# ANNUAL PLO ASSESSMENT REPORT
## 2016-2017

## I. Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Name of Department Chair or Program Director</th>
<th>Annual Report for Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Charles L. Feinberg Center for Messianic Jewish Studies M.Div. in Messianic Jewish Studies</td>
<td>Gregory Hagg</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. PLO Assessment Activity

**List the Program Learning Outcome Assessed this Year**

- **University Learning Objective (ULO #3):** Patterns of Action - All students will be equipped with patterns of action to lead in the face of unscripted problems for the good of a changing world.
- **MDiv PLO #2:** Exegete and apply a biblical text properly through application of historical-grammatical hermeneutics (see ULO 3).
- **Messianic Jewish Studies (MJS PLO #1):** Demonstrate and be committed to an accurate exposition of the Word of God. Students will learn pertinent background information for Bible books, the evangelical principles of literary interpretation of the Word of God, and skills for the exposition of biblical texts (see MDiv PLO #2).

**PT723 Integration in Messianic Jewish Studies** is a capstone course in our program. Led by Dr. Gregory Hagg, he and the other professors spend time with the students to integrate coursework that has already been taken in the various disciplines. This course had been scheduled for evaluation during 2015-2016, but due to having no qualified students that semester, it was postponed to this year, 2016-2017. According to the syllabus, students will be able to focus on primary Biblical texts that relate to their teaching and preaching ministries among the Jewish people. The PLO in exegesis was also evaluated last year, but because of the specificity, depth, and focus on Jewish ministry in the integration course, this PLO was selected once again.

**Describe the student evidence collected to evaluate the outcome (e.g. the final research paper from BBST 465)**

The specific PLO stated above concerning exegesis was evaluated through the following assignment:

- **Hermeneutics – Interpreting Key Passages**
- Comparing the Evangelical Christian and Jewish Approach to the Bible, compare and contrast the Evangelical hermeneutical approach to the Old Testament with the traditional Jewish approach to the Old Testament? How might these differences influence the ways in which Messianic Jews and missionaries to the Jewish people interpret and teach the Hebrew Scriptures?
Readings:
Bock and Glaser, Gospel According to Isaiah 53, pp. 33-61
Evans, Craig, Jesus and Jewish Hermeneutics, (article provided)

Paper #: In light of the above, discuss either Isaiah 53 or Deuteronomy 6:4, using what you have learned from studying Hebrew exegesis. How is the text approached and viewed by Christians, Jews, and Messianic Jews?

The above assignment was one of a series of 8 research/reflection papers (along with oral presentations) on topics detailed in the course syllabus. Topics included Hermeneutics, Hebrew and Greek Exegesis of critical passages, Historical Theology, Messianic Jewish Theology, Missiology, Eschatology, and Ecclesiology. Other topics included the analysis of Jewish views of Christian history, attitudes of Jewish scholarship toward the Messianic Hope, exegesis of Romans 9-11 in various traditions, current views of Israel’s political and/or biblical right to the Land, etc. Students also submitted reflection papers on museum field trips and films that were viewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate the Number of Assignments Collected:</th>
<th>Indicate the Number of Collected Assignments Evaluated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 in Hermeneutics (24 in all)</td>
<td>3 in Hermeneutics (24 in all)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If only some assignments were evaluated, please explain why, and the selection process
N/A

Evaluation Process (Please explain how the student evidence was evaluated. Please attach rubrics or other evaluation materials used)
I have attached rubric(s) used for evaluation ___X__Yes ___No

Individual(s) who evaluated the evidence: Dr. Gregory Hagg, Dr. Mitch Glaser, Dr. Zhava Glaser, and Dr. Rich Flashman

How the evidence was evaluated:
A rubric for academic writing was provided for the students. All professors read all the papers, although the professor who led the discussion on his or her topics issued the grades. Dr. Hagg tabulated the final grades. Students were also evaluated on their participation in the discussion of each other’s papers during the class sessions. The students also reported on the required reading for the course.

