

#4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Course: Theo 252 Alternative Format: Other Explain "Other" if selected: May Term
Department: Theology Date: 5/31/17
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld, David Coe
See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</i>
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> See attached Exegetical Study Steps with point values assigned to each step. 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared).</i> If the scores from the Exegetical project in the Alternative Delivery are within a range of 10-15% of Traditional Delivery, then the analysis will have revealed comparability of the two methods.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> What is involved in exploring a biblical text to develop an accurate interpretation of its meaning and to apply it to a contemporary setting? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The average score on the Exegetical project for Theo 252-01 during the Spring Semester of 2017 (total number of students = 26) was 82.1 out of 100 points possible. The average score on the Exegetical project for Theo 252 during the Alternative Deliver May Term semester of 2017 (total number of students = 9) was 84.6 our of 100 points possible. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The scores from the Exegetical project in the Alternative Delivery were within a range of 10-15% of Traditional Delivery (3.0%). These results are interpreted to mean that the methods employed in the Alternative Delivery semester are similarly as effective as in the Traditional Delievery semester. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). The outcomes indicate that the Alternative Delivery semester is very comparable with the Traditional Delivery semester. There is no loss of course effectiveness or student outcome.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 8/10/17 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Members of the Department of Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages Department considered the results. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld, David Coe
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> The results of the Alternative Delivery assessment indicate that no changes need to be made in the Alternative Delivery semester for Theo 252 in future May Term semesters. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> On the basis of the assessment it is anticipated that students will continue to benefit from taking Theo 252 in the Alternative Delivery semester of May Term, and that

advisors can encourage students to regard this Alternative Delivery course a viable option in meeting this criterion for appropriate program and major fields of study.

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

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Charles Blanco

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 8/23/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 8/23/17