

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	Date: June 5, 2026	Course(s): Rel 121
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit	Select	Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Holtorf, Tom Lange, and Doug Braun		
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>		
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Means will be derived from both the traditional and alternative courses and a t-test will be conducted between the traditional course and the alternative course based on the final exam scores. 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).</i> NA		
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 1. Can the student demonstrate a knowledge of what the Old Testament concept of Messiah is, what the term means and how the term is expressed in Hebrew and Greek? 2. Can the student demonstrate the development of the messianic theme using Old Testament book and chapter references, and by showing how both David (a believer) and Cyrus (an unbeliever) can each be called messiah? 3. Can the student demonstrate how the New Testament presents Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament concept of Messiah? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> DC, N=43. ; CUNE, N=29; DC mean=91.67; CUNE, mean=91.59; DC, SD=6.03; CUNE, SD=10.92; p-value, .97 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The department's goal is to see no difference between the dual credit offering and the CUNE offering. By conventional criteria (.05), the difference is considered not to be statistically significant. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> NA 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? There is not a statistically significant difference between the final exam scores of the dual credit and CUNE scores.		
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: June 16, 2026 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Email <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> David Coe, John Genter, Mark Meehl, Paul Holtorf, Jon Rusnak, Daniel Lewis, Tom Lange, and Doug Braun.		
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> The department is pleased to see that with the addition of new schools and instructors, consistency and quality of instruction has been maintained. The department will ask the dual credit schools to submit a copy of the final exam for departmental review. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> The department will continue with exam scores for the assessment process. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <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		
Submitted by: Paul Holtorf Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):		
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:		
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:		