Assessing Teachers' of Religion in U.S. Post Secondary Education

Nathan R. Kollar

Diversity and pluralism are characteristic marks of American life. They also characterize both what and how religion is taught in our colleges and universities. Many American's religious viewpoint, however, prevents them from seeing this diversity of content and pedagogy. It is necessary, therefore, to describe the different ways religion is taught on our campuses as well as how it is assessed before actually describing how those who teach it are accessed. This paper will do that in three major sections and several appendices: 1) A general commentary on how religion is taught and attempts to assess it both before and after the contemporary assessment movement; 2) A particular description, based on the RARSTAP survey[1] of how it is taught and its teachers are assessed in Religion, Religious Studies, and Theology departments and programs throughout the United States; 3) Reflections on issues arising from the survey with the intent of describing future refinements in both teaching religion and assessing this teaching. Appendixes will deal with the assessment methods in teaching religion and their relationship to the survey as well as some of the results of the survey of Religious Studies departments and Theology departments.

Teaching Religion Today: Definitions, Distinctions, and Departments.

After thirty-five years of teaching introductory courses in religion, theology, and religious studies I know that both students and teachers are individuals composed of various biases associated with "religion." A paper such as this cannot refine the bias of the reader but it can attempt to offer the views of others regarding religion and in particular the views of those academic disciplines that deal with it and how those views affect the content, methodology, and assessment of one's teaching.

Teaching "it."

"Religion," as with many contemporary words and phrases has a long history - a history that many times is reflected in contemporary usage. Central to contemporary usage is that "religion" is an abstract category capable of universal application, somehow suggesting a possible reality separate from others.[2] This all began to occur shortly after 1400 when the word "religion," which had for centuries usually meant "a religious rule or order and those who followed or belonged to it," was revived from classical Latin to

---

[1] The Rochester Area Religious Studies and Theology Assessment Project (RARSTAP) surveyed departmental and program chairs of those belonging to The American Academy of Religion (AAR), The College Theology Society (CTS), and the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). It was composed of two parts: one, a survey of the ATS member schools which was a general, blunt instrument to gather information and help design the larger one of the AAR and CTS and, two, the survey to 998 chairs of the AAR to discover their methods of assessment and pedagogy. All of these and their results are found as appendices. Part two is dependent on the AAR survey. Part three is dependent on all of these.

[2] N. Kollar, "Religious, Identity, and Three Ways of Life" *Explorations* 4(1999) 2-15.

mean "a worshipful attitude to God or a respect for holy things." By 1700 "religion" had become a social and moral entity characterized by systems of belief and sets of moral principles. This understanding of religion, as able to be distinguished from politics, law, ethics etc., is part of our contemporary understanding. We can, therefore, claim that we teach "it."

This "it," that is being taught, however, may further be distinguished as it enters into the context of teacher and taught in higher education. The following ways of teaching religion are arranged from the most subjective to the most objective.

"Born again" admittedly is a borrowing from Evangelical Christianity but it does describe those on our campuses who are constantly talking to others, attempting to share with them the deep experience they have undergone and wish to stimulate in others. They are teaching us this personal experience that changed their lives, by both their engagement with us and with others. They teach that one can only understand if one experiences deeply. To understand "religion" is to understand my religion and that is to understand my deep "born again" experience. To some religious illiterates their witnessing also provides a definition of religion as "religion" always meaning a person's personal experience or a person's spirituality. Few professionals in teaching religion would accept such a definition. Nevertheless, it does describe a very loud, adversarial group of individuals whose objective is to change a person's life and experience such that they join those individuals' religion.

"Our religion" is taught when individuals instruct fellow believers about the content and skills necessary to live their religious way of life. The objective of such teaching is that people become more adept first in the rudiments of their religious way of life and, ultimately, in the minutiae necessary to live that life as a full member. Many times this is understood as teaching "the tradition" even in those religions that reject any concept of tradition. The teachers, here, are literally handing down what they were taught about their way of life. It would be disingenuous, in the context of post secondary education, not to mention a prevalent anti-religious stance that teaches from this same perspective. This is when someone teaches anti-religion in the exact way as *our religion* is taught. This happens when one accepts the anti-religious stance of one's late 19th century or early 20th century disciplinary progenitors as part of one's disciplinary persona and tradition. Consequently, when teaching one's discipline, part of that teaching is a mouthing of these great, great grandparents' ideas and words. Freud, Marx, Frazier, and Huxley's words and ideas about religion become incarnate in the 21st century through the teacher. The objective of this famous teacher was to avoid the contamination of their contemporary religions upon people. The objective of the present day teacher is many times the same, with the presupposition that neither the religions nor the professions have changed over time.

Our religion, studied (*theology)* presupposes that one can, or even must, study one's religious way of life. "Faith seeking understanding," is a famous phrase of St. Anselm describing the theologian's task of examining in a systematic way one's way of life. Most religions admit the necessity of such examination; all have various methodologies for

carrying out such an examination. In many Evangelical groups, for example, one can use only the Bible to examine the Bible. In all mainline Christian groups all the various disciplines found in the college and university are used to examine one's total way of life, Bible included. Because the historical roots of all our mainline Christian religions are found in Roman Catholicism, a brief aside will help set the stage for some subsequent comments. Catholic theology has always affirmed the necessity and use of reason. The most prominent tool of reason was philosophy. Thus when Anselm said that theology is faith seeking understanding he looked to philosophy to achieve this understanding. The constitutive context, therefore, for studying the Catholic Christian religion, were the tools of philosophy. In the last hundred years or so our contemporary disciplines have developed as tools for understanding our world, or, in this case, our religious world. The general term "theology," therefore, is used to refer to studying one's religion using the social sciences as well as philosophy. More specific designations such as "Philosophical" Theology, Systematic Theology, Historical Theology, and Pastoral Theology indicate in more detail the type of theology that is being done. The objective is still that of Anselm "faith seeking understanding" but it is achieved by using the full array of contemporary methods used to seek truth, including philosophy.

Studying religions occurs when the above religious traditions are objectified. One does not have to belong to any religion to study about religion. This perspective presupposes, as does much of contemporary physical science, that there is an object out there that can be known, and therefore studied. The "object" in this case is a religious way of life as a whole. Religious Studies, or some sub-disciplinary interest such as the sociology of religion, is the means through which it is taught. The "it" that is taught is determined by the methodological and content concerns of the respective discipline. The methodological objective is shared with one's discipline (e.g. social sciences, literature, and philosophy). The content objective is unique to one's own investigation but usually has ramifications upon theology.

The concept of the "invisible curriculum" reminds us that education is composed of more than what we do but also in what we do not do or derogate in what we do. *Anti-religious behavior* also teaches. The "it" behind these various kinds of behavior reflect the above, positive, categories. Some teach against a religion that they experience(d) as destructive of their life. Some teach that religions other than their tradition are not religions at all. Some teach that theological methodologies, for example those of the social sciences, are not proper ways of seeking to understand their way of life. Still others, while teaching "objectively" eliminate the subjective from religion such that, for example, those in our first category are understood as an aberration of religion rather than one expression of it. These negative as well as the positive ways of teaching religion are present on our campuses.

Teaching religion and teaching about religion.

Each campus milieu emphasizes various ways of teaching religion. This causes a variety of methods for and a pluralism of views upon studying religion. Many times that campus milieu is shaped by the dominant disciplines on campus and by a way of

understanding religion as found in the 1963 Supreme Court Case Abington v Schempp. In that case the Supreme Court made the distinction between "teaching religion" and "teaching about religion." The understanding here was that public institutions could not teach religion but they could teach about religion. This would be equivalent to our above categories, theology (teaching religion) and studying religion (teaching about religion). These two modes of studying religion in tax supported institutions are generally reflected in the division on our campuses between chaplaincy and academic departments or programs. Some institutions allow chaplaincy services to occur on campus, or seemingly on campus; others, demand that they are seen as distinct from the institution itself. Notice that "teaching about religion" is to occur when public funds are received, not only when it is a public intuition. Many private schools also adhere to "teaching about religion." In those instances they would have a Religious Studies Department or Program while hesitating to label their religious requirements and advocacy apart from those departments and programs as "teaching." In this instance we have various ways of describing both teaching and religion. One also finds, in the private school situation, that the mission statement will reflect the institutional relationship to a present or former religion. Usually "in the tradition of….." means that they are certainly moving away from "born again" but generally favor discussion and involvement in one religion in particular, in whatever tradition it is "of," and all religions in general. Usually if there is an explicit statement, for example, that this is a "Baptist" institution, that means that Church authorities have a direct say in whatever and however religion is taught and understood in his institution. In what follows, some of what we have already said will be repeated but under a different rubric. We will see where "it" is generally taught and suggest general methods of assessment associated with that teaching.

Where and Who Teaches Religion in Our Schools.

If we grant that teaching occurs in more places than the classroom, then religious teaching will occur in many places outside the classroom. Let us also grant that "it" is taught by individuals in one on one in many different places and times. Doing this we can focus on public individuals in public places. These are four.

1. *Major gatherings where public advocates for particular religions voice the teachings of their religion:* Many times this is in an argumentative style and the content is specific to the purpose of the gathering. For example a member of a "peace" church will state strongly in a gathering advocating war what and why his particular religion holds what it does.

2. *Public gatherings of one or more official representatives of various religions for the purpose of discussing a particular topic from the perspective of these representative religions*: This is happening more and more these days, especially with representatives of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Most of these gatherings seem more at ease with clergy representatives of these religions. Thus, in the case of the above mentioned three: Rabbi, Minister/Priest, and Imam. The lecture method dominates these gatherings with some entry into dialogue and a hint of argument. The one exception to this methodology is the presence of Evangelical

Christians who will usually move to personal witness and/or a strong argumentative style to demonstrate their teachings.

3. *Gatherings in religious institutions in classrooms or other places for the designated purpose of conveying the teachings of a particular religion:* Leaders of these meetings are generally formally or informally trained in contemporary pedagogies that respect the age level of those gathered. Ordinarily these leaders gather among themselves and/or with others who perform the same function as they do in other religions to review the appropriateness of the pedagogies being used. The *Religious Education Association* is an example of an organization that recognizes all religions and, at the same time, seeks to improve and professionalize what these leaders do. At the post secondary theological educational level we find the same difficulties present among all disciplines in contemporary attempts to awaken the teachers to student centered curricula and methods. This recent emphasis can be particularly difficult among those religions that place emphasis on the spoken and/or written word and repeat the lecture and/or narrative methods of their founders.

