SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Bioethics and Health Studies   Department: Health Care Ethics

Degree or Certificate Level: BA   College/School: CAS

Date (Month/Year): 09/2023   Assessment Contact: Harold Braswell

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 2022-3

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021

1. **Student Learning Outcomes**
    Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

    1. Students will identify and evaluate the impact of disparities in identity categories on health care access and quality.

    2. Students will apply different disciplinary approaches to ethical issues in health care science, delivery, and research.

2. **Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning**
    Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe and 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.

    In HCE 2070 and 2090, student final papers were used to assess these outcomes (1 and 2 respectively). In HCE 4960, students' capstone projects were used to assess them.

3. **Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process**
    What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (do not just refer to the assessment plan).

    Instructors of HCE 2070, 2090, and 4960 all graded final papers according to departmentally-approved rubrics, which are attached to this report.

4. **Data/Results**
    What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Instructors, generally, assessed the existing program artifacts positively. The instructor of 2070 and 2090 found that having her final assignments structured as a group paper hindered their effectiveness at meeting learning outcomes, in large part because of dilemmas related to collaboration. She found that the papers in 2090 to be more successful because they were tied to an earlier class assignment (the "Ethics Bowl.") This feedback did not relate to modality or location—all courses were in-person on SLU's STL campus. Rather, it concerned ways in which the assignment might be structured.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**
What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

Overall, we learned that our courses are achieving their goals. Nevertheless, there are changes that we can make to individual courses that will better equip students to write argumentative research papers, and to critically integrate interdisciplinary scholarship. These potential changes will be discussed with program faculty at the October 2023 faculty meeting.

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Current</u> Assessment Findings**
   A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

   Assessment data will be discussed with program faculty at the faculty meeting October 19.

   B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

   Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies
   - Course content
   - Teaching techniques
   - Improvements in technology
   - Prerequisites
   - Course sequence
   - New courses
   - Deletion of courses
   - Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

   Changes to the Assessment Plan
   - Student learning outcomes
   - Artifacts of student learning
   - Evaluation process
   - Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
   - Data collection methods
   - Frequency of data collection

   Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

   Minor changes will be made to the final paper assignments of HCE 2070 and 2090 in order to give students a better foundation in making arguments that draw on interdisciplinary evidence, particularly that relating to health disparities.

   If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. **Closing the Loop: Review of <u>Previous</u> Assessment Findings and Changes**
   A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

   This is the second year that we have collected data, and we responded to last year's data by changing the assignment structure of HCE 2050 so that there were fewer difficult philosophical readings early in the

semester. We are also considering ways we can integrate more training in making arguments into this course, to prepare students who have not taken HCE 2010.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

HCE 2050 has not been offered since the last assessment; therefore we have not had a chance to implement these changes.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.

Quick Rubric

HCE 2070 "Bioethics of Difference" Rubric

	Proficient *25 Points*	**Emerging** *19 Points*	**Beginning** *13 Points*
Paper makes a normative argument regarding a bioethical issue (issues that are not in the conventional "canon" of bioethics are welcome, so long as their inclusion is explained).			
Paper includes a thorough consideration of relevant power relations, particularly as pertaining to identity categories such as race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and religious affiliation.			
Paper meaningfully integrates at minimum five peer-reviewed sources.			
Paper adheres to assigned length and is appropriately formatted (no spelling and grammatical errors, appropriate citation style when using sources).			

This rubric was created with **Quick Rubric** and can be found at - http://www.quickrubric.com/r#/qr/hbraswell/hce 2070--bioethics-of-difference--rubric

Quick Rubric

HCE 2090: Bioethics in an Interdisciplinary Perspective Final Paper Rubric

	Proficient *25 Points*	Emerging *19 Points*	Beginning *13 Points*
Paper makes a normative argument regarding a bioethical issue (issues that are not in the conventional "canon" bioethics of are welcome so long as their inclusion is explained.)			
Paper draws, meaningfully, on scholarship in at minimum two academic disciplines outside of bioethics.			
Paper meaningfully integrates at minimum eight peer-reviewed sources.			
Paper adheres to assigned length and is appropriately formatted (no spelling and grammatical errors, appropriate citation style when using sources).			

This rubric was created with **Quick Rubric** and can be found at - http://www.quickrubric.com/r#/qr/hbraswell/hce 2090--bioethics-in-an-interdisciplinary-perspective-final-paper-rubric

Quick Rubric

HCE 4960 Capstone

	Proficient *17 Points*	Emerging *13 Points*	Beginning *8 Points*
Paper makes a normative argument regarding a bioethical issue (issues that are not in the conventional "canon" bioethics are welcome, so long as their inclusion is explained.)			
Paper situates argument in relevant philosophical and/or theological literature underlying the chosen topic.			
Paper includes a thorough consideration of relevant power relations, particularly as pertaining to identity categories such as race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and religious affiliation.			
Paper draws, meaningfully, on scholarship in at minimum two academic disciplines outside of bioethics.			

	Proficient *17 Points*	**Emerging** *13 Points*	**Beginning** *8 Points*
Paper meaningfully integrates at minimum twenty peer-reviewed sources.			
Paper adheres to assigned length, and is appropriately formatted (no spelling and grammatical errors, appropriate citation style when using sources).			

This rubric was created with **Quick Rubric** and can be found at - http://www.quickrubric.com/r#/qr/hbraswell/hce 4960-capstone