

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports (**SOASRs**) are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 21-22**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. **NEW FOR 2022:** Complete either the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

To accommodate demands on faculty time and programs undergoing accreditation or program review, SOASR will be accepted on a rolling basis.

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE DEAN OR ASSESSMENT DIRECTOR REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Early Submission:
September 1, 2022

Last Day to Submit:
November 23, 2022

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate Dean or Assessment Director, as guidelines vary by college.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson:
kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975, or visit Fall Office Hours in the FCTE, Tuesdays 8:30a-9:30a & Wednesdays 3:30p-4:30p or by appt.



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

Academic Program:	Philosophy (PHIL)	Date:	
Author(s):	Namita Goswami, Katherine Lee		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu .		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Curriculum Map
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	Assessment Strategies Used			Established Benchmark for Proficiency	Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark	Prior Results for Comparison (if applicable)
	Course	Assignment/Activity	Evaluation Tool i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
SLO 1: Thinking objectively about issues and arguments, not being swayed by emotion and irrational personal preferences.	PHIL 330 (Fall 21), PHIL 430 (Fall 21), PHIL 324 (Spring 22), PHIL 401 (Spring 22)	Final grades of philosophy majors. Note: PHIL has traditionally assessed the final writing assignments from PHIL majors in select courses, but the Blackboard-Canvas transition precluded this method for the AY 21-22 assessment.	Final grades	Goal: 80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of this outcome (score 4 on rubric). Note: the rubric can be found at the end of this document.	Out of six students, four (66%) scored 4 on the rubric (strong evidence) while two scored 3 on the rubric demonstrating proficiency.	N/A
SLO 2: Thinking independently rather than primarily relying on others' opinions.	PHIL 330 (Fall 21), PHIL 430 (Fall 21), PHIL 324 (Spring	Final grades of philosophy majors.		Goal: 80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of this outcome	Out of six students, four (66%) scored 4 on the rubric (strong evidence) while two scored 3 on the rubric demonstrating proficiency.	N/A



	22), PHIL 401 (Spring 22)			(score 4 on rubric)		
--	------------------------------------	--	--	------------------------	--	--

Student Success Activities

Use the “Academic Chair” tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program’s data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	Student success activities that are working well include regular advising, class discussion, close reading of texts, and written assignments (in some cases requiring drafts and revisions).
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	As noted above, PHIL’s assessment took into account overall course grades rather than analyzing the results of an isolated assignment, hence the results inevitably differ from those in previous years. PHIL will discuss and consider whether this year’s approach to assessment will work for next year, or whether to return to assessing the final writing assignment.

If you don’t have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. <i>What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?</i>	The primary factors that prohibit student performance, learning, and success are the university’s lack of support in terms of infrastructure and faculty, and its prioritization of allegedly more “useful” fields, even as evidence clearly demonstrates PHIL as one of the most desired majors by businesses, law schools, medical schools, management companies, digital fields, etc. The bulk of the work oriented toward student success in PHIL is performed by Dr. Goswami, and it is simply not possible for any single faculty member, no matter how dedicated, to sustain and grow a discipline at ISU on her own.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	PHIL majors have been and continue to be successful in job placement and admission to graduate programs, thanks largely to the efforts of Dr. Goswami, who conducts PHIL’s advisement, assessment, curricular/programmatic revision, and recruitment.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Next year PHIL will assess the specific Student Learning Objectives listed below. The courses that will be assessed are also listed below, though this list is tentative and subject to scheduling changes.



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>SLO: Cultivating critical and analytical thinking: penetrate deeply and critically into issues, rather than merely settling for a superficial understanding. Synthesize and contrast various ideas.</i> ▪ <i>SLO: Communicating clearly and succinctly in writing</i> ▪ Courses: PHIL 330, 430 (Fall 22); 409 (Spring 23)
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	Five MST faculty discussed and planned the overall assessment process, with direct contributions to the PHIL report from Drs. Goswami and Lee. The assessment findings will be shared with the PHIL and MST faculty as needed.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: BA Philosophy Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
<p>Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.</p>		<p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle</p> <p>Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning</p> <p>Outcome(s) is measurable</p> <p>Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)</p>		Mature
<p>Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understand student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.</p>		<p>Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s)</p> <p>Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s)</p> <p>Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives</p> <p>Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum</p> <p>Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.)</p> <p>Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)</p>	<p>NOTE: Data loss from LMS transition resulted in use of a proxy measure (course grades) rather than the assessment measure (final writing assignments). The highlighted areas to the left are based on the intended assessment strategy rather than proxy strategy used, as it seems understood by the notes in the report that course grades are not a good measure of specific LO mastery.</p>	Mature

<p>Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.</p>		<p>The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used</p> <p>The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program</p> <p>Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used</p> <p>Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included</p> <p>When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery)</p> <p>When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described</p>	<p>NOTE: Data loss from LMS transition resulted in use of a proxy measure (course grades) rather than the assessment measure (final writing assignments). The highlighted areas to the left are based on the intended assessment strategy rather than proxy strategy used, as it seems understood by the notes in the report that course grades are not a good measure of specific LO mastery.</p>	<p>Mature</p>
<p>Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.</p>		<p>Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty</p> <p>If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed</p> <p>A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment</p> <p>Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders</p>	<p>Insights into concerns with program support are noted. If these concerns have not been shared with college leadership, please be sure to do so (though I am sure they have been shared, I feel it important to note as they may not review these reports in the detail with which I read them).</p> <p>No discussion is provided about the areas for learning improvement for students not achieving mastery thresholds. This could be due to the lack of LO-specific data lost in the LMS transition.</p>	<p>Developing</p>

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.