

**Program Assessment Plan**

**Program:** BA, Philosophy for Ministry, Religious Tracks  
**Department:** Philosophy & Letters  
**College/School:** College of Philosophy & Letters  
**Date:** June 27, 2018  
**Primary Assessment Contact:**

*Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.*

#	<b>Program Learning Outcomes</b> What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Note: These should be measurable, and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).</i></li> </ul>	<b>Assessment Mapping</b> From what specific courses (or other educational/professional experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed to demonstrate achievement of the outcome? Include courses taught at the Madrid campus and/or online as applicable.	<b>Assessment Methods</b> What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.</i></li> </ul> Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	<b>Use of Assessment Data</b> How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes <i>made in previous years</i> ?
1	<b>Outcome 1</b> Students can identify connections among major thinkers and ideas that have shaped the history of Western philosophy.	--Capstone Preparation course --Course in the History of Modern Philosophy (PHIL4600). The Dean will request from the Philosophy Department results for College of Phil & Lett students in this course	(1) Direct: historical-knowledge test at start of the one-hour capstone preparation course, <i>or</i> analysis of capstone papers (normally, Capstone Prep papers suffice). (2) Direct: analysis of final exams in PHIL 4600, using the Historical Synthesis Rubric developed by the Dept. of Philosophy (Appendix I) (3) Indirect: Student feedback on the quality of these courses, delivered orally to Dean.	Assessment results of (1) will be used to guide pedagogy in capstone preparation course. Results of (1), (2), and (3) will be used in advising students on course and instructor selection the following year, and be shared with the Philosophy Dept. chair for philosophy course improvement. Assessment of changes will normally occur at the end of the semester or year in which the changes were implemented

2	<p><b>Outcome 2</b> Students are able to state and explain key philosophical ideas and methods suitable for understanding and analyzing contexts of Catholic ministry.</p>	<p>--Capstone Preparation course, in which students develop a set of philosophical positions across four areas of philosophy most relevant to their capstone project</p> <p>--Capstone Project course, in which students apply their philosophical views to a specific challenge that arises in some context of ministry</p>	<p>Direct (1): Satisfaction of correlative objectives in the Capstone Preparation course.</p> <p>Direct (2): The capstone course grade will be based partly on satisfaction of this outcome; Dean will collect data from the instructor that indicates level of achievement of the specific outcome.</p> <p>Indirect: Student and instructor feedback on the quality of these courses (exit survey, course evaluations)</p>	<p>Results will inform program development and advising on required philosophy courses and electives.</p> <p>Specific improvements in the capstone preparation and capstone will be made to address identifiable weakness revealed by assessment; these improvements will be assessed following the semester of their implementation.</p>
3	<p><b>Outcome 3</b> Students can analyze specific challenges in the contexts of Catholic ministry using philosophy and other relevant knowledge.</p>	<p>The Capstone Project course, in which students apply their philosophical views, along with other knowledge they have gained in relevant courses and research, to the analysis of a specific challenge of ministry</p>	<p>Direct: The capstone course grade will be based partly on satisfaction of this outcome; Dean will collect data from the instructor that indicates level of achievement of the specific outcome, using the rubric in Appendix II.</p> <p>Indirect: Student and instructor feedback on the quality of these courses (exit survey, course evaluations)</p>	<p>Specific improvements in the capstone preparation and capstone will be made to address identifiable weakness revealed by assessment; these improvements will be assessed following the semester of their implementation.</p>
4	<p><b>Outcome 4</b> Students demonstrate knowledge of relevant humanistic, social-scientific, and STEM resources for understanding today's world, as a context of Catholic ministry.</p>	<p>--Mentoring with the Dean</p> <p>--The Capstone Project course</p>	<p>Direct (1): The Dean will evaluate the breadth of the student's awareness through an oral interview, at the start of the student's final year in the program, using the rubric in Appendix IIIa</p> <p>Direct (2): The instructor of the Capstone Project course will assess the student's ability to identify relevant non-philosophical resources for the capstone, using the rubric in Appendix IIIb</p>	<p>Cohort results of the two direct assessments will be used to modify the BA program in 2019-2020. Modifications will target specific areas (humanities, social sciences, or STEM) for which students' performance did not meet expectations, as identified by the direct measures.</p>

## Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the above-noted program learning outcomes? (*It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.*)

June 2018: Outcomes 2 & 3

June 2019: Outcome 1

June 2020: Outcomes 3, 4

June 2021: Outcome 2

June 2022: Outcome 1, 3

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

Philosophy Department faculty constructed the second direct method of assessment, and associated rubric, for Outcome 1. See appendix. A Political Science/Philosophy faculty member analyzed results from method 1.

