

Catholic Studies and Social Thought — Minor

ASSESSMENT REPORT ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018 REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018

Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated.

Note: Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

Some useful contacts:

- 1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts <u>adamati@usfca.edu</u>
- 2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences <u>lendvay@usfca.edu</u>
- 3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities meritt@usfca.edu
- 4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences <u>mrjonas@usfca.edu</u>
- 5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness <u>schakraborty2@usfca.edu</u>
- 6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- <u>ceschwabenland@usfca.edu</u>

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment

Email to submit the report: assessment cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line. For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor); FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I. LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Program Director: Cathal Doherty SJ (cdohertysj@usfca.edu)

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.

Yes.

Mission Statement:

The Minor in Catholic Studies explores the Catholic tradition in all its cultural diversity and universal scope. Catholicism (from Greek $kat\dot{a} + holos$: 'relating to the whole') is arguably the first 'globalization' having an immense impact on human society worldwide. In this minor, students achieve critical insight into the self-understanding of Catholicism as transcendent actor for the common good and human flourishing, in the intellectual enterprise, the arts and its relations with other religions.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs. Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, <u>gamson@usfca.edu</u>). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

Yes. Minor editorial changes:

Program Learning Outcomes:

Students will:

1. *Catholic Social Teaching:* Demonstrate an understanding of how Catholic social teaching interfaces with religious and secular culture.

2. *Catholic Intellectual Tradition:* Articulate the major intellectual, social, historical, and aesthetic perspectives of the Catholic cultural tradition.

3. *Pluralism & the Common Good:* Articulate how Catholic social teaching interfaces with other religions in a pluralist society.

(Minor editorial revisions October 2018)

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

PLO Three (Pluralism and the Common Good).

II. METHODOLOGY

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

For example, "the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions."

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use "direct methods" which relate to a <u>direct evaluation of a</u> <u>student work product</u>. "Indirect methods" like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional I complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that <u>every 3 years</u>, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

Important: Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.

The program currently has only one active and responsive student. Given such numbers, assessment of PLOs, therefore, clearly requires a multi-year strategy. Assessment for 2018-19, therefore, continues on the same line as last year, with PLO 3 (Pluralism and the Common Good).

Collection of data was a challenge. Since the director was on leave from January 2018 until August 2018, and was not replaced during his absence, it was not possible to collect any direct data during the Spring semester of 2018.

Moreover, a change in the method of collecting data was required. Last year's method took the form of soliciting out of class written work from students by means of a question sent out by e-mail. Given that the one active student in the program had also provided data last year, by responding to this method, I did not feel it appropriate or useful to ask the same student to provide more direct data by the same out of class method on the same PLO.

This report, therefore, is based on direct data in the form of written work (essay) that the student prepared for a class in fulfillment of requirements for the minor, as well as indirect data, in the form of an advising interview conducted with the student in September 2018.

During this interview, and in written work, the student demonstrated excellent mastery of PLO 3 (Pluralism and the Common Good).

III. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

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

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

- a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,
- b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and
- c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

The major takeaway from this exercise is that the assessment process needs to be adapted somewhat for a minor with such low enrollment. With only one or two students to work with, tables such as the following seem redundant or uninformative:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	100%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	0%

Mastered some parts of the outcome	0%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	0%

On the other hand, however, such small numbers provide an opportunity to assess all three PLOs every year.

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.

As director of the program, my first priority is to attempt to increase enrollment — initially, by revising the program name (simplifying it to "Catholic Studies"). Coming back from leave only in August 2018, however, it will take another semester before any change can be effected.

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?

The most important suggestions in the feedback were (i) to make the Mission Statement more concise and (ii) to revise the language of the Program Learning Outcomes. Both these suggestions have been directly addressed in this report. The Mission Statement has been reduced to 75 words approximately and the PLOs have been made more succinct and the language adapted for the assessment process. They have also been given explanatory titles.

The feedback also suggested that the curriculum map requires some revision. Namely, learning outcomes are not differentiated, and each course is labeled "Introductory". Some courses were also listed which do not address a PLO.

These revisions have not yet been carried out, as they are dependent on the broader restructuring planned for the program.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

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

Rubric/Evaluation metric for PLO 3 (Pluralism and the Common Good):

Excellent mastery: relates two or more elements of Catholic Social Teaching to multiculturalism & pluralism

Good mastery: relates two elements of Catholic Social Teaching to multiculturalism & pluralism

Adequate mastery: roots one element of Catholic Social Teaching to multiculturalism & pluralism

Inadequate mastery: roots no elements of Catholic Social Teaching to multiculturalism & pluralism.