

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR 2009-10

Department/Program: Philosophy

Date Submitted: MAY 2010

Authors: Harry van der Linden, Tiberiu Popa, and Stuart Glennan

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	For each SLO, list two methodologies and the criteria for successful performance (such as a measurement, rubric or scale that indicates a baseline for competency).				Term Assessed (F07 or S08)
	<i>Methodology 1</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	<i>Methodology 2</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	
1. Recognize and explain basic ideas of some main figures of western philosophy.	Department test: Part A, Major Philosophers, multiple choice questions.	<p>Assessment scale: 0=not competent; 1=minimally competent; 2=competent; 3=highly competent.</p> <p>Criteria for success: 100% score 1 or above; 80% scores 2 or above; 20% scores 3.</p> <p>The score will be determined by the rate of success in answering questions on the relevant section of the test. Control group: test administered to students in Introduction to Philosophy.</p>	Questionnaire for graduating philosophy seniors. Part B: Questions about the Student Learning Outcomes of Philosophy	<p>Questions will be answered with the following scale: 5 (strongly agree), 4 (agree), 3 (neutral), 2 (disagree), and 1 (strongly disagree).</p> <p>Criterion for success: Average score of 4 or above for the question(s) addressing this SLO.</p>	Spring 2008 Spring 2009 Spring 2010

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	For each SLO, list two methodologies and the criteria for successful performance (such as a measurement, rubric or scale that indicates a baseline for competency).				Term Assessed (F09 or S10)
	<i>Methodology 1</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	<i>Methodology 2</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	
2. Distinguish between major areas of western philosophy (such as metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy and philosophy of language, mind, science, law) and demonstrate understanding of the major issues in several of these areas.	Department test: Part B, Major Philosophy Areas, multiple choice questions	See Criteria for Success for Methodology I for SLO 1.	Questionnaire, part B	See Criterion for Success for Methodology II for SLO 1.	Spring 2008 Spring 2009 Spring 2010
3. Critically evaluate evidence, concepts, and argumentation.	Department test: Part C, Logic, with multiple choice questions and analysis of a short text passage.	See Criteria for Success for Methodology I for SLO 1. A rubric will be used for the text analysis with the same assessment scale as used for the multiple choice questions.	Questionnaire, part B	See Criterion for Success for Methodology II for SLO 1.	Spring 2010

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	For each SLO, list two methodologies and the criteria for successful performance (such as a measurement, rubric or scale that indicates a baseline for competency).				Term Assessed (F09 or S10)
	<i>Methodology 1</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	<i>Methodology 2</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	
4. Recognize, identify, and use credible sources of information, employing technology as appropriate.	Portfolio: Term paper from PL 410, Seminar in Philosophy (or an equivalent course)	<p>Assessment scale: 0=not competent; 1=minimally competent; 2=competent; 3=highly competent.</p> <p>A rubric with this assessment scale will be used for examining the paper in terms of this SLO.</p> <p>Criteria for success: 100% score 1 or above; 80% scores 2 or above; 20% scores 3.</p>	Questionnaire, part B	See Criterion for Success for Methodology II for SLO 1.	Spring 2010
5. Research and write expository and argumentative papers.	Portfolio: Term paper from PL 410, Seminar in Philosophy (or an equivalent course)	See Criteria for Success for Methodology I for SLO 4.	Questionnaire, part B	See Criterion for Success for Methodology II for SLO 1.	Spring 2010

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	For each SLO, list two methodologies and the criteria for successful performance (such as a measurement, rubric or scale that indicates a baseline for competency).				Term Assessed (F09 or S10)
	<i>Methodology 1</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	<i>Methodology 2</i>	<i>Criteria for Success</i>	
6. Discuss and question their own philosophical ideas as well as philosophical ideas raised in class, their broader academic community, and society at large	Questionnaire, part C	<p>Students will be asked questions about their engagement in non-academic activities. These questions will allow us to measure changes in engagement in larger communities and the degree to which these changes are connected to their philosophical education.</p> <p>Assessment scale: 0=not competent; 1=minimally competent; 2=competent; 3=highly competent.</p>	Questionnaire, part B	See Criterion for Success for Methodology II for SLO 1.	Spring 2009
7. Allow their philosophical convictions to help guide their conduct.	Questionnaire, part C	See Criteria for Success for Methodology I for SLO 6	Questionnaire, part B	See Criterion for Success for Methodology II for SLO 1.	Spring 2009

