Master of Theological Studies Program Review Report
Prepared by the Curriculum and Educational Policy Committee

The Curriculum and Educational Policy Committee (CEPC) evaluated the Master of Theological Studies (MTS) Program Review on April 12, 2007. Dr. Howard Ebert was present to provide clarification and answer questions about the Review. This report summarizes the strengths, observations, concerns and recommendations of the CEPC.

Strengths

1. The program engaged an outside evaluator to aid in program evaluation.
2. The program’s list of action steps regarding the thesis directly address concerns articulated by the outside evaluator.
3. The program maintains close ties to the Diocese of Green Bay.
4. The program has maintained satisfactory enrollment.
5. Students report a high level of satisfaction with the program.
6. The off-campus outreach in Albuquerque is laudable.
7. The program makes good use of Norbertine resources.
8. The program benefits from a strong faculty.

Observations

1. The student satisfaction numbers were unconventionally documented. The document offered no timetables or percentages, only raw numbers.
2. The report identified outcomes but did not clearly delineate assessment results.
3. There was no discussion of the current student market in the De Pere, WI region.
4. The report did not include a summary of theses reviews.
5. Student post-graduation success was not measured.
6. The report did not clarify the organization and role of the Advisory Council.
7. The report did not offer comparable data on peer and aspirant institutions.
8. The role of the thesis advisors was not clarified.
9. The different religious denominations represented by students were not summarized.
10. The report did not discuss the impact of the MTS on the Religious Studies discipline as a whole.

Concerns

1. The report is incomplete.
   a. The process for declaring, attaining and transcribing the certificate(s) has not been clarified.
   b. Substantial concerns expressed by the outside evaluator have not been addressed.
   c. The report is not as data-driven as required by the guidelines.
d. There are no assessment data on theses or qualifying exams.
e. There are no assessment data for the Albuquerque site.
f. The financial viability of the program was not presented.
2. The Director has limited time to dedicate himself to the program.
3. There are no institutional evaluations for specialization courses.
4. Academic rigor appropriate to a graduate program was not presented.
5. Scheduling of courses appears haphazard.
6. Students take an inordinate amount of time to finish their theses.
7. The report was not carefully edited.

Recommendations

1. The missing and/or incomplete data should be included in the report.
2. The process for declaring, attaining and transcribing the certificate(s) must be clarified and regularized.
3. The concerns expressed by the outside evaluator - especially those regarding the writing and quality of the thesis and the time allotted for its completion - should be addressed.
4. The role of the Advisory Council should be clarified.
5. All faculty teaching in the program should be regularly evaluated. Both SOOTs and additional, program-specific forms should be used.
6. An assessment plan should be developed and implemented for the Albuquerque site.
7. The financial viability of the program should be presented.
8. The Director of the MTS should hold no other administrative position (the exception being, perhaps, the directorship of another graduate program).
9. The scheduling of courses should be regularized.
10. A comprehensive marketing plan for both sites should be developed.
11. The report should be more carefully edited.

The CEPC requests that the MTS Advisory Council submit a revised report incorporating the Committee’s recommendations in Spring, 2008.