

2019– 20 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages Date: June 19, 2020 Course(s): Rel 131
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit Select Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Deterding and Paul Holtorf
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: <i>a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</i>
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> See attached document regarding scoring rubric 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery 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.
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 DC class involved 5 artifacts for analysis. The CUNE classes included a random sample of 20 artifacts, approximately 35% of the total artifacts. The same scoring rubric was used for both sets of submissions. The following are the results: Statement I: DC, 3.2; CUNE, 3.4; Statement II: DC, 3.2; CUNE, 3.5; Statement III: DC, 2.2; CUNE, 3.3; Statement IV: DC, 3.2; CUNE, 4.1; Statement V: DC, 3.2; CUNE, 3.9 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The criterion has been met for both the DC course as well as the CUNE course, except for Statement III. A couple of factors to consider here: small artifact size from the DC course and a review by the CUNE department re: the assessment questions. Overall the writing from both the DC and CUNE course was at a college-level in terms of clarity, organization, and content. 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). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Both sets of artifacts--DC and CUNE--met the criteria except for Statement III. Overall, the quality of the papers reflected strong Biblical and theological content aligned with the course objectives.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 19, 2020 <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, Brian Gauthier, 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> CUNE will review the assessment questions above and include language that reflects an Old Testament dimension to the assignment. CUNE will communicate the revision with the participating DC school. 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> The writing assignment as an assessment tool demonstrates a good measurement of the content for both the DC course and the CUNE course. This assignment ensures consistency of course objectives for both the DC participating school and CUNE. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). None
Submitted by: Paul Holtorf Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 7/15/2020
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 7/15/2020
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na