

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): October, 2020 Primary Assessment Contact: Ed Hogan, Kenrick-Glennon Seminary

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2019, 2020

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2020

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.

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.

Papers and exams 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.

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. 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?

For a first run through, we learned: 1) The artifacts chosen were good – they provide a good window into this program outcome. 2) The rubric was good – it was clear in itself, and it produced consistent results between reviewers. 3) The data analysis process was good – the breakdown of scores on each component will allow us, down the line, to set some solid benchmarks.

We aren't drawing any bigger conclusions at this time: 1) Because this is our first time through the process. 2) Because we don't yet have comparative data to see trends. 3) Because the process was affected by the COVID shutdown.

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?

Faculty received everything (Assessment Plan, Process overview, Rubric, Data) by e-mail on September 9, 2020. Faculty discussion was held on September 30, 2020. Faculty received a draft of this report on October 1, 2020, and provided some comments, which were incorporated.

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.

1) Because of the COVID shutdown, the rubric was drawn up by the Academic Dean and Director of Assessment at the Seminary. It's a good rubric, in and of itself. (It was drawn up on the basis of a similar rubric used by the SLU Department of Philosophy, and revised to match our Outcome. It is systematically clear, and produced consistent results.) But next time we do this outcome, and for the outcome we do this coming year, we will have the faculty involved in the creation of the rubric. 2) While the rubric was *systematically* very precise, in its *actual use* the first and last categories (the 0 and 4 scores) were underutilized. (Out of 132 scores, there were no zeroes and only one four.) It should be possible to simplify this rubric, and also keep that lesson in mind when drawing up the rubrics for other outcomes. We hope this produces even better data for reaching conclusions as we continue the assessment process.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

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?

NA – this is our first cycle of assessment of this program.

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

NA – this is our first cycle of assessment of this program.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

NA – this is our first cycle of assessment of this program.

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

NA – this is our first cycle of assessment of this program.

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

“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.

Learning Outcome Component	Complete Failure (0 pts)	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)	Exceptional Mastery (4 pts)
Demonstrated Knowledge of One Philosopher /Position	Student fails to portray or significantly misrepresents the position of a philosopher on the chosen topic. <i>("I have no idea what you're talking about.")</i>	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>	Student's portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position shows exceptional clarity/depth/insight and/or connection to experience. <i>("Wow – that's superb.")</i>
Demonstrated Knowledge of Another Philosopher /Position	Student fails to portray or significantly misrepresents the position of a philosopher on the chosen topic. <i>("I have no idea what you're talking about.")</i>	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>	Student's portrayal of the other philosopher /position shows exceptional clarity/depth/insight and/or connection to experience. <i>("Wow – that's superb.")</i>
Demonstrated Ability to Compare Philosophers / Positions	Student fails to identify a clear topic for comparison/contrast, or misrepresents the relevant similarities and differences between the chosen philosophers. <i>("I have no idea what you're talking about.")</i>	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>	The discussion suggests a grasp of the philosophical issues that is exceptional in its clarity/depth/insight and/or connection to experience. None of the points are irrelevant to the comparison. <i>("Wow – that's superb.")</i>

Process

1. We gathered the artifacts for outcome 2 in Spring of 2019 and 2020.
2. We revised the rubric (see below) in Summer of 2020.
 - A) Changed from “Historical” rubric to “Comparison” rubric.
 - B) Changed from 3-point to 5-point scale.
 - C) Made the scale more descriptive.
3. We scored the artifacts in Summer of 2020.
4. Data were presented for College faculty discussion in September of 2020.

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.

Learning Outcome Component	Complete Failure (0 pts)	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)	Exceptional Mastery (4 pts)
Demonstrated Knowledge of One Philosopher/Position	Student fails to portray or significantly misrepresents the position of a philosopher on the chosen topic. <i>("I have no idea what you're talking about.")</i>	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>	Student's portrayal of the chosen philosopher /position shows exceptional clarity/depth/insight and/or connection to experience. <i>("Wow – that's superb.")</i>
Demonstrated Knowledge of Another Philosopher/Position	Student fails to portray or significantly misrepresents the position of a philosopher on the chosen topic. <i>("I have no idea what you're talking about.")</i>	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>	Student's portrayal of the other philosopher /position shows exceptional clarity/depth/insight and/or connection to experience. <i>("Wow – that's superb.")</i>
Demonstrated Ability to Compare Philosophers / Positions	Student fails to identify a clear topic for comparison/contrast, or misrepresents the relevant similarities and differences between the chosen philosophers. <i>("I have no idea what you're talking about.")</i>	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>	The discussion suggests a grasp of the philosophical issues that is exceptional in its clarity/depth/insight and/or connection to experience. None of the points are irrelevant to the comparison. <i>("Wow – that's superb.")</i>

