SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Philosophy for Ministry, Archdiocesan Track	Department: NA
Degree or Certificate Level: BA	College/School: Philosophy and Letters
Date (Month/Year): February, 2023	Primary Assessment Contact: Dr. Ed Hogan (Kenrick-Glennon Seminary)

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? We gathered artefacts for Outcome 1 in Fall of 2019 and Fall of 2020. (Somehow we missed collecting artefacts in the Fall of 2021.)

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? It is reviewed every year. The last year it was updated was 2020. It is being updated again this year.

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Outcome 1: Students can analyze and evaluate arguments.

2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Student papers were collected from PLJ 4250: *Natural Theology* and student exams were collected from PLJ 4000: *Metaphysics*. The courses were offered face to face only, at Kenrick-Glennon Seminary. Note: Both courses come from the second (final) year of the program, so we have a better sense of what the *program* is accomplishing.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Artefacts were scored using an "Analysis and Evaluation Rubric" (included at the end of this report). Scoring was done by the Academic Dean and the Coordinator of Assessment at Kenrick-Glennon Seminary. The process is described in the attached document: 2022 Process & Rubric.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Data are attached in an Excel file. Teaching modality and location were the same for all classes.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

1. Students were reasonably strong in all areas of assessment which could be scored. 2. The strongest areas in each artefact (see the highest average scores) appeared to be largely due to what the teacher required. "Presentation" was the strongest outcome of the "Sherman" artefact, partly because that's where the teacher focused. "Analysis" was the strongest outcome of the "Aquinas" artefact, partly because that's where the teacher focused. 3. Still, average scores lend support to the conclusion that students are learning how to present, analyze, and evaluate arguments well.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

> Preliminary findings were shared briefly at a faculty curriculum meeting on December 16, 2022. A more complete discussion was held at the full faculty meeting on February 1, 2023.

B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies	• Course content • Teaching techniques • Improvements in technology • Prerequisites	• Course sequence • New courses • Deletion of courses • Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings
Changes to the Assessment Plan	• Student learning outcomes • Student artifacts collected • Evaluation process	• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics) • Data collection methods • Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

> No actions at this time.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

> 1. Because this is our first cycle of assessment with this outcome. 2. Because the data support the conclusion that students are doing reasonably well with this outcome. 3. Because the most important result is not these particular scores on these particular artefacts – it is the fact that the faculty are repeatedly having conversations about the curriculum and the habits the curriculum aims to build. These conversations are having the right effect: faculty are seeing together and working together.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

> We changed the way Rubrics are constructed (from 5-point to 3-point scale). We changed the way faculty are involved in the construction of rubrics (faculty review a draft of the rubric, so they have a hand in shaping it).

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

> Informally. The qualitative conversations have been more important than the quantitative outcomes.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

> 1. The *process* works very smoothly, in terms of the distribution of labor, the construction of rubrics, the scoring of artefacts, and the follow-up reporting and conversation. 2. The *morale* is good – faculty feel a part of the process, not too much is required of them, and the process generates conversation about what the program is doing. 3. The fruits of the assessment process are most evident in the conversations the faculty have about the curriculum, and the skills that the courses are building.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

> Continue with a strong process. Continue to be attentive to faculty participation in and morale about the assessment program. Continue to look for ways to improve the program, and the assessment process.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

"Analyze & Evaluate" RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF OUTCOME 1 (2022)

SLO 1: Students can analyze and evaluate arguments.

Learning Outcome Component	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)
Presentation of the argument is clear. (Identifies the <u>thesis / claim</u> that the author is making.)	Student's presentation of the argument is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus. Does not clearly identify the thesis. *("Are you sure that's the author's argument?)*	Student's presentation of the argument is accurate, clear, and focused. Clearly identifies the thesis. *("Yes – that's clearly presented.)*	Student's presentation of the argument is accurate, well-focused, and shows depth of insight (e.g. it is well organized, shows insight into personal or historical context of the argument). Presents the thesis with nuance. *("Hey – that's quite good.")*
Analysis of the argument is clear. (Here are the <u>component parts</u> of the argument.)	Student's presentation of the component parts of the argument lacks focus; fails to identify key elements of the argument; little awareness of the argument's movement. *("I don't think that's sharp enough.")*	Student's presentation of the component parts of the argument is focused; clearly identifies key elements of the argument and overall movement. *("Good – that's clear.")*	Student's presentation of the component parts of the argument is well-focused; shows depth of insight and nuance in presenting the elements of the argument. (E.g. not only individual components of the argument but also overall flow; identifies the category of argument being used.) *("Hey – that's quite good.")*
Evaluation of the argument is clear. (The argument does or does not <u>support the conclusion</u>.)	Student does not really give an evaluation of the argument; fails to identify key strengths or weaknesses of the argument. *("I'm not sure you answered this.)*	Student gives a clear evaluation of the argument; clearly identifies key strengths or weaknesses of the argument. *("Good – I know where you stand.)*	Student gives a clear and nuanced evaluation of the argument. (E.g. not only evaluating the argument *per se* but placing it in historical or personal context; incorporating the category of argument into the evaluation.) *("Hey – that's quite good.")*

Notes
Present: Represent. Identify the thesis / claim the author is making. Be clear. Be fair.
Analyze: Break down – here are the component parts. Show movement. Put together – here's how the parts relate to each other.
Evaluate: Is the argument valid or not? Convincing or not? Distinguish between *true* and *well argued*. Distinguish between *false* and *incomplete*. Distinguish between the *intention* of the author and the *actual argument*. Evaluate in historical context. Evaluate or apply in personal context. Show awareness of what type of argument we're dealing with.