UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO | College of Arts and Sciences

Saint Ignatius Institute

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019

I. LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent.

Katrina B. Olds, Director, kbolds@usfca.edu

Mark Miller, Associate Director, mtmiller2@usfca.edu

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018?

No changes were made to the mission statement since Oct. 2018:

The St. Ignatius Institute is a core living/learning community at the University of San Francisco ("USF") that is distinctively Jesuit.

The St. Ignatius Institute ("SII") educates students in the great books tradition while exposing them to the challenging realities of our contemporary world, sharing community, and exploring spirituality in the Jesuit tradition so that they are able to use their imagination, creativity, and critical analysis to promote the common good, especially for those most in need.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2018?

No major changes were made to the PLOs since Oct. 2018:

Upon graduation from the St. Ignatius Institute, students will have:

1. *examined and evaluated the influential texts of Western and non-Western cultures, both classical and contemporary;*
2. *in small group settings, demonstrated critical academic skills of reading, listening, writing, and speaking;*
3. *experienced diverse aspects of local and global communities and developed strong interpersonal skills to relate respectfully with members of various ethnic, cultural, professional, and socio-economic backgrounds;*

4. *evaluated challenges facing local and global communities in light of academic learning, personal experience, and social engagement to create innovative solutions that account for all stakeholders, including the environment and those most in need;*

5. *reflected on their personal spiritualties in light of major world religions, particularly the Catholic, Jesuit tradition and its emphasis on such principles as finding God in all things and becoming people for others.*

4. Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?

#1: *examined and evaluated the influential texts of Western and non-Western cultures, both classical and contemporary;*

II.   METHODOLOGY

5. Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

We used the direct method with sample student essays that were collected from SII 214: Theories of Ethics, a 4-credit, core course, conducted in Spring 2019. Student work products were evaluated by two full-time faculty members, one of whom was the instructor of the course from which samples were selected.

This was the third time the SII has conducted an assessment exercise. The first two times, one full-time instructor reviewed works from more than one 2-credit symposia. Last year, we committed to reviewing a 4-credit core class and to having more than one reviewer. We chose the ethics class in part because it is not in introductory course (Since it is offered in the spring, students generally have taken at least one or two other courses before it), and in part because it was the only 4-credit course for which an instructor submitted students' work.

A four-point rubric was designed to assess the collected student work products. A score of "4" indicated that the product exceeded expectations for the designated outcome, and a score of "3" indicated that it met expectations for that outcome. Products achieving scores of "3" or "4" were considered to have performed adequately or better on the designated outcome. A score of "2" indicated that the work product showed some signs of development in achieving the outcome, and a score of "1" indicated little to no development towards the outcome. Work products achieving scores of "1" and "2" were considered to have performed inadequately on the designated outcome.

The learning outcome is very comprehensive, with three pairs joined by "and": (1) "examined *and* evaluated," (2) "Western *and* non-Western cultures," and (3) classical *and* contemporary. The assignment assessed was not comprehensive of the program or the semester, and it was not designed to meet all six parts of the outcome. It focused on one item in each pair, namely *examination* of two *classical*, *Western* texts. As a whole, the course includes five of the six parts, with other papers covering

contemporary works, and evaluation being part of class participation and a comprehensive, oral exam. Non-Western works are covered in other courses. Because the assignment was not comprehensive of all six parts, we decided that no paper would be given a "4." On the other hand, we decided that since the learning outcome was designed for the program as a whole rather than one class, we would assess the works based on whether they demonstrated not only examination of the texts but comprehension of them, as specified by the assignment. Similarly, the past two years, when we conducted assessment, we assessed only students' written work when the learning outcome specified "reading, listening, writing, *and* speaking" *skills.*

III.   RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

6. What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

As indicated in the chart below, a majority of students (fifteen of eighteen) met expected performance on the designated outcome. Three students performed just below the acceptable level of performance.

Score	Level	Description
4	Exceeds Expectations	0 (32%)
3	Meets Expectations	15 (50%)
2	Developing	3 (18%)
1	Inadequate	0 (0%)

Comparing these results to last year's results, the overall yield is consistent with the largest group of students attaining level three, "meets expectations," the smallest group at "developing" and none at "inadequate." This year, however, we had no students at "exceeds expectations."

IV.   CLOSING THE LOOP

7. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

At this time, it is difficult for us to make long-term plans for assessment, since the SII is merging with the Honors College and we will begin to revise our mission statement and PLOs next semester. However, we plan to improve our assessment efforts for next year in the following ways:

1) We would need to discuss this as a faculty, but our first priority might be to modify the PLO to use "and/or" instead of simply "and." When we wrote the PLOs, we did not have assessment of particular assignments in mind, but rather what we hoped for students to have developed by the end of their four years in the program.
2) We could keep the PLO as is and request that faculty submit works that covered all parts of the PLO, or perhaps even design an assignment that covers all the parts.
3) Indirect methods: Perhaps faculty in the program can develop indirect assessment instruments (e. g., student surveys/interviews) to determine student perceptions regarding progress toward learning outcomes.

8. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

Last year Mark Merritt noted on three limitations of our assessment: (1) scoring by a single reader, (2) lack of assessment of speaking or listening, and (3) design of the rubric by a single faculty member without consultation.

Responding to these limitations, this year, we (1) had two faculty members score the assignments, (2) chose a different learning outcome, and (3) had both faculty members design the rubric and how it would be applied to the assignments. To address the second limitation we to implement one of the three steps noted above.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)