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Introduction

Institutional effectiveness at Dallas Theological Seminary is much more than just a means of satisfying the expectations of the many regulatory agencies associated with the institution. The DTS institutional effectiveness process is the embodiment of the Seminary's commitment to the continuous quality improvement of all aspects associated with meeting its expanded statement of mission. That commitment is driven by the simple fact that DTS students demand and deserve no less. They should and do expect that the Seminary's administration, faculty, staff, and governing board will devote themselves seriously, systematically and continuously to the task of providing high quality educational programs and services.

This commitment to continuous quality improvement is ongoing, broad-based and ingrained within the DTS culture. The Seminary's institutional effectiveness efforts involve all personnel in responding to the following questions:

- Is the Seminary operating according to its mission and expanded statement of purpose?
- Is the Seminary accomplishing what it set out to accomplish?
- What can the Seminary do to improve the quality of education provided to students?
- Have the Seminary’s improvement efforts produced meaningful and positive changes within the institution?
The Institutional Effectiveness Paradigm

The goal is to integrate planning, evaluation, and reporting processes into a comprehensive program of institutional effectiveness that not only encompasses teaching and learning but also the array of administrative and support services which sustain the core activities of the seminary. **We must both demonstrate and prove that our institutional mission is not just an empty promise. We must show solid and verifiable evidence that we are indeed fulfilling our mission and that the seminary is actively engaged in an ongoing quest for quality.** Every component of the institution must demonstrate planning, evaluation, and the use of findings to improve programs and services.

Although budgetary requests often originate as a result of the institutional effectiveness process, IE is not a resource-based system. Institutional effectiveness is designed to encompass a much broader spectrum of evolutionary, ongoing, and incremental improvement. Resource based planning is conducted through the strategic planning process under the oversight of the Executive Committee and the Board of Incorporate Members. The institutional effectiveness and strategic planning processes, however, integrate initiatives through committee interaction and the budgetary process. These initiatives are identified in the budgetary process and are given priority for funding.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee

The effectiveness process involves the active participation of each and every individual component of the seminary under the oversight of a system-wide
Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Committee. The IE Committee is appointed by the President and charged with the ongoing assessment of all aspects of the IE process including the implementation of plans for all departments and degree programs (referred to collectively as “IE units”), review of outcome statements, evaluation of assessment documentation, and utilization of results for improvement purposes. The Committee also oversees the implementation of institutional effectiveness training for seminary personnel.

The Institutional Effectiveness Plan

The mechanism used by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to document and monitor the institutional effectiveness process is the Institutional Effectiveness Plan, a form which adapts a “five-column model” developed by Dr. Jim Nichols, nationally recognized as a leading authority on effectiveness and assessment in higher education. The form divides the effectiveness process into five sections or stages: a statement of purpose above four columns of process benchmarks. These columns are completed at scheduled intervals within the annual institutional effectiveness cycle and provide a structure for documenting all activities that demonstrate institutional effectiveness.

An Overview of the Five-Part I.E. Process

Form Subheading: Expanded Statement of Purpose for Department or Program

At the top of the form is the statement of the mission of Dallas Theological Seminary. Below that mission is the subheading of the purpose of this department or degree program. This subheading relates each IE unit to the
mission of the seminary and to one or more of the purposes of the school. The school’s purposes are delineated in the Seminary’s Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose at the core of the Seminary’s Strategic Plan. The purposes for degree programs and instructional departments are listed in the Catalog at the head of the sections describing those programs and the course offerings of those departments. Every noninstructional department must complete its statement of purpose which supports the institution's mission and goals.

*Column One: Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes*

Each IE unit utilizes column one to articulate a list of outcome statements directly related to supporting its purpose. Each of these outcomes **must** be performance oriented and **must** establish an expectation that is *clear* and *measurable*. Outcomes generally focus on areas where improvement is necessary. A degree program should address two sets of outcomes: those reflecting institutional goals (delineated in the front of the Catalog) and those reflecting program-specific goals (delineated in the Catalog section that describes each program). Administrative or department outcomes should advance its departmental purpose, recognizing that in some instances those goals may address student outcomes only indirectly.

*Column Two: Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success*

Column two is used to establish the anticipated criteria for success and benchmark performance standards for achieving the outcomes identified in column one.
Column Three: Assessment Results

At the end of the annual cycle, the data used for assessing the IE unit's performance in meeting the specified outcome are documented in column three.

