

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

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 (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?	b. (1) What method(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. Thinking objectively about issues and arguments, not being swayed by emotion and irrational personal preferences.	1. See attached assessment rubric form for evaluating final papers. 2. PHIL 324 (Feminist Philosophies) PHIL 425 (Bioethics of Genome Science) PHIL 313 (Philosophy of Religion)	80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of learning outcome #1.	Out of 8 students, 4 students exhibited strong evidence (50%); 1 exhibited proficiency; 2 exhibited limited evidence; and 1 exhibited no evidence	Joe Grcic, Michael Deem, and Namita Goswami gathered assessment data in their courses and provided results to Namita Goswami to tabulate and evaluate; results emailed to program faculty
2. Thinking independently rather than primarily relying on others' opinions.	1. See attached assessment rubric form for evaluating final papers. 2. PHIL 324 (Feminist Philosophies) PHIL 425 (Bioethics of Genome Science) PHIL 313 (Philosophy of Religion)	80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of learning outcome #2.	Out of 8 students, 4 students exhibited strong evidence (50%); 1 exhibited proficiency; 2 exhibited limited evidence; and 1 exhibited no evidence	Joe Grcic, Michael Deem, and Namita Goswami gathered assessment data in their courses and provided results to Namita Goswami to tabulate and evaluate; results emailed to program faculty

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. In general, students seem to be gaining the skills necessary for the outcomes assessed this year. Students who are well on their way to completing the major exhibited strong evidence. Students who are in the beginning stages of the major exhibited limited evidence. The student who exhibited no evidence realized that the course was not of interest and did not drop the course in time.
2. The student exhibiting limited evidence was advised by athletics to declare a philosophy major because of the number of credits required to complete this major. As a result, the student during one semester (Fall 2016) took 4 300/400 level courses. This is a remarkable load that would be difficult for even a seasoned major to accomplish. Once this reason for declaring the major was discovered, the academic advisor spoke to athletics. It was requested that students who do show interest or capability in philosophy should not be told to declare philosophy as their major simply because of the number of credits required. Given that tutoring is now available for majors, students will be directed to use this resource. The program will consider requiring pre-requisites before students take higher-level courses. They will be advised to take PHIL 201 (Ethics and the Good Life) and PHIL 105 (Introduction to Logic) before they take higher-level courses. The philosophy program will also use an exit survey filled out by graduating seniors to glean possible ways of improving courses and the program overall.

1. Regarding plans for assessment next year, the following objectives will be evaluated:

Objective 3. Developing open-mindedness, including understanding opposing views and appreciating the need for this understanding.

Objective 4. Recognizing the myriad ways that ethical and other philosophical principles apply to everyday experiences and life.

Student Learning Outcomes	Courses/Educational Strategies	Assessment Method(s)	Source(s) of Assessment	Target for Student Achievement	Time of Data Collection	Person(s) Responsible
---------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

<p>Developing openmindedness, including understanding opposing views and appreciating the need for this understanding.</p>	<p>Fall: PHIL 430 (Philosophy of the Absurd) PHIL 302 (Medical Ethics) PHIL 313 (Philosophy of Religion) PHIL 343 (Existentialism) PHIL 353 (Environmental Ethics) Spring: PHIL 316 (Political Philosophy) PHIL 324 (Feminist Philosophies) PHIL 335 (Modern Philosophy) PHIL 336: (Eastern Philosophy) PHIL 401 (Ethical Theory) PHIL 409 (Philosophy of Science) PHIL 425/525 (Bioethics of Genome Science)</p>	<p>See attached rubric.</p>	<p>Final Papers.</p>	<p>80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of outcome 3.</p>	<p>Fall 2017 & Spring 2018</p>	<p>Steve Harris, Joe Grcic, Namita Goswami, adjunct(s) TBD</p>
<p>Recognizing the myriad ways that ethical and other philosophical principles apply to everyday experiences and life.</p>	<p>Fall: PHIL 430 (Philosophy of the Absurd) PHIL 302 (Medical Ethics) PHIL 313 (Philosophy of Religion) PHIL 343 (Existentialism) PHIL 353 (Environmental Ethics) Spring: PHIL 316 (Political Philosophy) PHIL 324 (Feminist Philosophies) PHIL 335 (Modern Philosophy) PHIL 336: (Eastern</p>	<p>See attached rubric.</p>	<p>Final Papers.</p>	<p>80% of students will exhibit strong evidence of outcome 4.</p>	<p>Fall 2017 & Spring 2018</p>	<p>Steve Harris, Joe Grcic, Namita Goswami, adjunct(s) TBD</p>
	<p>Philosophy) PHIL 401 (Ethical Theory) PHIL 409 (Philosophy of Science) PHIL 425/525 (Bioethics of Genome Science)</p>					

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BA in Philosophy Date: 01.20.18

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

				<p>addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to</p>

				<p>assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards</p>

	standards set for them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	achieving the performance standards expected of them.	they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ?? <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. ?? <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are

				easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

The program’s outcomes still are too vague (since we cannot measure thinking); please consider recasting them so that they identify the specific actions students must demonstrate—as in “Students will be able to analyze issues objectively and draw sound conclusions.” Both outcomes were assessed via the final paper, which is evaluated using a very general rubric. This rubric would yield more useful information about student learning if it included the specific criteria you expect students to demonstrate if they are to earn the “strong evidence,” “limited evidence,” etc. rating; it also would give you specific evidence to report and analyze in Part Two. Standards are high, and this year, students did not meet them. Consequently, I would expect to see plans for improvement in Part Two, and I do: The program is making plans to enforce prerequisites. Are other, more directly connected changes in course content or teaching practices warranted?

Thank you for sharing your Student Learning Summary Report!