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## ANALYSIS OF GRADUATION/RETENTION RATES/PLACEMENT RATES

NCF first offered classes in the fall 2009 and has maintained a graduation rate of between $50-83 \%$. In addition, the retention rate (based on First Time/Full Time) since 2017 (who have not yet reached the end of their program) ranges between $80-100 \%$. This indicates healthy graduation and retention rates.

| Class Entering: | Graduation Rates | Retention Rates* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 82\% |  |
| 2010 | 86\% |  |
| 2011 | 50\% |  |
| 2012 | 83\% |  |
| 2013 | 63\% |  |
| 2014 | 50\% |  |
| 2015 | 67\% |  |
| 2016 | 67\% |  |
| 2017 | 85.7\% | 84\%** |
| 2018 | 80\% | 100\%** |
| 2019 | 71.4\% | 85\%** |
| 2020 | 85.7\% | 87\%** |
| 2021 | 62.5\% | 80\%** |
| 2022 | 67 | 74\% |

*retention rates are calculated based on those who are still attending.
** calculated and updated 10/2023

Of the graduates of New College Franklin, nearly every student began employment or further education within six months of graduation (a few students have not reconnected with NCF after graduation). The following is a breakdown by class:

| Graduates of <br> Class | Employment | Homemaker | Additional <br> Schooling | Unknown |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 | $100 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 2012 | $100 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 2013 | $50 \%$ | - | - | $50 \%$ |
| 2014 | $50 \%$ | - | $33 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| 2015 | $75 \%$ | $25 \%$ | - | - |
| 2016 | $75 \%$ | - | $25 \%$ | - |
| 2017 | $67 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | - |
| 2018 | $75 \%$ | - | $25 \%$ | - |
| 2019 | $100 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 2020 | $100 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 2021 | $80 \%$ |  | $20 \%$ |  |
| 2022 | $80 \%$ |  | $20 \%$ |  |
| 2023 | $100 \%$ | - | - | - |

## SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE EVALUATIONS

## Administration Evaluations

The Administration and Staff of NCF are evaluated annually by the supervisor according to the job description, and these are placed in the personnel file. Board reviews are maintained by the Board.

| Name: | Title: | Supervisor | Evaluation Conducted |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Board of Trustees | Board of Trustees | Board Self Evaluation | In Progress |
| Greg Wilbur | President | Board of Trustees | In Progress |
| Brandon Spun | Dean of Academics/CAO | Greg Wilbur | In Progress |
| Larry Catlett | CFO | Greg Wilbur | In Progress |
| Tammy McCoy | Head of Operations, <br> Registrar, \& Bursar | In Progress |  |
| Nathan Johnson | Assistant Dean of <br> Academics \& Head of <br> Program | Brandon Spun | Completed |
| Faith Gulliver | Student and Library <br> Services | Tammy McCoy | Completed |
| Emmie Stuart | Librarian | Brandon Spun | Completed |

## Faculty Evaluations

The faculty were evaluated using several different methods and standards. First, nearly every faculty member was evaluated through an in-class observation (the form is available in the appendices of the Faculty Handbook). Second, faculty were evaluated through a student survey provided at the end of the semester for each course.
Third, faculty conducted a self-evaluation to review what they perceived were strengths and weaknesses that can be addressed in the future. Finally, faculty were reviewed according to the job description by the Head of Program or Academic Dean. The following is a summary list of evaluations available in the faculty files:

| Name: | Job Description | Self-Evaluation | In-Class Observation | Student Surveys |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brandon Spun | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Caleb Faires | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Carolyn Weber | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| David Filson | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Elijah Lubben | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Greg Wilbur | no | no | yes | yes |
| Jamie Crampton | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Kim Keck | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Nate Shurden | yes | no | yes | yes |
| Nathan Johnson | yes | yes | yes |  |

## Summary of Student Faculty/Course Surveys

The students were asked 12 questions related to the learning outcomes, preparedness of the professor, perceived quality of the course and the teacher, workload, and personal interest in the topic, etc., and were given the opportunity to rate each on a scale of 1 to 5 , with $1=$ poor and $5=$ excellent. The following is a summary of the average score for each professor, given in no particular order, and kept confidential. The overall average of all professors is 4.5 / 5

| Professor | Number of Students <br> Participating | Average Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Professor \# 1 | 3 | $4.5(90 \%)$ |
| Professor \# 2 | 22 | $3.0(60 \%)$ |
| Professor \# 3 | 6 | $4.8(97 \%)$ |


| Professor \#4 | 20 | $4.6(92 \%)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Professor \# 5 | 12 | $4.4(88 \%)$ |
| Professor \# 6 | 6 | $4.3(87 \%)$ |
| Professor \# 7 | 35 | $4.6(92 \%)$ |
| Professor \# 8 | 15 | $4.7(95 \%)$ |
| Professor \# 9 | 47 | $4.7(94 \%)$ |
| Professor \# 10 | 50 | $4.7(93 \%)$ |
| Professor \#11 | 8 | $4.7(94 \%)$ |

