



SAINT LOUIS
UNIVERSITY

Saint Louis University
Program Assessment Plan

Program (Major, Minor, Core): Philosophy Doctoral Program

Department: Philosophy

College/School: College of Arts and Sciences

Person(s) Responsible for Implementing the Plan: Theodore Vitali (Chair) and Scott Ragland (Dept. Assessment Coordinator)

Date Submitted:

Program Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	Use of Assessment Data
<i>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</i>	<i>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</i>	<i>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</i>	<i>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and "close the loop" to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</i>
1. Assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in philosophy.	At completion of dissertation defense, based on content of the written dissertation.	Students demonstrate this primarily in the dissertation. Measured by dissertation committee's assessment of the quality of the dissertation and oral defense (see Dissertation Rubric)	Student results are included in the annual OA report written by OA Coordinator. This is seen by the chair and associate dean and is also archived so that comparisons can be made year-to-year to observe trends in the results. Results will also be brought to a department meeting so that the faculty can discuss whether changes are needed to the program.
2. Apply some of the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in philosophy.	At completion of dissertation defense, based on content of the written dissertation.	Same as above	Same as above

<p>3. Articulate arguments or explanations to a disciplinary or professional audience in both oral and written forms.</p>	<p>At completion of dissertation defense, based on both dissertation content and oral presentation and responses to questions at the defense.</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p>4. Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.</p>	<p>At the oral defense of the dissertation, based on both dissertation content and oral presentation and responses to questions at the defense.</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p>5. Apply knowledge from the field(s) of study to address problems in broader contexts (e.g., use knowledge of specific topic to advance broader disciplinary discussions)</p>	<p>At completion of dissertation defense, based on content of the written dissertation.</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p>6. Articulate arguments or explanations to a general audience (especially a classroom audience) in both oral and written forms.</p>	<p>Every student's teaching is assessed at a point determined by the student, prior to the end of the student's fourth year of the graduate program.</p>	<p>Student demonstrates in a course s/he is teaching. A faculty-member visits a section of the course and assesses the student's teaching using " Checklist for Review of Graduate Student Teachers " and will forward to the OA director and chair, along with a copy of the student's syllabus.</p>	<p>Results kept in student's file. Positive comments from the teaching rubric can be incorporated into the "teaching letter" written by the chair for the job market. Any areas in which students fail to meet expectations will be communicated to them so that they can figure out how to improve during their fifth year of study. Results will also be communicated to the director of the department's first-year teacher training program to see if any changes need to be made there to avoid any problematic patterns that are observed.</p>

1. It is **not recommended** to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.

Outcome 1 will be measured for all relevant students in Spring 2020. Outcome 2 will be assessed by the end of each spring term beginning in the 2015-16 academic year. It is important to do that annually for all students approaching the job market.

2. Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)? Coordination of these learning outcomes with Madrid is not required, because the Madrid does not have graduate programs.
3. The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:

- a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)

The plan will be reviewed annually by the OA coordinator. If coordinator would like to recommend changes to the program, these will be reported to the chair and discussed at a department meeting early the following year. In late August 2016, the current plan was revised in light of feedback from Dean Donna LaVoie. The new plan incorporates university-wide graduate learning outcomes.

- b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.

Students were not incorporated in the initial development of this plan. However, the OA coordinator would like to meet with the Philosophy Graduate Student Association to discuss the program at during the spring term of 2016. Students recommended changing the original plan of doing the teaching assessment of all 4th-year graduate students to a different plan that required students to initiate the procedure, with a deadline of the end of the 4th year. This requirement was added to the graduate student “Bingo Sheet” or checklist of requirements for progress through the program.

- c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?

None.

- d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel.

Assessment of #1 involves only minimal extra effort for committee members, and the numbers of PhD's are small, so processing the data will be simple for the OA coordinator.

Assessment of #2 is more involved. However, we have been able to review student teaching like this in the past, so it seems feasible.

Dissertation and Dissertation Defense Rubric

Student Name:

Dissertation Title:

Term:

Assessing Professor:

Learning Outcome	Fails to Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
1. Assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in philosophy.	Student fails to address essential relevant literature or fails to assess such literature.	Student addresses all essential relevant literature and assesses it.	Student's assessment of relevant literature is unusually illuminating.
2. Apply the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in philosophy.	Dissertation exhibits a lack of mastery of relevant theories, methods, or argumentative practices.	Dissertation shows mastery of some standard methods, theories, or argumentative practices.	Dissertation employs groundbreaking methods or synthesizes existing practices or theories in a novel way.
3. Apply knowledge from the field(s) of study to address problems in broader contexts [e.g., use knowledge of specific topic to advance broader disciplinary discussions]	The dissertation does not advance the state of the discussion on the chosen topic and shows little promise of developing into an early-career research program.	Student synthesizes information uncovered in extensive research to generate a novel thesis that advances the state of the discussion on the chosen topic. The dissertation has strong potential to be mined for future publications, whether articles or books.	The thesis of the dissertation is a "game changer" likely to be highly influential in the field.
4. Articulate arguments or explanations to a disciplinary or professional audience in both oral and written forms.	The dissertation does not clearly articulate arguments in a professional manner, or the student cannot defend such arguments in conversation at the defense.	The dissertation professionally articulates arguments and the student can further defend his or her position at the oral defense.	The dissertation's arguments are unusually powerful or novel, or the student's oral defense of them is unusually strong.
5. Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.	Dissertation contains plagiarism or shoddy citation methods	Dissertation is entirely the student's own work and all sources are clearly cited.	Citation and bibliography are unusually thorough, so as to be especially helpful in understanding the relevant field.

Checklist for Review of Graduate Student Teachers (GST's)

Dimensions of Effectively Articulating arguments or explanations to a general classroom audience	Fails to Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
GST gives effective oral presentation of information			
GST uses visual aids effectively			
GST effectively uses student questions and comments to further group learning			
GST creates a safe atmosphere conducive to student inquiry and engagement			
GST begins and ends class promptly			
GST's syllabus clearly articulates appropriate course learning outcomes			
GST's course design covers content necessary for achievement of specified "content" outcomes.			
GST's course design includes exercises enabling students to develop skills specified in learning outcomes.			

Below, please include comments to explain the boxes you marked, as well as any other comments you have regarding the graduate student's strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.