

**Undergraduate Assessment of Student Learning Report
Report for Academic Year: 2019-2020**

A. Program Information

Department: Philosophy
Program: Philosophy
Contact Name: Bruce Glymour
Contact Email: glymour@ksu.edu
Program assessment website:

http://www.k-state.edu/philos/future_students/assessment.html

B. Outcome Reporting

Include the following information for each outcome assessed this year:

Student Learning Outcome

We assessed 5 SLOs in AY 19-20:

SLO 1: Students should be able to analyze philosophical arguments using informal methods to differentiate valid arguments, invalid arguments, and arguments that, while valid, rely on contentious premises.

SLO 2: Students should be able to use semantic methods to assess the validity of arguments in sentential logic, and should be able to construct derivations in first order logic.

SLO 3: Students should be able to compose extended philosophical essays in clear prose that meet professional ethical standards of charity, open-mindedness, avoidance of ad hominem attacks, and proper citation of other's ideas.

SLO 4: Students should be able to describe and apply a range of important philosophical theories in epistemology metaphysics, ethics, social and political philosophy and decision theory.

SLO 5: Students should be able to verbally debate philosophical theories, defending and critiquing

alternatives in a manner that meets professional ethical standards of charity, open-mindedness, avoidance of ad hominem attacks, and proper credit given to others' ideas.

Assessment Method(s)

Describe the assessment tools, measures, instruments, and/or forms of evidence utilized to demonstrate students' achievement of the learning outcomes. Provide information on who is assessed (what course(s) and students) and expected levels of student performance (minimum expected level, proficient level, etc.).

A total of 626 student-assessments were conducted over 5 SLOs.

SLO 1 was assessed by direct measures using multiple instruments in two class (Philo 303, Philo 335, Philo 340). A total of 53 students were assessed; in total assessments employed 10 instruments.

SLO 2 was assessed by direct measures in one class using a multi-question quiz (Philo 320). A total of 20 students were assessed; in total assessments employed 6 instruments.

SLO 3 was assessed by direct measures using multiple writing assignments in one class (Philo 303). A total of 21 students were assessed; in total, assessments employed 3 instruments.

SLO 4 was assessed by direct measures in two classes (Philo 335, Philo 340) using multi-question quizzes with true/false, multiple choice and open-ended essay questions. A total of 32 students were assessed; in total, assessments employed 7 instruments.

SLO 5 was assessed by direct measures in two classes (Philo 335, Philo 340) by observation of class presentations. A total of 32 students were assessed; in total, assessments employed 6 instruments.

Philo 303, 320, 335, and 340 are all required core courses for majors.

No indirect measures were used, because we judge sample sizes too low for reliable inference.

We have Program and Class specific objectives. We aim to ensure that our students have mastered the skills relevant to each SLO, and that as many as possible show truly excellent abilities. We judge a student to have mastered an SLO if his or her average score across all measures of the skills associated with the SLO is at least 75%; we judge the student to have demonstrated excellence if that average is at least 90%. Class Specific Objectives: we aim for each class to contribute to student success, and judge this by class-specific performance on relevant SLOs. Specifically, we want a) the mean score over all measures of an SLO, in each class, to be at least 75%, and b) we desire that 90% of the students in a class demonstrate mastery of the SLOs measured in that class. Program Specific Objectives: for each SLO, we want mean student performance to be at least 75%, with at least 90% of our students exhibiting mastery and 30% of our students exhibiting excellence. Examples of direct measures can be found at <http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/plans/measures/direct.htm>.

Results AY18-19

Table 1: Average of Student Performance by Class and SLO

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
301	NA			NA	
303	87%		86%		
305				NA	
320		95%			
330	NA			NA	NA
335	86%			90%	91%
340	86%			90%	94%
345	NA			NA	NA

Table 2: Class Performance by Achievement (Excellence) and SLO

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
301	NA			NA	
303	43%		38%		
305				NA	
320		80%			
330	NA			NA	NA

335	33%	67%	100%
340	65%	65%	78%
345	NA	NA	NA

Class Performance by Achievement (Mastery) and SLO

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
301	NA			NA	
303	95%		95%		
305				NA	
320		95%			
330	NA			NA	NA
335	100%			100%	100%
340	83%			96%	91%
345	NA			NA	NA

Program Performance	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5
Grand Average	87%	95%	86%	92%	94%
Excellence	53%	80%	38%	72%	94%
Mastery	95%	95%	95%	97%	94%

Class Specific Objectives: We note that all sections met benchmark goals with respect to overall average and mastery, excepting only Philo 340 with respect to SLO 1. As 340 is traditionally one of the two most difficult core courses and the instructor was teaching it for the first time, we are not overly concerned with that result, and expect benchmark levels of mastery will be attained in AY 20-21.

Year-on-year comparison for class specific objectives: Year-on-year comparisons with respect to class specific objectives exhibited no more variance than expected as result of changes in student population, instructor and instructional methods.

Program Specific Objectives: All benchmark program goals were successfully achieved. Average scores in all SLOs were well above 75%. Students exhibited acceptable levels of excellence (above 30%) with respect to all SLOs. And students achieved benchmark levels of mastery, with more than 90% of students exhibiting mastery of all five SLOs.

Year-on-year comparison for program specific objectives: Because our move to on-line delivery in March disrupted assessment testing, we are unwilling to draw any inferences from the recorded data. Hence, we decline to make year-on-year comparisons from program specific benchmarks.

C. Program Self Review

Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data and Process

Given the success with respect to class-specific objectives and the inability to draw year-on-year comparisons for program objectives, faculty review drew no conclusions.

Program Improvements

Per the inability to perform useful analysis of the data, no program improvements were undertaken.

Future Plans

We will assess again this academic year without disruption. We hope to use fall 2019 data to estimate bias in the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 data generated by the move to on-line delivery in the 2021 assessment report.

Summary of this Report

In AY 2019-2020 the Philosophy Department appeared to succeed in all program objectives and in all but one course objective. The single failure to achieve benchmark is explicable-the deviation was small, in the hardest of our courses, which was being taught by a new instructor for the first time. Further inference from the data is not possible, given the interruption of the assessment regime in the Spring semester consequent to the COVID shutdown.