

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	Date: June 22, 2026	Course(s): Rel 131
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 and Tom Lange		
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 unit 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 the concept of God's grace in the New Testament? 2. Can the student demonstrate how the concept of God's grace can be seen in Jesus Christ? 3. Can the student communicate how the concept of God's grace can be seen in Jesus Christ? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> DC, N=12; CUNE, N=66; DC mean=90.54; CUNE mean=85.45; DC SD=7.07; CUNE SD=11.37; p-value .03 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 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 a statistically significant difference between the exam scores of the dual credit and CUNE scores.		
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: June 22, 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 and Tom Lange		
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> Prior the 2026-27 academic year of the dual credit school, the department requests to review the course syllabus, a sample of the course lectures, and a copy of all exams from the 2025-26 academic year. The department will review the artifacts and provide feedback to the dual credit school. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> 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): 6/25/26		
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/25/26		
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na		