

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Theology, Philosophy and Biblical Languages	Date: 6/19/17	Course(s):
Rel 121		
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:		
Dual Credit	Select	Select
Select	Select	Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Deterding (SPLHS) and Paul Holtorf (CUNE)		
See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>		
Analysis of artifacts:		
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Compared final exam scores from SPLHS with final exam scores from CUNE.</i>		
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). A mean will be calculated for both the traditional course (CUNE) and the alternative course (SPLHS). A t-test will be calculated to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the traditional course and the alternative course. If there is not a statistically significant difference between the two courses, then the department can say that both courses offer the same content in both the traditional course and the alternative course.</i>		
Summary of RESULTS*:		
1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i>		
1. Can the student demonstrate a knowledge of what the Old Testament concept of messiah is, what the term means and how the term is expressed in Hebrew and Greek?		
2. Can the student demonstrate the development of the messianic theme by using Old Testament book and chapter references, and by showing how both David (a believer) and Cyrus (an unbeliever) can each be called a messiah?		
3. Can the student demonstrate how the New Testament presents Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament concept of messiah?		
2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. A t-test was conducted to see if there was any statistical significance between the alternative delivery and the traditional delivery. There was a statistically significant difference between the alternative delivery mean and the traditional delivery mean..</i>		
3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Because the alternative delivery mean is lower than the traditional delivery mean in a significant way, the results suggest that the alternative students are not performing at a level comparable to the traditional delivery students.</i>		
4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) None</i>		
5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? In the alternative delivery, there were only five scores to calculate as opposed to a much more robust sample in the traditional delivery.		
Sharing of Results:		
<i>When were results shared? Date: 6/21/17</i>		
<i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Sent as an email</i>		
<i>Who were results shared with? (List names): Paul Deterding, SPLHS; Bernie Toenjes, CUNE; Charles Blanco, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, David Coe, Russ Sommerfeld, Mark Meehl, all from CUNE.</i>		
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:		
1. ACTION* - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of</i>		

this course starting the next academic year? The liaison from the traditional delivery method will contact the alternative delivery instructor prior to the start of the academic year to review the course objectives, course materials, and instructional methods. For the 2017-18 academic year, the same assessment plan implemented for 2016-17 will utilized for 2017-18.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* To have the alternative delivery students demonstrate a comparable learning experience and outcome with the traditional delivery students.

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: Paul Holtorf

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/22/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/22/17