

## 2018– 19 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	<b>Date:</b> June 14, 2019	<b>Course(s):</b> Rel 131
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> Dual Credit	Select	Select
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Paul Holtorf		
<b>Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) <i>Course requirement evaluation;</i> b) <i>Student Outcome;</i> c) <i>Question(s);</i> e) <i>Methodology</i>		
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> See attached document regarding scoring rubric. 2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – <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> If the scoring rubric for both the alternative and the traditional written assignments score an average of 3, then the department will be satisfied that the alternative delivery reflects the same content quality related to the concept of Christology as the traditional method.		
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 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 DC class involved 16 artifacts for analysis. The CUNE classes included a random sample of 24 artifacts, approximately 40% of the total artifacts. The same scoring rubric was used for both sets of submissions. The following are the results: Statement I: DC, 3.5; CUNE, 3.6; Statement II: DC, 3.4; CUNE, 3.7; Statement III: DC, 4.3; CUNE, 3.7; Statement IV: DC, 3.1; CUNE, 4.3; Statement V: DC, 4.2; CUNE, 4.3 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Overall, the criterion has been met for both the DC class as well as the CUNE class, which means that the DC course and the CUNE course are equivalent in its content and delivery. Improved communication between the DC site and CUNE re: assessment expectations and the assignment accounts for some of the improved scores from the previous year. Also, CUNE selected a different assignment which was better aligned to the assessment plan as well as the DC assignment. Finally, the DC artifact size was much larger than in previous years which gave a better sample size to compare with the CUNE artifacts. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) NA 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> Both sets of artifacts--DC and CUNE--met the criterion, so therefore, the courses demonstrated equivalency according to the standard set in the assessment plan.		
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 14, 2019 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> 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		
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> Continue to highlight and emphasize the assessment questions as stated above and maintain the course objectives of the course syllabus. 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Continue to use the writing assignment as the assessment tool to ensure consistency of content across both the DC course and the CUNE course. 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <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> None		
<b>Submitted by:</b> Paul Holtorf <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/17/19		
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved 6/17/19		
<b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na		