

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages

Date: May 10, 2017

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Mark Meehl, Charles Blanco, Terence Groth, David Coe

See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) *Student Outcome*; b) *Background*; c) *Question(s)*; d) *Methodology*

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*
Random sample scored by using the rubric/scoring tool. Scores were averaged.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*

Students will use appropriate source material to write a research-based paper that meets the standards of the discipline as partially demonstrated by the following:

1. Can the student demonstrate good research skills in the construction of a research paper?
2. Can the student write a research paper in the style of MLA?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

Four (30% of 14) artifacts were assessed using the statements from the scoring rubric on a Likert scale of 1 (fails to meet outcome), 3 (meets outcome), and 5 (exceeds outcome).

The following are the mean scores:

Statement 1: 4

Statement 2: 3.75.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

The Department desired to see scores in the 3 range on both Statement 1 and 2. This desired outcome was met for both.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) na*

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: May 10, 2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Met as a department

Who were results shared with? (List names): Mark Meehl, Charles Blanco, Terence Groth, David Coe, Paul Holtorf, Russ Sommerfeld

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*

See Assessment question 2. Even though the desired outcome was met, the department desires an improved score on this item. Action: Give the students increased instruction in utilizing resources regarding MLA citation so that students will cite source material in an appropriate and academic manner.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year*

Students will demonstrate improved ability to utilize MLA style as it pertains to a theological research paper.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).* None

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? The department will undertake the same assignment for assessment in 2017-18 to determine if the proposed action improved citation performance. 50% of papers will be assessed.

**Submitted by: Paul Holtorf
5/16/17**

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/17/16