1. **Findings**—*Summarize the findings from the assessment activities for each SLO that was assessed. Identify the SLO # and append supporting documentation such as rubrics, scales, pass rates, test scores, or other measurements used to assess each SLO.*

We used an exam and questionnaire for determining the success of our four Philosophy graduating seniors in meeting SLOs 1, 2, and 3. The questionnaire was also used to test indirectly test SLOs 4 and 5. We directly tested the success of the four students in meeting SLOs 4 and 5 on basis of their term paper in PL 410, Seminar in Philosophy, Spring 2010. We also tested SLOs 1 and 2 in the Spring semesters of 2008 and 2009. **EVEN THOUGH THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT TO TEST SLO 1 and 2 EVERY YEAR, WE ARE OF THE OPINION THAT THESE SLOs ARE SO INTEGRAL TO THE PL PROGRAM THAT IT BENEFITS US TO TEST THEM YEARLY.** A copy of the exam has been submitted in a separate document. This document should not be placed on the IR website. Part A of the exam directly tested SLO1. This part consists of six multiple choice questions (on page 1 of the exam) and 17 matching questions (on page 4 of the exam). Part B of the exam directly tested SLO2 and consists of 12 multiple choice questions (on pages 2 and 3 of the exam). Part C of the exam consisted of multiple choice questions and an analysis of a text passage. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part A is not meant to test any SLO in particular but rather invites responses to the program that might help to improve the program. The second Part indirectly tests all PL SLOs. The questionnaire is in Appendix I; the rubrics and assessment scales for the direct testing of SLOs 3, 4, and 5 are in Appendix II.

SLO 1

1 Exam (direct testing)

The criterion of success is that 100% of the students score 1 (minimally competent) or above; 80% score 2 (competent) or above, and 20% score 3 (highly competent). Students were given 6 multiple choice questions (1-6 on the test) to test SLO 1 as well 17 questions requiring them to match terms, texts, or short quotes with the name of a specific philosopher out of a list of 21 philosophers (see page 4 of the test). Scores for the multiple choice questions (correct/number of questions): student A: 6/6; student B: 5/6; student C: 6/6, and student D: 6/6. Matching questions: student A: 13/17; student B: 11/17; student C: 8/17, and student D: 17/17. Total scores: student A: 19/23; student B: 16/23; student C: 14/23, and student D: 23/23. We decided that highly competent requires a score of 80% on the test; competent a score of 70%; and minimally competent a score of 60%. Accordingly, students A and D are highly competent, while student B is competent, and student C is minimally competent with regard to SLO 1. The small number of students makes it reasonable to conclude that enough students (75%) satisfied the percentage of competent students (80%) required by our criterion of success. **It follows that on basis of the exam that the PL program met success in 2010 with regard to SLO 1.** This is the first year that the PL program has fully satisfied SLO 1.

1 Questionnaire, Part B (indirect testing)

Question 1 of the questionnaire tested SLO 1. Scores for question 1: 5, 4, 5, and 5. The criterion of success is that the average score is 4 or above. The average score is 4.5. **It follows that on basis of the questionnaire the PL program met success in 2010 with regard to SLO 1.**

SLO 2

1 Exam (direct testing)

The criterion of success is that 100% of the students score 1 (minimally competent) or above; 80% score 2 (competent) or above, and 20% score 3 (highly competent). The students were given 12 multiple choice questions (questions 7-18 on the test) to test SLO 2. Scores for the multiple choice questions (correct/number of questions): student A: 9/12; student B: 8/12; student C: 10/12; student D: 9/12. We decided that highly competent requires a score of 80%; competent a score of 70%; and minimally competent a score of 60%. Accordingly, student C is highly competent, students A and D are competent, and student B is minimally competent. The small number of students makes it reasonable to conclude that enough students (75%) satisfied the percentage of competent students (80%) required by our criterion of success. **It follows that on basis of the exam the PL program met its criterion of success with regard to SLO 2.**