Column Four: Use of Results

The heart of the IE process is found in column four where each unit explains how the assessment results are used to improve and enhance performance.

Closing the Loop

With the completion of the fourth column, the previous cycle is finalized and a new cycle begins. Since the IE process is ongoing, the closing of one cycle of the effectiveness process leads directly to initiation of the subsequent cycle. Continuity from year to year is expected. Many of the outcome statements and means of assessment will remain the same until such time as they are adequately and consistently realized.
THE FIVE-PART MODEL - Column By Column

The Nichols' five-part model was first implemented at Dallas Theological Seminary in the winter of 2001-02. The model has proven to be a functional approach for promoting and documenting a culture of continuous quality improvement within the institution. This section of the IE Handbook provides a practical step-by-step guide through the five-part model. A sample IE unit will be developed for a Generic Student Services Component to provide insight in the completion of the Nichols' process.

Observe the following model carefully. The columns are labeled according to the order in which they are to be completed. The header and the first and second are completed at the beginning of the IE cycle. Columns three and four are completed at the conclusion of the cycle. The time-lapse between columns two and three allows for implementation of the desired outcomes before the assessment is conducted.

ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
Dallas Theological Seminary
Generic Student Services Component
2002 Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminary Mission (given)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Expanded Statement of Purpose for Department or Program</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:</td>
<td>Assessment Results:</td>
<td>Use of Results:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Seminary Mission Statement

The preamble to the plan is the Seminary mission that is printed in the Catalog. Sometimes, as was true in Spring 2002, a mission revision will have been proposed to the board for approval at the same time that the I.E. planning process is going on. At those times, both the current and the proposed mission statements are included and the department’s or program’s purpose needs to align with both of them.

Subheading: Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose

The material in the second box from the top establishes the linkage between the IE unit and the institution. For a degree program, this is the purpose of the degree as stated in the Catalog. For an academic department, this is the purpose of the department that is printed in the Catalog at the beginning of that department’s courses.

Section 3.2 of the 1998 Criteria for Accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools requires that each administrative and educational support service unit establish a clearly defined purpose that supports the institution's mission and goal statements. Accordingly, every non-instructional department must develop an expanded statement of purpose to confirm their support of the institutional mission.

In Spring 2002 the Seminary’s Board of Incorporate Members approved a formal Expanded Statement of Purpose that supplements and expands on the school’s Mission Statement. An element of that Expanded Statement of Purpose is the following:

The Seminary is committed to providing the appropriate support services, departments, resources, and facilities to accomplish the mission of the institution.
An administrative office or educational support service will want to consider making reference to this element of the Expanded Statement and indicate the department’s role in the school accomplishing its mission.

The *Generic Student Services Component* might provide the following rationale in support of the seminary mission statement:

*The Generic Student Services Component provides appropriate noninstructional support services to DTS students as they pursue their educational goals.*

### ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Dallas Theological Seminary  
Generic Student Services Component  
2002 Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminary Mission (given)</th>
<th>Expanded Statement of Purpose for Department or Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Generic Student Services Component provides appropriate noninstructional support services to DTS students as they pursue their educational goals</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:</td>
<td>Assessment Results:</td>
<td>Use of Results:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column One - Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes**

The first column, fulfilling with the second part of the Nichols' model, provides the opportunity to plan for improvement through the identification of desired outcome statements. Outcome statements must support the institutional goal identified in the purpose statements in the heading and subheading. Furthermore, it **must** be written in *clear* and *measurable* terms. Dr. Nichols warns against writing "process-oriented" rather than "results-oriented" outcome statements.
Process vs. Results

Process-oriented outcomes focus upon the internal processes of how the institution operates while results-oriented outcomes describe what the internal or external constituents of the IE unit will know, think, or do. The institution's mission is service oriented. All thirteen institutional goals are educational outcomes that address means by which the mission is accomplished. It becomes imperative that every outcome statement spotlight means by which service to the institution's internal and external constituents may be enhanced. *It does not matter how good we think we are at meeting the institution's mission! What really matters is how our constituents perceive us!* *Do they think that we are meeting the institution's mission? How can we improve our unit's performance?*

The difference between these two types of outcome statements can be seen in the following examples. The first two are process-oriented, and the second two are results-oriented.

