

2020 – 21 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	Date: 5.12.21
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: David Coe, Brian Gauthier, and Paul Holtorf	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: <i>a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology</i>	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> A statistical analysis of student submissions for Theo 361, arriving at a mean score for the assignment. A score of 80% or better will be required of 70% of the students in the class.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 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 work in theology? 2. Can a student demonstrate the ability to accurately summarize the theological arguments put forward in an upper-level, scholarly work in theology? 3. Can a student demonstrate the ability to assess and evaluate the arguments put forward in an upper level, scholarly work in theology? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> Fall 2020: N=18; Mean: 96.36; 100% of students scored 80% or better. Spring 2021: N=23; Mean: 88.43; 100% of students scored 80% or better. 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The papers demonstrated a high ability in comprehension of the material and demonstrated upper-level, scholarly work in theology. Students demonstrated a high ability in summarizing accurately theological arguments in an upper-level scholarly work in theology. Finally, students demonstrated a high ability to assess and evaluate arguments in an upper-level scholarly work in theology. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> Not applicable	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> May 12, 2021 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Emailed to the department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Charles Blanco, David Coe, Brian Gauthier, 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 the learning outcomes for the course. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Continue to keep the assignment in the course. c. <i>Program:</i> Continue to emphasize the scope and sequence of the theology courses as they pertain to the prerequisites and sequence of Theo 361 and Theo 362. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Continue to maintain the performance criteria as it demonstrates the level of competency re: the student's skills in evaluation and summarizing in theology. 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> To continue using the same assignment for future assessment purposes, using the same assessment criteria. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</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> With the addition of a new faculty member in the department who teaches the course along with current faculty, the department will proceed with the same assessment for the 2021-22 academic year.	
Submitted by: Paul Holtorf	Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/6/2021
Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: Approved 7/6/2021 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na	