Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16   **Due to your dean by June 1**
                                                                             Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: ___Philosophy____**Contact Name and Email** _Namita Goswami (Advisor) 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.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)s 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 expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Intended Student Outcome # 1: Thinking objectively about issues and arguments, not being swayed by emotion and irrational personal preferences.	PHIL 201: Our assessment method consists of reviewing a random sample of papers assigned in PHIL 201 using an agreed-upon rubric. Upper Level Papers: Our assessment method consists of reviewing a random sample of papers produced by majors in 300/400 level courses using an agreed-upon rubric. PHIL 201 (majors and non-majors) and 300/400 level (majors) courses.	PHIL 201: Our target is to have 60% of our students in the most advanced category in year 1, 75% in year 2, and 80% in year 3. 300/400 level courses: Our target is to have 70% of our students in the most advanced category in year 1, 75% in year 2, and 80% in year 3.	PHIL 201: The sample papers demonstrate that we have met our target. Students were able to state the arguments made by various philosophers and schools of thought without undue influence from their own preferences, biases, personal politics, etc. 300/400 level courses: The sample papers demonstrate that we have met our target. Sample papers demonstrate student ability to state the philosophical positions of assigned philosophers without undue influence from their own preferences, biases, personal politics, etc. In addition, they were able to deploy these philosophical positions and	Dr. Namita Goswami, Dr. Joseph Grcic, and Dr. Michael Deem. Electronically.

			schools of thought to make ethical and normative arguments without undue influence from these preferences, biases, and personal politics, etc.	
2.				
3.				

* See .

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 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).
  e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two
In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

1. The discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself.

PHIL 201: Since this class is a general education course, students come from various disciplines and schools. Students were assigned papers that require them to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of a philosopher or tradition of thought. This entails stating this knowledge and understanding in their own words without recourse to opinion or personal preference. The sample papers also included assignments requiring students to deploy this knowledge and understanding of a philosopher or tradition of thought by evaluating particular ethical questions (for e.g. abortion, euthanasia, etc.). Such assignments require students to consider opposing positions fairly and accurately. In addition, some assignments

encouraged students to articulate their own opinion (and its ethical bases) but only after due consideration of the philosophers and schools of thought examined in the course.

300/400 level courses: Because these are upper level courses designed especially for majors, the sample papers were much longer. The assignments themselves were more sophisticated requiring students to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding by providing substantive analyses of assigned philosophers and schools of thought. Students were also expected to provide insights regarding specific issues and fields (e.g. pre-natal genetic testing, libertarian politics, mathematics and philosophy, etc.). As such, the sample papers provided extensive evidence of student ability to think objectively.

2. The changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary.

PHIL 201: Student writing ability remains a challenge, one that is not unique to the philosophy program. Good writing skills are necessary for good reading skills. Good reading skills, in turn, facilitate objective thinking. As a general education course, PHIL 201 has large class sizes. As a result, faculty are unable to provide the sustained personalized attention possible in 300/400 level courses. In response, we will determine whether all philosophy faculty should make using the writing center mandatory.

300/400 level courses: Although philosophy is a small program, we have had considerable success in placing our students in graduate programs. For example, our students have been accepted in graduate programs for cognitive science and philosophy, genomic advocacy, public administration, and theology as well as philosophy. The sample papers demonstrate that majors are receiving training in thinking objectively and conducting substantive analyses. As we proceed, we will establish greater ties with the Career Center and also conduct faculty led workshops on applying to graduate school.

3. What your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

For 2016-2017, we will focus on Intended Student Outcome # 2: Thinking independently rather than primarily relying on others' opinions.

Degree Program: <u>BA in Philosophy</u>   Date: <u>8.24.16</u>

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	**Level 1 – Developing**	**Level 2 – Mature**	**Level 3 – Exemplary**
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes are identified. ☐ No Curriculum Map was provided.	☒ Outcomes were identified. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☒ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. ☐ Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☐ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☒ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☐ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☒ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

				☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☒ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Some results are provided. ☒ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Results are provided. ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☒ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☒ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ Faculty and other important

	plans.	☒ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☒ **Level 1 - Developing**	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   The identified outcome should be revised to ensure that it is clear and measurable (since you cannot measure what students think). You might consider a statement such as "Employ logic to analyze, evaluate, respond to, and construct arguments." Outcome #2 will need similar revision.

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   The program uses papers to assess students' attainment of the outcome, first in lower-division and then in upper-division courses. Expectations increase accordingly. Sufficient detail is provided in Part Two to demonstrate that these papers align with the outcome. Keep in mind that you will need to identify an indirect measure as well.

3. **Results**
   A very general summary of the results is offered. What evidence is there that students met expectations? What was the sample size? What percentage of students achieved advanced standing? Please summarize what your rubric assesses and how you determine the level of student achievement. (You may also provide the rubric via Blackboard.) What exactly does assessment tell you about what students know and can do?

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   Multiple faculty members collect and analyze the results. Though the report indicates that they are shared, it is not clear from Part Two that the faculty engages in regular conversation about what the data reveal and how they might be used to develop actions to improve student learning. (In fact, the one weakness cited here—student writing—is not referenced in Part One.) I look forward to learning more about your student learning assessment program and plans in next year's report.