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| learning objectives | | How/where/ when THEY ARE assessed | | | | expectation | results | | # RESPONSES | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Critical Thinking | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Analyze and understand philosophical concepts and arguments. | | Faculty Surveys | | | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | Met. 3.6 | 61  1  58  1 | | |
| Student Self-Reports | | | | Improvement. Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | Met  Exit average 4 |
| 1.2. Evaluate philosophical reasoning | | Faculty Surveys | | | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | Met 3.53 |
| Student Self-Reports | | | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale. (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | Met  Exit average 4 |
| Quantitative Reasoning | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Demonstrate understanding of scientific and quantitative reasoning | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | NOT MET 1.9 | | | 16  1 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | NOT MET  Exit average 2 | | |
| 2.2 Demonstrate information literacy by integrating source materials appropriately | | Faculty Course Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | Met 3.53 | | | 34  1 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | Met  Exit average 4 | | |
| **Speaking and Listening** | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Demonstrate competence in oral communication | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | Met 3.55 | | | 45  1  3 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | Met  Exit average 4 | | |
| University Speaking  Assessments | | Above 3.5 | | Met  Overall average 3.6 | | |
|  |
| 3.2 Demonstrates active and reflective listening that augments comprehension | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | Met 3.58 | | | 61  1 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | Met 4 | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Writing | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Write arguments in coherent form | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | Met 3.51 | 55  1 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | Met  Exit average 4 |
| 4.2 Effectively express their own ideas in writing | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | **Met 3.56** | 55  1  11 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | **Met**  **Exit average 4** |
| EWPs | | 3.5 Average for submissions from majors | | Met 3.73 |
| **Ethics & Responsible Citizenship** | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 Demonstrate understanding of cultural and philosophical pluralism | | Faculty Surveys | | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | Met 3.72 | 50  1  38  1  49  1 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | Met  Exit average 4 |
| 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 | | Met 3.73 |
| Student Self-Reports | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | Met  Exit average 4 |
| 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 3.65 |
| Student Self-Reports | | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | Met  Exit average 4 |
| Responsible Citizenship Surveys | | | Average of 4  See description below. | Met 4 |
| **Content Knowledge** | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 Demonstrate competence in understanding the historical periods of philosophy | | Faculty Surveys | | | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | Met 3.47 | 47  1  55  1 |
| Student Self-Reports | | | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | Met  Exit average 4 |
| 6.2 Demonstrate competence with the relevant areas of philosophy | | Faculty Surveys | Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale | | | Met 3.49 |
| Student Self-Reports | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | | Met  Exit average 3 |
| 6.3 Demonstrate competence with contemporary trends in philosophy | | Faculty Surveys | Average of 3 on 4-point scale | | | Met 3.60 | 51  1 |
| Student Self-Reports | Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit) | | | Met  Exit average 3 |

**RESULTS ARE SHARED BY DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR WITH ALL FACULTY DURING THE FALL PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT FACULTY MEETING. ALL ITEMS ARE DISCUSSED.**

**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-point 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.**

**Student Self-Reports:**

Students self-report on their perceptions 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 both 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 a one-point improvement on a 4-point scale on the outtake questionnaire. If we do not have an intake exam to compare for that student, we simply expect a 3 on a 4-point scale on the outtake (senior) questionnaire.

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS:

**Electronic Writing Portfolios:**

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

**Speaking Assessments:**

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

**Responsible Citizenship Surveys:**

We use responsible citizenship survey data to assess level of mastery of responsible citizenship self-report. This information tells us 1) whether students see certain criteria as necessary for responsible citizenship and 2) whether they see themselves as meeting those criteria. 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.**

We have continued with data collection: faculty surveys, student self-reports, and various university assessments.

We have analyzed learning on a variety of targets: individual students, individual courses, and intake and exit to the program.

We have responded to CASA report by including the number of respondents for each objective/question, and also by explaining how the responsible citizenship data is used to tell us about the attainment of our objectives (see above). We chose particular questions from the responsible citizenship university assessment that meet department learning goals, and 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?**

Plans for the future include making the data capture more fine-grained. For example, we would like to separate online courses for the report.

We also will offer more scientific and quantitative reasoning opportunities for students and reevaluate our curriculum in light of our failure to meet expectations in that area. This may be resolved simply by offering our Philosophy of Science course, for example.

We have created an entirely new program in Philosophy with a separate option in Integrative Studies that allows students to integrate their philosophical studies with other disciplines. This allows those in sciences, for example, such as Pre-Law and Biology, to incorporate their philosophy courses into a holistic study of Medicine, Law, or some other area.