

**Review of Assessment Report  
Assessment Review Committee (ARC)**

Academic Program: **PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION**

Date: **September 2016**

Criteria	Description of Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary	Comments
<b>SLOs</b>	The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) establish the critical components of student learning that define the program and articulate the knowledge and abilities expected of program graduates in ways that are observable and measurable.		X			We recommend revising SLO #3: "Understand the processes by which scholars of philosophy or religion develop methodologies and/or theories of interpretation to construct frameworks of meaning." Rather than talk about what students would <i>understand</i> , think in terms of how students would <i>demonstrate</i> (or <i>synthesize</i> or <i>apply</i> or <i>act upon</i> ) these abilities. A good goal for the department would be to develop a rubric that identifies what evidence of learning would meet this SLO. What are the subset of skills involved here?
<b>Evidence of Student Learning</b>	Results are based upon evidence of student learning, and evidence can be provided to both internal and external reviewers (preferably in electronic form)	X				Please keep archives of student work.
<b>Meaningful Rubrics</b>	Criteria for successful performance are provided through rubrics or other specific descriptions.		X			In the rubric for SLO 1, you rely on <i>awareness</i> as an outcome, but awareness seems to fall short of describing the dynamic activity involved in gaining, demonstrating, and applying this knowledge, so we would encourage you to think about how students would <i>show</i> this knowledge –what are the sub-skills involved, and where would you see this knowledge demonstrated – in papers, exams, elsewhere?

## **Review of Philosophy/ Religion Assessment Report September 2016**

### **Additional Comments:**

We are pleased with the assessment work Philosophy and Religion has done and want to encourage you to continue to move in this direction.

We encourage you to return to a fundamental problem you addressed in your report, the problem of students being able to analyze texts. Students can't read or aren't reading? It's an important pedagogical issue, one we all ought to be asking. If students aren't making the time to read, we have one problem. If they try but can't do the reading, it's a different problem and requires a different approach. If ability is the issue, how do we talk to them about how to read? And how does that inform the opening assignments and activities in the course? Can we offer tools that guide struggling students to become better readers? We encourage this conversation to be at the heart of post-assessment discussion in your department.

For the 2016-17 Assessment Report (due in June), please include one or more key assessment results, and a corresponding recommendation for action. See the "Program Assessment Report Worksheet" for a detailed explanation of this guideline at <http://www.drury.edu/academicaffairs/pdf/biannual.pdf>.

### **Next Steps:**

- 1—Please discuss your assessment report and the ARC review with your department so all faculty are contributing to the assessment of student learning.
- 2—Continue to collect evidence of student learning (preferably in electronic form) according to your LO Matrix.
- 3—Based on recommendations from Program Assessment Committees, the next Assessment Report will be due June 2017 (rather than in January 2017 as originally planned). Departments should continue to collect and assess student learning (as described in your LO Matrix), but ARC will ask for just one annual Assessment Report instead of two.

