

**Undergraduate Assessment of Student Learning Report
Report for Academic Year: 2020-2021**

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 four (SLOs 1, 3, 4 and 5) of our 5 SLOs in AY 20-21:

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 others' 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 145 student-assessments were conducted over 5 SLOs.

SLO 1 was assessed by direct measures using multiple instruments in three classes (Philo 330, Philo 335, Philo 345). A total of 45 students were assessed; in total assessments employed 3 instruments, all direct.

SLO 2 was not assessed

SLO 3 was assessed by direct measures in two classes (Philo 335 and Philo 345), using two writing assignments. A total of 28 students were assessed.

SLO 4 was assessed by direct measures in two classes (Philo 305, Philo 330) using multi-question quizzes with true/false, multiple choice and open-ended essay questions. A total of 21 students were assessed; in total, assessments employed 3 instruments.

SLO 5 was assessed by direct measures in three classes (Philo 330, Philo 335, Philo 345) by observation of class presentations. A total of 45 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 https://www.k-state.edu/philos/documents/assessment_documents/SLO%20Instruments%20for%20Philosophy%20Assessment.pdf

Results AY20-21

Table 1: Average of Student Performance by Class and SLO

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
301					
303					
305				82%	
320					
330	95%			94%	95%
335	91%		91%		100%
340					
345	90%		89%		100%

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

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
301					
303					
305				33%	
320					
330	100%			71%	94%
335	100%		100%		100%
340					
345	53%		59%		94%

Class Performance by Achievement (Mastery) and SLO

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
301					
303					
305				89%	
320					
330	100%			100%	100%
335	100%		100%		100%
340					
345	94%		94%		94%
Program Performance	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5
Grand Average	88%	NA	90%	90%	97%
Excellence	98%	NA	75%	46%	95%
Mastery	82%	NA	96%	96%	98%

Class Specific Objectives: We note that all sections met benchmark goals with respect to overall average and mastery, excepting only Philo 305 with respect to SLO 4.

Year-on-year comparison for class specific objectives: Year-on-year comparisons with respect to class specific objectives is not meaningful because of the disruptions occasioned by moves to distance and hybrid delivery in AY 19-20 and AY 20-21.

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 four SLOs we assessed.

Year-on-year comparison for program specific objectives: Year-on-year comparisons with respect to class specific objectives is not meaningful because of the disruptions occasioned by moves to distance and hybrid delivery in AY 19-20 and AY 20-21.

C. Program Self Review

Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data and Process

Given the COVID induced disruptions to class delivery, 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, hopefully without disruption.

Summary of this Report

In AY 2020-2021 the Philosophy Department appeared to succeed in all program objectives and in all but one course objective. Further inference from the data is not possible, given the interruption of the assessment regime consequent to the COVID disruption in instruction.