4. *Gatherings in classrooms of private or public post secondary educational institutions led by professionals in Religious Studies*: These generally have a Ph.D., are aware of contemporary pedagogies, and undergo the rigors of departmental and tenure review. As we will see, they reflect the general tenor of post secondary teachers in general. We should also include here those who teach about religion in the other disciplines in the institution. They reflect the culture of their particular discipline and institution. Thus their expectation of assessment will coincide with their discipline.

Assessing Religion Today: The Contemporary Assessment Movement and Past and Present Religion Teaching.

Evaluation, assessment existed before the contemporary assessment movement. Professionals and the public wanted to know if professionals, including teachers, were doing what they claimed. There were always concerns by teachers whether they were successful or not. Life failures did not have to be the only test of the content and skills that were taught. We must be able to examine people's knowledge and skills before they entered into actual activities to cut down on the amount of possible failures. Thus arose the various tests, certification, and license processes.

The success or failure of religious teaching could, of course, be said to be only found in the afterlife. On one hand that may be true; on the other hand, every religion has everyday demands of belief, morals, ritual, and community associations that are visible evidence of how one was/is taught. Since teaching religion has been in existence since the first humans came into existence, it might be helpful to briefly review how teaching religion was assessed over time. In the past teaching about religion was sporadic and shared in the assessment methods of that time.

Even after the beginning of the age of specialization, and certainly within Western religions, the family was the primary teacher. Many would say that it is only in the sixteenth century that the family gradually begins to be evaluated for its religious teaching by someone beside the parents. Aside from the family, religious teaching did occur in catechetical and theological centers. Both these centers shared in the mode of assessment of other developing professions. We will briefly review these modes of assessment because some of them are still very much a part of teaching religion and teaching about religion.

Life Before The Assessment Movement

Teachers began with the first humans. The question of who is a good teacher began at the same time. What varies throughout history is how we judge, or assess, who is a good teacher. I would suggest six general ways of claiming that one is a good teacher. The claim, of course, is always within its respective culture.

Teaching has always been with us but those early Greek teachers such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle became teachers as people recognized in both the manner and results of their questions and answers something worthy of imitation. This was an *entrepreneurial type of assessment* in which the teacher was recognized as "good" by the quantity and quality of the students who gathered around him.

Over the centuries, an individual became a teacher because the nobleman, noblewoman, bishop or abbess recognized him as such. One continued a teacher because the *boss's assessment* affirmed one as doing what he or she wanted one to do. Consequently, wages, research, and recognition depended upon one's boss.

As teachers become more common, and gained a more important role in society, they began to determine among themselves who was a good teacher. This *peer type of assessment* usually occurred in a culture with individual guilds for other activities and products. What is important here is, that although the master teacher might still act as a boss, there were some constraints on extreme acts of assessment by the teacher's peers.

When the guilds developed into professions, it was not only what the peers said that resulted in assessment but also whether *the proper processes of assessment* were followed. Did the person follow the proper stages or processes to be assessed a good teacher? Receive the proper grades? Have the correct academic degree? Spend the entire class period doing approved actions and communicating approved information? Profession and process were intertwined because this machine culture presupposed that if certain things were done in a proper way proper results would occur. Teachers were instructed in the proper skills and the proper information associated with their profession. The presupposition was that once these skills and information were perfected one was a good teacher. Once the door on the classroom closed, no one was to open it except the teacher. The closed door reflected the arrangement of departments. Each was isolated from the other by content and method; automatically rejecting the critique of those departments outside the discipline within which one was trained (professionalized).

Closed doors did not produce a proper academic *collegium* for dealing with constant change and the crossing over of departmental boundaries. The doors had to be opened to urge teachers to deal with the swiftly developing world outside the classroom and their discipline. The students needed to become part of a true academic *collegium* so that they could go into any classroom in the world and understand what was being taught there. If students were not provided with the necessary skills and knowledge to cross academic boundaries in the college or university, there were many who offered to do it by using television and the Internet.

How does the academic culture respond to the global culture? How does the teacher become part of this global culture and demonstrate or be recognized as a good teacher in this culture? Attempts to answer these questions bring us to our present situation.

Three responses and one movement resulted from this new situation. One response was to increase *peer assessment* as the principle indicator of one being a good teacher. One knew one was a good teacher if one's peers, usually making decisions through the Rank and Tenure Committee, said one was a good teacher. One's peers in the department combined with one's peers in the academic institution, accepted or rejected one as an instructor, assistant, associate, or full professor. Teaching, sometimes in a major way, sometimes in a minor way, was recognized as necessary to be a "professor." Exactly what this "teaching" was awaited and awaits determination. But it would take the teaching and assessment movements to bring these definitions and difficulties into focus.

Another response was *scientific assessment.* Words such as "formal standardized instruments of assessment," "teacher evaluation," and "established criteria" for being a good teacher, began to surface in public discussion and documents. What was presupposed was that teaching, like everything else, could be measured, numbered, and normed. Another variation of this was to establish assessment instruments that could measure organizational goals. In a combination of "peer" and "scientific" assessment the teacher was basically asked to say what she or he was doing and then prove, through scientific measurement, that it was done.

One final response was *political assessment*. One was a good teacher when all the stakeholders, or publics, were satisfied that one was a good teacher. Many times peer and scientific assessment came into play here but, when all was said and done, teaching and teacher were accepted as good when everyone was satisfied they were good. Many times "good" was indicated by a certain set of numbers produced by standardized assessment instruments.

As we come to the end of this short history, we find that those in the professorate are not trusted to do what they say they are doing. They share this distrust with many others in authority. Stakeholders in the education process, especially religious, political, and business leaders, feel that teachers are not doing what they are paid to do. The outcomes of assessment are now made public to everyone through newspapers, magazines, and government agencies. Significant cultural change is forcing educational institutions to

demonstrate their worth to all the stakeholders. The response to this demand for a clear and demonstrable proof of one's worth as teacher is what might be described as the Contemporary Assessment Movement.

The Contemporary Assessment Movement

Over the last thirty years, radical changes have occurred in the assessment process for students, teachers, and stakeholders. Those responsible for these changes belong to what might be described as the *Contemporary Assessment Movement* (CAM). CAM focuses, for the most part, upon measurable outcomes in the teaching-learning process and event. The objective and outcome models of evaluation, upon which much of the literature is based, assume that the quality of teaching can be implied from student behavior and learning. These are not the only models of assessment but they do dominate CAM. (Aschroft & Palacido, p. 100-3).

CAM has evolved over the years in both its focus and understanding of teaching assessment. (Crib Note: Assessment (March, 1999). In the 1980s its focus was on the academic institution itself. Institutions were urged to perform self-assessment and be held accountable for everything they claimed. Anyone who has participated in institutional or departmental certification programs recognizes and has gone through the process of describing one's mission, goals, and objectives and how to measure whether they have been fulfilled.

In the early 1990s, the movement focused on specific assessment techniques and approaches. Advocates of these techniques were usually on the fringes of the institution or department since, as noted above, peer, scientific, and political assessment were part of the choices for responding to contemporary challenges. Lately, however, what was in the wings is now at center stage. The principle thrust of CAM today is an attempt to bring the needs of the 80s and the specifics of the 90s into the mainstream of academic life and therefore, in this instance, into the life of professors of theology, religious studies, or religion.

Today, we find teaching assessment usually focused on what happens in the classroom and results from a systematic gathering of information intended to improve learning and teaching based upon stated mission, goals, and outcomes. Many of the professional agencies and committees dealing with teacher assessment have this understanding of assessment. This would include groups such as AAHE's Assessment Forum and its "Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning," IDEA Papers (IDEA Center email: IDEA@ ksu.edu), ERIC,'s Clearinghouse on Higher Education's CRIB sheets on Assessment Performance Indicators, Improving Teaching and Learning (www.eriche.org/Library/crib) and the American Academy of Religion's Committee on Teaching and Learning. (www.aar.org).

The Language of Assessment

Within the context of the contemporary assessment movement the following are terms involved with or similar to "assessment": Evaluation, discernment, effectiveness, efficiency, inputs, process, outputs, excellence, quality, and accountability. These terms are merely the tip of the iceberg of this linguistic community. To become acquainted with the language of this movement we need to review some things that you may already know and refine others in the light of the survey we will review and the issues we will highlight. Let us first ask why we are asking the questions about teaching and then use some of the distinctions from CAM to respond to our questions in the light of these distinctions. Afterwards we will see, from the survey, whether and how religion teachers share in the contemporary assessment movement.

Why are you assessing your teaching?

We have already seen the historical reasons for and means of assessment. I would like to focus, here, on why you as an individual would seek assessment. Knowledge of why the individual teacher (you) seeks assessment, determines the assessment methods.

If you are trying to discover how to improve your classroom teaching, you are doing *formative assessment*. Formative assessment is diagnostic. Its sole purpose is to improve what you are doing in the classroom. *Summative assessment* is done to rank the outcomes of your teaching-learning process with others for reward or punishment. From summative assessments come your salary, your promotion, and other "rewards" for your service in academia.

Some authors suggest that it is best to keep these two types of assessment separate from each other. If that is possible, we should do that. Both types of assessment answer the same question: "Are you a good teacher?" The purpose of the answer in both instances is to improve teaching. The principle reason for the competition (summative assessment) among teachers is to make them better teachers not to give them more money or prestige. It may be true, however, that the instruments we use to answer the question of whether we are a good teacher, may not always "fit" our intentions. For example, quantitative answers help to make summative assessment more easily than qualitative answers. Qualitative answers are better responses to formative assessment questions. Our survey reveals a general use of summative rather than qualitative assessment instruments.

Quantitative assessment focuses on the collection of large numbers of numerical data. Its models are based on the scientific tradition of experimental and quasi-experimental research methods. It seeks clear and distinct results from research. It analyzes and generalizes these results for use. It is a good research tool when the results are valid and reliable. Its weakness is the triviality of findings and the lack of application to the actual classroom. Many times the questions asked are not examined for the particular bias of the researcher. Their "generalizability" and numerical nature make them easy to use for comparing teachers "objectively" among themselves and for presentations about the state of teaching to the various stakeholders.

Qualitative assessment focuses on describing the event(s) within its / their natural settings. It seeks to understand the underlying presuppositions of what is happening to enable one to work better with this group over a prolonged period. Problem centered and pragmatic, it many times is based on ethnographic methods found within anthropology. Its weakness is its limited scope, particularity and subjectivity. Because it many times is non numerical in nature, it seems more subjective than a quantitative report. Its narrative form usually takes more time to read than the charts and formulas of quantitative reports, thus it does not receive the same attention by the many stakeholders who are pressed for time in their decision making process about the state of teaching in the institution.

