

Program: \_\_\_\_\_Philosophy (minor)\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_31 May 2017\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_John O'Connor\_\_\_\_\_

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): \_\_\_Andrew Corsa\_\_\_\_\_

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, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2017. You’ll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>.

Please describe the 2016-2017 assessment activities for your program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2017-2018 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2016-2017 designed to close-the-loop (improve student learning in the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in previous cycles. Thank you.

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

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 last assessed? <b>Please indicate the 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.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of 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?
<i>SLO #3:</i> Students will be able to	SLO #3 was last assessed	A rubric (attached) was used to	The set of assessed students	Per the assessment plan, 80% of	Three of the three students	<b>Strengths:</b> Student work continues to	The weakness noted may be a natural consequence of the increasingly

<p>recognize and assess the relevance of 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>in spring 2015.</p> <p>SLO #4 was last assessed in spring 2014.</p>	<p>evaluate writing samples from PHIL 485: <i>American Pragmatism</i> and PHIL 491 Special Topics: <i>Filming Philosophy</i></p>	<p>consists of the three seniors who completed the philosophy minor this year. Writing samples were drawn from those students' portfolios.</p>	<p>the students should perform at 'proficient' or better for these SLOs, as measured on the attached rubric.</p> <p>Given that three seniors completed the minor and therefore were assessed, at least two students (and a bit less than half of the third) would be expected to perform at 'proficient' or better.</p>	<p>met the expectations and performed at 'proficient' or better for SLO #3.</p> <p>Three of the three students met the expectations and performed at 'proficient' or better for SLO #4.</p>	<p>demonstrate a strong ability to reason, and to discuss and engage with philosophical concepts in historical/cultural context.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> Although the cohort met performance expectations, this year's assessment revealed a need to help students better distinguish philosophical from non-philosophical methods (SLO #4).</p>	<p>applied and multi-disciplinary direction of our field and curriculum. When we ask students to <i>apply</i> philosophy to the contemporary world, we should expect some blurring (but not erasing) of disciplinary boundaries.</p> <p>This tendency will be addressed at the topic choice and draft review stages of the paper-writing process. In advanced classes, student peer-critiques (where appropriate) will also explicitly incorporate this question: <i>what makes this paper philosophical?</i></p>
.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

Comments:

**PART II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this 2016-2017 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? Please indicate the semester and year.	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><b>SLO #1</b> 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><b>SLO #2.</b> Students will</p>	<p>Both SLO #1 and SLO #2 were last assessed in spring 2016.</p>	<p>Our class instruction and writing / draft evaluation was to pay greater attention to 1) argument pattern recognition, 2) maintaining thesis consistency, and 3) identification of unstated assumption.</p> <p>PHIL 204: <i>Critical Reasoning</i> and PHIL 205: <i>Deductive Logic</i> already treat the formal aspects of SLOs #1 and 2 extensively, so those courses were to emphasize, where possible, how the formal aspects of logic relate to paper writing.</p>	<p>Yes. The instructor of the writing intensive classes was able to pay greater attention on the draft critiques to the issues being addressed. The instructor of the logic classes addressed paper argument structure and development as an application of logical patterns.</p>	<p>We continue to find that students respond well to intervention at the draft review stage. Although these SLOs were not evaluated directly this cycle, none of the papers assessed revealed deficits in the areas addressed. Only one of the assessed students took our logic courses this year; the others took them previously. Thus we are unable to use this assessment to evaluate the recent changes in teaching logic.</p> <p>We will continue with this year's changes in logic, however, in anticipation that it will benefit students at earlier stages of the program.</p>

be able to construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of theses in writing.				
--	--	--	--	--

Comments: