

2018 – 2019/2019 – 2020 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages Date: June 12, 2019
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Charles Blanco, David Coe, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, and Russ Sommerfeld
General Education Assessment Plan: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Following the collection of the writing assignment from Rel 121, the department will randomly select 30-40% from the sections of Rel 121 and score them. Attached is the rubric. The department desires to see scores in the 3 range, based on a Likert scale of 1(fails to meet outcome) to 5 (exceeds the outcome).
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 1. Can the student recognize various academic viewpoints? 2. Can the student critically evaluate differing academic viewpoints? 3. Can the student synthesize differing academic viewpoints? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Thirty artifacts were assessed using the statements from the scoring rubric on a Likert scale of 1(fails to meet outcome), 3 (meets outcome), and 5(exceeds outcome). The following are the results: Statement I = 3.43; Statement II = 3.23; Statement III = 3.43; Statement IV = 3.5 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The expected outcomes of achieving a 3 for all four statements were met. A few observations: 1. The content of the assignments reflected a strong understanding of the academic debates re: the Messiah. 2. There were a variety of writing abilities across the artifacts. 3. The analysis within the assignments was to be expected, given that most students in the course are first and second year students at the university. The skill of analysis will be developed more as students become more knowledgeable of the content and the various approaches in Biblical studies. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> None
Sharing of Results: <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
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <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 foster analysis in the Biblical literacy courses. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Continue to maintain the performance criteria as it demonstrates the level of analysis for the Biblical literacy course in the General Education curriculum. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> In the 2017-18 academic year, the same assignment was assessed and in that assessment, the expected outcomes were not met. In the 2018-19 academic year, the expected outcomes were met. The same assignment and assessment process will be incorporated to ensure that the analysis outcome is maintained. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <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
<i>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</i>
<i>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</i> See 2. IMPACT response.
Submitted by: Paul Holtorf Assessment Committee Reviewed: 6/17/19
Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed: approved 6/17/19

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na