3. On what schedule/cycle will faculty review and, if needed, modify this assessment plan?

Review is scheduled for 2021

***IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any assessment rubrics (as noted above) along with this report.***

## APPENDIX I: HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS RUBRIC

### PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT TOOL FOR OUTCOME 1, SECOND ARTIFACT & METHOD

#### PROMPT QUESTION:

*Choose one modern philosopher covered in our course whose position on some philosophical question is interestingly similar to, or different from, some ancient or medieval philosopher you have studied in another course. Describe the relevant aspects of both philosophers in order to compare and/or contrast their positions on the philosophical issue. What, if anything, does this comparison/contrast help you understand about the issue itself? NB: please identify the prior course in which you learned about the ancient or medieval philosopher. **An overall score of 6 points (2 per row) or more indicates student meets expectations***

Learning Outcome Component	Fails to Meet Expectations (1 pt)	Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)
Demonstrated Knowledge of Modern Philosophy	Student fails to portray the position of a modern philosopher, or significantly misrepresents the philosopher's position on the chosen topic	Student's portrayal of the modern philosopher is accurate, demonstrating a level of knowledge commensurate with an upper-level undergraduate.	Student's portrayal of the modern 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 portrayal 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.

## **APPENDIX II: KNOWLEDGE OF REVELANT SOURCES FOR UNDERSTANDING A CONTEXT OF MINISTRY**

*Rubric for Outcome 3, Direct Method: The instructor of the Capstone course will assess the student's ability to identify relevant resources in philosophy and other disciplines for the capstone, using the rubric below:*

Fails to meet expectations	student was alerted to relevant material for his or her capstone paper, but ignored it, weakening the resulting paper
Meets expectations	student does a decent job of bringing in relevant knowledge as discussed in class and feedback
Exceeds expectations	student goes beyond what the instructor would expect, showing impressive initiative in mastering new information

## APPENDIX IIIa: KNOWLEDGE OF DISCIPLINARY SOURCES FOR UNDERSTANDING TODAY’S WORLD

*Rubric for Outcome 4, Method 1, Dean’s interview with students.*

PROMPT QUESTION: *Given your context of ministry, identify courses you have taken in humanities, social sciences, and STEM disciplines, or courses in other areas that reflected on science and technology, illuminate that context, and explain how they illuminate it. You may also refer to other experiences and sources of knowledge besides coursework. For each area (humanities, social sciences, STEM), a score of 1 point indicates student meets expectations in that area.*

Learning Outcome Component	Fails to Meet Expectations (0 pts)	Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Exceeds Expectations (2 pts)
Demonstrated Knowledge of Sources from the Humanities	Student fails to explain how any previous coursework in the humanities or direct experience of humanities illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.	Student demonstrates an introductory-level ability to explain how previous courses in humanities, or direct experiences of the humanities illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.	Student demonstrates a graduate-level ability to explain how previous courses in humanities, or direct experiences of the humanities illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.
Demonstrated Knowledge of Sources from the Social Sciences	Student fails to explain how any previous coursework in the social sciences or other acquired knowledge of social science illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.	Student demonstrates an introductory-level ability to explain how previous courses in social science, or other acquired knowledge of social science illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.	Student demonstrates a graduate-level ability to explain how previous courses in social science, or other acquired knowledge of social science illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.
Demonstrated Knowledge of Sources from STEM disciplines	Student fails to explain how any previous coursework with a STEM component, or other acquired knowledge of STEM, illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.	Student demonstrates an introductory-level ability to explain how previous coursework with a STEM component, or other acquired knowledge of STEM, illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.	Student demonstrates a graduate-level ability to explain how previous coursework with a STEM component, or other acquired knowledge of STEM, illuminates today’s world as a context of ministry.

### Notes:

1. A “direct experience of” humanities refers to previous reading, study, or other engagement (e.g., play attendance) with the humanities outside a formal classroom setting.
2. “Other acquired knowledge of social science” refers to knowledge acquired by self-study, previous work experience, and the like.
3. “Introductory-level ability” is the ability a student should have after successful completion of core courses outside the student’s major.
4. “Coursework with a STEM component” includes both STEM courses and courses in other fields that focus on STEM (e.g., a course in environmental ethics, or in theology and science).
5. “Graduate-level ability” refers to the ability one would expect of a student with a bachelor’s degree in the area, and thus would be able to draw on a wide range of sources in the area.

### **APPENDIX IIIb: KNOWLEDGE OF REVELANT SOURCES FOR UNDERSTANDING A CONTEXT OF MINISTRY**

*Rubric for Outcome 4, Method 2: The instructor of the Capstone course will assess the student's ability to identify relevant non-philosophical resources for the capstone, using the rubric in Appendix III*

Fails to meet expectations	student was alerted to relevant material for his or her capstone paper, but ignored it, weakening the resulting paper
Meets expectations	student does a decent job of bringing in relevant knowledge as discussed in class and feedback
Exceeds expectations	student goes beyond what the instructor would expect, showing impressive initiative in mastering new information