

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Philosophy and Religion DATE April 21, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Philosophy concentration

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Kenneth Ruit and Sukhvarsh Jerath

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments: The Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan for the Department of Philosophy and Religion is not dated although the first academic year referenced in the plan is 2006-07. The five generally-stated goals (with objectives) are applicable to both the philosophy concentration and the religion concentration.

In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”) |

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals: Communication, critical thinking, information literacy, and diversity are explicitly stated among the program's five goals. Creative thinking is more implicitly referenced in integration of theory and practice and pursuit of career endeavors in philosophy and religion.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments: The faculty collected and analyzed student work (exams or papers) using an agreed-upon scoring rubric (not provided) to assess student achievement for program goals in critical thinking, sensitivity to diversity, and philosophic literacy. A survey of graduating philosophy majors was also employed. Both of these direct and indirect assessment methods are specifically referenced in the current departmental assessment plan.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? 	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? 	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: Evaluation of student work (exams, papers) yielded results that the faculty describe as “disappointing”. The quality of student work could generally be categorized as either “highly successful” or “completely underperforming”. The faculty reflected on the results of their analysis and came to a couple of meaningful conclusions that have stimulated further discussion and action. According to the faculty, graduating students are able to effectively articulate complex thoughts and arguments in a systematic and coherent fashion but are not sufficiently “philosophically literate”. In view of the student performance results, the faculty feel there may be a curricular imbalance between the considerable emphasis placed on clear thought/communication and that placed on acquisition of more specialized, particular knowledge of philosophic texts, thinkers and discipline-relevant methodologies. Moreover, the faculty suggest that the results may also reflect an influence of the diversity of expertise (and expectations) among the faculty as they score/evaluate student work that may not specifically align with their own approaches and emphases, and may result in faculty members perhaps being more critical of student work in certain areas. Therefore, as the faculty suggest, the observed “low scores [may be] more a product of our assessment methods than a true reflection of our students’ learning”.

No results were reported on the basis of the survey of graduating majors other than the comment that the survey “prompted a discussion about the need to cultivate a stronger philosophy “culture” on campus and around the department”.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.

- ☐ 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- ☒ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- ☐ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- ☐ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- ☒ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- ☒ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- ☐ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- ☐ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals: The evaluation of student work and the graduating senior survey methods assess critical thinking, sensitivity to diversity, and philosophic literacy. Student performance is strong in ability to articulate complex thoughts and arguments in a systematic and coherent fashion but is weaker in knowledge and application of philosophic literature and methods. No results were specifically reported that addressed student learning for the goal of “sensitivity to diversity”.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? 	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments: The department does not indicate that any curricular improvements/changes are necessary or will be made on the basis of the reported assessment results. However, the department is clear that the major changes that need to take place for the coming year are related to how the faculty goes about the collection and evaluation of student work. Changes will include having faculty members score student work within their own areas of expertise and refining elements of the scoring rubric. Specific changes that will be made to enhance the “culture of philosophy” in the department will include

designation of departmental space as a “philosophy lounge” for students and faculty; it is thought that such a space will promote unity and the institutional value of “gathering” in a direct and explicit way.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ✓ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ✓ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ✓ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ✓ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- _____ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ✓ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ✓ Results are reported.
- ✓ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- _____ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- _____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- _____ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- _____ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ✓ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- _____ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- _____ No results are reported.
- _____ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: *The Department of Philosophy and Religion places a high priority on assessment of student learning. Goals and objectives for student learning are well-articulated and the philosophy faculty has implemented direct and indirect assessment methods that have, in their mind, yielded mixed (and perhaps misleading) results regarding what their graduating seniors have learned. The implementation of these assessment methods has revealed how their subsequent revision is necessary. The committee is looking forward to the department’s updated assessment plan and how it will reflect revision of current assessment and evaluation practices (proposed by the department as a priority for next academic year).*

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| ✓ Annual report | ✓ Assessment plan (as posted) |
| _____ Appendices (cited in annual report) | ✓ Previous assessment review |
| _____ Other (please describe) | |

