

2021 – 22 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	Date: June 3, 2022
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Russ Sommerfeld and Paul Holtorf	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). A statistical analysis of student submissions for Theo 381, 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). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): 1. What is the definition of vocation? 2. How is the Christian faith linked to vocation? 3. In what way is vocation seen as a gift from God? 2). Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.) Fall 2021: N=22; Mean, 86%; Scoring above 80%, 86%; Spring 2022: N=17; Mean, 99.24%; Scoring above 80%, 100%; For the academic year: N=39; Mean, 91.63; Scoring above 80%, 92%. 3). INTERPRETATION * - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The analysis demonstrated that students addressed and responded to the three assessment questions in a satisfactory manner, exceeding the requirement established by the department for assessment purposes. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). NA	
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: June 3, 2022 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, John Genter, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, and Russ Sommerfeld	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION *- How will what the department learned from the assessment impact: a. Teaching: Continue to keep the learning outcome in the course. b. Assignment/course: Continue to keep the assignment in the course. c. Program: Continue to emphasize the importance of this assignment (Educator Interview paper) in the Theology requirements for educators. d. Assessment: Continue to maintain the performance criteria as it demonstrates the level of competency re: the student skills in evaluation and summarizing in Theological and Educational studies. 2. IMPACT *- What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION * on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? To continue using the same assignment for future assessment purposes, using the same assessment criteria. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION * None	
If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.	
What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? Maintain the same questions as stated in this summary	
Submitted by: Paul Holtorf	Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/14/22
Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: Approved 6/14/22 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na	