

## 2022 – 23 & 2023 - 24 General Education Executive Summary

<b>Department:</b> Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages <b>Date:</b> May 30, 2023
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Paul Holtorf and Mark Meehl
<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 Rel 121, 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. Can the student recognize the thesis statement of a peer-reviewed scholarly journal article, along with the evidence provided in the article in support of that thesis statement? 2. Can the student critically evaluate the author's thesis statement on the evidence provided in the article and also based on the student's own reading of the Old Testament literature? 3. Can the student provide a clear summary and critique of the peer-reviewed scholarly journal article?  2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> N = 93; Mean = 85.45%; Those students scoring at or above 80% = 84%.  3). <b>INTERPRETATION</b> * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The analysis demonstrated that the 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> May 31, 2023 <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, Brian Gauthier, John Genter, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl
<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 (Journal article review) for the General Education-Biblical Literacy.  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 Biblical 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> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). None
<b>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</b>
<b>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</b> Maintain the same questions as stated in the summary.
<b>Submitted by:</b> Paul Holtorf <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed:</b> 7/11/23

**Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:**Approved

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