1 Questionnaire (indirect testing)

Questions 2 and 3 of the questionnaire tested SLO 2. Scores for question 2: 5, 4, 5, and 5. Scores for question 3: 5, 5, 5, and 5. The criterion of success is that the average score is at least 4. The average score is 4.875. **It follows that on basis of the questionnaire the PL program met success in 2010 with regard to SLO 2.**

SLO 3

1 Direct testing:

The score is based on five multiple choice questions (one point each) and a text analysis (score: 0-3; see Appendix II). We multiplied the text analysis score by two. Total scores: Student A: 7; student B: 8; student C: 6; student D: 10. Assessment scale: highly competent: 10-11; competent: 7-9; minimally competent: 6. Accordingly, student D is highly competent, students A and B are competent, and student C is minimally competent. The criterion of success is that 100% of the students score minimally competent or above; 80% score competent or above and, 20% score highly competent. The small number of students makes it reasonable to conclude that enough students (75%) satisfied the percentage of competent students (80%) required by our criterion of success. It follows that on basis of the exam and the text analysis that the PL program met its criterion of success in 2010 with regard to SLO 3.

2 Indirect testing:

We indirectly tested the SLO 3 in Part B of the Questionnaire, questions 4 and 5. Scores for question 4: 5, 5, 5, and 5. Scores for question 5: 4, 3, 3, and 5. The criterion of success is that the average score is at least 4. The average score is 4.375. It follows that on basis of the questionnaire the PL program met success in 2010 with regard to SLO 2.

SLO 4

1 Direct testing:

We analyzed the term paper written for PL 410, Seminar in Philosophy, Spring 2010. Using the rubric stated in Appendix II, below, students A, B, and C received a score of 2, while student D scored 3. The criterion of success is that 100% of the students score 1 (minimally competent) or above; 80% score 2 (competent) or above, and 20% score 3 (highly competent). It follows that on basis of our analysis of the term papers of the graduating students that the PL program met its criterion of success with regard to SLO 4.

2 Indirect testing:

We indirectly tested the SLO 4 in Part B of the Questionnaire, question 6. Scores for question 6: 5, 4, 5, and 4. The criterion of success is that the average score is at least 4. The average score is 4.5. It follows that on basis of the questionnaire the PL program met success in 2010 with regard to SLO 4.

SLO 5

1 Direct testing:

We analyzed the term paper written for PL 410, Seminar in Philosophy, Spring 2010. Using the rubric stated in Appendix II, below, students A, B, and C received a score of 2, while student D scored 3. The criterion of success is that 100% of the students score 1 (minimally competent) or above; 80% score 2 (competent) or above, and 20% score 3 (highly competent). It follows that on basis of our analysis of the term papers of the graduating students that the PL program met its criterion of success with regard to SLO 5.

2 Indirect testing:

We indirectly tested the SLO 5 in Part B of the Questionnaire, questions 7 and 8. Scores for question 7: 5, 3, 5, and 5. Scores for question 8: 5, 4, 5, and 4. The criterion of success is that the average score is at least 4. The average score is 4.625. It follows that on basis of the questionnaire the PL program met success in 2010 with regard to SLO 5.

2. **Use of Results**—*What programmatic changes, if any, were made in response to the findings? Reference the SLO #.*

We made some changes in response to the SLO testing of 2008 and 2009. Our current results are such that we wish to continue on the track of success without making any fundamental changes.

3. What **support services or resources** for faculty would help your department assess its SLOs better?

We are fine.

4. What **revisions**, if any, to current SLOs did you make or are under consideration?

None.

