SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Master's	Department: Philosophy
Degree or Certificate Level: MA	College/School: CAS
Date (Month/Year): 9/21	Primary Assessment Contact: Scott Ragland
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2020-21	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2015	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?
The ones on the far left column of the below rubric:

Learning Outcome	Fails to Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
1 Students will gather sources relevant to a philosophical problem.	Student fails to include necessary sources for the topic or includes irrelevant sources.	Student includes all and only relevant primary and secondary sources. and accurately interprets those writings. The student's paper is a good snapshot of the current state of discussion.	Student includes groundbreaking research into primary sources or synthesizes information in novel ways that advance the current discussion of the topic.
2. Students will interpret sources relevant to that philosophical problem.	Student significantly misinterprets sources	Student's interpretation of sources is accurate and plausible on all significant points.	Student offers a compelling interpretation of sources that is novel or groundbreaking in some way.
3. Students will synthesize sources relevant to that philosophical problem.	Student's synthesis misrepresents the current state of the debate on the topic or fails to adequately connect to the student's defense of own position.	Thesis presents an accurate, unified snapshot of the current state of discussion about a philosophical problem in a way that motivates the student's own argument.	Thesis portrays the current state of discussion in a way that is not only accurate and unified, but also novel—opening up new possibilities for research or argument. The student's own position draws on this portrayal.
4. Students will argue for a philosophical thesis pertaining to that philosophical problem.	Student's thesis is not sufficiently clear, or is not sufficiently related to the focal philosophical problem, or is not sufficiently supported by an argument.	Student articulates and argues for a thesis related to the focal philosophical problem.	Student's thesis or argument is sufficiently original, innovative or excellent as to constitute a publishable contribution to existing literature on the subject.
5. Students will defend their thesis.	Student fails to consider or respond to relevant criticisms, or offers only a superficial or facile response.	Student considers relevant objections and provides rigorous responses.	Student's responses to objections are unusually insightful or novel.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

The plan was to collect philosophy MA theses, or Jesuit "De U" project papers.   The De U papers were related to PHIL 5800. MA theses to PHIL 5900.

3. **Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process**

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Supervising faculty were supposed to score the paper against a google form version of the rubric. However, due to a communication breakdown in the philosophy department office, the supervisors were not sent the links to the form, so no data was collected.

4. **Data/Results**

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

There were no data this year.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

Conclusion: our process for assessing the MA program has failed and must be revised.

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings**

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

This report will be shared with the faculty at a meeting in October or November of 2021.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies
- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan
- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

An AY 21-22 MA Rubric (google survey) has already been constructed. In each term, the graduate coordinator will be asked to identify MA students who appear to be in their final term of the MA program. During finals week of each term, the department administrator will email instructions from the chair to each of the students' philosophy instructors, asking them to complete the rubric as the grade the student's final paper. This will ensure assessment by (in most cases) more than one professor of more than one student artifact at a mature stage of the student's development in the program. The chair and admin have set reminders about this on their calendar already.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                                   │
│                                                                   │
│                                                                   │
│                                                                   │
│                                                                   │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

7. Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes

   A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

> We changed our approach to gathering assessment data in 19/20, and got a good data set for the first time for the MA program in that cycle. However, due to logistical problems, that same program was not implemented in 20/21 and so we have no data for that cycle.

   B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

> They are assessed in the process of writing this report.

   C. What were the findings of the assessment?

> Although we have developed a good rubric/survey, we lacked some administrative protocols necessary to ensure that we used the rubric to gather data. We need to take steps to ensure data is gathered for 21/22. Also, it became clear in this assessment cycle that some MA students do not complete the capstone-type assignments that we were targeting for assessment. Therefore, the assessment process needs to be expanded to take in all the MA students in their last term.

   D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

> We will implement the plan described above in 6B.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.