1. *Generic Student Services* will conduct a survey of student satisfaction.
2. *Generic Student Services* will hire another support staff member.
3. *Generic Student Services* will provide the student population with accurate information regarding any specific program.
4. *Generic Student Services* will enhance the retention of the resident student population.

**Outcome Statement One:** Surveys are often conducted as an assessment measure to determine client perception; however, merely administering a student survey does not constitute a results-oriented outcome statement. Outcome statement one does not address what the constituent will
know, think, or do. It might be corrected accordingly, "Generic Student Services will provide assistance in acquainting students with opportunities for on-campus fellowship and socialization." A student survey could be utilized to measure student perception of Generic Student Services' performance. The unit might then evaluate the results and identify means of improvement.

**Outcome Statement Two:** The acquisition of additional staff does not speak directly to the quality of service provided by an individual IE unit. Again, this outcome does not address what the constituent will know, think, or do. This outcome statement might be corrected to read, "Generic Student Services will provide prompt response to student inquiries regarding seminary life." Assessment of the unit's performance might require the addition of staff as a means of improving service, and it might not. Additional staff does not necessarily guarantee enhanced performance.

**Outcome Statement Three:** This outcome statement is results-oriented because it references what the constituent will know. Students will receive accurate information regarding any given program. This outcome statement speaks to the performance of Generic Student Services in providing information to members of the DTS student body.

**Outcome Statement Four:** This outcome statement is also results-oriented because it refers to what the constituent will do. Resident students will be retained in the institution.

**Other Pitfalls to Writing Outcome Statements**

Dr. Nichols says there is no "correct" means or method for writing results-oriented outcome statements; however, it is of paramount importance
that the outcomes are *clear* and *easily understood*. They **must** be measurable in some meaningful way so that assessment results can be documented, verified, and used as a basis for improvement. IE units should avoid compound outcome statements. A multiple outcome statement, such as "*Generic Student Services* will provide accurate and current information regarding any given program in a friendly, prompt, and professional manner," can seriously complicate the assessment process. It is best to break multiple outcome statements into a number of single statements, each of which can be easily assessed.

**How Many Outcome Statements Are Enough?**

Dr. Nichols recommends that each IE unit annually identify between three to five outcome statements. Why such a small number? He sums it up this way:

> If there ever existed a subject in which the "KISS" *(Keep It Simple Stupid)* principle applied, outcomes assessment in higher education is that subject. Limiting the number of outcome statements is the first step in adhering to that principle. Far better to limit the number of such statements, conduct successful programs of assessment to determine if you are accomplishing these intentions, and use the assessment results to improve student learning, than to curse a large pile of paper which has been difficult to produce, expensive, and is virtually useless.

In fact, three to five meaningful outcome statements may prove to be all that most IE units can reasonably and effectively administer.

**Questions to Ask When Writing Outcomes**

A few simple questions can assist in writing results-oriented outcomes to successfully foster improvement. An affirmative answer to the following
four questions will serve to facilitate the writing of quality outcome statements. (1) Does this outcome support one of the institutional goals or expanded statements of purpose? (2) Does the outcome address what the unit's internal or external customer will know, think, or do? (3) Is the outcome statement concise? (4) Is the outcome statement measurable?

**Selecting Outcome Statements**

The development of a *long list* and a subsequent *short list* will serve to assist in the selection of appropriate outcome statements. Every IE unit can construct a *long list* of potential outcome statements through the identification of the major activities of the unit. *Generic Student Services* might construct a *long list* as follows. The major activities of *Generic Student Services* might include:

1. Fostering a spirit of community on campus,
2. Arranging for reasonable accommodation of students’ disabilities,
3. Guiding students through the Entering Student Interview process,
4. Providing orientation sessions for students and their spouses,
5. Conducting activities to enhance student retention,
6. Assisting students in the acquisition of required community services,
7. Improving chapel attendance,
8. Providing events and services that are relevant and helpful to students, and
9. Assisting students in the acquisition of seminary services.

