

2019 – 20 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: Theology, Philosophy, and Biblical Languages	Date: June 19, 2020
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: David Coe and Paul Holtorf	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> A statistical analysis of student submissions for each unit of Phil 499, arriving at a mean score for each unit. A score of 80% or better will be required of 70% of the students in the class.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 1. Can a student demonstrate the ability to read and understand the material in an upper-level, scholarly work in philosophy? 2. Can a student demonstrate the ability to accurately summarize the philosophical arguments put forward in an upper-level, scholarly work in philosophy? 3. Can a student demonstrate the ability to assess and evaluate the arguments put forward in an upper level, scholarly work in philosophy? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> The scores of the unit papers submitted by the students were used to determine the mean score for each unit. The mean score for each unit is as follows: Unit I:89.6; Unit II: 93.8; Unit III: 97; Unit IV: 94; Unit V: 94.6; Unit VI: 91; Final Paper: 96.4. A score of 80% or better was met for 70% of the students in the class. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The papers demonstrated a high ability in comprehension of the material and demonstrated upper-level, scholarly work in philosophy. Students demonstrate a high ability to accurately summarize various philosophical arguments in keeping with upper-level philosophical courses. Finally, students demonstrated a high ability to evaluate arguments in a upper-level philosophical course in keeping with the expectations of the course learning outcomes. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> Not applicable	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 24, 2020 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Email to the department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Charles Blanco, David Coe, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, and Russ Sommerfeld	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> Continue to keep the learning outcomes for the course b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Continue to keep the assignment in the course. c. <i>Program:</i> Continue to emphasize the scope and sequence of the philosophy courses, culminating in the honors course in Philosophy. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Continue to maintain the performance criteria as it demonstrates the level of competency re: the student's skills in evaluation and summarizing in philosophy. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> To continue using the Philosophy Honors Course, using the same assessment questions and performance criteria. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> None	
If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.	
What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? A new assignment within the department program will be selected for the 2020-21 academic year.	
Submitted by: Paul Holtorf	Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/14/2020

Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed: 7/14/2020

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na