

**Undergraduate Assessment of Student Learning Report
Report for Academic Year: 2021-2022**

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 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 119 student-assessments were conducted over 5 SLOs.

SLO 1 was assessed by direct measures using multiple instruments in two classes (Philo 330 and Philo 345). A total of 32 students were assessed; in total assessments employed 2 instruments, all direct.

SLO 2 was assessed in one class (Philo 320). A total of 14 students were assessed using 5 instruments, all direct.

SLO 3 was assessed by direct measures in one class (Philo 332). A total of 22 students were assessed using two instruments, both direct.

SLO 4 was assessed in one class (Philo 330). A total of 20 students were assessed, using 5 instruments, all direct.

SLO 5 was assessed in three classes (Philo 330, Philo 332, Philo 340). 43 students were assessed, all by direct observation of class presentations.

Philo 320, 330, and 340 are all required core courses for majors. Philo 332 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		84%			
330	91%			87%	93%
332				87%	89%
340	95%		99%		96%

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

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
320		64%			
330	59%			59%	82%
332				36%	68%
340	89%		100%		89%

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

Classes	SLO				
	1	2	3	4	5
320		79%			
330	100%			89%	100%
332				100%	100%
340	100%		100%		89%

Program Performance	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5
Grand Average	92%	84%	90%	86%	94%
Excellence	72%	64%	59%	50%	77%
Mastery	100%	79%	100%	90%	98%

Class Specific Objectives: We note that all sections met benchmark goals with respect to overall average and mastery, excepting only Philo 320 with respect to SLO 2.

Year-on-year comparison for class specific objectives: Year-on-year comparison with respect to class specific objectives is uninformative: scores are not materially different (i.e. all are above benchmark), excepting Philo 320, which was not assessed in 2020-2021.

Program Specific Objectives: All benchmark program goals were successfully achieved, excepting only SLO 2 in Philo 320. 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 SLOs we assessed, except only in Philo 320.

Year-on-year comparison for program specific objectives: Year-on-year comparisons with respect to program specific objectives is not informative because benchmarks were achieved in both years, excepting SLO 2 in Philo 320, which was not assessed in 2020-2021.

C. Program Self Review

Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data and Process

The only SLO-Class of concern is Philo 320. Because enrollment was low in that course, and the instructor and material have been constant, we think the benchmark miss was simply a result of chance rather than some flaw in pedagogy. However, the instructor for Philo 320 is has handed that course of to a colleague for Fall 2022; a comparison of results next year may be informative.

Program Improvements

Because the data did not indicate any necessary adjustments, no program improvements were undertaken in response to this assessment.

Future Plans

We will assess again this academic year, and may learn something about instruction in Philo 320.

Summary of this Report

In AY 2021-2022 the Philosophy Department appeared to succeed in all but one program and course objectives. We judge that the single missed benchmark resulted from low enrollment in the single course in which SLO 2 was assessed. Coincidentally, however, the instructor changed from Fall 2021 to Fall 2022, permitting a comparison in the next assessment cycle.