The *long list* might include any of a myriad of activities. It should include enough activities to provide a reasonable base from which to draw
the *short list*. To produce the *short list*, an IE unit should focus on from three to five areas. *Generic Student Services* might complete column one as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:</th>
<th>2. Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:</th>
<th>3. Assessment Results:</th>
<th>4. Use of Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Generic Student Services</em> will provide events and services that are relevant and helpful to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Generic Student Services</em> will conduct activities to enhance student retention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Generic Student Services</em> will assist students in the acquisition of required community services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three identified outcome statements are results-oriented and plainly tie to the institutional mission and purpose. Each outcome is clearly stated and can be easily assessed. Once outcome statements are adopted the IE unit must proceed to develop a clear means of assessing its performance.
Column Two - Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success

Assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice begins with and enacts a vision of the kinds of advancement that are most valued. *Assessment must be a process of improving what we really care about.* Consequently, column two is intended to provide a bridge between performance-based outcome statements and the implementation of improvements in programs or services.

The perfect means of assessment will never exist. However, an effective assessment process must utilize several means or methods of assessment and strive to provide a fair and unbiased appraisal of the IE unit's performance.

**Local Vs. Institutional Means of Assessment**

Assessment often constitutes the most demanding portion of the IE process. IE units should avoid burdening themselves with complicated and arduous evaluation methodologies. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IR) regularly conducts assessment activities on a system-wide basis. The utilization of system-wide IR assessment data not only provides consistent and unbiased analysis but allows the IE unit to focus energy on using the results to improve performance. Some of the assessment efforts are listed below. Information on each may be obtained from the IR office.

1. Entering Student Information Survey
2. Test of Biblical and Theological Knowledge (TBTK)
3. Organizational Effectiveness Survey
4. Graduating Student Survey
5. Seminary Orientation Survey
6. Educational Support Survey
7. Extension Student Survey
8. Five-Year Anniversary Alumni Survey
9. Ten-Year Anniversary Alumni Survey
10. Prospective Student Survey  
11. Nonenrolling Student Survey  
12. Adult Student Priorities Survey  
13. Institutional Priorities Survey  
14. Placement Report  
15. Grade Distribution Report  
16. Semester Enrollment Report  
17. Annual Graduation & Placement Rates  
18. Course Evaluation Report  
19. Spiritual Formation Course Evaluation Report

**Establishing an Acceptable Standard for Assessment**

*It does not matter how good we think we are at meeting the institution's mission! What really matters is how our customers perceive us! Do they think that we are meeting the institution's mission? How can we improve?*

An IE unit must avoid internal assessment methodologies that involve the unit's perception of its own performance. This type of evaluation will prove virtually worthless in the pursuit of continuous quality improvement. Rather, the selected methods of assessment should solicit input from the unit's internal and external constituents. The following assessment statements address the first intended educational outcome listed in our sample IE unit, *"Generic Student Services will provide events and services that are relevant and helpful to students."* The first assessment statement does not meet an acceptable assessment standard. The second and third are in compliance.

1. Staff members in *Generic Student Services* will rate the campus staff as being caring and helpful at 6.3 or higher on a 7 point Likert scale as indicated on question 4 of the 2003 Survey of Organizational Effectiveness.
2. Students will rate the helpfulness and relevance of events and services provided by Generic Student Services at 5.5 or higher on a 7 point Likert scale as indicated on question 67 of the 2002 Adult Student Priorities Survey.

3. Faculty, Front Line Staff, and Management Staff will rate the various student services as being appropriate to the school’s mission at 4.0 or higher on a 5 point Likert scale as indicated on question 4 of the 2003 Survey of Organizational Effectiveness.

**Assessment Statement One:** No IE unit should base improvement efforts on self-evaluation. The staff members of Generic Student Services may firmly believe that they are doing a wonderful job of providing accurate information to students when the exact opposite may be true.

**Assessment Statement Two:** Students are major constituents of Generic Student Services. Their assessment of the unit's performance is most appropriate.

**Assessment Statement Three:** Seminary faculty and staff members are major constituents of Generic Student Services. The assessment of the unit's performance provided by this group will invariably supply significant insight into meaningful improvement.

**How Many Assessment Statements Are Enough?**

Generally, each outcome statement will require a minimum of two assessment statements to provide sufficient diversity to adequately analyze the unit's performance. On occasion, one assessment statement may be clearly indicative of the IE unit's performance in meeting an objective. In all cases, special care must be given to adequately document the use of assessment results to improve the unit's performance.
**Writing Assessment Statements**

