

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Philosophy for Ministry, Archdiocesan Track      Department: NA  
Degree or Certificate Level: BA      College/School: Philosophy and Letters  
Date (Month/Year): September, 2023      Primary Assessment Contact: Dr. Ed Hogan (Kenrick-Glennon Seminary)

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? We gathered the artifacts in Spring of 2021, 2022, and 2023.

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? It is reviewed every year. The last year it was changed was 2020. We have had a conversation all last year about whether or not to add a fourth outcome, pertaining to faith and reason.

### 1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Outcome 2: Students can identify similarities and differences among major thinkers & ideas that have shaped the history of Western philosophy.

### 2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? 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.

Student papers and exams were collected from PLJ 4800: Contemporary Philosophy. The course was offered face to face only, at Kenrick-Glennon Seminary. Notes: 1) This course comes from the Spring semester of the second (final) year of the program, so we have a better sense of what the *program* is accomplishing. 2) The artefacts came from two different teachers (Brown & Romero). Again, this gives us a sense of what the *program* is accomplishing. 3) Each artefact was looking at a different comparison (Hume v. Ayer; Sokolowski v. Descartes; Hegel v. Kierkegaard). So we are confident that it gives us a sense of the Student Learning Outcome on a general level, not just pertaining to a particular set of thinkers.

### 3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

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

Artefacts were scored using a "Comparison" rubric (included at the end of this report). Scoring was done by the Academic Dean and the Coordinator of Assessment at Kenrick-Glennon Seminary. The process is described in the attached document: 2023 Process & Rubric.

### 4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? 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)?

Data are attached in an Excel file. Teaching modality and location were the same for all classes.

### 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

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

The data show that students are doing fairly well in this dimension of the program. 1) The breakdown of scores shows solid results within each dimension of the rubric. 2) Scores are, on average, slightly higher than they were in 2020. Conversation with the faculty confirmed that the quantitative results are a good representation of the qualitative performance of the students. Faculty members, who have also taught at other institutions, also confirm that the students are doing well comparatively.

**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?

Findings and a first draft of this report were e-mailed to faculty one week before the September 27, 2023 meeting. All of this material was then presented at the 9/27 faculty meeting. Input was taken, and the report was written based on the discussion.

**B.** How specifically have you decided to use 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
- Student artifacts collected
- 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 the findings.

No actions.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

1) The particular results this year confirm that students are doing well learning this core skill. 2) The general process continues to work well: the faculty are having deliberate conversations about the core dimensions of the program, and how to keep building those core skills.

**7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous 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 how we construct the rubrics: 1) We changed from a 5-point to a 3-point scale. 2) Faculty participate in the construction of the rubric. (We have also been in discussion about revising the Rubric for Outcome 1.)

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

Only informally. The change to a 3-point scale *has* resulted in more streamlined scoring. The involvement of faculty in the construction of rubrics has increased a sense of faculty ownership of the program.

**C.** What were the findings of the assessment?

See above.

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

Continue to make faculty involvement in assessment *meaningful* without being *onerous*.

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

**REVISED “COMPARISON” RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF OUTCOME 2**

SLO 2: Students can identify similarities and differences among major thinkers & ideas that have shaped the history of Western philosophy.

<b>Learning Outcome Component</b>	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)
Demonstrated Knowledge of One Philosopher/Position	Student’s portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus. <i>(“I think I see what you mean...”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused. <i>(“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused, and shows occasional depth of insight into that position. <i>(“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>
Demonstrated Knowledge of Another Philosopher/Position	Student’s portrayal of the other philosopher /position is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus. <i>(“I think I see what you mean...”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the other philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused. <i>(“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the other philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused, and shows occasional depth of insight into that position. <i>(“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>
Demonstrated Ability to Compare Philosophers / Positions	Student identifies a topic for comparison/contrast. But the account of similarities and differences lacks clarity and focus, or too much irrelevant information is presented. <i>(“I think I see what you mean...”)</i>	Student clearly identifies a topic for comparison/contrast, presenting a direct and focused account of similarities and differences without too much irrelevant information being presented. <i>(“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	The discussion is direct and focused, and shows some exceptional insight into the philosophical issues, or connection with experience. None of the points are irrelevant to the comparison. <i>(“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>

## Process

1. We gathered the artifacts for outcome 2 in Spring of 2021, 2022, and 2023.
2. We used the rubric that had already been devised for Outcome 2. (This was last used in 2020. Following the conclusions reached that year, and implemented in subsequent years, we changed the rubric from a 5-point scale to a 3-point scale.)
3. We scored the artifacts in late Summer of 2023.  
Reviewers met to reconcile any instances in which there were differences of 2 points in their respective scores. There were 174 pairs of scores. After initial scoring, reviewers differed by 2 points on only 11 pairs (6%).
4. Data were presented for College faculty discussion in September of 2023. (All materials were e-mailed to the faculty one week before. The material was then presented at the faculty meeting on September 27. Discussion followed, and the report was written on the basis of that discussion.)

