

## 2018 – 19 Departmental Executive Summary

<b>Department:</b> Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	<b>Date:</b> June 12, 2019
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Charles Blanco and Paul Holtorf	
<b>See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:</b> a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> A statistical analysis of student submissions for each week of the semester will be conducted, arriving at a mean score for each week. A score of 80% or better will be required of 70% of the students in the class.	
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 1. Can a student demonstrate the ability to read and understand the material in an upper-level, scholarly commentary on a book of the Greek New Testament? 2. Can a student demonstrate the ability to accurately summarize the linguistic and theological arguments put forward in an upper-level scholarly commentary on a book of the Greek New Testament? 3. Can a student demonstrate the ability to assess and evaluate the arguments put forward in an upper-level, scholarly commentary on a book of the Greek New Testament, utilizing scholarly tools of the field (grammars, lexicons, other commentaries, etc.) 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> Measuring the actual students over the two semesters and the grade they received: 9 total students, 8 received a grade of A, 1 received a grade of B. Thus, the department achieved the performance criteria of a score of 80% or better required of 70% of the students in the class. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> 1. The artifacts were very impressive in their ability to analyze commentary material. 2. The artifacts demonstrated a high level of critical thinking. 3. The artifacts demonstrated clear writing and good presentation of complex material. 4. The artifacts demonstrated the ability to use technical exegetical and linguistic language terms in a manner that was both understandable and readable. 5. The artifacts demonstrated that the students have adopted well the ethos of exegetical methodology. 6. The artifacts demonstrated that the students possessed sufficient knowledge in the field to work with upper-level scholarly resources in the field. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> None	
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> May 9, 2019 <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	
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> Continue to keep this course objective in the course syllabus. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Continue to incorporate this assignment in the course. c. <i>Program:</i> Continue to maintain high expectations re: exegetical and linguistic knowledge and skills for students taking this class d. <i>Assessment:</i> Continue to maintain the performance criteria as it demonstrates the level of competency re: the student's exegetical and linguistic skills. 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> To consider using the Hebrew Readings course, using the same assessment questions and performance criteria. 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> None	
<b>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</b>	
<b>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</b> See "2 IMPACT ACTION" above	

**Submitted by:** Paul Holtorf

**Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):** 6/17/19

**Department Chair notified/additional action needed:** na **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment**

**Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** na **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:** 6/17/19