Summary of Results (Please include a description, using percentages and mean scores, of the major findings from the assessment activity. Data or charts may be attached)
All three students earned an A for their well-written papers, oral defense, and completed reading. Other objective measurements were difficult to ascertain. The subjective analysis of writing and verbal presentation by the professors was sufficient to determine the grades for the course.

Methods Used for Sharing Assessment Information
Discussion among professors. Since the Feinberg program is relatively small, the student/teacher ratio allows significant interaction. The professors frequently evaluated the performance of the students in this course and had ample time with the students on an individual basis.

Note: this is an essential part of the process and must be completed before moving forward with the remainder of the report.
Conclusions
What did the data tell your faculty team about students’ attainment of the learning outcome?
Concerning the specific PLO #1, “Demonstrate and be committed to an accurate exposition of the Word of God. Students will learn pertinent background information for Bible books, the evangelical principles of literary interpretation of the Word of God, and skills for the exposition of biblical texts,” the papers and presentations on Deuteronomy 6 and Isaiah 53, coupled with the class discussions, provided evidence that the students successfully met the goals.

The faculty members also concluded that each of the students demonstrated abilities to integrate Jewish and Christian studies, to understand and respond to issues related to supersessionism, and to exegete and defend specific passages of scripture related to Jewish ministry. They were also able to determine which approach to Messianic Jewish theology and practice best represented their personal convictions. In addition to other learning outcomes, the faculty members were satisfied that students demonstrated an attainment of the specific PLO under evaluation, “Employ knowledge of Jewish culture and values effectively in diverse ministry situations.”

Explain any strength or weakness suggested about the curriculum:
Although the students visited museums and viewed a theatrical production, they suggested additional experiences like these. The educational value of being in the field is significant. More such “hands-on” sessions should be incorporated into the course for the future.

Identifying Changes to Result From Faculty Team’s Conclusions
The evidence suggested that we need to:

☐ Develop a Rubric  ☐ Revise Existing Rubric  ☐ Revise the Assignment  ☐ Implement a new pedagogy  ☐ Implement new technology
☐ Provide models to students  ☐ Identify courses earlier in program where students could further practice the skill  ☐ Revise Curriculum Map
☐ Revise Course sequencing  ☐ Other – Please Specify: see above

Please describe the changes and/or improvement planned as a result of your analysis.
Enhanced field experience.

☐ No changes (while this would be unlikely, in rare cases where multiple cycles of assessment have already occurred, this might occur)

Please Explain:

Implementing the Proposed Change
Describe the change that will be implemented:
This course is scheduled to be offered again in the Spring of 2019. An additional 2-3 sessions will be scheduled for visits to Jewish museums, agencies, synagogues, seminaries, theaters, or other institutions that can provide personal experiences in the Jewish community of New York.

When will the change be implemented?
During the next offering of the course in the Spring of 2019.

**How will the change be implemented?**
The syllabus will reflect the change.

III. PLO Assessment Plan for Next Academic Year (2017-2018)

All of the items in Section III are about the assessment activity the department/program plans to complete during the next academic year.

**List the Program Learning Outcome(s) to be assessed**

M.Div. PLO#10: Develop skills of ministry specifically appropriate for the Jewish community. (Formerly, employ knowledge of Jewish culture and values effectively in diverse ministry situations.)

TH622 – Theology of the Siddur is the course to be evaluated in the Spring of 2018.

**Describe the student evidence to be collected for assessment**

Examinations, in-class recitation, corporate worship.

**Term evidence will be collected:** *(Note: experience indicates it is often best to assess in fall, and complete the analysis in spring)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(if student evidence is collected in Spring 2018, the analysis may need to be completed in Fall 2018.)

IV. Follow Up on PLO Assessment and Programmatic Changes from Previous Year (2015-2016)

**List the Program Learning Outcome Assessed in 2015-16**

BE517 Hermeneutics (Fall 2015)

PLO #1: Demonstrate and be committed to an accurate exposition of the Word of God. Students will learn pertinent background information for Bible books, the evangelical principles of literary interpretation of the Word of God, and skills for the exposition of biblical texts.