Assessment statements require careful declaration of the criteria for success. They should identify the method of assessment and focus on the expected results. Attention to detail in writing assessment statements can significantly lighten the work involved in completing column four of the model, and allow the individual IE unit to focus its efforts on improvement. A model for *Generic Student Services* is provided below. For the sake of brevity only outcome one is addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanded Statement of Purpose for Department or Program</th>
<th>Seminary Mission (given)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Generic Student Services Component provides appropriate noninstructional support services to DTS students as they pursue their educational goals</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment Results:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use of Results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Generic Student Services</em> will provide events and services that are relevant and helpful to students.</td>
<td>1A. Students will rate the helpfulness and relevance of events and services provided by <em>Generic Student Services</em> at 5.5 or higher on a 7 point Likert scale as indicated on question 67 of the 2002 Adult Student Priorities Survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Generic Student Services</em> will conduct activities to enhance student retention.</td>
<td>1B. Faculty, Front Line Staff, and Management Staff will rate the various student services as being appropriate to the school’s mission at 4.0 or higher on a 5 point Likert scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community services.</td>
<td>as indicated on question 4 of the 2003 Survey of Organizational Effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Column Three: Assessment Results

At the end of the annual cycle, assessment results are documented in column three. Adequate time for meaningful assessment should be allowed between the completion of the first two columns and the reporting of results that occurs in this column. Assessment findings should be clearly stated without defensiveness or rationalization.

What Happens If Assessment Results Fail to Meet the Benchmark?

Superior assessment is founded upon the establishment of meaningful and motivating benchmarks. Failure to meet a benchmark is acceptable since such assessment usually implies that some of the selected standards are not going to be achieved. An IE unit might consider raising its expectations for performance if it is consistently and regularly meeting all benchmarks for a given outcome statement. In some cases, the IE unit might deem the benchmark as inappropriate and select a more suitable assessment statement.

The real problem occurs when an IE unit does not meet a benchmark and then fails to utilize the assessment results as a basis to improve performance. This breakdown is obviously unacceptable and contradicts the very purpose of institutional effectiveness. The focus is not on the persistent achievement of all indicated benchmarks. The focus remains upon the continuous quality improvement of every aspect of the seminary. Failure is acceptable if it leads to documented and verifiable progress in achieving the institution's mission.

Stating Assessment Results

One might quote the old Dragnet television series, "Just the facts, Ma'am!" When stating assessment results, give the facts without attempting to defend, rationalize, or justify the IE unit's performance. To complete
column three, *Generic Student Services* would examine the *Spring 2002 Survey of Student Opinions* and the *Spring 2002 Academic Advising Survey*. The findings should be stated as clearly and concisely as possible. Either the unit met the indicated benchmarks, or it did not. This column requires no further explanation. *Generic Student Services* might list evaluation results as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Seminary Mission (given)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Expanded Statement of Purpose for Department or Program</strong></th>
<th><strong>1 Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:</strong></th>
<th><strong>2 Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:</strong></th>
<th><strong>3 Assessment Results:</strong></th>
<th><strong>4 Use of Results:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The <em>Generic Student Services Component</em> provides appropriate noninstructional support services to DTS students as they pursue their educational goals</td>
<td>1. <em>Generic Student Services</em> will provide events and services that are relevant and helpful to students.</td>
<td>1A. Students will rate the helpfulness and relevance of events and services provided by <em>Generic Student Services</em> at 5.5 or higher on a 7 point Likert scale as indicated on question 67 of the 2002 Adult Student Priorities Survey.</td>
<td>1A. Students rated the helpfulness and relevance of events and services provided by <em>Generic Student Services</em> at 5.1 on question 67 of the 2002 ASP. The criterion was not met.</td>
<td><strong>1B.</strong> Faculty, Front Line Staff, and Management Staff will rate the various student services as being appropriate to the school’s mission at 4.0 or higher on a 5 point Likert scale on question 4 of the 2003 Organizational Effectiveness Survey. <strong>1B.</strong> On question 4 of the 2003 OES assessing the various student services as being appropriate to the school’s mission, Faculty rated them 4.3, Front Line Staff 4.7, and Management Staff 4.15. The criteria were met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessment results indicate that *Generic Student Services* did not meet one of the benchmark criteria. At this point, staff assigned to *Generic Student Services* should consider possible reasons that its constituents evaluated the unit's performance at this level. One question should govern the dialogue, "**What can we do to improve service provided to our constituents?**"

**Column Four: Use of Results**

The end product of the assessment process is the improvement of instructional and support programs within the institution. Therefore, IE units must demonstrate and document that assessment results have been used for improvement purposes. This use of assessment results to improve the quality of an IE unit is known as "**Closing the loop.**"

**Completing Column Four**

*Listen to the assessment results!* The assessment results often provide important insight into methods by which the IE unit can improve.

