

Program Assessment Plan

Program: Certificate in Philosophy for Ministry
Department: Philosophy & Letters
College/School: College of Philosophy & Letters
Date: June 22, 2019
Primary Assessment Contact: Bill Rehg, SJ, Dean, College of Philosophy & Letters (314-977-3827)

Note: This Plan will also be used for students who complete the philosophy concentration in Philosophy & Letters as a second major, toward a bachelor’s degree in another College/School.

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

| # | Program Learning Outcomes | Assessment Mapping | Assessment Methods | Use of Assessment Data |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: These should be measurable, and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient). <p>Outcome 1 Students can identify connections among major thinkers and ideas that have shaped the history of Western philosophy.</p> | <p>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.</p> <p>--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</p> | <p>What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement. <p>Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.</p> <p>(1) Direct: historical-knowledge test at start of the one-hour capstone preparation course, or analysis of capstone papers (normally, Capstone Prep papers suffice).</p> <p>(2) Direct: analysis of final exams in PHIL 4600, using the Historical Synthesis Rubric developed by the Dept. of Philosophy (Appendix)</p> <p>(3) Indirect: Student feedback on the quality of these courses, delivered orally to Dean.</p> | <p>How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work?</p> <p>How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?</p> <p>Assessment results of (1) will be used to guide pedagogy in future capstone preparation courses.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Assessment of changes will normally occur at the end of the semester in which the changes were implemented</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| 2 | <p>Outcome 2 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 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>Outcome 3 Students can analyze specific challenges in the contexts of Catholic ministry using philosophy and other relevant knowledge.</p> | <p>The capstone 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, following 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 weaknesses revealed by assessment; these improvements will be assessed following the semester of their implementation.</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: Outcome 3

June 2021: Outcome 2

June 2022: Outcomes 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. 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 | Fails to Meet Expectations (1pt) | 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 synthesize 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, by assessing the final capstone paper with 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 |