

**Undergraduate Assessment of Student Learning Report
Report for Academic Year: 2022-2023**

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 all five of our five SLOs in AY 22-23:

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 93 student-assessments were conducted over 5 SLOs.

SLO 1 was assessed by direct measures using multiple instruments in three classes (Philo 330, Philo 335 and Philo 346). A total of 32 students were assessed; in total assessments employed 14 instruments, all direct.

SLO 2 was assessed in one class (Philo 320). A total of 19 students were assessed using 1 direct instruments.

SLO 3 was assessed by direct measures in one class (Philo 331). A total of 4 students were assessed using 1 direct instrument.

SLO 4 was assessed in two classes (Philo 335 and Philo 346). A total of 21 students were assessed, using 10 instruments, all direct.

SLO 5 was assessed in three classes (Philo 330 and Philo 331). 18 students were assessed, all by direct observation of class presentations.

Philo 320, 330, 335 and 346 are all required core courses for majors. Philo 331 is an elective course populated by majors fulfilling elective requirements within the major.

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 AY21-22

Table 1: Average of Student Performance by Class and SLO

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
320		90%			
330	93%				97%
331			97%		87%
335	93%			80%	
346	93%			93%	

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

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
320		68%			
330	73%				100%
331			100%		67%
335	64%			18%	
346	56%			56%	

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

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
320		95%			
330	91%				100%
331			100%		83%
335	100%			82%	
346	100%			100%	

Program Performance	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5
Grand Average	93%	90%	97%	90%	93%
Excellence	66%	68%	100%	40%	89%
Mastery	97%	95%	100%	90%	94%

Class Specific Objectives: We note that all sections met benchmark goals with respect to overall average and mastery, excepting Philo 331 with 83% mastery for SLO5 and Philo 335 with 82% mastery for SLO 4. Sample size is small, so those differences from benchmark may be sampling error, but we have refocused attention to on those SLOs in those classes.

Year-on-year comparison for class specific objectives: We note that scores for SLO 2 in Philo 320 are now above benchmark; adjustments from last year appear to have worked. Attention to SLOs 4 and 5 in Philo 331 and 335 is indicated.

Program Specific Objectives: All benchmark program goals were successfully achieved.

Year-on-year comparison for program specific objectives: Year-on-year comparisons with respect indicate improvement in the instructional quality in Philo 320, but also reflect the under-performance in Philo 331 and Philo 335 with respect to SLOs 5 and 4, respectively. Again, attention to pedagogy is indicated here.

C. Program Self Review

Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data and Process

As noted above, attention to levels of mastery in Philo 331 (SLO 5) and 335 (SLO 4) is indicated. It is possible the differences from benchmark are a matter of sampling error, but attention to pedagogy in both courses is indicated as well.

Program Improvements

Performance in Philo 320 (SLO 2) has improved. The instructor for Philo 331 has changed for Fall 2023.

Future Plans

We will assess again this academic year, and may learn something about instruction in Philo 331 and Philo 335.

Summary of this Report

In AY 2022-2023 the Philosophy Department succeeded in all Program Objectives and in all but two course objectives. While sampling error may account of differences from benchmark in those two cases, the instructor for one course has changed and the pedagogy for the other has been modified. Changes undertaken as a result of the last round of assessment have resulted in improved scores for SLO 2 in Philo 320.