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| learning objectives | | How/where/ when THEY ARE assessed | | | | expectation | results | results shared | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Critical Thinking | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Analyze and understand philosophical concepts and arguments. | | Faculty Survey | | | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | Met. 3.6 | Department Chair & Assessment Coordinator  Results are discussed among faculty during the fall faculty meeting of the Philosophy Department.  **ALL ITEMS** | |
| Student Self Report | | | | Improvement. Improvement of 1 point on 5 point scale (If no intake, 4 expected on exit) | Met  Exit average 5.0 |
| 1.2. Evaluate philosophical reasoning | | Faculty Surveys | | | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | Met 3.6 |
| Student Self Report | | | | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale. (If no intake, 4 expected on exit) | Met  Exit average 5.0 |
| Quantitative Reasoning | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Demonstrate understanding of scientific and quantitative reasoning | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | Met 3.7 | |  |
| Student Self Report | | Improvement. Improvement of 1 point on 5 point scale (If no intake, 4 expected on exit) | | Met  Exit average 4 | |
| 2.2 Demonstrate information literacy by integrating source materials appropriately. | | Faculty Course Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | Met Avg = 3.3 | |  |
| Student Self Report | | Improvement. Improvement of 1 point on 5 point scale (If no intake, 4 expected on exit) | |  | |
| **Speaking and Listening** | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Demonstrate competence in oral communication | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | Met Avg = 3.7 | |  |
| Student Self Report | | (If no intake, 4 expected on exit) | | Met. Exit average 4.0 | |
| University Speaking  Assessment | | Above 3.5 | | Met.  Overall Avg. 3.6 | |
|  |
| 3.2 Demonstrates active and reflective listening that augments comprehension. | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | |  | |  |
| Student Self Report | | ImImprovement of 1 point on 5 point scale (If no intake, 4 expected on exit) | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Writing | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Write arguments in coherent form. | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | Met.  Avg = 3.6 |  |
| Student Self Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale | | Met  Exit average = 5 |
| 4.2 Effectively express their own ideas in writing. | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | **Met.**  **Avg = 3.7** |  |
| Student Self Report | | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale | | **Met**  **Exit average =5** |
| EWP | | 3.5 Average for submissions from majors | | Met  Avg = 3.8 |
| **Ethics & Responsible Citizenship** | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 Demonstrate understanding of cultural and philosophical pluralism. | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | Met.  Exit Avg = 3.7 |  |
| Student Self Report | | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale | | Met  Exit average = 5 |
| 5.2 Identify the implications of applying ethical arguments to considerations of multi-culturalism, gender, race, age, sexual orientation, and class. | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | |  |
| Students Self Report | | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale | | Met  Exit Avg =4.5 |
| 5.3 Reflect on, evaluate and identify their individual ethical responsibilities as citizens in a global community | | Faculty Surveys | | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | Met 3.6 |
| Students Self Report | | | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale |  |
| Responsible Citizenship Survey | | | Average of 4.  See description below. | Met  Avg = 4.75 |
| **Content Knowledge** | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 Demonstrate competence in understanding the historical periods of philosophy | | Faculty Surveys | | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | Met 3.6 | . |
| Student Self-Reports | | | Improvement of 1 point on 5 point scale | Met.  Exit Avg = 4.5 |
| 6.2 Demonstrate competence with the relevant areas of philosophy | | Faculty Surveys | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | | Met  Avg = 3.6 |
| Student Self-Reports | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale | | | Met  Exit average = 4.5 |
| 6.3 Demonstrate competence with contemporary trends in philosophy | | Faculty Surveys | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | | Met  Average = 3.7 | . |
| Student Self-Reports | Improvement of 1 point on five point scale | | | Not met  Exit average = 3 |

**Department Specific Assessment Instruments**

**FACULTY SURVEYS**

Faculty complete surveys on all final papers and final exams for all majors in each philosophy course. Questions correspond to learning goals. For instance learning goal 6.3 “Demonstrate competence with contemporary trends in philosophy” is captured by survey question “Student demonstrates competence with contemporary trends in philosophy.” Reported are the averaged responses on each question on the survey. Our expectation is 3 or better on a 4 pt. scale for each question. We report whether we did get an overall average of 3 on a 4 point scale as “met” or “not met.” We also report the average score.

Our reporting gives us a good look at whether goals are being met holistically in the current program taught and it is best for concise reporting. We do analyze data over a variety of targets: individual student performance, goals as met in particular courses. We also consider the nature and number of N/A (not applicable) responses.

S**TUDENT SELF-REPORT**

Students self-report on their perception of achievement on our learning goals. We aim for each student to take a self report when they enter the major and to retake the self-report when they exit the major. Intake is compared with final semester of the final year before graduation. Like the faculty survey, survey questions match the goals. We report average of all exit surveys. We do ask more fine grained questions than reported. For instance, our learning goal of “historical periods of philosophy” is broken down into understanding of ancient and modern philosophy. For ease of reporting we look at over-all scores but we look carefully at scores and written responses to note any useful information or reported perceived lack of achievement in learning.

We expect one point improvement on a five point scale on the outtake questionnaire. If we do not have an intake exam to compare for that student, we simply expect a 4 on a 5 point scale on the outtake (senior) questionnaire.

**University Assessment Instruments**

**Electronic Writing Portfolio.**

We use EWP data as reported to track majors’ writing ability. We use the over-all scores.

**Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Exam**

We track WG data as a tool to measure critical thinking. Over-all score is reported.

**Speaking Assessment**

We use speaking assessment administered in the senior seminar to assess level of mastery at the end of thee senior year. Over-all score reported.

**Responsible Citizenship Survey**

We use responsible citizenship survey data to assess level of mastery of responsible citizenship self-report. We convert assessment such as “essential” and “slightly disagree” onto a 5 point scale. Expecting an overall average of 4, across the average score for each question:

becoming a community leader

helping others who are in difficulty

developing a meaningful  philosophy of life

influencing the political structure

volunteering in my community

help to promote racial understanding

PART TWO:

**Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.**

Continued with data collection: faculty surveys, student self-reports, university assessments

Analyzed learning on a variety of targets: individual students, individual courses, intake and exit to the program

Responded to CASA report by clarifying descriptions of assessment instruments and numbers reported. Chose particular questions from responsible citizenship university assessment that meet department learning goals, clarified expectations.

**PART THREE**

**Summarize changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?**

Looking holistically at the data of faculty surveys, student surveys, and university assessments --students meet expectations in the areas of university learning goals and content areas of philosophy, students concur in program exit self-reports.

Students self report that they are not achieving in the area of contemporary trends in either analytic or continental philosophy. This find will be addressed in department meeting fall 2017.

Plans for the future include integrating any curricular changes with learning goals, expectations and assessment reporting.

A couple of faculty and student survey data points are missing due to errors in the instruments, will be fixed for fall 2017.