## REVIEW OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The following is a chart identifying the course, success rate for each student learning outcome, and a brief analysis if scores were lower than the $80 \%$ threshold.

| Course | SLO 1 | SLO2 | SLO3 | SLO4 | SLO5 | Analysis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Art (F) | 93 | 94 | 92 | 92 |  | Portfolio \& projects |
| Art (S) | 98 | 97 | 98 | 97 |  | Project |
| Composition | 88 | 87 | 85 | 86 |  | Essays |
| Arithmetic (F) | 76 | 76 | 76 | 76 |  | Final Exam |
| Arithmetic (S) | 90 | 87 | 90 | 90 |  | Final Exam |
| Greek I (F) | 91.8 | 91.8 | 91.8 | 91.8 |  | Exam |
| Greek II (S) | 90 | 81 | 89 |  |  |  |
| Greek III (F) | 85.4 | 85.4 | 85.4 | 85.4 |  | Exam |
| Harmonia (F) | 91 | 91 | 86 | 91 |  | Reading; Discussion; Writing |
| Harmonia (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ora et labora (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poetics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Logic | 80 | 80 | 90 | 90 |  | Exams; classwork; paper |
| Music (F) | 82 | 94 | 88 |  |  | Exam |
| Music (S) | 88 | 87 | 92 |  |  |  |
| MP1 (F) | 94 | 87 | 89 |  |  | Exam |
| MP1 (S) | 87 | 88 | 87 | 87 |  | Exam |
| MP2 (S) | 88 | 88 | 86 | 87 |  | Paper |
| MP2 Moral Philosophy (F) | 89 | 89 | 91 | 87 |  | Essay 1,2, Final Exam, Response Papers |
| MP3 (F) Moral Philosophy | 88 | 89 | 88 |  |  | Paper 2, Paper 3, Paper 1 |
| MP3 (S) Moral Philosophy | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 |  | Response Papers, Final Paper |
| MPIV (F) | 88 | 90 | 87 |  |  | HW; Paper |
| MPIV (S) | 89 | 89 | 88 | 88 |  | Exam and Paper |
| Rhetoric I (F) | 93 | 91 | 93 | 90 |  | Papers, Speeches, Transcripts |
| Rhetoric II (S) | 88 | 88 | 80 | 90 |  | Speeches \& Exam |
| Theology Seminar (F) | 87 | 87 | 89 | 89 | 89 | Final Exam |
| Theology Seminar (S) | 90 | 90 | 88 | 88 | 83 | Final Exam |
| Sacred Theology (F) |  |  |  |  |  | Exam |
| Sacred Theology (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing (F) | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Writing (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional courses did not properly assess SLOs |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## REVIEW OF OUTCOMES AT PROGRAM AND INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

## PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

| Program Objective | Sources | Average Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1\| Students will investigate the sovereign plan of God as executed in the progression of ideas and literature throughout major epochs of history and develop an appreciation of the past and its impact on present reality and future trends. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MP1- } \\ & \text { MP2- } \\ & \text { MP3- } \\ & \text { MP4- } \end{aligned}$ | 88\% |
| 2 \| Students will broaden their understanding of God through His works which display his beauty, order and wisdom, particularly through number, by investigating the nature of number (arithmetic), number in shape (Geometry), number in time (Harmonia), and number in space and time (Cosmology). | Arithmetic-Harmonia- | 85\% |
| $3 \mid$ Students will engage in the process of academic discovery, to value the deep and complex relationship between word and deed and construct meaningful conversations that are critical and creative, clearly communicated, and formulated with integrity. | Comp- <br> Logic- <br> Rhetoric- | 87\% |
| 4 \| Students will examine and articulate the overarching plan of God revealed through His Word, translate and interpret the Word of God from the original Greek, and analyze and apply theology as handed down from the historic tradition. | Greek - MP1 - MP2 - MP3- Theology Sem.- | 88\% |
| 5 \| Students will engage the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice by refining skills in artistic and musical expression, exploring practical application of knowledge in Preceptorial classes, and demonstrating personal development in projects or internships. | Art <br> Poetics <br> Music <br> Harmonia <br> Preceptorials | 90\% |

## INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|c|}\hline \text { Institutional Objective } & \text { Sources } & \text { Average Score } \\ \hline \text { 1| Wisdom | Fear of the Lord is the beginning of } & \text { Arith } & 87 \% \\ \text { wisdom; therefore, the community of New College } & \text { Art } & \\ \text { Franklin submits all learning, knowledge, } & \text { Logic } & \\ \text { institutional practice, and identity to the Lordship } & \text { MP1 } & \\ \text { of Christ by analyzing all human knowledge } & \text { MP2 } & \\ \text { through the framework of the Word of God and } & \text { MP3 } & \\ \text { humbling ourselves before the Word. } & \text { MP4 } & \\ & \text { Greek } & \text { Rhetoric }\end{array}\right]$