Knowing the goals of our assessment should determine our instrument of assessment. The following questions help determine whether we need qualitative or quantitative instruments. We will, in evaluating the results of our survey, presuppose such goal-instrument causality. Consequently the results will be seen to tell us something about the goals of both the institutions and the departments/programs surveyed. We will see that while nearly everyone sees the purpose of assessment to be the improvement of teaching and the production of better departmental offerings, there is no clear link between the goals and the instruments.

- Do we want to discover changes in our overall approach to teaching and learning? Do we want to provide information for others to aid in their teaching learning process? (quantitative)

- Do we want to discover what to do with this classroom situation as it is evolving this term? Do we need to know how to deal with this particular subset of students in this classroom? (qualitative)

No matter which of these assessment goals and instruments are used it is important to realize that there is much more to assessment than gathering information for becoming or evaluating one's teaching. It socializes and norms teacher, administrator, and the entire institution.

Assessment: Instrument of Socialization and Central Norms

As long as both teachers and students accept some authority beyond the classroom assessment is necessary. That authority may be their individual and/or communal goals; religious superiors, profession, political weal, or ideological bias; personal experience or written source. With authority comes power to shape and form individuals over a prolonged period of time. Saying, through the assessment instrument, what and how something should be taught is a basic socialization process - it shapes people, especially when people freely accept the process as true and good for them and society.

If we discover a people's instruments of assessment we should, therefore, be able to discover what they consider important, what is normative for them as expressed through these authoritative norms of assessment. This is what we will do in the next section. We will first describe how teachers' are assessed, thus we will discover what authorities

consider important for them to do. Then we will look at the prevalent pedagogies in the classrooms of theology, religious studies, and religion. Looking at these we will discover what these teachers see as normative. All of these "looks" will be through the eyes of the departmental and program directors who completed the surveys.

Assessing the Teacher of Religion and Describing their Pedagogies.

What follows is a summary of the survey primarily sent to chairs who were members of the American Academy of Religion with some contributions from the College Theology Society.[3] It was titled the "Departmental Survey For Assessment and Pedagogy." As mentioned above, the Association of Theological Schools was also surveyed but with a different instrument. The form and results of all these surveys may be found in the appendix. Let us first review the salient results of the survey before highlighting the issues surfaced by the survey.

Assessing Those Who Teach Religion in Post Secondary Institutions.

The primary reasons for assessing members of departments and programs are improving teaching (64.9%) and improving departmental offerings (42.5%).

When does this assessment take place?
- Most (86%) institutions assess many of their teachers yearly. But those who are assessed yearly differ among the various institutions.
- 56% assess all teaching faculty every year, every course.
- Senior faculty are assessed with varying regularity. The two most popular intervals are every three years (20.4%) and five (9.3%).
- Junior faculty are usually assessed every year (74.5%) with varying degrees of regularity after tenure.

Individual faculty assessment almost always (81.3%) includes both the faculty member and the chair. Many times (67%) the Dean is also included.

What are the instruments of assessing the faculty?
   Paper Instruments include:
- Departmental minutes are always used by 23% of the institutions.
- Student response to printed forms are always used by 86.1% of the institutions.
- Student standardized printed forms were always used by 39.5% of the institutions.
- Student standardized printed forms were used 75% of the time by 20.6% of the institutions.

---

[3] The Rochester Area Religious Studies and Theology Assessment Project (RARSTAP) surveyed departmental and program chairs of those belonging to AAR, CTS, and ATS to discover their methods of assessment and pedagogy. In what follows we will be referring to the AAR survey with a response of 275 from the AAR mailing list of 998. Qualitiative research dealing with clergy education, ATS members, may be found in the 2005 Auburn Studies "Signs of the times: present and future theological faculty," at www.auburnsem.org/ also the soon to be published Carneigie Foundation study will add to the Auburn study. It too is qualitative. www.carnegiefoundation.org/PPP/clergystudy/

- Student standardized printed forms were used 50% of the time by 21.8% of the institutions.
- Faculty may respond in written form to student written assessments was always permitted by 25.8% of the institutions.
- In 43% of the institutions the Dean sends her or his review of the student assessment to faculty members.
- Faculty portfolios were always used by 39% of the institutions.

Either paper and/or oral include:
- Peer evaluator(s) and dean: always used by 44.2%
- Exit interviews with graduating seniors: always used by 37.7%
- Survey with graduates: always used by 23.5%

Conversation is used.
- Annually among dean, faculty person, and peer: always, 25%
- Discussion in class among students and faculty person: seldom 54.8% and never 36%.
- Formal student meetings assessing the class: never, 66.7% and seldom, 28.9%

Significant assessment instruments of faculty (> 37%) listed in order of priority are:
1. Student response to printed forms at the end of the term.
2. The dean sending reviews of student responses to faculty member.
3. A combination of peer evaluator(s), faculty member and dean.
4. Faculty portfolio.
5. Exit interviews with graduating majors.

Faculty self-evaluation is found among 80.7% of the institutions. These self evaluations generally go to one's dean (60%) and one's chair (55.6%).

It is quite clear that the departments and programs surveyed are not assessed differently than others in their institution (86.7%)and they do not feel they should be assessed differently (87.3%, Religious Studies and 84.3% Theology) than others. They are also very adamant in requesting equality in all assessment procedures. Distinctions, they state, should not be made because of seniority (89.8%), gender (98.9%), ordination (97.5%), the class one teaches (81.8%), specialization (88.7%), ethnic heritage (99.3%), language proficiency (98.2%), or class profile (89.55%).

How Religion is taught in Religious Studies, Religion, and Theology Departments and Programs

Granted that professional assessment covers more areas than teaching, teaching is still a very important area of concern. It is fascinating to observe how the teachers teach. The fact of the matter is that they teach and examine the same way they have taught and examined for centuries. The only exception being that oral exams were used in the past whereas today everything is written. The lecture method is used most of the time by most

of the professors. 52% use it between 100%-66% of the time. Essay exams are used by approximately the same amount of teachers (56.1%) the same amount of time. Term papers were also a favorite (44%) for over 66% of the faculty and 88% for 66% of the faculty.

More than 66% of the faculty seldom, if ever, used any of the contemporary pedagogical methods. These include the following :Cooperative learning, simulation games, role playing, case studies, field experiences, experiential learning, active learning, team/group exams, computer assisted instruction, use of community resources, portfolios, retreats, journals, group learning, clinical experiences, management teams, learning communities, service learning, find education, internet, debates, internships, independent study, contract learning, and peer teaching peer teaching. It is important to note, however, that these were not unknown pedagogies because over 80% of those surveyed were familiar with the terminology.

What we have seen, with no comment given, is what administrators accept as both normative and acceptable. Some contemporary pedagogical and assessment processes surfaced as seldom used by over two hundred and fifty actual institutions in the United States. If indicative of what is happening in other institutions this is a significant rejection of many contemporary methods. Look back, not with an eye for describing what is happening but for what is normative, and this rejection will become clear. A glance at the actual survey results shows what terms were not understood by how many chairs.

Present Issues and the Future of Assessing Religion Teachers in Post Secondary Education

Does Assessment Tell Us Anything?

Once we begin to broach the topics of reliability, validity, quantitative, and qualitative methods, we see that decisions made about our teaching that rely solely on any one of these methods are very limited. Yet many of our stakeholders want to rely on only one of these methods. We seem to be culturally conditioned to seek quick numbers to make quick decisions that can be based upon the numbers. CAM is aware of this and, in the professional literature, takes these limitations into account. In the light of that literature, I would like to make three observations in response to what assessment tells us.

First, the focus on classroom teaching alone results in seeing teaching from too narrow a perspective. There is always the necessary distinction between teaching in the classroom and teaching outside the classroom.

 Once we look outside the classroom to determine a professor's teaching effectiveness some (Hoyt & Pallett) make a distinction between "direct" and "indirect" contributions of faculty to teaching and learning.

Second, assessment of direct contributions attempts to evaluate how the individual's personal intervention or involvement impacts program goals, the department, and the

teaching-learning process. Assessment of indirect contributions attempts to discover the effect one has upon enhancing the general educational environment resulting in a better institution, school, and teaching-learning process, e.g. New texts, techniques, suggestions for reform of curricula.

Such distinctions emphasize what we already know, that most teaching assessment views teaching in the classroom as isolated from the other aspects of our professorial life.

"Classroom" is the primary place where the interaction of teachers and learners occur. But what teachers bring to this place is dependent upon their past educational experiences in all classrooms they have participated in. Teaching assessment, many times, is a discernment of what must be "unlearned" as well as "learned." It may be that a particular professor's most important work is not in the classroom. There is more to classroom teaching itself as the following list of professional teaching responsibilities makes clear: submitting grades, communicating text/library needs, pursuing professional development opportunities, conducting classroom research, and developing innovative instructional materials or opportunities (Hoyt & Pallett). These are in addition to research, community service, and student advising responsibilities.[4]

Third. Most of the CAM literature focuses not on the teacher but the student. The mention of conducting *classroom research* highlights a phrase, along with *teaching as scholarship*, that is found in much of CAM literature that advocates we become involved in the evaluation of our own teaching and learning as it takes place. We should be trained to be a careful observer of the teaching process, to collect feedback on what and how well students learn, and to evaluate the effectiveness of our instruction. (Boyer, 1990; Kreber and Cranton).

A central question in all CAM literature asks "Has the student learned anything?" A key phrase repeated over and over again is that all assessment must be s*tudent centered.* The student's learning is primary in the teaching-learning process. This is also a subtle reminder that the other stakeholders (e.g. the faculty) in the process are not the primary concern. If the teaching instruments for assessing teaching do not result in a better learning environment for the students, faculty are useless.

Although the concept of student-centered assessment is not meant to remind us of it, it is helpful to remember how easy it is to enhance the results of our assessment processes. Ashcroft and Palacio (p. 44) describe our ability to "play with the numbers" as the c*orruption coefficient* "the extent to which scores can be raised (or lowered) without changes in teaching or learning, by subtly adjusting assessment tasks, processes or context." I would like to call it the *Lake Wobegon effect* where our students are always the best and our professors always knowledgeable and skillful. Without becoming cynical about the assessment process, it is necessary to remind ourselves of how easy it is to "cook the numbers" or whatever else we use for assessment. It is easy to do this in our principle research discipline as easy as here in education. As in our home discipline,

---

[4] See Braskamp & Ory:41 for a more extensive list of "teaching responsibilities.

teaching assessment always depends upon trustworthy people searching for truth and ways to improve life.

It is with this concern for finding the truth and refining our present instruments and methods of assessment that we now turn to the many issues associated with contemporary assessment of Religious Studies, Theology, and Religion in Post Secondary Education.

Assessment Issues

A profession advances only by asking questions. Teaching Theology, Religion, or Religious Studies is no different. What is different is that these assessment questions many times are forced upon us from stakeholders outside the profession and both questions and expected answers are usually formulated from outside the profession. There are numerous issues surrounding the assessment of teaching Religion, Theology, and Religious Studies. We have already reviewed some of the issues surrounding the instruments of assessment, what we do here is review some significant issues inherent to assessment from the perspective of the entire discipline.

The Issue of Mission Goals and Objectives.

The basic principles of the Assessment Movement in Higher Education cannot be challenged, not because they are correct but because so many stakeholders believe assessment, with its consequent improvements in teaching, will provide a better educational system.

The Contemporary Assessment Movement is part of a larger thrust in leadership and managerial literature rationalizing human interaction in groups into clear, definable, and measurable units. Key to this rationalizing process is the mission statement. In contemporary academic life, if you cannot write a mission statement for it, it does not exist. Therefore, the arguments we have over the nature of our disciplines and the differences between our disciplines must be clarified. We will not exist on campus unless we clearly state what Religion, Religious Studies, or Theology are and what are the essential differences between them. Assessment must assess something. If we cannot be clear about what we are, we cannot assess it.

What we are teaching and what we expect from our teaching may be different from other disciplines. In theology, for example, many of us include an explicit spiritual dimension in our teaching and the expectations associated with it. In the RASTAP survey of theological schools it was quite obvious among about 25% of the schools that their expectations for theology teachers was quite different than the expectations of non-theological disciplines. They included in their assessment instruments questions about spirituality, doctrine, and church affairs.

A deeper philosophical issue stands behind our necessity to clarify who we are. This is the issue of the relationship between what we teach and the reception of that material. The majority of assessment instruments make no distinction between humanities, social

science, and religion in what they consider acceptable classroom pedagogies. Respondents to the survey reflect this supposed neutrality. The issue is whether we should accept such neutrality of pedagogies. Are they all equally acceptable for what happens in our classroom? If all pedagogies are equally acceptable, what does distinguish our profession from other professions?

The Issue of Faculty Involvement

Faculty's involvement with contemporary assessment is tenuous not only because of its newness but also because many of its research methods and much of its language echoes that of the education department. Only a few faculty are willing to cross disciplinary boundaries and invest time, energy, and mental labor in a discipline they were not trained for and for which they have no interest. They teach in another discipline because they do not want to teach in the education department. Some feel that CAM is the attempt of the Education Department to build an empire and run their department.

This issue of expectations and priorities, among education and one's disciplinary obligations, is found at every level of higher education and among the gatekeepers to those levels. For example, how much emphasis does an institution give to teaching in Rank and Tenure decisions? How much is one's institutional identity associated with teaching (Community college vs Research University)? Do Church authorities wish its theologians to be teachers, understood as those who pass down information, rather than researchers (understood as those who search for new knowledge and applications.)? When we make teaching a priority, what happens to our involvement in our discipline? What receives more attention: what we teach or how we teach?

The Issue of Trust in the Institution.

The contemporary assessment movement was born out of distrust ((Walvoord & Anderson), yet trust and mutual respect are essential for good formative assessment (Hoyt & Pallett). Instruments of assessment are useless without the trust and mutual respect which energize the motivators for improvement. ((Bess)

The Issue of Teaching for Assessment.

We must realize that our instruments of assessment establish and reflect established norms. We have heard of "teaching for the test." There is also teaching for formative or summative assessment. When we realize that a strong institutional assessment process is also a centralized control of the classroom, we might begin to see unintended consequences of the assessment movement: the corruption coefficient is one; the need to critique the norms and the norm makers is another. "Who assesses the assessor?" is an important question in this context.

We are teaching the next generation how to assess through how we assess our classroom. Our instruments of assessment in themselves are teaching and learning tools and must be

seen as part of the teaching- learning process. We teach our students assessment by how we assess them and ourselves.

Description of assessment or ratings is already an interpretation of the assessment or ratings. We must be sensitive not only to our assessment instruments but also to the way we convey the results of these instruments. As no assessment instrument is a neutral tool for discovering some objective truth, neither is the presentation of the results of the assessment that has significant consequences on individual and institutional morale. Assessment done well improves and creates an educational community; done badly it destroys both the institution and the people within it.

The Issue of Classroom Complexity.

A question often asked of teachers is "Are you a good teacher?" It is such a simple question but it is simplistic and abstract. Without referring to whom we are teaching, its answer tells us nothing. More properly we should ask: are we good teachers: of one, ten, one hundred students, of those taking a general education, core, upper or lower level course, of those specializing in the discipline or not, of those who need special help, those from the general population, those who are highly motivated, of those of the same religion or varied religions, of those who are religiously literate or not, of liberals or conservatives, of those opposed to religions other than their own or those who are open to other religions. The teaching of religion and/or theology is a very complex endeavor. Most of our classrooms are gathering places for people of varying motives, educational backgrounds, and religious convictions. If our assessment instruments do not attend to this complexity they do little to prepare us for the real world with its real classrooms. Some things to keep in mind as we face the issue of complexity are the following.

- Classroom assessment in Religious Studies Departments must recognize the multiple goals of those departments: 1) the core or general studies goals of the college/university 2) the basic literacy goals (How do we teach "Religious Language(s)?" 3) There is no equivalent to a bar exam for Religious Studies thus "Who provides the norms for the discipline?"
- Anyone who has taught graduate theology knows that numbers two and three, above, can be reiterated for theology.
- Classroom assessment, to succeed, must move beyond the classroom to discover the mutual support for teaching and learning within the department and within the educational institution.
- Do not forget the necessity to sustain faculty & staff morale in shifting to a student centered college / university needs to be emphasized.
- One "assessment" is never enough. One instrument of assessment (for example, a survey at the end of a term) needs other instruments. Formative assessment needs encouragement from administration and colleagues in the form of rewards such as time off to improve one's teaching methods or money to go to a conference (summative assessment). The goals of the classroom must fit into the goals of the department and, in turn, into the goals of the school. One assessment is never enough.

- The classroom process is one part of one's professional and personal life. Perspective and priorities are essential in designing, analyzing, and responding to classroom assessment.
- Expressed dissatisfaction may not be an expressed complaint. (Ashcroft and Palacio, p. 119).
- A university claims to allow all voices to be heard. There should be no censorship of ideas. Can a university also allow all pedagogies to be used? In accepting the presuppositions and norms of the Contemporary Assessment Movement are we not abandoning the community of pluralism and diversity our universities have come to advocate?
- Do not let complexity become chaos. Stephen Brookfield's advice should always be recognized in our continual struggle to become a better teacher: "Don't misinterpret poor evaluations," "Be wary of the myth of the perfect teacher," "Don't confuse academic success with teaching skills," "Accept the normality of failure," and "Be realistic about your limits." (Brookfield 5-11)

The Issue of Ethical Consequences of Assessment

A classroom ethic asks "Who is responsible for what happens in the classroom?" "Who/what is a good teacher?" "Who/what is a good student?" To assess educational processes and behavioral outcomes without dealing with the issue of responsibility is to allow behaviorism to establish the norms for the educational endeavor. Once this issue is recognized the questions multiply.
- There are twenty-four hours in a day. If we increase the hours for focusing on classroom assessment, what are we giving up? What are the consequences of such a choice? Changes in assessment always cost something (money, emotions, energy, research and advising time, do the benefits match the cost?)
- What happens to good students when the assessment process focuses on the majority?
- Once valid and reliable formative classroom assessment has occurred, how deeply must a teacher modify her/his personality to improve her/his teaching? For example, should a naturally shy teacher be severely criticized for not making eye contact with the students; should someone who has always had difficulty remembering names be criticized for not knowing all the names of his or her students?
- Fairness.

The Issue of Hidden Assessments.

Everything we have reviewed so far is part of the public forum in our college, universities, and theological schools. There has always existed the hidden evaluation of institution, administrator, and peers that occurs at lunch and behind closed doors. These are part of everyday life and human relationships. In the last decade a type of evaluation has arisen that is very public and influential in decision-making yet has not openly entered into the assessment process for teaching at the post secondary level. It is

becoming a dominant mode of assessment but is not recognized as such. I would label this category of hidden assessment *student numbers assessment*.

As higher education has enlisted the aid of business models and personnel for institutional survival, there has also entered into the academic culture student teacher ratios as a very important indicator of whether the person is a good teacher or the department is a viable educational entity. All the educational models of good assessment become interpreted and pointed toward gaining more students and majors for a department or school.

As I said above, this type of assessment is public, but it is hidden because no one openly says to individual teachers "Your summative assessment is based on how many students sign up for your class, how many majors you have entered into your discipline, how many students you retain for the institution." This is a new kind of entrepreneurial assessment because it emphasizes quantity not quality. Much like business in the 70s and 80s mass produced consumer products that made money but did not last, so many of our institutions are interested in producing degreed individuals without a concern for what the degree represents. Until we recognize that this new type of entrepreneurial assessment dominates our assessment processes we can never satisfy all of our stakeholders because their expected answers are different that our attempts to answer their questions.

Beyond The Issues: Growing a New Future Together?

I have held leadership roles in both the Program for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (PETAL) and the Rochester Area Religious Studies and Theology Assessment Project (RARSTAP). The principle conclusion to RARSTAP after one year of study was that the professors of Religious Studies, Religion, or Theology must share their concerns, successes and failures with peer professionals to improve their teaching. Eight years with PETAL convinced me that while the workshops led by professional educators and/or authors of books and articles about assessment were good and necessary, the motivation to change occurred when there was group reflection. We became so convinced of this that we programmed into the yearly schedule topics unique to our school and our teaching. These topics, led by our faculty, generally attracted more faculty than some of the more costly lectures and workshops. From follow up discussions, it was obvious to us that these also resulted in real change in the classroom.

All these issues can be dealt with. We can become better teachers. Our assessment processes and the norms they project can lead to better professional teachers. But we have to do it together.

We do not teach alone. We teach within a culture of teaching - learning, accepted and/or rejected. To understand our individual teaching and how teaching occurs within the culture of our discipline and our institution, we need others. Group reflection is meeting with those other teachers.[5] Group reflection occurs in either formal or informal meetings

---

[5] The RARSTAP survey indicates class conversation assessing the class happens "always" among 9.2% and sometimes among 54.8% of those surveyed. Formal student meetings assessing happens always among

of concerned faculty with a mutual interest in discovering, understanding, and improving the teaching-learning processes and events for which they are responsible. If those who gather are honest with their presentation and with their mutual critique, this is one of the better formative assessment tools.

