

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

**Course:** Theo 361    **Alternative Format:** Other    **Explain "Other" if selected:** Summer Term  
**Department:** Theology    **Date:** 8/7/18

**Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:** Paul Holtorf and Terry Groth

**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).* T-test performed between Spring semester and Summer semester.

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).* If the difference between the scores from the Spring semester and the Summer semester are not statistically significant, then one can say that the courses are equivalent in learning outcomes.

#### **Summary of RESULTS\*:**

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* What is involved in creating a doctrinal essay on a topic within Christian doctrine and its application to teaching and proclaiming the Gospel?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Spring semester: Mean, 88.27; SD, 6.83; SEM, 2.06; N=11; Summer semester: Mean, 89.89; SD, 7.15; SEM, 2.38; N=9

3). **INTERPRETATION\*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The two-tailed P value equals 0.6123, so by conventional criteria this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

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

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). **The outcomes indicate that the Alternative Delivery semester is very comparable with the Traditional Delivery semester. There is no loss of course effectiveness or student outcome.**

#### **Sharing of Results:**

*When were results shared? Date:* 8/9/17

*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Members of the Department of Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages Department considered the results.

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

#### **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?* The results of the Alternative Delivery assessment indicate that no changes need to be made in the Alternative Delivery semester for Theo 361 in future Summer Term semesters.

2. **IMPACT\***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION\* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* On the basis of the assessment it is anticipated that students will continue to benefit from taking Theo 361 in the Alternative Delivery semester of Summer Term, and that advisors can encourage students to regard this Alternative Delivery course a viable option in meeting this criterion for appropriate program and major fields of study.

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): 8-9-18**

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**

**Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 8-9-18**