

#2. 2017 – 2018 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

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 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* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Random sample scored by using the rubric/scoring tool. See attached.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 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). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Thirty-six 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: 2.61; Statement 2: 1.70; Statement 3: 2.70; Statement 4: 2.1; Statement 5: 2.70. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The expected outcomes of achieving a 3 for all five statements were not met. A few observations: 1. Generally students did not perceive the linguistic background of the term grace, nor was able to articulate it in their papers. 2. Students varied significantly in their exegetical and writing skills. 3. At times, explanations of God's grace often focused on human behaviors rather than God's actions in Christ. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> NA	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> May 11, 2018 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Met as a department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Charles Blanco, David Coe, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, and Russ Sommerfeld	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> Be intentional in explaining the phrase grace of God by highlighting Scriptural examples. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Revise assignment slightly so that other concepts such as love and forgiveness can be seen in the broader sense of the grace of God. c. <i>Program:</i> Continue to incorporate the phrase in the General Education curriculum (Rel 131) d. <i>Assessment:</i> This was the second year in a row that these questions were assessed. The department will select a difference course and focus for 2018-19. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> The department will select a different course and focus on a different aspect of the learning content for 2018-19. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> NA	

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 has not determined the assessment questions at this time. The learning outcome for General Education for 2018-19 will be Analysis.

Submitted by:Paul Holtorf **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 6/14/18

Department Chair notified/additional action needed:na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**Approved & Posted to**

Assessment site: 7/1/18