The drawbacks of group reflection prove difficult to overcome and are only overcome with energetic and creative leadership. The first difficulty is one common to all faculty projects: sustaining interest in teaching over a prolonged period of time as other priorities for one's time and energy compete for primacy of place. Only if the administration provides clear support for group reflection, and links formative and summative assessment to it, can such interest be sustained. The linkage between formative and summative assessment is provided when it becomes obvious to all that the improvement of one's teaching is not optional in the school. Teaching improvement must be part of the school's culture. When it is, it enters into the competition for the professor's time and energy in a strong position to win.

Another difficulty is to keep the group reflection moving in a healthy direction. Complaining is healthy if the complaints are reflected on as a source of analysis for growth. Group reflection cannot become a meeting in which complaints and negative feelings *dominate* the meeting. The leadership of the group reflection must constantly guard that this does not occur. Usually if they are aware of this they are also aware of the group dynamics that can be used to move the reflection in a healthy direction.

The difficulties of people working in a group when overcome reap impressive results for change. For the change occurs in both the individuals participating within the group as well as the group's effectiveness within the institution. Mandates by Boards of Trustees and administrators certainly can begin change but effective change only occurs when people decide to do so.

Appendix

Assessment Methods in Teaching Religion or About Religion

If one thing is clear after reviewing the history of and contemporary views upon assessment, it is that one means of assessment is never enough. We need multiple methods of assessment to discover whether we are a good teacher and to develop into a better teacher. In what follows, we will review several methods of assessment. In doing so we will first describe the method, then provide several examples of the method, and then suggest issues associated with its use.

Questionnaires or Surveys:

Most of us use this method. The RARSTAP survey found that 86.7% of our institutions use printed forms at the end of the term for teacher assessment.

4.5% and sometimes among 28.9%.

Questionnaires or surveys, usually distributed toward the end of the term, seek to describe what has happened in the classroom throughout the term. Many times they require only the student's response; sometimes, the teacher's response. Although most of us do it, the difficulty is in knowing precisely what the results indicate.

ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) says that these questionnaires and surveys are student evaluations of teacher performance. IDEA (Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment System) says that these are student ratings of teacher performance. This is no small distinction. Do the results really tell us how good a teacher we are (evaluation) or what the students think of us in comparison with other teachers they have (ratings)? No matter where one comes down in the evaluation vs ratings argument, this is one of the most important contemporary methods of assessment.

This is also an area of exponential growth because it seems to provide to the stakeholders an easy means for decision-making. Although a few sources will be mentioned below, the best thing to do, in order to remain current with developments, is to use the typical search engines one uses for academic investigation. Some key phrases that provide instant web sites and information are: Instructional Assessment System, Instructor and Course Evaluation, Instructional Evaluation and Instructional Development and Effectiveness. Many institutions are turning to web based / internet based evaluation systems in their drive to reflect being on the cutting edge of technology. A number of our institutions use their own forms but many also use some of the following.

- The *Instructional Assessment System* (*IAS*) is a program to collect and summarize student ratings of instruction at the postsecondary level. Originally developed to evaluate in-class courses using scannable forms, it is among the oldest and largest student ratings programs in the nation. Scannable forms are used to assess more than 11,000 courses annually at the University of Washington, and *IAS* services are utilized on a cost-incurred basis at 30 other institutions of higher education nationwide. IAS offers 11 course evaluation forms. (www.washington.edu/oea/ias/1.htm).
- The IDEA System is used by many institutions. The use of its various instruments enables your class to be rated with other institutions in the United States as well as to have useful information for formative assessment. One of the better systems.
- The OACS *course feedback system* is a feedback web site that enables customized questions from the professors to be used nested in a general questionnaire. (www.bsos.umd.edu/oacs/teacher.htm.)

Even if everyone seems to be using one of the above methods of rating teacher's performance, our questions are not answered. Because "everyone does it" does not mean they are doing it because this is *the* best way to assess teachers. Used

well they are *one* very good means that *must be* used with others to assess one's performance.

From one perspective, they gather large amounts of "surface" information quickly. Some things to keep in mind when using this method are:

- Mail in or web based questionnaires receive less response than those given out in class.
- Do the questions cover all aspects of the course? Sometimes they focus only on lecture and do not take into consideration other pedagogies.
- Interpretation of the data should always be done by more than one person.
- Students who are satisfied with a course are less likely to fill out a questionnaire than those who are dissatisfied.
- The most recent classroom events are the most influential upon ratings. Over time, even a term, we forget because present feelings and responses cloud memories.
- When forms ask for complaints / negatives /dislikes they may get them even though such negatives are a minor part of the students evaluation. (What do you like / dislike about a course?)

Grades:

It seems that no one wishes to use a method that has been around for some time – the grades students receive in our classes. Before CAM, grades were seen as a significant indictor of whether one was a good teacher or not. If one's students succeeded, one was a good teacher. If they did not, one was a bad teacher. It seems simple. Nevertheless, as various educators began to research exactly what grades indicated about students, grades diminished in value as an evaluative tool for teacher and student.

As Walvoord and Anderson describe them: "Grading: An assessment method that has nearly universal faculty participation, enjoys superb student participation, is never accused of violating academic freedom, provides detailed diagnostic assessment of student learning, is tightly linked to teaching, has a feedback loop into classroom learning and teacher planning and is cheep to implement. (p. xvii)

In Walvoord and Anderson's hands grading returns as an excellent assessment tool for teaching because the role of teaching does not end with "giving" grades. Grades, as a teaching assessment method, tell us where we may have not been clear, where we may not have provided enough direction, where we may have taken account of only one type of intelligence in our teaching and grading practices. . They would describe grades as "… a form of summative assessment stated in numerical or letter form to indicate relative rank among participants in a class." Grades, in their entire context, may be excellent tools of teacher assessment.

Yet the original critique of grades remains. What do grades mean? They seem to have little validity and reliability when the norms upon which they are based, and their actual giving, are not consistent among members of a department, program, or school. It is true that they are part of our educational culture, yet their full measure and use in assessment of both teacher and student are only a partial, clouded, response to the questions surrounding our teaching.

Document Analysis

Document analysis occurs when paper(s) or electronic files are presented for evaluation by professionals capable of comparing and contrasting these papers and/or files with others of like nature. This assessment is either a formal (content analysis or agreed upon stated categories) or an informal evaluation ("Do these documents fulfill the goals of the course?"). We find document analysis occurring when a committee reviews our syllabus or proposal for a new class, when a department chair or dean examines our student examinations, and our teaching portfolios. The RARSTAP study found that teaching portfolios were used by 39% of the institutions, 12.9% used departmental minutes, and 80.7% used self evaluation forms.   Document analysis happens when we, in turn, examine documents to discover whether the students are learning such as student learning logs, diaries, portfolios, short inquiries about their understanding of the class (e.g. muddiest point in Angelo and Cross) syllabi, web page design, BlackBoard resources, previous evaluations and reports, promotional material for the course/program/department, reports to external bodies such as accrediting or church agencies. Many academics and administrators seem to feel that the more paper or files they have read the better they understand the teacher. Certainly documentary review may be one important way to understand whether one is a good teacher but it certainly cannot be one of the principle ways.

Why should document analysis associated with teaching be any different than such analysis carried out in other research in the academic world? How many various and diverse researchers have poured over the works of famous authors to arrive at different and sometimes opposing views of poems, essays, novels, and other "documents."

Other points to keep in mind are:
- How many documents need to be reviewed to provide valid and reliable evidence?
- The categories of analysis usually become "cookie cutters" that provide a clearly definable response from disparate material. Yet we must ask: "Do they accurately reflect what is happening/happened? For example, to read a student learning log for an "impression" of how the student learns is an extremely subjective endeavor; to do more than that is to spend an enormous about of time on one student and possibly an impossible amount of time on all the students. Yet using content analysis misses the human dimension of the document.

- How many readers do we need for each document to approach validity?
- What is the difference between a teacher looking at a student's activities in a classroom and providing an impressionistic "That's a good student!" and looking at their documents and saying, "That's a good student!" The result is the same and each process has no more validity than the other.

Expert Opinion:

Assessment experts are those who are either participants in the teaching-learning process or outsiders to that process. Their role is to use their expert/professional training to judge whether the stated mission, goals, and outcomes of the class are being achieved during the time of their observations and / or to judge whether the teacher is using appropriate pedagogies for the class. This can also be used, within a different observational frame, with documents replacing observation.

"Experts" are many times stakeholders in the educational process: administrators, departmental peers, disciplinary peers, peers in the Department of Education or professional development, board members. Self reports, faculty colleague reviews, department or divisional chair review, interaction with one's mentor, the feedback of someone who is a member of one's learning community. (Centra, 1996). The RARSTAP survey found that peers were *always* used 47.9% of the time and the deans, 66.8%, and chairs, 82.3%.

Expert opinion is an always-ready source of assessment. In academic life we are surrounded by experts ready to give us their opinion. The difficulty arises when we ask the expert to defend her or his opinion. This difficulty is diminished in the assessment process when the categories of assessment are clearly stated and the "rules" of evidence are clearly delineated. But we must realize that here, as elsewhere, the experts opinion cannot take away from the responsibility of making decisions personally or institutionally by those sponsoring the exercise. Some suggest that the use of video and/or audio recorders would help provide evidence for the expert's opinion. Such tools might help the decision maker to understand why the expert came to her or his conclusions but ultimately the reason the expert is brought in is because only an expert can provide a unique perspective on the object of assessment. Ultimately we cannot avoid the fact that expert opinion in Theology, Religious Studies, and Religion depends on the expert's opinion not the evidence.

Have you ever watched the results of a skating competition or a boxing match? The line between good and bad is usually clear but the one between good, better, and best is very subjective. If the educational institution is open to a pluralism of pedagogies, the expert many times walks that thin line.

Responding to Symbols and Rituals (Patterns of Words and Actions in the Classroom and Institution.) as Assessment.

Classroom symbols and rituals are those patterns of words and actions that bind together those involved in the teaching learning process and are expressive of the concepts, attitudes, and values of everyone involved in the process. Symbols and rituals are context and culture driven patterns that we are socialized into throughout our life cycle. To understand them is to understand what is happening. To recognize what causes them to be broken is to begin a process of growth to a new teaching-learning process.

Most teachers have found that a presentation and process that worked at one time and with one class does not work with another class. The ritual of the classroom process and the symbols of language have lost their context. They no longer convey meaning to those involved and no longer bind everyone together in a teaching-learning community. Symbols of the broken teaching-learning process abound: a yawn, talking among students, a lack of interest and energy in what is occurring, the physical condition of the room (especially the desks), the movement of the class from one time slot to another, the students who sign up for the class, whether the students and teachers talk about what happens in the class outside the class. Angelo and Cross's book <u>Classroom Assessment</u> <u>Techniques,</u> Second Edition, provides many practical ways of discovering the brokenness of symbols and ritual.

