

## 2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages <b>Date:</b> June 2, 2021 <b>Course(s):</b> Rel 121
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> <b>Dual Credit</b> <b>Select</b> <b>Select</b>
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Paul Deterding and Paul Holtorf
<b>See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Final Exams; Means will be derived from both the traditional and alternative courses and a t-test will be conducted between the traditional course and the alternative course based on the final exam scores. 2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). NA
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): 1. Can the student demonstrate a knowledge of what the Old Testament concept of messiah is, what the term means and how the term is expressed in Hebrew and Greek? 2. Can the student demonstrate the development of the messianic theme using Old Testament book and chapter references, and by showing how David (a believer) and Cyrus (an unbeliever) can each be called a messiah? 3. Can the student demonstrate how the New Testament presents Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament concept of messiah? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The dual credit class had two final exam scores: 93.3% and 100%. There were not enough dual credit scores to generate an analysis. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The department's goal is to see no difference between the dual credit offering and the CUNE offering. By conventional criteria, the difference is considered not to be statistically significant. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (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> Given the small sample size of the dual credit course, a statistical analysis could not be generated.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> When were results shared? Date: June 2, 2021    How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email    Who were results shared with? (List names): Charles Blanco, David Coe, Brian Gauthier, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Russ Sommerfeld, and Paul Deterding.
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year? Continue to highlight and emphasize the assessment questions as stated above and maintain the course objectives of the course syllabus. 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - What is the anticipated impact of the <b>ACTION*</b> on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Continue to use the final exam as the assessment tool to ensure consistency of content across both the dual credit course and the CUNE course. 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the <b>ACTION*</b> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).    None
<b>Submitted by:</b> Paul Holtorf <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 7/9/2021
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved
<b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na