

#4. 2017 – 18 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages **Date:** 6.21.18 **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:** Nancy Elwell, Paul Deterding, and Paul Holtorf

See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) *Course requirement evaluation*; b) *Student Outcome*; c) *Question(s)*; e) *Methodology*

Analysis of artifacts:

1). Student Outcome: **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)*. Final exam test scores.

2). **COMPARABILITY** – *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 t-test was calculated to compare the mean scores of the CUNE and Dual Credit classes.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

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). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Total number of scores analyzed: DC site: 6; CUNE: Section 1: 39; Section 2: 36

Mean scores: DC site: 92.5; CUNE: 93.51

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s)*. The department desired to see no difference between the DC offering and the CUNE offering. There is not a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the DC course and the CUNE course.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* NA

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** There is not a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the DC course and the CUNE course.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: June 21, 2018

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Through email

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

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* Continue to highlight and emphasize the assessment questions as stated above and maintain the course objectives of the course syllabus.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Continue to use the final exam as the assessment tool to ensure consistency of content across both the DC course and the CUNE course.

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): 6/25/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/25/18