The brokenness of these cultural and classroom rituals were the old way of doing formative assessment   Many times the teacher would blame the students "for falling asleep," "losing interest," and "failing an exam." The student centered nature of CAM many times results in the opposite presupposition as the teacher is seen "to lack motivational skills," " have a sense of humor," accommodate to the unique intelligence of the student," "provide a proper test of the student's knowledge," "recognize the cultural background of each student."

For this assessment instrument to be of value the classroom itself must be recognized as a mixing of symbols and rituals of the diverse cultures of all teachers and learners. True teaching and learning does not occur, in this situation, until there is a recognition and acceptance of common symbols and rituals..

Once one enters into the swamp of multiple intelligences, symbols, rituals, languages, and cultures in the classroom one enters into a world impervious to many forms of assessment. If all we have are individuals with no common bond, then the generalizations found in any assessment report do not hold. Education is a teaching-learning process that leads to generalizations and/or universals. If we start with each student as a world unto him or herself, with no common bond, then we have no way to think or deal with a group. A group, a class, of its nature must be seen as having something in common. If a third of the semester must be spent

discovering our common (class) language of symbol and ritual we are always beginning again.

Each of us meets a new class projecting the set of symbols and rituals garnered from a life time of professional involvement. It must be taken for granted that those who gather in this class want to become involved in these symbols and rituals. If they do not, they should not be there. However, symbols and rituals do break. They do change. We can learn something if we recognize their brokenness. When an old ritual is broken, a new world is seen through the crack. To understand fully what has happened and what to do is best found through combining qualitative and quantitative methods with reflective practice. Sometimes such reflection is best done when everything is over. However, if we use only that data dependent upon our memory, we are limited. Other helps may be necessary such as video or audio accounts, We should end every class day quiet and alone, reflecting on what happened during the day. Make a few notes of what we thought was good and what was not so good. At the end of the semester, or before teaching the class again, we should go back over these notes and make changes in the ritual and symbols in the teaching-learning process.

Reflective Practice as Assessment.

Reflective practice is both common sense and an ancient practice. (Dewey, 1933). Reflective practice is necessary to perfect oneself in all areas of life, not only teaching. It is through reflective practice that we bring new skills of teaching and learning into our professional life. (Centra, 1993; Ashcroft & Palacio).

Reflective practice is a habit of asking, answering, and testing our answers, about our teaching. Below are eight questions we should make a habit of asking ourselves at the end of each class.
    1. What did I do?
    2. Who helped me do it?
    3. Did everyone contribute the same or differently to what I did?
    4. How do I know I did it?
    5. How well do/did I do it?
    6. What must I do different next time?
    7. If I was to do it totally different, what would I do?
    8. Now, what am I going to do?

The principle issue surrounding reflective practice is that many times what is a formative assessment instrument may be turned into a summative assessment instrument. Some teachers are open to share their reflections with administrators. Some administrators are not accustomed to honesty and openness in public documents and see admittance of failure or weakness regarding one's goals as ineptitude. In an academic culture that is not accustomed to talking about one's lack of success in teaching, some administrators latch on to one's admissions of

imperfection as reasons for dismissal or lower pay. Teachers must be very careful with whom they share their reflections. Many academic cultures are so accustomed to blaming the students for lack of learning, that, when we begin to ask whether some of the blame might be the teachers, there is denial and rejection of those who may make such suggestions.

Such denial and blame may also be part of our reflective practice. The teacher is not responsible for everything that happens in the classroom. To demand such total responsibility is to denigrate the maturity and responsibility necessary for teaching-learning to occur in the college and university classroom. *Everyone in the classroom is responsible for what happens there.* At the same time it is very easy in the reflective process to hold on to one's former ways for one's comfort, not for the sake of the contemporary student.

REFERENCES

Aleamoni, L. M. (1981). "Student Ratings of Instruction". In J. Millman (Ed.), *Handbook* of Teacher Evaluation, 110-145. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Angelo, T.A., (1991) *Ten Easy Pieces: Assessing Higher Learning in Four dimensions.* In T.A. Angelo (ed.), Classroom Research: Easy Lessons from Success. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 17-31.

Angelo, T.A., (1995) " Reassessing (and Defining) Assessment." *The AAHE Bulletin*, 48 (November)2:. 7-9

Ashcroft and Palacio, David, (1996) *Researching into Assessment and Evaluation in College and Universities* London, England: Kogan Page Limited..

Banda, Trudy W., John P. Lund, Karen E. Black, and Frances W. Oberlander.(1996) *Assessment in Practice: Putting Principles to Work on College Campuses.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
.
Bernstein, Daniel (1996). "A Department System for Balancing the Development and Evaluation of College Teaching: A 20, No. 4, 241-247.Commentary on Cavanagh". *Innovative Higher Education* ,

James L. Bess, ed.(1997) *Teaching Well and Liking It: Motivating Faculty to Teach Effectively* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins U.

Boyer, Ernest (1990*), Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* .Princeton, NJ. The Carnegie Foundation.

Boys, Mary. (1995) "Evaluating an Uncertain Craft: Faculty Assessment and Theological Education," *Theological Education*, XXXI 2: 37-50.

Braskamp, Larry and Ory, John. (1994) *Assessing Faculty Work.* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brinko, K. T. (1991). "The Interactions of Teaching Improvement." In M. Theall & J. Franklin, (eds.), *Effective practices* for improving teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 48, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, Stephen. (1990) *The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cashin, W. E. (1989). "Defining and Evaluating College Teaching", IDEA Paper No. 21, IDEA Center, Kansas State University.

Cashin, W. E. (1995). "Student Ratings of Teaching: The Research Revisited," *IDEA Paper* No. 32, IDEA Center, Kansas State University.

Cashin, William .(1996)#33: *Developing an Effective Faculty Evaluation System IDEA Paper* No. 33, IDEA Center, Kansas State University..

Centra, John A.
(1993) *Reflective Faculty Evaluation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
(1994) "The Use of Teaching Portfolio and Student Evaluations for Summative Evaluations," in *Journal of Higher Education* 65(Sept-Oct. 1994) 5:555-70.
(1996) "Identifying Exemplary Teachers: Evidence From Colleagues, Administrators, and Alumni," in New Directions for Teaching and Learning Spring, 1996. 65:51-56.

Chickering, A. W. and Gamson, Z. (1987). "Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education". *American* Association *for Higher Education Bulletin,* 39, 3-7.

Cohen, P. A. (1980). "Effectiveness of Student Rating Feedback for Improving College Instruction: A Meta-Analysis of Findings." Research *in Higher Education, 13,* 321-341.

Cohen, P. A. & McKeachie, W. J. (1980). "The Role of Colleagues in the Evaluation of Teaching". Improving *College and University* Teaching, 28,147-154.

CRIB notes
Multiculturalism and Faculty Development (March, 1999)
Performance Indicators (March, 1999).
Improving Teaching and Learning(March, 1999)
Assessment(March, 1999)

DeZure, D. (1999). "Evaluating Teaching Through Peer Classroom Observation". In Seldin, P. & Associates, *Changing practices in evaluation teaching,* pp. 70-96, Bolton, MA: Anker.

ERIC: Clearinghouse on Higher Education
        Faculty Tenure
        Post-Tenure Review

Diamond, Robert M. "Broad curriculum reform is needed if students are
        to master core skills" *Chronicle of Higher Education* August 1, 1997 v.43 (47) p.
        B7.

Feldman, Kenneth A. (1982) "The Perceived Instructional Effectiveness of
        College Teachers as Related to their Personality and Attitudinal Characteristics: A
        Review and Synthesis," in *Research in Higher Education* 24 (1986)2:139-213.

Gardiner, Lion and Anderson, Caitlin and Cambridge, Barbara eds. (1997)
         Learning Through Assessment: A Resource Guide for Higher Education
        an AAHE publication #AS9701.

Glennon., Fred. (1999) "Assessment for the Right Reason: The Ethics of Outcomes
        Assessment," *Teaching Theology and Religion*. February, 1999, pp. 14-26.

Greenwald, Anthony and Gillmore, Gerald, (1997) "No Pain, No Gain? The Importance
        of Measuring Course Workload in Student Ratings of Instruction," in *Journal of
        Educational Psychology* 89(Dec.)4:743-51.

Hoyt, Donald P. & Pallett, William H., (1999) "Appraising Teaching Effectiveness:
        Beyond Student Ratings," Idea paper #36 (November)

Hutchings, P. (Ed.) (1995). *From idea to prototype:* The *peer review of teaching: A
        project handbook.* Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Keiz, L. & Waggoner, M. D. (1994). *Collaborative peer* review: The *role of faculty in
        improving college* teaching. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 2.
        Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of
        Education and Human Development.

Kollar, Nathan.

(1972) "Methods and Theologies in Religious Education," *Religious Education*
                (November-December, l972) LXVII:440-48
(1990)"Secular Fundamentalism or Secular Humanism: Continuing a
        Tradition," in *Humanities in the South* 72(Fall)
(1995) "The Death of National Symbols: Roman Catholicism in Quebec," in
        Ethnicity,Nationality, and Religious Experience. Peter C. Phan ed.
        (Lanham, MD: University Press of America,).
(1999) "Doing It Together: Changing Pedagogies," in Teaching Theology and
        Religion   (Oct..)
(2004) "Necessary Cynicism About Contemporary Assessment Methods and Motives,"

Kreber, Carolin and Cranton, Patricia (1997) "Teaching as Scholarship: A Model for Instructional Development," as found in *Issues & Inquiry in College Learning and Teaching* (Winter)4-12.

Logan Jr , Samuel T. (1995) "Faculty Development: An Organic Perspective," *Theological Education*   XXXI (1995)2: 27-36.

Markham, Ian. 1998. "The Meaning and Ends of Teaching Religion," *TeachingTheology and Religion*, October, , pp. 135-148.

Palmer, Parker J. 1993. "Good talk about good teaching through conversation and community" *Change*. November v. 25 (6) p. 8-13.

Perry ,Raymond P. and Smart, John C., eds. 1997.   *Effective Teaching in Higher Education; Research and Practice.* Bronx, NY: Agathon Press.

Readings, Will, 1996. *The University in Ruins.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schwehn, Mark R. (1993). *Exiles in Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America.* Oxford University Press.

Seldin, P. (1993). *Successful Use of Teaching Portfolios*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

(1997). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide toimproved performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (2nd.). Bolton, MA: Anker.