*Note: the point of the exercise is less to focus on the specific scores generated from the artifacts, and more to use those scores as an occasion to reflect on this dimension of the program.*

**REVISED “COMPARISON” RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF OUTCOME 2**

SLO 2: Students can identify similarities and differences among major thinkers & ideas that have shaped the history of Western philosophy.

<b>Learning Outcome Component</b>	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)
Demonstrated Knowledge of One Philosopher/Position	Student’s portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus. <i>(“I think I see what you mean...”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused. <i>(“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused, and shows occasional depth of insight into that position. <i>(“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>
Demonstrated Knowledge of Another Philosopher/Position	Student’s portrayal of the other philosopher /position is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus. <i>(“I think I see what you mean...”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the other philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused. <i>(“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	Student’s portrayal of the other philosopher /position is accurate, consistently clear, and focused, and shows occasional depth of insight into that position. <i>(“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>
Demonstrated Ability to Compare Philosophers / Positions	Student identifies a topic for comparison/contrast. But the account of similarities and differences lacks clarity and focus, or too much irrelevant information is presented. <i>(“I think I see what you mean...”)</i>	Student clearly identifies a topic for comparison/contrast, presenting a direct and focused account of similarities and differences without too much irrelevant information being presented. <i>(“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	The discussion is direct and focused, and shows some exceptional insight into the philosophical issues, or connection with experience. None of the points are irrelevant to the comparison. <i>(“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>

First Reviewer					Second Reviewer				
Western Philosophers					Western Philosophers				
ID Number	One Philosopher	Another Philosopher	Compare Philosophers	Total	ID Number	One Philosopher	Another Philosopher	Compare Philosophers	Total
1	2	2	2	6	1	3	2	3	8
2	2	2	1	5	2	1	2	2	5
3	2	3	1	6	3	2	2	2	6
4	3	1	2	6	4	3	1	2	6
5	3	3	3	9	5	3	3	3	9
6	2	1	2	5	6	1	1	1	3
7	3	2	2	7	7	3	2	2	7
8	3	1	2	6	8	3	1	2	6
9	2	2	2	6	9	2	2	1	5
10	3	2	2	7	10	3	1	1	5
11	3	3	3	9	11	2	2	2	6
12	2	2	2	6	12	2	2	2	6
13	3	3	2	8	13	3	3	2	8
14	2	2	1	5	14	1	1	1	3
15	1	1	1	3	15	1	1	1	3
16	2	2	1	5	16	2	2	1	5
17	3	2	2	7	17	3	2	1	6
18	3	2	3	8	18	3	2	3	8
19	3	3	3	9	19	3	2	3	8
20	2	2	1	5	20	1	1	1	3
21	3	3	2	8	21	2	2	2	6
22	3	3	2	8	22	2	2	3	7
23	2	2	1	5	23	2	1	1	4
24	2	2	2	6	24	2	1	1	4
25	2	1	2	5	25	2	2	2	6
26	2	1	1	4	26	2	2	2	6
27	3	2	2	7	27	3	2	3	8
28	3	2	2	7	28	3	3	2	8
29	2	2	2	6	29	3	1	2	6
30	3	2	3	8	30	3	3	3	9
31	2	1	2	5	31	3	2	3	8
32	2	2	2	6	32	2	2	2	6
33	2	2	2	6	33	3	3	3	9
34	2	2	2	6	34	1	1	1	3
35	2	1	2	5	35	1	2	2	5
36	2	1	2	5	36	2	2	3	7
37	2	2	2	6	37	3	3	3	9
38	3	3	2	8	38	2	3	2	7
39	3	3	2	8	39	2	3	3	8
40	3	2	2	7	40	2	1	1	4
41	3	2	2	7	41	3	3	3	9
42	2	2	2	6	42	2	2	2	6
43	2	2	2	6	43	3	2	2	7
44	3	3	3	9	44	2	3	2	7
45	3	2	2	7	45	3	3	3	9
46	2	1	1	4	46	1	1	1	3
47	2	2	2	6	47	3	2	3	8
48	2	3	2	7	48	2	2	3	7
49	2	2	2	6	49	2	2	3	7
50	2	2	3	7	50	3	3	3	9
51	2	2	2	6	51	3	3	3	9
52	3	3	2	8	52	2	2	3	7
53	3	3	2	8	53	3	3	2	8
54	3	1	3	7	54	2	1	2	5
55	2	3	3	8	55	2	2	3	7
56	3	3	2	8	56	2	2	3	7
57	3	2	3	8	57	3	3	3	9
58	2	3	2	7	58	2	3	3	8
AVGS	2.43	2.09	2.02	6.53	AVGS	2.29	2.03	2.19	6.52

1=1(2%)	1=11(19%)	1=9(16%)		1=8(14%)	1=14(24%)	1=13(22%)	
2=31(53%)	2=31(53%)	2=39(67%)	78% 6 or higher	2=25(43%)	2=28(48%)	2=21(36%)	74% 6 or higher
3=26(45%)	3=16(28%)	3=10(17%)		3=25(43%)	3=16(28%)	3=24(41%)	
98% 2 or 3	81% 2 or 3	84% 2 or 3		86% 2 or 3	76% 2 or 3	78% 2 or 3	