

2024 – 25 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	Date: June 13, 2025
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Holtorf and David Coe	
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 362, arriving at a means 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. What are the basic tenets of the Lord's Supper from a Lutheran and denominations outside of the Lutheran Church? 2. What is meant by Close(d) Communion? 3. What are Scripture passages that support an understanding of the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> N = 46; Mean = 96%; Those students scoring at or above 80% = 96%. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The analysis demonstrated that the students addressed and responded to 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> NA	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 13, 2025 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Paul Holtorf, David Coe, Daniel Lewis, Mark Meehl, John Genter, Jon Rusnak	
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 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 (written assignment) for the department/program major and associated certifications. 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. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> To stay within the course Theo 362 but select another assignment that captures other questions re: the department/program, using the same assessment criteria. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> 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? Change the assessment questions to coincide with the new assignment selected within Theo 362. These questions will be developed once the new assignment is identified by the department.	
Submitted by: Paul Holtorf Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/30/25	
Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: Approved BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na	