.

Office of Academic Affairs is also in process of developing Direct method of assessment on student learning in addition to the indirect method of course evaluation to assess student learning outcomes with more subtle and objective tools.

2016 SPRING NEW FINDINGS AND OUTCOMES

The following is the assessment outcome data:

Courses	NT504	PT519	PT505	LAN501	PT313	NT304	LAN102	IMMP306	Average		
I. Self-Assessment											
In this course I improved my ability to evaluate new information and analyze the central ideas of this subject area.	4.75	4.57	4.40	4.60	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67		
In this course I learned useful strategies for approaching complex questions in a variety of reasonable ways.	5.00	4.71	4.20	4.40	4.33	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.58		
In this course I seldom found myself actively engaged in thinking about difficult questions for which we still need to find answers.	5.00	4.86	4.00	4.60	4.33	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.60		
As a result of taking this course I find that I am more fair-minded.	5.00	4.57	4.20	4.20	3.33	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.35		
As a result of taking this course my thinking is more focused and systematic, at least in this subject area.	5.00	4.86	4.60	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.56		
My interest in the subject has been stimulated by this course.	4.50	4.86	4.00	4.60	4.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.49		
In this course I improved my ability to give sound reasons for my beliefs and opinions regarding issues in this subject area.	5.00	4.86	4.20	4.60	4.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.64	4.56	91.12%
II. Instructor Evaluation											
The instructor was appropriately respectful of those of us enrolled in this course.	5.00	4.86	4.20	4.60	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75		
The instructor's teaching methods assisted me in achieving the course's learning goals.	4.50	4.71	4.20	4.40	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.64		
The instructor has been punctual all throughout this semester.	5.00	4.57	3.80	4.20	4.33	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.36		
The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter.	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.40	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.48		
The instructor encouraged useful participation through discussion and other activities.	5.00	4.57	4.60	4.20	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67		
The instructor modeled the good thinking, sound judgment, and ethical decision-making.	5.00	4.71	4.20	4.20	4.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.51		
The instructor's examples and illustrations were helpful for a higher understandings of the materials given and presented.	5.00	4.71	4.60	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.48		
The instructor presented difficult and important course material clearly and well.	5.00	4.86	4.40	4.20	4.33	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.66		
The instructor demonstrated an interest in student progress.	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.20	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.66		
The instructor was accessible to students during office hours or after class.	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.40	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.50		
Feedback on examinations/papers/performance was valuable.	5.00	4.86	4.40	4.60	4.33	4.50	3.50	4.50	4.46		
The instructor responded timely for graded assignments.	5.00	4.86	4.20	4.60	4.33	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.69		
The Instructor successfully managed the given class time to meet the class goals and objectives.	5.00	4.86	4.40	4.20	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.68	4.58	91.62%
III. Course Evaluation											
The content of this course was organized and logically to meet the course's stated learning goals.	4.50	4.71	4.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.57		
The objectives for this course have been accomplished.	5.00	4.71	4.20	4.00	4.67	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.64		
There was agreement between the announced objectives and course content.	4.75	4.71	4.20	4.20	3.67	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.44		
The course materials and handouts helped me achieve the course's learning goals.	5.00	4.57	4.40	4.20	4.33	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.44		
The way the course was organized facilitated my achieving its learning goals.	5.00	4.71	4.00	4.40	4.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.51		
The course content was applicable to my own goals for	5.00	4.57	4.40	3.80	3.67	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.49		

2016 Fall Course Evaluation Outcome Report

taking the course.											
The course was intellectually challenging.	5.00	4.71	4.40	3.80	4.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.55		
Assignments contributed to an understanding of course content.	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.45		
Examinations (papers, projects) measured important aspects of this course.	5.00	4.86	4.20	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.57		
Methods of evaluating and grading student work reflected student's achievement.	5.00	4.57	4.20	4.00	3.67	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.49		
Course requirements and policies including grading are fully explained.	5.00	4.86	4.40	4.00	4.67	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.62		
Course syllabus was provided at the beginning of the course as the complete and useful guide for the course.	5.00	4.86	4.20	4.20	4.33	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.53	90.68 %
Course Evaluation per Course	4.94	4.74	4.28	4.24	4.11	4.70	4.58	4.88			
OVERALL Semester COURSE EVALUATION									4.56		

I. Course Evaluation Rating Changes

2016 Fall semester course evaluation is designed to assess the following three areas of academia for each course offered during the semester:

- (1) Self-Assessment
- (2) Instructor Evaluation
- (3) Course Evaluation

During the course of the term, the institution and the Office of Academic Affairs emphasized the importance of the assessment and the evaluation along with the learning outcomes and objectives to students. And throughout this course of effort, students are assessed to be more acceptable both in how to assess themselves and how to measure their improvement in evaluating new information and analyze the central ideas of this subject area.

