Assurance of Student Learning 2018-2019	
Potter College of Arts and Letters	Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies
745 - Philosophy	

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.

Student Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to effectively read, interpret, and evaluate a text in the discipline.

Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of upper-level research papers turned in by departmental majors in senior year.

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met

Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)

Overall, the results from this assessment indicate that our learning outcomes do not accurately reflect what we intend students to learn in our program and that our assessment process does not adequately assess what percentage of students are meeting the learning outcomes as stated or meeting learning outcomes that are intended.

We have taken several steps to address this:

1. We have modified stated student learning outcomes so that each outcome can be assessed with one Leap VALUE rubric rather than with several.
2. We have modified stated student learning outcomes so that the outcomes are distinct from each other.
3. We have modified stated student learning outcomes so that the outcomes include only one outcome instead of several wrapped into one.
4. We have decided to assess a higher quantity of artifacts for direct assessments so that the "percentage of program achieving target" in our assessment more accurately reflects the actual percentage of the program achieving target.
5. We have added one additional form of direct assessment and one form of indirect assessment per learning outcome so that our assessment more accurately captures the fullness of student learning and does not rely on only one measurement instrument.

Outcomes from the changes we have made:
- The "percentage of program achieving target" reported in the assessment for each measurement in the assessment will more accurately the actual percent of program achieving target.
- The "percentage of program achieving target" will be at least 90%.
- The learning outcomes we are tracking will more accurately reflect what we want students in our program to learn.
- Our assessment methods will more accurately assess if students in our program are learning the things we want students to learn.

Student Learning Outcome	
Students will be able to construct and effectively write a thesis for a research paper and defend thesis through the use of relevant literature and resources.	
Measurement Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of upper-level research papers turned in by departmental majors in senior year.

Criteria for Student Success	Drawing from AAC&U VALUES rubrics for information literacy, inquiry and analysis, and written communication, criteria for student success is as follows (modified rubric attached): 1. Reading VALUE Rubric: On *Comprehension* and *Reader's Voice* students should score at Capstone or Upper Milestone level. 2. Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric: On *Student's Position (perspective/thesis/hypothesis)*, students should score at Capstone or Upper Milestone level 3. Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric: On *Analysis*, students should score at Capstone or Upper Milestone level.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	90%	Percent of Program Achieving Target	100%

Methods	Direct: Artifacts from an upper level seminar were collected from students in the course. All seniors in the course who were majors were included in the initial sample (N=7). All identifiers were then removed. Then four of the seven papers were randomly selected for assessment. The papers were split among two full-time faculty so that each paper was read twice by two different reviewers. In the event there was a notable difference in the score between the two faculty members, a third faculty member read it and the score was average between the three readers. The rubric used for scoring was drawn from the Reading, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy Leap VALUE Rubrics from AAC&U.

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

Our primary concerns were not with student learning, per se, but with the way the learning outcomes were stated and the process for assessing if learning outcomes were met.

While written as a single outcome, this learning outcome was actually several outcomes wrapped up into one. Thus we have worked to clarify/differentiate outcomes so that they reflect what we intend student to learn.

Further, given the process we designed for this assessment, if only one paper (of the four randomly selected papers assessed for this outcome) did not meet the outcome, then it meant that we did not meet our "program success target" for that measurement. On the other hand, if the four selected meet the outcome, then it looks as though there is 100% program success rate. This does not adequately convey the actual percentage of program was achieving the target.

Below are the ways we have addressed the challenges to outcomes and the process of assessing said outcomes.

- We have modified student learning outcomes so that are several, each one of which can be assessed with one Leap VALUE rubric rather than with several.
- We have modified student learning outcomes so that each outcome is distinct from the other.
- We have decided to assess a higher quantity of artifacts for direct assessments so that the "percentage of program achieving target" in our assessment more accurately reflects the actual percentage of the program achieving target.
- We have added one additional form of direct assessment and one form of indirect assessment so that our assessment more accurately captures the fullness of student learning and does not rely on only one measurement instrument.

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

In the 2019-20 academic year:

- The "percentage of program achieving target" reported in the assessment for each measurement in the assessment will more accurately the actual percent of program achieving target.

- The "percentage of program achieving target" will be at least 90%.
- The learning outcomes we are tracking will more accurately reflect what we want students in our program to learn.
- Our assessment methods will more accurately assess if students in our program are learning the things we want students to learn.

Rubric for Student Learning Outcome

	Capstone (4)	Upper Milestone (3)	Lower Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
Comprehension	Recognizes possible implications of the text for contexts, perspectives, or issues beyond the assigned task within the classroom or beyond the author's explicit message.	Uses the text, general background, and/or specific knowledge of the author's context to draw more complex inferences about the author's message and attitude.	Evaluates how textual features contribute to the author's message and draws basic inferences about context and purpose of the text.	Apprehends vocabulary appropriately to paraphrase or summarize the information the text communicates.
Reader's Voice	Discusses text with an independent intellectual or ethical disposition so as to further or maintain disciplinary conversations.	Elaborates on the texts so as to deepen or enhance ongoing discussion.	Discusses texts in structured conversations in ways that contribute to basic, shared understanding of the text.	Comments about texts in a way that preserve the author's meaning and link them to the assignment.
Student's Position (perspective/thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Other points of views are synthesized.	Specific position takes into account the complexity of an issue, acknowledging other points of view.	Specific position acknowledges different sides of an issue	Specific position is stated, but simplistic and obvious.
Analysis	Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	List evidence but it is not organized and/or unrelated to focus.