



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2017-2018

Program: _Philosophy (minor)

(Due: June 1, 2018)

Date report completed: __31 May 2018__

Completed by: ____John O' Connor____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _____N/A_____

Please describe the 2017-2018 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.

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? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> assessed? (semester and year)	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(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 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?
SLO #1: Students will be able to recognize, analyze, and logically evaluate arguments	Spring 2016	Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student papers.	The set of assessed students consists of the five seniors who completed the philosophy	Per the assessment plan, 80% of the students should perform at 'proficient' or better for these SLOs,	100% of the students assessed performed proficiently or better on SLO #1.	<u>Strengths:</u> Student work continues to demonstrate a strong ability to reason and to explicate philosophical concepts and	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. The current approaches in each appear to be working. When the faculty reconvene in the fall we will discuss ways to improve the

encountered in sources ranging from philosophical and academic texts to the popular media. SLO #2: Students will be able to construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of theses in writing.	Spring 2016	Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student papers.	minor this year. Writing samples were drawn from those students' portfolios.	as measured on the attached rubric. Given that we had five seniors complete the program, four of those would be expected to be 'proficient' or better.	100% of the students assessed proficiently or better on SLO #2.	arguments <u>Weaknesses:</u> Although the cohort met our performance expectations, this year's assessment revealed a need to work more on the communicative aspects of their writing. Student work is well-reasoned, but explanations are not always as clear as they could be.	clarity of student writing as appropriate for each course.

Comments on part I:

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2017-2018 cycle. These are those 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)	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	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?
---	--	---	--	---

verbatim from the assessment plan.	change? Please indicate the semester and year.			
SLO #2: Students will be able to construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of theses in writing.	Spring 2016	<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>This is the second year in a row that the program sought to focus on SLO #2 in general, and the logical and communicative aspects of philosophical writing. The instructors of the writing intensive classes paid greater attention to the (re)iterative approach of writing, critique, and rewriting. The instructor of the logic classes addressed paper argument structure and development as an application of logical patterns.</p>	<p>After two years of emphasis in this area, it appears that we have a promising set of approaches to improving philosophical writing. While we will continue to refine our logic and writing pedagogy, we can now cycle our attention back to other areas. In particular, we hope to focus on <i>applying</i> philosophical methods to address contemporary issues (i.e. a subset of SLO #4).</p>

Comments on part II:

Philosophy Minor
Colorado State University-Pueblo
Philosophical Writing Rubric

Intended learning outcomes assessed with this instrument:

- **SLO #1.** *Students will be able to recognize, analyze, and logically evaluate arguments encountered in sources ranging from philosophical and academic texts to the popular media.*
- **SLO #2.** *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 (SLO #2)	Thesis is <i>explicit, precise, and clear.</i>	Thesis is <i>explicit.</i>	Thesis is <i>implied</i> and/or <i>unsophisticated.</i>	
Presence of philosophical ideas, methods or arguments (SLO #1)	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 (SLO #1)	Arguments are <i>relevant & well-explained / analyzed.</i>	<i>Mostly accurate</i> explanations or analyses of relevant arguments.	Explanations are <i>not usually accurate</i> , or the ideas, methods and arguments employed are <i>not usually relevant</i>	
Quality of reasoning (SLO #1, #2) [includes assessment of others' arguments as well as presentation of student's own].	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).	
Writing style & execution (SLO #2)	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	

Philosophy Program Assessment Plan Summary

Date Submitted: _____ 31 May 2018 _____ For Academic Years: _____ 17-18 _____

Student Learning Outcome	Measure description (direct or indirect?)	Timeline or cycle
<i>SLO1</i> Students will be able to recognize, analyze, and logically evaluate arguments encountered in sources ranging from philosophical and academic texts to the popular media.	Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student papers.	2 year cycle: odd academic years (e.g. AY2015-16, AY2017-18)
<i>SLO2</i> Students will be able to construct and present clear, well-reasoned defenses of theses in writing.	Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student papers.	2 year cycle: odd academic years (e.g. AY2015-16, AY2017-18)
<i>SLO3</i> Students will be able to recognize and assess the relevance of philosophical ideas and methods in the historical interplay of philosophy and culture.	Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student papers.	2 year cycle: even academic years (e.g. AY2016-17, AY2018-19)
<i>SLO4</i> Students will be able to apply philosophical methods to conduct ethical, metaphysical, and epistemological analyses.	Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student papers.	2 year cycle: even academic years (e.g. AY2016-17, AY2018-19)
Expected level of student proficiency (definition and percentage)	At least 80% of students completing the minor should be <i>proficient</i> or better in each SLO. Performance criteria for <i>proficiency</i> vary by SLO. See rubrics for details.	

Italics indicate example entries only.

Please revise chart as needed to fit clearly the structure of your Assessment plan.

Student Proficiency definition and percentage are included in the 2015-2020 University Strategic Plan. This may be defined for each distinct SLO or summarized overall by student (as in above example).