

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2012-2013

Due: June 1, 2013

Program: _____ Philosophy minor _____

Date: _____ 05/31/2013 _____

Completed by: _____ John O'Connor _____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Doug Eskew, Associate Professor of English _____

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, 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, and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2013. 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 include 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	2012	Two faculty members used a common rubric (attached) to evaluate papers from the history of philosophy	We assessed the work of seniors completing the philosophy minor. Writing samples	Per the assessment plan, 80% of the students should perform at 'proficient' or better for these SLOs,	Six of the seven students met the expectations and performed at 'proficient'	<u>Strengths:</u> Student work demonstrates a strong ability to reason and to explicate philosophical concepts and arguments in their philosophical	In the history of philosophy courses: 1) we will ensure a) that students' annotated bibliographies contain appropriate sources for background material <i>and</i> b) that in the research and drafting phases

<p>from philosophical and academic texts to the popular media.</p> <p>* Students will be able to recognize and assess the relevance of philosophical ideas and methods in the historical interplay of philosophy and culture.</p>	N/A	courses.	were drawn from those students' work in PHIL 393, PHIL 480, and PHIL 485.	as measured on the attached rubric. Given that seven students were assessed, six (or 5.6) students should perform at 'proficient' or better.	or better.	<p>context.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> This assessment cycle revealed two main weaknesses. 1) When venturing outside the direct scope of course readings and discussion, students were not as adept at using historically or theoretically relevant background material as we would have liked. (E.G., clichéd use or reference to Charles Darwin.) 2) Over-reliance on, or misuse of, quotations (especially block quotes) occasionally hindered students from displaying their grasp of the material.</p>	<p>students receive the guidance necessary to develop more nuanced and historically appropriate readings of the background material; 2) class discussion and instruction concerning textual support in an academic paper a) will pay greater attention to the mechanics involved, <i>and</i> b) will use examples to demonstrate the pitfalls of over-reliance on, or misuse of, quotations. These issues will be emphasized in draft critiques as well.</p> <p>Program faculty will meet at the start of the fall 2013 semester to discuss other ways to address the weaknesses revealed in this assessment cycle.</p>

Comments:

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?
<p>* Students will be able to recognize, analyze, and logically evaluate arguments encountered in sources ranging from philosophical and academic texts to the popular media.</p> <p>* Students will be able to construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of</p>	<p>These SLOs were last assessed in May 2012, at the conclusion of the 2011-12 assessment cycle.</p>	<p>Program faculty were to meet and discuss how the weaknesses could be addressed through changes of pedagogy and assignment expectations.</p> <p>Instructors were to pay greater attention to the structural desiderata of an academic paper, the importance of textual justifications, and integration of quotations into the text.</p>	<p>Yes, the recommendations were acted upon.</p> <p>During August Convocation week 2012, John O'Connor, Joan Wolf, Stacey Douglas, and Mike Kim (Philosophy program faculty) met and committed to addressing the weaknesses by paying greater attention to the structural desiderata of an academic paper, the importance of textual justifications, and the integration of quotations into the text. At the meeting program faculty also discussed specific strategies for teaching</p>	<p>Although the academic writing SLO has not been re-assessed directly, the informally observed results of the changes appear mostly positive. So, for example, the revised rubric for PHIL 201 does communicate the standards and desiderata of academic writing better than did the previous rubric. As a result, it can be used as <i>both</i> a teaching and an assessment tool. Plans are underway to adapt this rubric to be used in the four history of philosophy courses as well.</p> <p>At the same time, however, a weakness identified in the current assessment cycle (see I. G. #2 above) may reveal an unintended consequence of faculty efforts to emphasize the importance of textual justifications. This will be addressed by</p>

theses in writing.			academic writing. Concretely, these discussions resulted in changes to rubrics (provided to students in advance), developing and refining multi-stage writing assignments, and devoting more class time to explicit discussion of / or practice in these areas of writing.	the changes outlined in I. H. #2 (above).

Comments:

Philosophy Minor
Colorado State University-Pueblo
Philosophical History & Methods 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 recognize and assess the relevance of philosophical ideas and methods in the historical interplay of philosophy and culture.*

Work assessed: Papers from student portfolios / history of philosophy courses.

	Exemplary	Proficient	Emerging	Not Present
Presence of ideas, methods or arguments from the history of philosophy	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> .	
Treatment of philosophical ideas, methods or arguments	Ideas, methods or arguments are <i>relevant & 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>	
Quality of reasoning [to include student assessment of philosophical / historical / cultural relevance of ideas, methods or arguments].	Reasoning is <i>generally good</i> (i.e. strong or valid) and <i>well-explained</i> .	Reasoning is <i>generally good</i> .	Reasoning is <i>not generally good</i> (i.e. work is characterized by <i>weak</i> reasoning).	