**Describe the student evidence that was collected for assessment**

Meditative Hermeneutical Project in which the students analyze Luke 16:1-13 using the principles of interpretation learned throughout the course.

University Learning Objective (ULO #3): Patterns of Action - All students will be equipped with patterns of action to lead in the face of unscripted problems for the good of a changing world.

MDiv PLO #2: Exegete and apply a biblical text properly through application of historical-grammatical hermeneutics (see ULO 3).

Messianic Jewish Studies (MJS PLO #1): Demonstrate and be committed to an accurate exposition of the Word of God. Students will learn pertinent background information for Bible books, the evangelical principles of literary interpretation of the Word of God, and skills for the exposition of biblical texts.
(see MDiv PLO #2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What curricular change was implemented?</th>
<th>Was new data collected after this change?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More personal classroom time with the facilitating professor was made available during the course when it was next offered Fall of 2017. A new Talbot course has been developed to provide Research Methodology training. It is an online, non-credit course that is required for all students. It replaces the 1 credit course that was previously required in the first summer session for all Feinberg students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has there been any observable impact on teaching or learning? If so, describe.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students appreciate the opportunity to interact with the facilitating professor of this hybrid course. The students also appreciate the online format of the research methodology course, and they will be completing it during the spring of 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If no data was collected, when will new data be collected and evaluated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Guidelines for the Meditative Hermeneutical Paper

Due: See assignment info in Canvas

Length: No More than 10 Double-spaced Pages! INSERT PAGE NUMBERS!!!

Goal: To explain Luke 16:1-13 by placing it within the broader and more immediate context of the argument of its biblical book and to explain the structure and content of your passage, including any and all exegetical options and theological issues, which should culminate in a meaningful personal application from the passage as you meditate upon its meaning and its significance to your life.

Methodology: Section 1. The Broader Context: the Gospel of Luke: You should first do your own inductive study of the argument of the Gospel of Luke to see how your passage fits into this broader scheme of the whole of this book. You should briefly summarize this argument in 1-1.5 pages and how your passage fits into it. Remember, the part primarily derives its meaning in relationship to the whole! Consult the course handout, “Suggested Steps in the Exegesis of a Biblical Passage” for this full process. Section 2. The “Travel Narrative” Context: Now explain briefly how your passage relates to Luke’s “Travel Narrative of Jesus” (Luke 9:51-19:28). This deals with the more immediate context of the last 6 months of Jesus’ ministry as He sets His face to go to Jerusalem and suffer and die. Spend approximately 2 pages demonstrating the specific themes in these chapters that relate thematically to the topic in Luke 16:1-13. Section 3. Within the Paragraph: Now you are ready to tackle your specific paragraph/pericope and to explain the unique content within it. Begin by tracing the flow of thought within your passage. What is the structural and logical shape of your section? What is the author's intention within this passage? State the author's main idea of the passage in a concise, one sentence summary of the passage. Express the development of this main idea in an outline, diagram, or chart of your passage. Section 4. Exposition: Now put meat on the bones of your structural and logical skeleton of the passage by systematically going through the passage, following your outline in a section-by-section manner. Clearly demonstrate how each section develops the main idea of the passage and how it fits into the structural and logical flow of the paragraph. Section 5.
Issues & Commentaries: As you are systematically going through the passage, you may encounter some exegetical or theological problems or issues. Lay out the interpretive options for the issues and give your best defense of one of these options. Clearly delineate what the issues and choices are and why you chose the one that you did. Consult at least 3 good commentaries, if you need additional help on these issues. You normally go in-depth at this point, but must be brief in this paper! Section 6. Meditation & Your Report about It: Finally, after you have done all of the above exegetical work, you are ready to make some application to yourself based on the truths within your passage. What is the significance of these truths to you as you meditate upon them for at least 4 hours? This process takes some specific focus, so allow adequate meditative time for this passage’s truths to “trickle down” into your soul! Suggestion: Do 4 times at 1 hour each or 2 times at 2 hours each set aside simply to ponder the significance of these truths and their relevance to your life. Record your meditations on the final 2-3 pages of your paper. Specifically state the amount of time you spent meditating.

See the Grading Rubric on the following page and the Luke Commentaries on reserve in the Biola Library.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Score: 1-10</th>
<th>10 Outstanding</th>
<th>8-9 Good/Very Good</th>
<th>7 Acceptable</th>
<th>1-6 Not Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Accounts fully for the historical context of the passage and shows relevance</td>
<td>Accounts for the historical context of the passage in a helpful way</td>
<td>Accounts the historical context of the passage but not well-integrated into exegesis</td>
<td>Merely mentions or fails to account for the historical context of the passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Accounts fully for the literary context of the passage and shows relevance</td>
<td>Accounts for the literary context of the passage in a helpful way</td>
<td>Accounts the literary context of the passage but not well-integrated into exegesis</td>
<td>Merely mentions or fails to account for the literary context of the passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Accounts fully for the genre</td>
<td>Accounts for the genre of</td>
<td>Accounts the genre of the</td>
<td>Merely mentions or fails to account for the genre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Effectiveness
2013-14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Text</strong></th>
<th>Score: Recognizes all important exegetical questions regarding the passage (lexical, grammatical, discourse, historical/cultural, geographical, etc.)</th>
<th>Score: Provides insightful responses to the exegetical questions, showing relevance for understanding the passage</th>
<th>Score: Provides a clear and exegetically sound summary of the meaning of the passage</th>
<th>Score: Uses appropriate sources to answer the exegetical questions (one or two commentaries, e.g.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes most important exegetical questions regarding the passage</td>
<td>Provides good responses to the exegetical questions and shows relevance for understanding the passage</td>
<td>Provides mostly clear and exegetically sound summary of the meaning of the passage</td>
<td>Uses a number of good sources to address the exegetical questions but with even less variety or appropriateness (perhaps several good commentaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes some of the important exegetical questions of the passage</td>
<td>Provides responses to the exegetical questions but with minimal helpfulness for understanding the passage</td>
<td>Provides a somewhat clear and exegetically acceptable summary of the meaning of the passage</td>
<td>Uses a minimum of sources to answer the exegetical questions (one or two commentaries, e.g.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fails to recognize most of the important exegetical questions of the passage</td>
<td>Provides minimal or no responses to the exegetical questions and fails to show relevance for understanding the passage</td>
<td>Gives an unclear or exegetically unsound summary of the meaning of the passage or none at all</td>
<td>Uses a variety of appropriate sources to address the exegetical issues but could expand to include a greater variety of or more appropriate sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Gives a thoughtful and reasonable summary of the author’s intention in the passage (how the author intended to affect the audience, given their historical situation)</td>
<td>Gives a reasonable summary of the author’s intention in the passage (how the author intended to affect the audience, given their historical situation)</td>
<td>Gives a summary of the author’s intention in the passage (how the author intended to affect the audience, given their historical situation), though lacking in depth of insight or not as well-founded on the exegesis</td>
<td>Gives a summary of the author’s intention in the passage (how the author intended to affect the audience, given their historical situation) lacking any real insight or gives no summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Makes an appropriate and very insightful application of the passage to themself or the modern church.</td>
<td>Makes a moderately insightful and appropriate application of the passage to themself or the modern church.</td>
<td>Makes an appropriate application to themself or the modern church, though depth of insight is lacking</td>
<td>Makes inappropriate or very pedestrian application to themself or the modern church or no application at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>Meditated 4 hours</td>
<td>Meditated 3 hours</td>
<td>Meditated 2 hours</td>
<td>Meditated 0 or 1 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment #2

Narrative Concerning Program Learning Objectives