*Focus on meaningful improvement!* The IE process provides a wonderful opportunity to enhance performance. Take advantage of this by focusing on those changes that will truly improve the unit's service to its constituents.

*Provide the facts!* Narrative contained within column four should truthfully and honestly describe the IE unit's efforts to improve performance and avoid inflated or exaggerated descriptions.

*Remember, "Good intentions do not count!"* The improvements listed in column four must be genuine for which verifiable documentary evidence exists. A general rule is to write it up using verbs in the past tense. If an IE unit chooses to state an intended improvement, the improvement
must be tracked in the subsequent cycle to demonstrate implementation. Intended improvements can be stated beginning with the words, “It was decided to . . .” or something similar. It thus reflects an improvement that has already been made in the plans of the school.

Writing Up The Results

After careful deliberation, the staff members of Generic Student Services convened a student and faculty taskforce and determined that changes needed to be made to improve the accuracy of the information provided to students regarding any specific program. The four-column model was completed as follows.
## ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
### Dallas Theological Seminary
### Generic Student Services Component
### 2003 Cycle

| 1 | Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:  
1. **Generic Student Services** will provide events and services that are relevant and helpful to students.  
2. **Generic Student Services** will conduct activities to enhance student retention.  
3. **Generic Student Services** will assist students in the acquisition of required community services. |
|---|---|
| 2 | Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success:  
**1A.** Students will rate the helpfulness and relevance of events and services provided by **Generic Student Services** at 5.5 or higher on a 7 point Likert scale as indicated on question 67 of the 2002 Adult Student Priorities Survey.  
**1B.** Faculty, Front Line Staff, and Management Staff will rate the various student services as being appropriate to the school’s mission at 4.0 or higher on a 5 point Likert scale as indicated on question 4 of the 2003 Survey of Organizational Effectiveness. |
| 3 | Assessment Results:  
**1A.** Students rated the helpfulness and relevance of events and services provided by **Generic Student Services** at 5.1 on question 67 of the 2002 ASP. The criterion was not met.  
**1B.** On question 4 of the 2003 OES assessing the various student services as being appropriate to the school’s mission, Faculty rated them 4.3, Front Line Staff 4.7, and Management Staff 4.15. The criteria were met |
| 4 | Use of Results:  
**1A-B.** A review of the information packet provided through **Generic Student Services** was conducted by a selected task force composed of students and faculty. Based on their findings the following changes were implemented:  
1. The list of faculty sponsors for any specified program was updated.  
2. Information relative to campus programs was modified to include a more detailed description of each program's purpose.  
3. The contact information for local churches was updated.  
4. A standing advisory committee was formed and charged with the annual review of student social events. |
The completion of column four ends the current cycle. Since the IE process is ongoing from year to year, the closing of one cycle of the effectiveness process leads directly to initiation of the next year's cycle. New outcome statements can now be added, and the prior year's outcome statements retained, modified, or discarded, and as the IE unit deems appropriate.
For each assessment cycle, the implementation of the institutional effectiveness process is staggered over a period of twenty-four months. The preceding diagram clearly indicates the cyclical nature of this process. A month-by-month breakdown of the biennial cycle, with a description of the
activities that should take place within each segment of the cycle, is provided below.

**May, Previous Academic Year through August, Academic Year 1**
- The IE unit considers the assessment results for the previous cycle and decisions to make required changes. (*Columns Three and Four of previous cycle’s IE chart*)

**August through September, Academic Year 1**
- The IE unit adopts outcome statements for the new cycle with appropriate assessment results. (*Subheading and Columns One and Two*)

**September through November, Academic Year 1**
- The IE unit presents the proposed new cycle to the IE Committee for approval.

**November, Academic Year 1 through December, Academic Year 2**
- The IE unit implements the approved outcome statements.
- Assessment is conducted as appropriate.

**February through April, Academic Year 2**
- The IE unit reviews the assessment results and implements required changes. (*Columns Three and Four*)
- The IE unit presents the completed model and the proposed new cycle to the IE Committee for approval.

**Obtaining the Required Forms**

The four-column model form is being made available on the Seminary website. In the interim and for additional assistance, please contact the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at x3701.