

Program: _____Philosophy_minor_____

Date: __05/29/2012_____

Completed by: _____John O'Connor_____

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2012. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please attach a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	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?
* Students will be able to recognize, analyze, and logically evaluate arguments encountered in sources ranging from philosophical and academic texts to the popular media. * Students will be able to	N/A	Three faculty members used a common rubric (attached) to evaluate papers from the final seminar taken by students completing the minor.	We assessed students who completed the philosophy minor this academic year. Writing samples were drawn from PHIL 393 (i.e., the highest-level Philosophy course offered this year.)	Per the assessment plan, 80% of the students should perform at 'proficient' or better for these SLOs, as measured on the rubric (attached). But, with three students (6 papers)	Two of the three students met the expectations and performed at 'proficient' or better on the SLOs.	<u>Strengths:</u> Student writing demonstrated a strong ability to reason, to explicate philosophical concepts and to remain focused on the needs of the topic/argument. <u>Weaknesses:</u> The main weaknesses revealed by this assessment cycle	Program faculty will meet to discuss how the weaknesses revealed in this assessment cycle can be addressed through changes of pedagogy and assignment expectations in each course. Though details of execution may vary depending on the needs of each course, philosophy classes will pay greater attention to the structural desiderata of an academic paper, the

construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of theses in writing.				qualifying for assessment, expectations are for at least two students to perform at 'proficient' or better for these SLOs.		were structural: poor placement of paper thesis & misalignment of introduction and conclusion detracted from clarity. Also, textual evidence for claims was not provided as frequently as would be hoped. Finally, greater integration or contextualization of quoted evidence is needed to enhance clarity	importance of textual justifications, and integration of quotations into the text.

Comments:

Assessment team members:

John O'Connor, Assistant Professor of Philosophy

Joel Johnson, Assistant Professor of Political Science

Matt Harris, Chair, Department of History, Political Science & Philosophy

B. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments:

As this is the first assessment cycle for the Philosophy minor, there are no follow-up activities from previous assessment cycles to report at this time.

Philosophy Minor
Colorado State University-Pueblo
Philosophical Writing Rubric

Intended learning outcomes assessed with this instrument:

- *Students will be able to recognize, analyze, and logically evaluate arguments encountered in sources ranging from philosophical and academic texts to the popular media.*
- *Students will be able to construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of theses in writing.*

Student work assessed: Papers from student portfolio.

	Exemplary	Proficient	Emerging	Not Present
Presence of thesis	Thesis is explicit, precise, and clear	Thesis is explicit.	Thesis is implied and/or unsophisticated	
Use of concepts, evidence, theories or arguments	Concepts, evidence and theories are relevant, clearly explained, and well-analyzed or -evaluated.	Concepts, evidence and theories are relevant.	Limited evidence.	
Quality of reasoning	Reasoning for thesis is good (strong or valid) and clearly-explained.	Reasoning supports the thesis.	Limited reasoning.	
Writing style & execution	Clear, compelling, grammatically correct language; fluid, easy-to-follow organization of ideas	Consistently clear language; sequencing of ideas poses no barrier to communication	Sometimes vague, confusing or hard to follow	