

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages 131			Date: 6.21.18			Course(s): Rel			
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:									
Dual Credit		Select		Select		Select		Select	
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Deterding and Paul Holtorf									
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).</i> New Testament paper on Jesus' titles and ministry									
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> Average scores on 5 statements in the New Testament paper were compared for the DC class and CUNE classes.									
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> The Dual Credit class involved six students' submissions for analysis. For the CUNE course, a random sample of 36 artifacts were assessed. The same scoring rubric was used for both sets of submissions. (See attached). The following are the results: Statement 1: DC, 1.5; CUNE, 2.61; Statement 2: DC, 1.5; CUNE, 1.70; Statement 3: DC, 2.33; CUNE, 2.70; Statement 4: DC, 2.17; CUNE, 2.1; Statement 5: DC, 4; CUNE, 2.70.									
3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> In only one statement (Statement 5) did the DC class meet and exceed the standard of a 3 which meant that the outcome was met. All the other statements from the DC class were under a 3 and under the scores from the CUNE course. It needs to be noted that the CUNE course did not receive a 3 for any of the five statements. An observation: Like the CUNE students, the DC students varied significantly in their exegetical and writing skills.									
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									
5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Both sets of artifacts--DC and CUNE-- were both below the expectations of the department in terms of the outcomes being met.									
Sharing of Results:									
<i>When were results shared?</i> Date: 6.21.18									
<i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Through email									
<i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Charles Blanco, David Coe, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Russ Sommerfeld, and Paul Deterding									
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 department will discuss what type of assessment questions can be identified, keeping the same assignment for the DC site but modifying the assignment at CUNE so that a more unified assignment and assessment questions can be conducted to ensure that the content and learning outcomes from both sites--CUNE and DC site-- are equivalent.									

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* A stronger and more unified approach in assessment and learning re: Rel 131.

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