Initial “Historical” Rubric from SLU

Learning Outcome Component	Fails to Meet Expectations (0 pts)	Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Exceeds Expectations (2 pts)
Demonstrated Knowledge of Modern / Contemporary Philosophy	Student fails to portray the position of a modern/contemporary philosopher, or significantly misrepresents the philosopher’s position on the chosen topic	Student’s portrayal of the chosen philosopher is accurate, demonstrating a level of knowledge commensurate with an upper-level undergraduate.	Student’s portray of the chosen philosopher is not only accurate, but suggests an expert level knowledge normally possessed only by graduate students or professors.
Demonstrated Knowledge of Ancient or Medieval Philosophy	Student fails to portray the position of an ancient/medieval philosopher, or significantly misrepresents the philosopher’s position on the chosen topic.	Student’s portrayal of the ancient/medieval philosopher is accurate, demonstrating a level of knowledge commensurate with an upper-level undergraduate.	Student’s portray of the ancient/medieval philosopher is not only accurate, but suggests an expert level knowledge normally possessed only by graduate students or professors.
Demonstrates ability to synthesis knowledge across historical periods	Student fails to identify a clear topic for comparison/contrast, or misrepresents the relevant similarities and differences between the chosen philosophers.	Student clearly identifies a topic for comparison/contrast, accurately presenting relevant similarities and differences without too much irrelevant information being presented. Suggests a grasp of the philosophical issues commensurate to an advanced undergraduate.	None of the student’s points are irrelevant to the comparison, and the discussion suggests a grasp of the philosophical issues commensurate with graduate or professional status.

First Reviewer

ID Number	1st Philosopher	2nd Philosopher	Comparison
11	2	2	3
21	3	3	3
31	2	2	2
41	2	2	2
51	1	1	1
61	2	1	2
71	2	2	2
81	3	3	3
91	3	3	3
101	2	1	1
111	2	2	2
121	2	2	2
131	2	2	2
141	2	2	2
151	1	2	2
161	3	3	3
171	2	2	2
181	2	2	0
191	2	2	1
201	2	2	2
211	2	2	1
221	2	2	2
AVGS	2.09	2.05	1.95

0=1 (5%)

1=2 (10%)

1=3 (14%)

1=4 (18%)

2=16 (72%)

2=15(68%)

2=12 (55%)

3=4 (18%)

3=4 (18%)

3=5 (22%)

90% 2 or 3

86% 2 or 3

77% 2 or 3

Second Reviewer

Total	ID Number	1st Philosopher	2nd Philosopher
7	12	3	2
9	22	3	3
6	32	1	2
6	42	2	1
3	52	2	2
5	62	1	2
6	72	2	1
9	82	3	2
9	92	2	2
4	102	1	1
6	112	2	2
6	122	2	2
6	132	2	2
6	142	2	2
5	152	2	3
9	162	2	2
6	172	2	2
4	182	1	1
5	192	2	2
6	202	2	2
5	212	2	2
6	222	2	2
6.09	AVGS	1.95	1.91

	1=4 (18%)	1=4 (18%)
68% 6 or higher	2=15 (68%)	2=16 (72%)
	3= 3 (14%)	3=2 (10%)
	82% 2 or 3	82% 2 or 3

Comparison	Total
3	8
4	10
1	4
2	5
2	6
1	4
3	6
4	9
2	6
1	3
1	5
3	7
1	5
3	7
3	8
2	6
2	6
1	3
1	5
2	6
2	6
2	6
2.09	5.95

1=7 (32%)

2=8 (36%)

3=5 (22%)

4=2 (10%)

68% 6 or higher

68% 2 or more