Continuous and systematic application of course evaluation have increased the awareness of the importance of student learning and student satisfaction in every facet of college administration.

From the 2016 Fall assessment, it was found that

Comprehensive course evaluation outcome for	2016 Spring	↔	2015 Fall (2015 Sp.)
1) Self-Assessment Average	4.56	↔	4.66 (2.1% ⬇)
2) Instructor Evaluation Average	4.58	↔	4.52 (1.3% ⬆)
3) Course Evaluation Average	4.53	↔	4.64 (2.4% ⬇)

Compared with the last-term statistics and findings based on a comprehensive assessment for both BATS and M.Div. programs, it was generally accepted that that each of the evaluation categories showed minimal substantive changes in the ratings; where each category reflected less than 2.5% changes compared with the previous assessment.

II. Course Evaluation Rating by Course

The Office of Academic Affairs compiled the statistical data from the assessment result to vividly present each faculty member and administrator the course satisfaction as follows:

Comprehensive course evaluation outcome for each course (in average ratings)

NT504	PT519	PT505	LAN501	PT313	NT304	LAN102	IMMP306
4.94	4.74	4.28	4.24	4.11	4.70	4.58	4.88

From the data compilation, the Office found that student satisfaction from all courses are evident.

It is notable to find the NT504 "Gospel of John and John Epistles" course reflected higher student satisfaction than any other courses, and on the other hand, PT313 taught by Dr. Suresh Thomas ranked the lowest in student satisfaction.

III. Course Evaluation Rating by Questions

The following table is for the items ranked the highest and lowest average score from student evaluation:

	Average
I. Self-Assessment	
In this course I improved my ability to evaluate new information and analyze the central ideas of this subject area.	4.67
In this course I seldom found myself actively engaged in thinking about difficult questions for which we still need to find answers.	4.60
II. Instructor Evaluation	
The instructor has been punctual all throughout this semester.	4.36
The instructor encouraged useful participation through discussion and other activities.	4.67
The instructor presented difficult and important course material clearly and well.	4.66
The instructor demonstrated an interest in student progress.	4.66
The instructor responded timely for graded assignments.	4.69
The Instructor successfully managed the given class time to meet the class goals and objectives.	4.68
III. Course Evaluation	
There was agreement between the announced objectives and course content.	4.44
The course materials and handouts helped me achieve the course's learning goals.	4.44
Assignments contributed to an understanding of course content.	4.45
Course requirements and policies including grading are fully explained.	4.62
Course syllabus was provided at the beginning of the course as the complete and useful guide for the course.	4.64

The common factors found from the lowest scored items are related to instruction and instructor quality as follows:

- 1) Instructors have not been punctual in classroom lectures
- 2) Students were not generally happy with instructors in assignment and preparedness for classroom lectures

IV. Action Plan for Improvement

The Office of Academic Affairs has thoroughly and objectively evaluated the outcomes of 2016 Fall Student Course Evaluation data as above, and concluded as follows:

- 1) Substantial satisfaction increased for faculty performance compared to the previous evaluation
- 2) Negative student responses toward courses taught in English or non-Korean instructors
- 3) Substantially lower satisfaction in faculty preparedness in course content and material to meet learning outcomes and objectives
- 4) Faculty tardiness or frequent leaves

In accordance with the above findings, the Office of Academic Affairs recommends the followings:

- 1) Faculty work ethics be reminded and re-oriented:
All instructors must report to the supervising officials if they are in need of tardy start or class cancelation in advance
- 2) Proper student orientation and preparedness to be successful in courses taught in English or taught by non-Korean speaking instructors
- 3) Faculty development effort must be immediately exerted including teaching pedagogy, instructor integrity, abidance to institutional policies and regulations, student assessment, and all the other aspects of quality education. Appropriate syllabus building and well-planned assignment may increase student satisfaction.
- 4) Remedial classes or helps must be provided to students lacking proficiencies