

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, 2021 Primary Assessment Contact: Dr. Ed Hogan (Kenrick-Glennon Seminary)

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2019, 2021 (Data from 2020 are missing because of the COVID pandemic.)

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 3: Students can construct arguments.

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 were collected from PLJ 4965: "Philosophy Capstone."
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 were scored using a "Construction Rubric" (included at the end of this report). Scoring was done by the Academic Dean and the Coordinator of Assessment at Kenrick-Glennon Seminary. Process is described in an attached document (2021 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?

1. The data are surprising in the sense that they are not similar to the typical grade distribution for classes. The assessment puts most student scores in the "average" range, whereas grade distribution is usually not a normal curve, but skews to the high and low ends. Still: a) the assessment is only meant to be a limited window into the program, not a re-grading of papers, and b) these data come from the *end* of the program, so we should expect a more even distribution of skill. In that sense, the data show that the program is doing good work developing this particular skill.
2. The reviewers' scores showed great similarity, which speaks to the quality of the rubric and process.

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 21, 2021. Faculty discussion was held on September 29, 2021. Faculty received a draft of this report on September 30, 2021 so that feedback could be given before final submission of the report.

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.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

No changes at this time because: 1) This is our first cycle of assessment with this outcome, so we don't see any trends. 2) The process was good, and the data look good.

In addition, of the low scores, two sets came from papers that were historical or expository rather than argumentative. It was no defect in the papers (or the program) that they scored low on an argumentative rubric. The program seems to be achieving this outcome pretty well.

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?

1. Involved the faculty in the creation of the rubric for scoring this outcome. 2. Changed from a 5-point to a 3-point scale.

No further changes because we are just in the second year of the assessment program.

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

Informally.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The change increases faculty ownership of – and therefore confidence in – the Assessment process.

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

Continue to involve the faculty in the creation of rubrics. Regularly review the Assessment Program to make sure it is understood, and is appropriate to the program. Continue to use a 3-point scale.

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

“CONSTRUCTION” RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF OUTCOME 3 (2021)

SLO 3: Students can construct arguments.

Learning Outcome Component	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)
Demonstrated clarity of premises	Student’s presentation of the premises 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 presentation of the premises is accurate, clear, and focused. <i> (“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	Student’s presentation of the premises is accurate, notably clear, focused, and shows depth of insight. <i> (“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>
Demonstrated clarity of conclusions	Student’s presentation of the conclusions 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 presentation of the conclusions is accurate, clear, and focused. <i> (“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	Student’s presentation of the conclusions is accurate, notably clear, focused, and shows depth of insight. <i> (“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>
Demonstrated clarity of movement from premises to conclusions	Student’s presentation of the movement from premises to conclusions 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 presentation of the movement from premises to conclusions is accurate, clear, and focused. <i> (“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i>	Student’s presentation of the movement from premises to conclusions is accurate, notably clear, focused, and shows depth of insight. <i> (“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i>

Process (2021)

1. We gathered artefacts for outcome 3 in Spring of 2019, and 2021. (Due to the pandemic – and its effects on classes and assignments – artefacts were not gathered in the Spring of 2020.)

2. We created a rubric in Spring of 2021.

A) The Academic Dean and Coordinator of Assessment drafted an initial rubric in late February / early March, heeding the lessons of the previous year: 1) Involve the college faculty in creation of the rubric. 2) Make it a three point scale rather than a five point scale.

B) Rubric was presented to college faculty and PLJ Dean for revision at April 14, 2021 meeting. Revisions were made.

3. Artefacts were scored in early Fall of 2021.

Note: normally this would have been done in the summer. But the Coordinator of Assessment retired in the summer of 2021. A replacement was hired in September of 2021.

After initial independent scoring, 3 out of 78 pairs of scores showed a discrepancy of 2 points. Reviewers went back to those artefacts, reconsidered them and, upon further review and discussion, reconciled the scores.

4. Data were presented for College faculty discussion in September of 2021.

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

“CONSTRUCTION” RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF OUTCOME 3 (2021)

SLO 3: Students can construct arguments.

Learning Outcome Component	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)
Demonstrated clarity of premises	<p>Student’s presentation of the premises is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus.</p> <p><i> (“I think I see what you mean...”)</i></p>	<p>Student’s presentation of the premises is accurate, clear, and focused.</p> <p><i> (“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i></p>	<p>Student’s presentation of the premises is accurate, notably clear, focused, and shows depth of insight.</p> <p><i> (“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i></p>
Demonstrated clarity of conclusions	<p>Student’s presentation of the conclusions is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus.</p> <p><i> (“I think I see what you mean...”)</i></p>	<p>Student’s presentation of the conclusions is accurate, clear, and focused.</p> <p><i> (“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i></p>	<p>Student’s presentation of the conclusions is accurate, notably clear, focused, and shows depth of insight.</p> <p><i> (“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i></p>
Demonstrated clarity of movement from premises to conclusions	<p>Student’s presentation of the movement from premises to conclusions is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus.</p> <p><i> (“I think I see what you mean...”)</i></p>	<p>Student’s presentation of the movement from premises to conclusions is accurate, clear, and focused.</p> <p><i> (“I see what you’re talking about.”)</i></p>	<p>Student’s presentation of the movement from premises to conclusions is accurate, notably clear, focused, and shows depth of insight.</p> <p><i> (“Hey – that’s quite good.”)</i></p>

First Reviewer

ID Number	Premises	Conclusion	Movement	Total
1	2	2	1	5
2	3	3	2	8
3	3	2	2	7
4	1	2	1	4
5	2	2	2	6
6	3	2	3	8
7	3	3	3	9
8	3	3	3	9
9	2	2	3	7
10	2	2	1	5
11	2	2	3	7
12	2	2	2	6
13	3	3	3	9
14	1	1	1	3
15	2	2	3	7
16	2	2	2	6
17	3	3	3	9
18	3	2	2	7
19	3	3	3	9
20	3	2	3	8
21	2	2	1	5
22	2	2	2	6
23	2	2	2	6
24	2	2	2	6
25	3	2	3	8
26	2	3	2	7
AVGS	2.35	2.23	2.23	6.81

Second Reviewer

ID Number	Premises	Conclusion	Movement	Total
1	2	3	2	7
2	2	2	2	6
3	2	3	3	8
4	2	2	2	6
5	3	3	2	8
6	3	2	2	7
7	3	3	3	9
8	2	3	3	8
9	2	3	3	8
10	1	3	2	6
11	3	3	3	9
12	2	3	2	7
13	2	2	2	6
14	1	1	1	3
15	3	2	2	7
16	2	2	2	6
17	3	2	2	7
18	3	3	3	9
19	2	3	3	8
20	2	2	2	6
21	2	2	2	6
22	2	3	3	8
23	3	3	3	9
24	3	2	2	7
25	2	2	3	7
26	2	2	2	6
AVGS	2.27	2.46	2.35	7.08

1=2(8%) 1=1(4%) 1=5(19%)
 2=13(50%) 2=18(69%) 2=10(38%) 81% 6 or higher
 3=11(42%) 3=7(27%) 3=11(42%)
 92% 2 or 3 96% 2 or 3 81% 2 or 3

1=2(8%) 1=1(4%) 1=1(4%)
 2=15(58%) 2=12(46%) 2=15(58%) 96% 6 or higher
 3=9(35%) 3=13(50%) 3=10(38%)
 92% 2 or 3 96% 2 or 3 96% 2 or 3