

Program: Philosophy for Ministry, Archdiocesan Track Department: NA

1 Student Certificate L Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Outcome 1:

Students can analyze and evaluate arguments.

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Student papers were collected from PLJ 4250: **Natural Theology** and student exams were collected from PLJ 4000: **Metaphysics**. The courses were offered face to face only, at Kenrick-Glennon Seminary. Note: Both courses come from the second (final) year of the program, so we have a better sense of what the **program** is accomplishing.

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric)

Artefacts were scored using an "Analysis and Evaluation Rubric" (included at the end of this report). Scoring was done by the A-campus site)

Data are attached in an Excel file. Teaching modality largely due to what the teacher required. "Presentation" was

When and how did

SLO 1: Students can analyze and evaluate arguments.

	Partially Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Adequately Meets Expectations (2 pts)	Exceeds Expectations (3 pts)
<p>Presentation of the argument is clear. (Identifies the <u>thesis / claim</u> that the author is making.)</p>	<p>Student's presentation of the argument is sometimes but not always accurate, is occasionally but not consistently clear, and lacks focus. Does not clearly identify the thesis. ("Are you sure that's the author's argument?")</p>	<p>Student's presentation of the argument is accurate, clear, and focused. Clearly identifies the thesis. ("Yes– that's clearly presented.")</p>	<p>Student's presentation of the argument is accurate, well-focused, and shows depth of insight (e.g. it is well organized, shows insight into personal or historical context of the argument). Presents the thesis with nuance. ("Hey– that's quite good.")</p>
<p>Analysis of the argument is clear. (Here are the <u>component parts</u> of the argument.)</p>	<p>Student's presentation of the component parts of the argument lacks focus; fails to identify key elements of the argument; little awareness of the argument's movement. ("I don't think that's sharp enough.")</p>	<p>Student's presentation of the component parts of the argument is focused and clearly identifies key elements of the argument and overall movement. ("Good– that's clear.")</p>	<p>Student's presentation of the component parts of the argument is accurate, well-focused, and shows depth of insight (e.g. it is well organized, shows insight into personal or historical context of the argument). Presents the thesis with nuance. ("Hey– that's quite good.")</p>