

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

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 Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for: a) Learning 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. See attached.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

1. Can the student demonstrate a knowledge of the concept of God's grace in the New Testament?
2. Can the student demonstrate how the concept of God's grace can be seen in Jesus Christ?
3. Can the student communicate how the concept of God's grace can be seen in Jesus Christ?

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

Twenty 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 results:

Statement 1: 1.95; Statement 2: 2.3; Statement 3: 2.25.

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

The expected outcomes of the statements were not met. The scores were lower than anticipated.

- a. An observation made that some students did follow the directions and expectations of the assignment.
- b. The written definition of grace seemed to be understood in inconsistent definitions.

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?*

- a. Instructions will be revised to provide three or four characteristics of grace, based on the Old Testament and New Testament passages before the writing assignment begins (b) so that the definition of grace may be understood and communicated in a consistent definition. In order to improve

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

The students will achieve higher scores on the three questions as stated above.

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 since the outcomes were not met in 2016-17.

**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: 5/16/17