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kenneth Ruit	Sukhvarsh Jerath
	Department	Basic Sciences	Civil Engineering
	Phone Number	777-2570	777-3564
	e-mail	kenneth.ruit@med.und.edu	sukhvarsh.jerath@und.edu

Section 1: __Y__ Section 2: __Y__ Section 3: __Y__ Section 4: __Q__

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported and it’s unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Philosophy and Religion DATE April 21, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Religion concentration

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Kenneth Ruit and Sukhvarsh Jerath

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments: The Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan for the Department of Philosophy and Religion is not dated although the first academic year referenced in the plan is 2006-07. The five generally-stated goals (with objectives) are applicable to both the philosophy concentration and the religion concentration.

In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”) |

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals: Communication, critical thinking, information literacy, and diversity are explicitly stated among the program's five goals. Creative thinking is more implicitly referenced in integration of theory and practice and pursuit of career endeavors in philosophy and religion.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <input type="checkbox"/> | NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments: The primary direct assessment method discussed in the 2012-13 annual report is a pre- and post-test of knowledge designed to address program goals and objectives for “knowledge”, “understanding” and “preparation” for future career aspirations. While the pre- and post-test assessment method is not one of the methods outlined in the current departmental assessment plan, the department is relying heavily on this method to determine the degree to which students are acquiring the knowledge the faculty feels is important for students' future success in the discipline.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *Student responses to pre- and post-test questions assessing discipline-based knowledge and understanding of diversity-related issues in religion were compared. Scores were reported and differences in performance were clear in how they affirm student achievement of learning goals. The faculty noted a wide range of performances on the post-test among graduating seniors, which indicates opportunity for improvement; the faculty would clearly like to see the number of graduating seniors who perform relatively poorly on the post-test in comparison to their peers reduced.*

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.

- ☐ 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- ☐ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- ☐ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- ☐ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- ☒ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- ☒ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- ☐ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- ☐ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals: *The pre- and post-test method assesses discipline-based knowledge and understanding of diversity-related issues in religion. Student performance is improved in “knowledge and used of basic vocabulary of the relevant discipline”, “knowledge of central movements, arguments and approaches to the discipline”, “preparation for respective entrance examinations and application processes” and “understanding of the various world views posed by diverse cultures”. Based on an analysis of student performance, the faculty has concluded that the religion curriculum is “highly effective at achieving learning outcomes” for the goals focused on during this academic year.*

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments: *The department does not indicate that any curricular improvements/changes are necessary or will be made on the basis of the reported assessment results. However, the department is clear that what it has learned from the implementation of the pre-and post-test assessment method will inform the development of a similar assessment method to assess goals for critical and creative thinking in the next academic year.*

SUMMARY

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A specific plan for assessment is in place.	<input type="checkbox"/> No specific plan for assessment is in place.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student learning goals are well-articulated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are clearly described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.

☒ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
☒ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
☒ Results are reported.
☒ Results are tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
☒ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
☐ No results are reported.
☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: *The Department of Philosophy and Religion places a high priority on assessment of student learning. Goals and objectives for student learning are well-articulated and the religion faculty has implemented a direct assessment method (pre-/post-testing) that has, in their mind, yielded valid and reliable results regarding what their graduating seniors have learned. The implementation of this assessment method will inform the development of a similar methods to assess other program goals. The committee is looking forward to the department's updated assessment plan and how it will reflect revision of current assessment and evaluation practices (proposed by the department as a priority for next academic year). Broadening the scope of implemented assessment methods in the religion concentration to include additional direct as well as indirect methods would enhance the department's assessment efforts.*

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☐ Other (please describe)

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kenneth Ruit	Sukhvarsh Jerath
	Department	Basic Sciences	Civil Engineering
	Phone Number	777-2570	777-3564
	e-mail	kenneth.ruit@med.und.edu	sukhvarsh.jerath@und.edu

Section 1: __Y__ Section 2: __Y__ Section 3: __Y__ Section 4: __Q__

Coding Key:

Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
 Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
 N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
 NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13