

## **#2. 2017 – 18 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:** June 14, 2018

**Members involved with analysis of artifacts:** Charles Blanco, David Coe, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, and Russ Sommerfeld

**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):*

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.*

Eight (50% of 16) 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: 3.38

Statement 2: 3.63

Statement 3: 3.38

Statement 4: 3.25

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

The department desired to see scores in the 3 range on all four statements. This desired outcome was met for all four statements.

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 11, 2018

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

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

### **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:**

1. **ACTION\***- *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:*

a. *Teaching:* Continue to highlight and emphasize the key points that address the two key assessment questions above.

b. *Assignment/course:* Maintain the requirements of the assignment to ensure a 400-level course learning experience.

c. *Program:* Maintain the course as a Writing Intensive course for the department.

d. *Assessment:* No longer will serve as part of the department's program assessment plan.

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

A new set of questions and assignment will be selected for the 2018-19 academic year.

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?*** Nothing has been decided at the time of the writing of the Executive Summary.

**Submitted by:** Paul Holtorf  
6/14/18

**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:** 7/1/18