Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18   *Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15.*
Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for
material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.

Unit/Program Name: ____Philosophy_____   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** _Namita Goswami__(Namita.Goswami@indstate.edu)_

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the assessment website.

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?
1. Developing open-mindedness, including understanding opposing views and appreciating the need for this understanding.	Final writing assignment of Philosophy majors in PHIL 316, 335, 339, 401, 409, and 525	80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of this outcome (score 4 on rubric)	1 – 1 2 – 3 3 – 4 4 – 7 46.7% exhibited strong evidence	Upon reflecting on the expectations we set and the low rate of students meeting those expectations, we realized that a) not all students come to ISU equally prepared to develop the skills we are assessing, b) a one point in time snapshot of student performance may hide progress made throughout a semester/course, and c) we need to revise our process for assessing these outcomes. Therefore rather than assessing only performance at the end of the semester and hoping 80% show strong evidence of the desired outcomes, we will modify our assessment techniques to compare

				students' initial writing in a course to their final writing in the course. Our new metric of success will be that 80% of students moved to a higher level of proficiency between the first and last writing assignments.
2. Recognizing the myriad ways that ethical and other philosophical principles apply to everyday experiences and life.	Final writing assignment of Philosophy majors in PHIL 316, 335, 339, 401, 409, and 525	80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of this outcome (score 4 on rubric)	1 – 1 2 – 3 3 – 6 4 – 5 33.3% exhibited strong evidence	Upon reflecting on the expectations we set and the low rate of students meeting those expectations, we realized that a) not all students come to ISU equally prepared to develop the skills we are assessing, b) a one point in time snapshot of student performance may hide progress made throughout a semester/course, and c) we need to revise our process for assessing these outcomes. Therefore rather than assessing only performance at the end of the semester and hoping 80% show strong evidence of the desired outcomes, we will modify our assessment techniques to compare students' initial writing in a course to their final writing in the course. Our new metric of success will be that 80% of students moved to a higher level of proficiency between the first and last writing assignments.

				We are also actively working on promoting student involvement in program activities through community engagement initiatives, the Philosophy Club, Ethics Bowl, etc.

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Notes
a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark."
d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., "85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark").

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

Given that we set a goal of 80%, it has become clear that this goal is unrealistic. Our students are not arriving with the kind of preparation necessary to attain such a goal, as demonstrated in their final assignments, written work, class preparedness, and public presentations. While learning is improving during the course of a particular class, as individual faculty note in their own classes, the overall goal of 80% is detrimental to the considered and step-by-step process required for students. We will continue to conduct the following:

(1) Require all philosophy majors after first year to meet with academic advisor once a year to discuss academic progress and time to completion (Academic Advisor)
(2) Encourage philosophy students to participate regularly in supportive undergraduate philosophy activities; e.g., philosophy club meetings (Philosophy faculty)
(3) Advertise philosophy club activities through email and posters on campus (Philosophy club advisor)
(4) Conduct annual application advising session for philosophy students interested in post-graduate academic programs, internships, or fellowships (Philosophy faculty)
(5) Encourage student use of Career Center and attendance at Career and Graduate School Fairs (Chair and Academic Advisor)
(6) Work with admissions on contacting students admitted to ISU who express interest in philosophy (Chair and Academic Advisor)

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. Develop student resources	Please see points 1-6 in 1b above.	The program joined the APA (American Philosophical Association); participated in a national Ethics Bowl	Students will be participating in the national Ethics Bowl again this year.	We will continue to build resources for our students.
2.Tutoring	All Philosophy faculty encourage their students to avail themselves of tutoring; the Philosophy tutor addresses students in various courses personally; students have a name and a face for their peer and feel less intimidated.	We offered tutoring last fall and will offer it again this fall.	In addition to the tutor gaining work experience, tutoring has been helpful to students in terms of submitting successful assignments and completing courses.	We will continue to offer student-led tutoring.
3.Maintain DFD: Fall 2017 19.47%; Fall 2016 19%; Spring 2017 18.89%;	Individual faculty deploy various techniques such as allowing revisions, holding writing workshops, requiring a diversity of assignment-types, etc.	Maintain DFD: Fall 2017 19.47%; Fall 2016 19%; Spring 2017 18.89%;	Individual faculty are able to track improvements in their courses in a variety of assignment types; the challenge is creating a streamlined database as each faculty member assigns different kinds of assignments.	Maintain DFD drop rates

Notes
   a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
   c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See Blue Reports database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the Office of Institutional Research for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials
(e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.

As stated above, the biggest challenge lies in student preparation, which affects their potential to succeed. In lieu of unrealistically high expectations, which intimidate students who often do not possess proper study habits, the program seeks to look at the broader picture when addressing student success. A holistic approach includes the following strategies:

(1) Require all first-year philosophy students to meet with Academic Advisor twice a semester to discuss student and program goals, student progress, and other pertinent issues.
(2) Continue work with Student Services to identify Philosophy tutors.
(3) Strongly encourage philosophy faculty to attend professional development workshops focused on improved teaching and pedagogical innovation.
(4) Hold welcoming reception for all first-year philosophy students and new majors during Fall semester.
(5) Cooperate in and contribute to efforts of Multidisciplinary Studies Department and College of Arts and Sciences in attracting and retraining first-year students.
(6) Request information from IR and University College to assist in advising students in the sequencing of both Foundational Studies and major courses to improve the preparation of students for Philosophy courses.

Dear Namita,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: BA Philosophy

Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Developing (1.8/3.00)
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Mature (2.00/3.00)

Strengths	Recommendations
- Clear, measurable, student-centered learning outcomes. - Clear information provided about which classes and which assignments in those classes will be used to evaluate student achievement of the learning outcomes. - Clear information about expectations of student performance and actual performance relative to expectations. - Excellent observations from analysis of findings and strategies for improvement that include adding formative assessment and encouraging student engagement. **Clear strategies for supporting student success through well-defined resources.** **Good use of tutoring to support student learning and completion.**	- Describe or attach a copy of the rubric, and discuss the ways that faculty are trained to use it. Since this evaluation occurs across multiple classes (assuming with multiple faculty) training on how to use the rubric is an important step in assuring data consistency and quality. - Consider the strategies you might use to improve performance after the formative assessment. Knowing that it is likely students will perform under expectations on that formative assessment, it's helpful to have strategies in advance to address areas for improvement. The strategies listed in 1b are great success strategies, but they might not apply directly to the issue of performance on these assignments. - Detail how information is shared with program faculty. **Consider reframing your goals away from the strategy (develop student resources, tutoring) to reflect what the success goal is for students (students will know and use resources, students will improve assignment quality and completion, etc.).** **Consider whether you want to maintain DFDr rates or if you want to adopt strategies to try to lessen them. These rates aren't poor, but if there's an opportunity to improve consider what might help.**

	• **Note which faculty are responsible for the various action steps listed.**

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included below with no notations just for your reference (the SSC did not choose to report in this way).
Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.	No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.

Analysis & Results	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals. Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with little description of analysis.	No data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice. A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.	Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.	No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	X **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)**Unit/Program:**
Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/ challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	□ **Undeveloped**	□ **Developing**	□ **Mature**	□ **Exemplary**