

**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
SUMMARY FORM**

Degree and Program Name:

Philosophy B.A.

Submitted By:

Jonelle DePetro

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		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement. Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
1.2. Evaluate philosophical reasoning	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale. (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
Quantitative Reasoning				
2.1 Demonstrate understanding of scientific and quantitative reasoning	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
2.2 Demonstrate information literacy by integrating source materials appropriately	Faculty Course Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
Speaking and Listening				
	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		

LEARNING OBJECTIVES	HOW/WHERE/ WHEN THEY ARE ASSESSED	EXPECTATION	RESULTS	# RESPONSES
3.1 Demonstrate competence in oral communication	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
	University Speaking Assessments	Above 3.5		
3.2 Demonstrates active and reflective listening that augments comprehension	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		

Writing				
4.1 Write arguments in coherent form	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
4.2 Effectively express their own ideas in writing	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
	EWPs	3.5 Average for submissions from majors		
Ethics & Responsible Citizenship				
5.1 Demonstrate understanding of cultural and philosophical pluralism	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
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		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale		

5.3 Reflect on, evaluate and identify their individual ethical responsibilities as citizens in a global community	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
	Responsible Citizenship Surveys	Average of 4 See description below.		
Content Knowledge				
6.1 Demonstrate competence in understanding the historical periods of philosophy	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
6.2 Demonstrate competence with the relevant areas of philosophy	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4 pt. scale		
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		
6.3 Demonstrate competence with contemporary trends in philosophy	Faculty Surveys	Average of 3 on 4-point scale		51
	Student Self-Reports	Improvement of 1 point on 4-point scale (If no intake, 3 expected on exit)		1

Improvements and Changes Based on Assessment

1. Curricular actions:

- Curriculum changes include a program change: adding the Integrative Studies major, allowing students to more fully integrate their philosophical abilities with other disciplines, such as law and medicine, for example. Also, a new course: Medical Ethics.
- **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.**
- **We have refined certain SLOs in order to more directly identify outcomes.**

2. Improvements or declines:

- **Students improved and met expectation in 5.3 LO Ethics and Responsible Citizenship in 2017-2018.**
- **Students did not meet expectations in 2.1 LO Quantitative Reasoning (earning an average of 1.9 and 2 on a target of 3).**

- Future plans include refined data capture. For example, separating online from FTF data.
 - Also, in order to improve quantitative reasoning outcomes, we plan to offer more science-related courses, and integrate more with the sciences.
3. Faculty and committee engagement:
- Results are shared by assessment and department chair with all faculty during the Fall Philosophy Department meeting.

History of Annual Review		
Date of Annual Review	Individuals/Groups who Reviewed Plan	Results of the Review (i.e., reference proposed changes from #1 above, revised SLOs, etc...)
August 28, 2018	Philosophy Department faculty	Assessment in Quan. Reasoning and Speaking and Listening/Refinement of SLOs
September 9, 2019	Philosophy Department faculty	Discussion of results where target not met in QR - no action taken at that time

CLAS Deans' comments on PHI B.A. (non-accredited) report

Reviewer: Christopher Mitchell

Please note: This is a STARTING POINT for conversation, with no rubric per se. We will be developing a rubric collaboratively (amongst chairs, Associate Deans, and our new EIU Assessment Coordinator, Yvette Smith) in the spring of 2021 based on peer/aspirant institution models, then we'll evaluate it by that. Meanwhile, if you'd like to modify your document based on these comments, feel free. We appreciate your patience with this process as it evolves!

1. SLOs are generally clear and measurable, using a good mix of high-level, mid-level, and low-level Bloom's Taxonomy verbs.
2. There are no ULGs synched to the SLOs. Please add that in in the next iteration, using the simplified version in the footnote at the bottom of the template page.
3. In the second column, you give a sense of how/where but not WHEN assessed. A few of them (for example, the 2nd box in that 3rd column) allude to entry and exit. In next iteration, please include the "when" in that second column for each entry.
4. Also in the second column, the terms "faculty surveys" and "student self-reports" are a trifle vague— what kind of surveys/reports are they? I notice you have them for every SLO, so maybe some differentiation might be a good idea?
5. Since this is in effect "starting over," the verbiage about what was done since is of course useful but not relevant until the next report (i.e. after data is collected as this iteration prescribes).

On the whole, the plan seems comprehensive and ready for data collection.