(1999). "Self-evaluation: What Works; What Doesn't" In Seldin, P. & Associates, *Changing Practices In Evaluating Teaching,* 97-113. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Sergiovanni, Thomas. (1995). *The Principalship*, 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sheppard, S. D., Johnson, M., & Leifer, L. (1998). "A Model of Peer and Student Involvement in Course Assessment." *ASEE Journal of Engineering Education,* 87 (4), 349-354.

Weimer, Maryellen (1990). *Improving College Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,1990.

Wright, W. Alan and Associates (1995). *Teaching Improvement Practices*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

Walvoord Barbara E. and Anderson, Virginia Johnson (1998). *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Surveys and their Results

Association of Theological Schools Responses

A questionnaire was sent to 120+/- Academic deans and/or heads of schools of theology using the Association of Theological Schools bulletin. I received fifty-seven responses. The following is a summary of those responses.

Bold print represents the question as asked.

How does your institution assess those who teach in your department?

How: *Generally no distinction was made between formative and summative assessment.*

- Classroom visits (forms).
- Syllabi evaluations (forms).
- Peer review of syllabi.
- Peer review committee prepares a report on the individual member which is given to the Dean.
- Peer evaluator(s) and faculty person meet with the dean.
- Individual student exit interviews each year.
- Dean has an exit interview with each graduating (graduated) student.
- Survey of graduates.
- Through departmental minutes and syllabi.
- Student response to year end/semester/tri-semester/quarter printed evaluation forms.
- Administrative assessment.
- Various types of peer assessment.
- Classroom visits by dean and/or chairs.
- The teacher reads and responds to the student evaluations as part of one's self assessment. The Dean reviews this response and deals with it appropriately.
- An annual conversation among: Dean, faculty person, peer chosen by the individual faculty.
- The class is evaluated by the students present in it and the faculty person in charge of it (the teacher).
- At quarterly student meetings one of the items on the agenda is a discussion and assessment of the classes.
- Six used some sort of portfolio method in individual assessment.

Who is involved?

- Students

- Self
- Peers: internal and external.
- Chairs
- Deans: Academic dean is critical to most evaluative processes.
- President
- Dean and chair
- Dean, Chair, Peers
- Committee

One's Self evaluation goes to:

- Peer: 10
- Peer and Dean: 5
- Dean: 9
- Chair ?

Most have self assessment

Some offer open-ended questionnaire as self assessment instrument; others printed multiple choice forms; most are open ended.

How many classes are assessed?
- All
- Some
- One

When is it done during the yearly cycle?
- January for some
- End of the semester, trimester, quarter.

Does you department have a process different from that used in other departments?

- Most stated that they were independent schools and therefore the question did not apply as asked.

But, answering the question,
Yes: 5
No: 17

Do you think that assessing what we do in our Religious Studies / Theology departments should be done differently than what is done in other departments?

Yes: 13
No/Doesn't Apply: 20

Not Sure: 3

Some conditioning factors which differentiate theology departments/schools and other departments:

- No tenure system in some.
- Independent Schools
- Other?

The role of "faith" or "denominational mandates" as expressed in the assessment instrument(s).

- Nineteen had "Faith" or denominational conditions within the classroom assessment instrument.

Further questions in this same vein were asked to be responded to in the self evaluation forms or elsewhere:

- How has this course contributed to your spiritual life?
- Demonstrate your active membership in the church.
- Demonstrate an active spiritual life.
- Demonstrate that you have a spiritual director.
- What percent of chapel services did you attend?
- Demonstrate your active membership in the church.

Do you think that length of time and or gender should demand different modes of assessment?

Gender?　　Yes: 2
　　　　　　No: all others
Length of Time / seniority/ professorial level?
　　　Yes: 21
　　　No: 22

- Tenured every other year.
- Non-tenured every year

- Many felt to use different modes of assessment because of gender was discriminatory

- Younger faculty should have mentors.

Additional comments that did not fit into the above responses:
(There may be some repeats from above since I made a list and then placed them into the above categories. I would appreciate it if you notice any repeats so I can eliminate them.)
- A formal self assessment form which resulted in the faculty person ending up indicating whether he/she were a type "A" or type "B" personality.

- Courses that included recent ATS initiatives regarding gender, multi culturalism, ecology, etc. in the assessment instrument.
- As a spiritual experience this course was _____.
- Mentor assessment.
- Dean's office reads and discusses problems with teachers.
- Full and Associate professors select one course per semester to be assessed. Request for a measurable action plan and areas of accountability.
- In house printed assessment instruments: a) Hand corrected, b) institution corrected, c) scantron.
- Provision for assessment of unique teaching situations.
- Peer teaching groups required at least once every six years.
- Separate forms for the type of teaching occurring, e.g. lecture, seminar etc.
- A review committee at the end of the Contract period is established for assessment: peers (inside the institution and outside), students and academic dean.
- Assessment for distance learning.
- Two institutions would not share the instrument used for assessment because it is a confidential document.
- Process of assessment is the same for everyone but more is expected of those with more experience.
- One institution said the faculty were free to use other forms if they wished.
- Follow up to self evaluation:
  - face to face with dean
  - face to face with chair
  - face to face with peers and then to dean.
- Peer review with external peer every three years.
- Professional growth contract shared with the entire faculty to provide encouragement.
- Dean has exit interview with all graduates.
- Peer review committee prepares a report on the individual member which is Given to the dean.

DEPARTMENTAL SURVEY FOR ASSESSMENT AND PEDAGOGY.
Survey and Results from Department Heads', Directors, Deans of Theology, Religious Studies and / or Religion.

We wish to enlist your aid in discovering the assessment methods and pedagogies in Religious Studies/Theology departments. Would you please respond to these questions and place your response in the in the self addressed envelope.

Respond by **filling in completely** (like this **O**)the circle corresponding to your answer. Your comments are more than welcome.

We are a   O private   O public   institution.

Which number is your student body closest to? O 20, 000   O 10,000   O 5,000 O 2000

We are a   O Religious Studies Department   O Theology Department
                   O Religious Studies Program   O Theology Program
                   O Both a Religious Studies and Theology Department / Program

We are an   O undergraduate department/program
       `   O graduate department/program
                   O both graduate and undergraduate

Approximately what percent of the student body do you teach per term?

       O 99%   O 66%   O 33%   O 10%

How many departmental majors do you have? Less than
       O 100   O 75   O 50   O 25 O 10
.
Every year our department assesses:
          Individual Faculty   O yes   O no
          The department as a whole   O yes   O no
          Programs within the department.   O yes   O no

          Comments:

The <u>primary</u> purpose of assessment in our department is to:
          Improve teaching   O yes O no O secondary
          To provide information for salary and promotion.
                                              O yes   O no O secondary
          To improve departmental offerings.   O yes   O no O secondary
          To improve academic advising.   O yes O no O secondary
          Comments:

Our department uses standardized forms:
           in all assessment processes.   O yes   O no
           in 75% of our assessment processes   O yes   O no
          in 50% of our assessment processes   O yes   O no
           It less than 25 % of our assessment processes.   O yes   O no
          Comments:

All teaching faculty are assessed every term, every class. O yes   O no
Senior faculty are assessed every how many years?:
          :   O three O four O   five O six   O   other
Junior faculty are evaluated every how many years?
                              O   One   O two O three O four O   five O six O

          comment:

The following are involved with individual faculty assessment:

Students   O always   O seldom O never
Self   O always   O seldom O never
Peer   O always   O seldom O never
Chair   O always   O seldom O never
Dean: O always   O seldom O never

Other

The following are used for classroom assessment in our department.
- Classroom visits.   O always   O seldom O never
- Syllabi evaluations by:
  - Peer(s)   O always   O seldom O never
  - Chair   O always   O seldom O never
  - Dean   O always   O seldom O never
  - Committee   O always   O seldom O never
  - Other   O always   O seldom O never
- Peer review committee   O always   O seldom O never
- Meeting of:
  Peer evaluator(s), faculty person and dean.
                                     O always   O seldom O never
- Individual student exit interviews.   O always   O seldom O never
- Exit interviews with graduating majors.
                                     O always   O seldom O never
- Survey of graduates.   O always   O seldom O never
- Departmental minutes.   O always   O seldom O never
- Student response to printed forms distributed at the end of the term:
                                     O always   O seldom O never
- Faculty response to student written assessments.
                                     O always   O seldom O never
- Dean sends her/his review of student responses to faculty person.
                                     O always   O seldom O never
- An annual conversation among: Dean, faculty person, peer chosen by the individual faculty.
                                O always   O seldom O never
- A discussion in class among students and faculty person.
                                     O always   O seldom O never
- Formal student meetings with one of the agenda items an assessment of the classes.
                                        O always   O seldom O never
- Faculty portfolios.   O always   O seldom O never

Comments:

10 All of the above are considered useful for helping improve faculty teaching. O yes   O no
        Comments:

11. One's Self evaluation goes to   O Peer   O Dean   O Chair
                                        O We do not have self evaluations.

Comments:

Our department has a different process for assessment than the rest of the college/university.
O yes   O no   O does not apply.

Assessment for Religious Studies should be different than for other departments.
O Yes   O no

Comments:

Different norms of assessment should be applied because of:
O Seniority   O Gender O Ordination O Classes taught
O Specialization   O Ethnic heritage   O language proficiency.
O Class profile of students.

Comments:

The following deals with the types of pedagogy used in your department or program's classes.

How often do your departmental / program faculty use the following:?

Lecture terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Essay exams terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Objective exams terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Term papers terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Book reports terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Team/Group exams terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Active learning	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown terminology
Experiential learning terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Field experience terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Case studies terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Role Playing terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Simulation games terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Cooperative learning terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
collaborative learning terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown

peer teaching terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
contract learning terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Independent study terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
internships terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Debates terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Audio visuals terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Internet	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown terminology
Field Education terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Service learning terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Learning Communities terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Management Teams terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Clinical Experience terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Teams or groups terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Journals terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Retreats terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Portfolios terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Team teaching	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown terminology
Community resources terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Computer assisted instruction terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown
Critical Thinking terminology	O 100 - 66%	O 67- 33%	O 32-0%	O Unknown

Leadership in pedagogical change comes principally from:
O The administration
O The faculty

Which department is the leader in pedagogical change in your institution?

Is there anyone in your department who would be interested in forming a study group dealing with experience based learning?