5. Map each of your program’s SLOs to the University Learning Outcomes. Make annual updates only if your SLOs changed. For example:

Butler University students will:

1. Explore various ways of knowing in the humanities, social and natural sciences, quantitative and analytic reasoning, and creative arts. (*Know*)
2. Articulate and apply required content knowledge within their area(s) of study. (*Know*)
3. Find, understand, analyze, synthesize, evaluate and use information, employing technology as appropriate. (*Know*)
4. Explore a variety of cultures. (*Know*)
5. Recognize the relationship between the natural world and broader societal issues. (*Know*)
6. Communicate clearly and effectively. (*Do*)
7. Demonstrate collaborative behavior with others. (*Do*)
8. Practice ways and means of physical well-being. (*Do*)
9. Acquire the skills to make informed, rational and ethical choices. (*Do*)
10. Appreciate diverse cultures, ethnicities, religions and sexual orientations. (*Value*)
11. Share their talents with Butler and the greater community at large. (*Value*)
12. Be exposed to the value of lifelong learning. (*Value*)

Philosophy Student Learning Outcomes:	Butler University Learning Outcomes											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Recognize and explain basic ideas of the main figures of western philosophy.	X	X							X			
2. Distinguish between major areas of western philosophy, (such as metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, political philosophy and philosophy of language, mind, science, law) and demonstrate understanding of the major issues in several of these areas.	X	X		X	X				X			X
3. Critically evaluate evidence, concepts, and argumentation.	X		X			X			X			
4. Recognize, identify, and use credible sources of information, employing technology as appropriate.			X									
5. Research and write expository and argumentative papers.	X	X	X	X	X	X			X			

6. Discuss and question their own philosophical ideas as well as philosophical ideas raised in class, their broader academic community, and society at large.		X		X		X	X		X	X	X	X
7. Will allow their philosophical convictions to help guide conduct.									X	X	X	X

6a. List all courses in the program and map each of your SLOs to the **curriculum** in which the learning occurs, indicating the extent to which the outcome is introduced (I) or refined (R). [Make annual updates only if your SLOs or curriculum changed.]

	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5	SLO 6	SLO 7
PL 201	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
PL 203	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
PL 210			R				
PL 245	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
PL 311	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 313	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 314	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 320	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 323	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 327	R	R	R	R	R	R	R

	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3	SLO 4	SLO 5	SLO 6	SLO 7
PL 340	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 342	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 343	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 344	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 345	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 346	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 348	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 349	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 360	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 363	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 375	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
PL 410	R	R	R	R	R	R	R

6b. **Learning/developmental opportunities for students outside the classroom**—*If any SLO was addressed outside the classroom, explain where and how the learning/developmental opportunities were provided to students in your program? (i.e., internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you may have employed.)*

Appendix I

Graduating Philosophy Major Questionnaire

PLEASE BE FRANK IN YOUR ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAM. WE WILL NOT LOOK AT YOUR ANSWERS UNTIL THE COMPLETION OF THE SEMESTER.

Questionnaire: Part A

1. In the space below, please discuss what you perceive to be some of the strengths of the philosophy program.
2. Please list some aspects of the philosophy major that need improvement.
3. What is your opinion about the set of required courses? Are there any courses that you would like to eliminate or add to the list of required courses? Should there be fewer or more required courses?
4. Are there any new philosophy courses that should be added to the philosophy program?
5. Do you think that your philosophy professors have been sufficiently accessible and supportive of your academic pursuit?
6. Please comment on the Philosophy Club. How often did you attend its meetings?

Questionnaire: Part B

In the questions below, please rate your experience using the following scale:

Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

1. Work in the major has taught me to recognize and explain basics of ideas of some main figures of western philosophy.
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1
2. I am able to distinguish between some major areas of western philosophy (such as metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of mind, ethics, and epistemology).
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1
3. Work in the major has taught me a basic understanding of main issues in several major areas of western philosophy (such as metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of mind, ethics, and political philosophy).
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1
4. Work in the major has helped me develop my ability to critically evaluate and assess evidence, concepts, and argumentation.
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1
5. I am able to distinguish between fallacious and valid arguments.
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1
6. Work in the major has helped me learn to recognize, identify, and use credible sources of information, employing technology as appropriate.
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1
7. I am able to research and write expository papers in philosophy.
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1
8. Work in the major has taught me to write argumentative papers.
Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1

9. Work in the major has taught me to discuss and question my own philosophical ideas.

Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1

10. Work in the major has taught me to discuss and question philosophical ideas raised in class, the university, and society at large.

Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1

11. I have learned to appreciate the value of ongoing philosophical reflection on the human condition.

Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1

12. I have learned to let philosophical convictions guide my conduct.

Circle one: 5 4 3 2 1

Appendix II

SLO 3

Part C of the test:

Five multiple choice questions with one point for each correct answer.

Text analysis

Rubric for essay analysis:

3-Gets main claim and argument clearly and succinctly. Identifies interesting problems with argument.

2-Gets main claim mostly right. Largely gets argument but may miss details. Identifies some issues or weaknesses, but not clearly, or not the most important.

1-Gets gist of main claim but misses nuances; seriously misunderstands argument or offers real non-sequiturs in discussion.

0-Completely misses point.

Total score: Score on multiple questions plus the score on the text analysis multiplied by two.

Assessment scale: highly competent: 10-11; competent: 7-9; minimally competent: 6; not competent: 5 and below.

SLO 4

Direct testing: examination of term paper of PL 410, Seminar in Philosophy.

Assessment scale: highly competent: 3; competent: 2; minimally competent: 1; not competent: 0.

Score 3:

Both primary and secondary sources are chosen with discernment, are relevant to the topic at hand and help the author to convey the novelty and plausibility of her interpretation. The student effectively made use of documents posted on Blackboard and ordered materials online (e.g. through Butler's Interlibrary Loan service).

Score 2:

Primary and secondary sources are relevant and are used throughout the paper but are not always analyzed with an alert critical eye. Materials available on Blackboard were used in writing this paper, but little use was made of online catalogues (e.g. WorldCat).

Score 1:

Sources are used without much discernment and include articles from third rate journals or works that are only incidentally related to the topic at hand. Inadequately few electronic resources were used in order to order materials or to determine their likely quality / reliability.

Score 0:

Primary sources are used occasionally (if at all), but secondary literature is virtually absent or inadequate; alternatively, internet sites containing unreliable commentaries etc. are used in what seems to be an act of intellectual desperation. Virtually no use of technology is discernible in choosing and obtaining relevant sources.

SLO 5

Direct testing: examination of term paper of PL 410, Seminar in Philosophy.

Assessment scale: highly competent: 3; competent: 2; minimally competent: 1; not competent: 0.

Rubric:

Highly competent (3)

The argument is carefully built and leads to a plausible conclusion.

The topic is commensurate with the length of the discussion and allows for close analysis.

The quality of the writing indicates clear and mature reflection.

It anticipates or addresses possible objections to the central thesis of the paper.

The argument relies on a careful scrutiny of primary sources.

It involves critical evaluation of relevant secondary sources.

The paper achieves or at least initiates a fresh reconsideration of a significant text or theory.

Competent (2)

The topic is not overly general and is fairly well circumscribed.

The premises are relevant and the conclusion is well supported, but the overall argument is less clearly articulated than in (3).

Statements generally, although not always, rely on a close reading of key passages in primary sources.

Selection of secondary sources is carefully done, but claims found in secondary sources are sometimes adopted or rejected rather summarily.

The paper is well written, but doesn't display the same crispness or elegance as in (3).

Minimally competent (1)

The paper is built around a thesis and offers a conclusion, but the scope of the topic is too broad for a careful scrutiny of relevant passages and arguments.

The conclusion is weakly supported.

Primary and/or secondary sources are used but not sufficiently or consistently.

The quality of the writing is unequal, although the style is by and large clear and adequate.

Not competent (0)

The paper betrays insufficient acquaintance with the topic at hand.

The segments of the overall argument are only loosely connected.

Freewheeling comments replace what should be a detailed and insightful analysis of relevant sources.

The style is inadequate or the writing is marred by too many grammatical errors and awkward formulations.