



**Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2018-2019**

(Due: May 1, 2019)

Program: philosophy (minor)

Date report completed: 2 May 2019

Completed by: John O'Connor

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): N/A

Please describe the 2018-2019 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

**Brief statement of Program mission and goals:**

**I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle.** Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> reported on prior to this cycle? <b>(semester and year)</b>	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
<i>SLO #3:</i> Students will be able to recognize and assess the relevance of	SLO #3 was last assessed in Spring 2017	A rubric (attached) was used to evaluate writing samples drawn from	The set of assessed students consists of the five seniors who completed	Per the assessment plan, 80% of the students should perform at 'proficient'	100% of the assessed students met the proficiency goal in SLO#3.	We are happy with our students' performance. The program's emphasis on writing as the single most	No changes are planned to the program as a result of this assessment.  The assessment results demonstrate that our students are proficient in this cycle's

<p>philosophical ideas and methods in the historical interplay of philosophy and culture.</p> <p><i>SLO #4:</i> Students will be able to apply philosophical methods to conduct ethical, metaphysical, and epistemological analyses.</p>	<p>SLO# 4 was last assessed in Spring 2017</p>	<p>coursework in PHIL 380, PHIL 480, PHIL 485, and PHIL 491</p>	<p>the philosophy minor this year. Writing samples were drawn from those students' portfolios.</p>	<p>or better for these SLOs, as measured on the attached rubric.</p> <p>Given that five seniors completed the minor and therefore were assessed, at least four students would be expected to perform at 'proficient' or better.</p>	<p>100% of the assessed students met the proficiency goal in SLO#4.</p>	<p>important tool for student learning (and assessment) appears to be returning dividends.</p>	<p>SLOs, so there is no urgent need for change. Even so, under normal conditions the program would seek to build on its strengths. However, the program is losing its only tenured / tenure-line faculty member, and there are no immediate plans to replace him. We assess <i>programs</i>, and as it is unlikely for the program to continue in its current form, I'll leave revised assessment prescriptions until it is clear what curriculum will remain to be assessed.</p>

Comments on part I:

**II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2018-2019 cycle.** These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
SLO #2: Students will be able to construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of theses in writing.	This SLO was last assessed in Spring 2018.	"We will continue to address student writing as a major focus in our textually-based courses, and as an application in our two logic courses."	With the increased interest in our two logic classes, PHIL 204 and PHIL 205, we chose to emphasize the application of logic to academic writing, as these courses feed into our writing intensive courses. In particular, we address both high-level logical structure of a paper, as well as thesis defense.	SLO#2 was not directly assessed this cycle, so the result of our efforts have not yet been measured with assessment tools. Furthermore, as the two courses in question are part of the philosophy core, we would not expect students in those courses to be graduating and assessed this cycle anyway. We look forward to seeing the results when SLO#2 is scheduled for assessment next year.

Comments on part II:

Philosophy Minor  
Colorado State University-Pueblo  
Assessment Rubric

Intended learning outcomes assessed with this instrument:

- **SLO #3.** *Students will be able to recognize and assess the relevance of philosophical ideas and methods in the historical interplay of philosophy and culture.*
- **SLO #4** *Students will be able to apply philosophical methods to conduct ethical, metaphysical, and epistemological analyses*

Student work assessed: Papers from student portfolio.

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Not Present</b>
<b>Presence of ideas, methods or arguments from the history of philosophy</b> (SLO #3)	Philosophical ideas, methods or arguments are <i>explicit</i> ; their historical / cultural / philosophical <i>relevance is prominent</i> .	Historical / cultural / philosophical ideas, methods or arguments are <i>explicit</i> .	Historical / cultural / philosophical ideas, methods or arguments are <i>implied</i> .	
<b>Discussion of philosophical ideas, methods or arguments</b> (SLO #3 & #4)	Ideas, methods or arguments are <i>relevant &amp; accurately explained in context</i> .	<i>Usually accurate</i> explanations of relevant ideas, methods or arguments.	Explanations are <i>not usually accurate</i> , or the ideas, methods and arguments employed are <i>not usually relevant</i>	
<b>Application of philosophical methods and quality of reasoning</b> (SLO #4)	Reasoning is <i>generally good</i> (i.e. strong or valid) and <i>well-explained</i> . Methods are philosophically <i>well-suited</i> to topic.	Reasoning is <i>generally good</i> . Methods are <i>appropriate</i> .	Reasoning is <i>not generally good</i> (i.e. work is characterized by <i>weak</i> reasoning), or the methods are <i>not</i> philosophically <i>appropriate</i> .	