Further comments about assessment and pedagogy.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS: DEPARTMENTAL SURVEY FOR ASSESSMENT AND PEDAGOGY

for all departments/programs/schools

		yes	no
Q5a: Every year our department assesses: Individual faculty	Count	223	34
		86.8 %	13.2%
Q5b: Every year our department assesses: The department as a whole	Count	93	148
		38 6%	61 4%
Q5c: Every year our department assesses: Programs within the department	Count	81	150
		35.1%	64 9%

	Improve teaching	To provide information for salary and promotion	To improve departmental offerings	To improve academic advising
Q6: The primary purpose of Assessment in our department is: Count	174	66	27	1
	64.9%	24.6%	10.1%	.4%
07: The secondary purpose of assessment Count	68	65	108	13
	26 8%	25 6%	42 5%	5 1%

ll

0.

Q8. Our department uses standardized forms:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	in all assessment processes	96	34 9	39.5	39.5
	in 75% of our assessment processes	50	18.2	20 6	60 1
	in 50% of our assessment processes	53	19.3	21.8	81 9
	in 25% of our assessment processes	………….44	16.0	18 1	100 0
	Total	………..243	88.4	100.0	

Missing System		32	11.6	
Total		275	100.0	

Q9: All teaching faculty are assessed every year, every course.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	147	53.5	56.3	56.3
	No	114	41.5	43.7	100.0
Total		261	94.9	100.0	
Missing	System	14	5.1		
Total		275	100.0		

Q9a: If not every term for all faculty, senior faculty are assessed every:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	three years	56	20.4	35 7	35.7
	four years	10	3.6	6.4	42.0
	five years	25	9.1	15.9	58.0
	six years	2	.7	1.3	59.2
	Other	64	23.3	40.8	100
	Total	157	57.1	100	
Missing	System	118	42.9		
Total		275	100.0		

Page 1

Q9b: If not every term for alt faculty, junior faculty are assessed every:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Year	120	43.6	74.5	74.5
	two years	23	8.4	14.3	88.8
	Three years	14	5.1	8.7	97.5
	four years	2	.7	1.2	98.8
	five years	1	.4	.6	99 4
	sıx years	1	4	.6	100.0
	Total	161	58.5	100.0	
Missing	System	114	41.5		
Total		275	100.0		

			always	seldom	never
	Q10b: Self is Involved in individual faculty assessment	Count	183	26	16
			81.3%	11.6%	7.1%
	010c r Peers are involved in individual faculty assessment.	Count	105	86	28
			47.9%	39.3%	12.8%
	Qi0d: Chair is involved in individual faculty assessment.	Count	190	29	12

40

		82.3%	12.6%	5.2%
Ql0e: Dean is involved in individual faculty assessment.	Count	157	51	27
		66.8%	21.7%	11.5%
Q10f: Others are involved in individual faculty assessment.	Count	30	38	62
		23.1%	29.2%	47.7%

		always	seldom	never
Q11a: Assessment includes: peer evaluator(s) faculty person and dean.	Count	115	108	37
		442%	41.5%	14.2%
011 b: Assessment includes: individual student exit interviews.	Count	63	88	98
		25.3%	35.3%	39.4%
011c Assessment includes: exit interviews with graduating majors.	Count	95	77	80
		37 7%	30 6%	31 7%
Q11d: Assessment includes: survey of graduates.	Count	59	133	59
		23.5%	53.0%	23.5%
O1ler Assessment includes: departmental minutes.	Count	31	49	162
		12.8%	20.2%	66.9%
Ol1f: Assessment includes: student response to printed forms at end of term.	Count	230	21	16
		86 1%	7 9%	6 0%
O11g: Assessment includes: faculty response to student written assessments.	Count	63	98	83
		25 8%	40 2%	34 0%
O11h: Assessment includes: dean sends review of student responses to faculty person.	Count	110	49	97
		43 0%	19 1%	379%
O11i: Assessment includes: annual conversation among: dean, faculty person, peer	Count	62	65	121
		25 0%	26 2%	48 8%
011j: Assessment includes: discussion in class among students and faculty person	Count.	23	137	90
		9 2%	54.8%	36 0%
011k: Assessment includes: formal student meetings about assessment of classes.	Count	11	71	164
		4 5%	28.9%	66.7%
Q11l: Assessment includes: faculty portfolios.	Count	98	75	78
		390%	29.9%	31.1%

Q12: All of the above (see *Q11)* are considered useful for helping improve faculty teaching.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	162	58.9	67.5	67.5
	no	78	28.4	32.5	100.0
	Total	240	87.3	100.0	
Missing System		35	12.7		
Total		275	100.0		

		checked	not checked
013a: Facuity selt evaluations go to peers .	Count	42	233

			15.3%	84.7%
Q13b: Faculty self evaluations go to: dean.	Count		165	110
			60.0%	40.0%
Q13c: Faculty self evaluations go to: chair.	Count		153	122
			55.6%	44.4%
Q13d: We do not have self evaluations	Count		53	222
			19.3%	80.7%

Q14: Our department has a different process for assessment than the rest of the institution.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	18	6.5	6.8	6.8
	No	210	76.4	79.8	86.7
	does not apply	35	12.7	13.3	100.0
	Total	263	95.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	4.4		
Total		275	100.0		

			yes	no
015: Assessment of Religious Studies should be different than for other departments.		Count	32	220
		%	12.7%	87.3%
Q16: Assessment for Theology should be different than for other departments.		Count	36	194
		%	15.7%	84.33~1

		checked	not checked
Q17a: Different norms of assessment should be applied because of: seniority.	Count	28	47
		10 2%	89 8%
Q17b: Different norms of assessment should be applied because of: gender.	Count	3	272
		1 1%	98.9%
Q17c: Different norms of assessment should be applied because of: ordination.	Count	7	268
		2 5%	97.5%
Q17d: Different norms of assessment should t be applied because of: classes taught.	Count	50	225
		i 8 2%	81 .8%
Q17e: Different norms of assessment should be applied because of: specialization.	Count	31	244
		ii ~	88.7%
Q17f: Different norms of assessment should be applied because of: ethnic heritage.	Count	2	273
		7%	99.3%
Q17g: Different norms of assessment should be applied because of: language proficiency.	Count	5	270
		1 8%	98.2%
Q17h: Different norms of assessment should be applied because of: class profile of students.	Count	29	246
		10 5%	89.5%

	100- 66%	65- 33%	32- 0%	unknown terminology
Q18a: How often does your faculty use lectures? Count	137	104	18	2
	525%	39.8%	6.9%	.8%
018b: How often does your faculty use essay exams? Count	148	94	20	2
	56.1%	35.6%	7.6%	.8%
Q18c: How often do your faculty use objective exams? Count	41	104	112	4
	15.7%	39.8%	42.9%	1.5%
Q18d:How often do you rfaculty use term papers? Count	114	117	31	1
	43.3%	44.5%	11.8%	.4%
Q18e: How often do your faculty use: book reports? Count	22	103	124	6
	8.6%	40.4%	48.6%	2.4%
Q18f: How often do your faculty use team/group exams? Count	6	18	189	29
	2 5%	7.4%	78 1%	12.0%
Q18g: How often do your faculty use active learning? Count	37	84	79	60
	14.2%	32.3%	30.4%	23 1%
Q18h: How often do your faculty use experiential learning? Count	12	69	136	38
	47%	27.1%	53 3%	14 9%
Q18i: How often do you faculty use: field experiences? Count	14	52	180	11
	5.4%	20.2%	70.0%	4.3%
Q18j: How often do your faculty use case studies? Count	4	65	169	16
	1.6%	25.6%	66.5%	6.3%
018k: How often do your faculty use role playing? Count	1	19	208	25
	.4%	7.5%	82.2%	9.9%
0181: How often do your faculty use simulation games? Count		7	212	37
		2 7%	82.8%	14.5%
018m: How often do your faculty use: cooperative learning? Count	16	79	119	39
	6.3%	31.2%	47 0%	15.4% 31
018n: How often do your faculty use: collaborative learning? Count	17	82	124	
	6.7%	32 3%	48 8%	12.2%

	100 .66%	65- 33%	32 .0%	unknown

				terminology
U18o:How otten do your taculty use peer teaching? Count	4	35	76	43
	16%	136%	682%	16.7%
Ol8p: How often do your faculty use contract learning? Count	1	16	180	63
	4%	6.2%	69.2%	24.2%
018q: How often do your faculty use: independent study? Count	12	61	188	4
	4.5%	23.0%	70 9%	1 5%
018r: How often do your faculty use: internships? Count	13	36	199	10
	5.0%	14.0%	77.1%	3.9%
018s: How often do you faculty use: debates? Count	2	18	217	20
	.8%	7.0%	84.4%	7.8%
018t: How often do your faculty use: audio visuals? Count	54	142	68	
	20.5%	53.8%	25 8%	
Q18u: How often do your faculty use: internet? Count %	26	5	141	2
	9.8%	36.0%	53.4%	.8%
Q18v: How often do your faculty use: field education? Count	19	38	178	20
	7.5%	14.9%	69 8%	7.8%
018w: How often do your faculty use service learning? Count	11	36	168	28
	4.5%	14.8%	69.1%	11 5%
Q18x: How often do your faculty use: learning communities? Count	3	19	140	95
	1 2%	7 4%	54 5%	37.0%
Ol8y: How often do your faculty use: management teams? Count			134	120
			52 8%	47 2%
Q18z: How often do your faculty use: clinical experience? Count	5	15	196	38
	20%	5 9%	77.2%	15.0%
Ql8aa: How often do your faculty use: teams or groups Count	11	61	163	21
	4.3%	23 8%	63 7%	8 2%
Ql8bb: How often do your faculty use: journals? Count	6	73	161	13
	2.4%	28.9%	63.6%	5.1%
018cc: How often do your faculty use. retreats? Count	5	9	206	32
	2.0%	3.6%	81.7%	12.7%
Ol8dd: How often do your faculty use: portfolios? Count	9	21	186	39
	3.5%	8.2%	72.9%	15 3%
Ql8ee: How often do your faculty use: team teaching? Count	i	30	206	16
	4%	11.9%	814%	63%
018ff: How often do your faculty use				

community resources? Count	4	32	189	30
	16%	125%	741%	118%
Ol8gg: How often do your faculty use computer assisted instruction? Count		62	172	12
	4 3%	24 1%	66.9%	4.7%
Ol8hh: How often do your faculty use critical thinking? Count	125	66	40	9
	52 1 ·~	27 5%	16 7%	3 8%

Q19: **In our institution, leadership in pedagogical change comes principally from:**

	Frequency	Percent	Vaid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid the administration	41	14 ~	16.0	16.0
the faculty	215	840		100.0
Total	256	1	100,0	
Missing System	19	~		
Total	275	~:		