

## 2020 – 21 & 2021 - 22 General Education Executive Summary

<b>Department:</b> Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages <b>Date:</b> June 3, 2022
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Brian Gauthier and Paul Holtorf
<b>See General Education Assessment Plan for:</b> a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> A statistical analysis of student submissions for Theo 210, 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.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 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). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Fall 2021: N=27; Mean, 94%; Scoring above 80%, 100%; Spring 2022: N=31; Mean, 93%; Scoring above 80%, 97%; For the academic year: N=58; Mean, 93.65%; Scoring above 80%, 98%.  3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> 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). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) NA</i>
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 3, 2022 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Charles Blanco, David Coe, Brian Gauthier, John Genter, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, and Russ Sommerfeld
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i>  a. <i>Teaching:</i> Continue to keep the learning outcome in the course.  b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Continue to keep the assignment in the course.  c. <i>Program:</i> Continue to emphasize the importance of this assignment (Vocational interview) for the general education-Theology component.  d. <i>Assessment:</i> Continue to maintain the performance criteria as it demonstrates the level of competency re: the student skills in evaluation and summarizing in Theological studies.  2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <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. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <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
<b><i>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</i></b>
<b><i>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</i></b> Maintain the same questions as stated in this summary.
<b>Submitted by:</b> Paul Holtorf <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed:</b> 6/14/22
<b>Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved 6/14/22

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**