

Annual Assessment Report Template AY23-24

Report due date: Friday, November 8, 2024

[Please refer to the Annual Assessment webpage for additional information, resources, and options for annual assessment.](#)

At the program level, the process of assessment provides evidence of student learning that is used to identify opportunities to improve our programs and better support our students. [The Provost's office requires](#) “each program at the University of San Francisco [to participate] in ongoing assessment and evaluation activities by assessing Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) – easily identifiable actions that students are expected to demonstrate in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes upon completion of a program. All programs should have an assessment plan that designates when each PLO will be assessed within a regular cycle. Programs then conduct an annual assessment of student learning focusing on that year’s PLO(s).”

Please note that all annual assessment reports are public documents. A digital repository of reports for the College of Arts & Sciences can be found [here](#).

Requirements of Assessment

- Our accreditors require each major, minor (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate program, certificate, and non-degree granting program to have an active, continuous, and current assessment plan.
- Each Program Learning Outcome (PLO) must be assessed at least one time between each Academic Program Review (APR).
- **Direct assessment** of student learning is also required when evaluating PLOs. Direct methods include the examination of student work products such as tests, papers, performances, presentations, etc.
- **Indirect assessments** such as surveys, exit interviews, and focus groups are not required, but can be an excellent way to supplement direct assessment. Indirect assessments can also be developed or used if all PLO statements have been evaluated between APRs.
- A good assessment program strives to continually review and improve student learning as indicated by the data. Remember, your program doesn't have to be bad to get better.

A thorough assessment plan should answer the following questions:

- What do you want your students to learn?
- Are they learning it?
- How do you know they are learning it?

Programs should also feel empowered to pursue questions that they want to answer regarding student learning, other than those listed above.

Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development (FDCD)

For guidance in carrying out assessment requirements and answers to specific questions that may arise at any stage in the assessment process, please contact the Faculty Director of Curriculum Development (FDCD) in your program area.

- **Arts:** vacant, please reach out to AD Cathy Gabor (cgabor@usfca.edu) for support
- **Humanities:** Mark Meritt (meritt@usfca.edu), Rhetoric and Language
- **Sciences:** John Lendvay (lendvay@usfca.edu), Environmental Sciences
- **Social Sciences:** Michael Jonas (mrjonas@usfca.edu), Economics

How to Submit the Annual Report

Please email a PDF copy of your annual assessment report to: assessment_cas@usfca.edu.

We also ask that you title your report according to the following naming convention: report year_program name_degree type. For example:

- AY21-22_Data Science_MS
- AY21-22_FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor)
OR AY21-22_FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting a combined major/minor aggregate report)

Report Structure

All reports should include the following information:

- Name(s) of all program(s) and degree type(s) assessed (Major, Minor, Graduate, or Non-Degree)
 - **Program and Degrees Being Assessed:** Philosophy Major, Philosophy Minor
- Names and contact information of the faculty coordinating the assessment of each program and report
 - **Name:** Nick Leonard
 - **Title:** Chair of the Philosophy Department
 - **Contact:** nleonard@usfca.edu
- Your Mission Statement; note any changes since last report

- **Mission Statement for the Philosophy Major:** The mission of the B.A. in Philosophy degree program is to provide students with an excellent grounding in the fundamental subjects, key movements, and central figures in the history of philosophy and in ethics. We emphasize the development of superior reading, writing, critical thinking, and logic. We prepare students for a wide variety of careers, including entry into various postgraduate and professional degree programs. Our students and faculty are diverse. Consonant with the University's mission, the department educates men and women for others.

- **Mission Statement for the Philosophy Minor:** The mission of the Minor in Philosophy degree program is to provide students with an excellent grounding in the fundamental subjects, key movements, and central figures in the history of philosophy and in ethics. We emphasize the development of superior reading, writing, and critical thinking. Our students and faculty are diverse. Consonant with the University's mission, the department educates men and women for others.

- **Changes Since Last Report:** None

- Your PLOs; note any changes since last report
 - **PLO's for the Major:**
 1. Students identify primary philosophical themes found in the writings of major ancient, medieval, modern, and moral philosophers.
 2. Students write historical and argumentative essays on central philosophical issues.
 3. Students develop philosophical arguments using formal and informal methods originated by historical and contemporary philosophers.

 - **PLO's for the Minor:**
 1. Students identify primary philosophical themes found in the writings of major philosophers.
 2. Students write historical and argumentative essays on central philosophical issues.
 3. Students develop philosophical arguments using methods originated by historical and contemporary philosophers.

 - **Changes Since Last Report:** None

- Your current Curricular Map; note any changes since last report
 - **Curricular Map:** See attachment

- Your assessment schedule between APRs: a year by year list of PLOs assessed since your last APR and those to be assessed before your next APR (Contact your FDCD for clarification if needed)
 - **2024-2025:** PLO 2
 - **2025-2026:** PLO 1
 - **2026-2027:** PLO 3
- Description of the assessment methodology
 - **Assessment Method:** Direct assessment of midterm essays.
 - **Course Assessed:** PHIL 310 Ancient and Medieval Philosophy
 - **PLO Assessed:** PLO 2
- Rubrics (and other instruments, if applicable)
 - **Rubric for Assessment:**

Below Expectations: The student is unable to ask relevant questions, to conceive, suggest and answer those questions, or to support their own positions with appropriate arguments. The student shows little or no understanding of any additional implications of their positions.

Meets Expectations: The student shows that they are able to ask relevant questions, to conceive, suggest and answer those questions appropriately, and to support their own positions with logically competent arguments. The student can also show an understanding of the more general implications of the question as framed and their position taken on that question.

Exceeds Expectations: The student shows that they are able to ask relevant and original questions, to suggest novel answers to those questions, and to support their own positions with creative and compelling arguments. The student can also take into account a range of competing arguments, and show why their position is superior to those alternatives.

- Description of your results, noting any significant findings from the data or assessment process
 - This year we only have two full-time faculty members to complete this assessment (the only other full-time faculty member is teaching the class that we are assessing). In keeping with past practices, we directly assessed papers from both our majors and our minors. Each faculty member graded each paper according to the rubric above, and the results are listed below.

Major/Minor	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Paper 1: Major		1 vote	1 vote
Paper 2: Major		2 votes	
Paper 3: Major		2 votes	
Paper 4: Minor			2 votes
Paper 5: Minor			2 votes
Paper 6: Minor		2 votes	

- **Description of the results:** Every paper either meets or exceeds expectations with respect to PLO 2.
- **Findings:** The fact that every paper either meets or exceeds expectations indicates that this PLO 2 is being achieved.
- Description of how the results were shared with faculty and how your department/program responded to the results, including any plans for future improvement or assessment of your program indicated by the results
- **Sharing the Results:** After the report is submitted it will also be shared with the department. Given that PLO 2 is clearly being satisfied, it is unlikely that there will be a need for any major changes.
- Discussion of any significant feedback from your previous year’s report and how your program responded to that feedback
- **Signification Feedback from Last Year’s Report:** Last year our department conducted an indirect assessment of our program. The only significant feedback was that we should resume with a direct assessment of our PLOs.
- **Response:** This year we conducted a direct assessment of PLO 2. In the following two years we will conduct a direct assessment of our two other PLOs.