Philosophy SLOAC work

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
PHIL 1	Comapare approaches and attempted solutions to these problems from a variety of philosophical traditions.				
	Defend an original position on at least one philosophical issue.				
	Describe the relevance of epistemological and metaphysical problems to contemporary popular concerns.				
	Identify and articulate philosophical problems pertaining to the nature of knowledge and reality.				
PHIL 10	Analyze and assess texts relevant to philosophy and democracy.				
	Articulate and defend their own position on at least one philosophical issue related to democracy.				
	Demonstrate an application of these tools to their own actions and decisions.				
	Identify and analyze philosophical problems pertaining to the nature of democracy.				
PHIL 14A	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one philosophical problem, figure or theory from Indian traditions.				
	Assess and analyze arguments and approaches to philosophical problems as found in Indian philosophical texts.				
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to one's own existence in the world.				
	Identify and assess the central				

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	figures, questions and themes of philosophy in Indian traditions.				
PHIL 14B	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one philosophical problem, figure or theory from Chinese traditions.				
	Assess and analyze arguments and approaches to philosophical problems as found in Chinese philosophical texts.				
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to one's own existence in the world.				
	Identify and assess the central figures, questions and themes of philosophy in Chinese traditions.				
PHIL 14C	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one philosophical problem, figure or theory from Japanese traditions.				
	Assess and analyze arguments and approaches to philosophical problems as found in Japanese philosophical texts.				
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to one's own existence in the world.				
	Identify and assess the central figures, questions and themes of philosophy in Japanese traditions.				
PHIL 2	Analyze and assess solutions to these problems from multiple philosophical positions.	An essay assignment will be given that requires students to apply philosophical theories to a hypothetical or real-world dilemma.			
	Articulate and defend your own position on at least one issue in social and political philosophy.	An essay assignment is given where students are asked to take a position on a current political issue and defend this			

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Articulate and defend your own position on at least one issue in social and political philosophy.	position with an original argument			
	Articulate and defend your own position on at least one issue in social and political philosophy.	An essay is assigned that requires students to take an original philosophical position on one of 4 topics.			
	Articulate and defend your own position on at least one issue in social and political philosophy.	An online forum will be used to require students to first articulate an original argument, and then critique an argument given by one of their peers			
	Identify and analyze the philosophical problems pertaining to social and political philosophy.	Specific exam questions will be selected that show students recognize basic concepts in social/political philsophy.			
PHIL 20A	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one ancient philosophical problem, figure or theory.				
	Assess and analyze arguments and approaches to philosophical problems as found in ancient philosophical texts.				
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to one's own existence in the world.				
	Identify and assess the central figures, questions and themes of ancient philosophy in the western tradition.				
PHIL 20B	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one early modern philosophical problem, figure or theory.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement for an ?original argument??students were expected to construct a critical response to a philosophical problem that would be assessed on the basis of originality,	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average ?argument? score was 81.8/100, which improved to 85/100 by the end of the course.	Faculty discussion seemed to approve of the authenticity of this assessment. It is of course difficult to develop ?hard data? for an outcome like this, but the data gathered here did seem to reflect something in the way of improvement in this ability over the course of the academic term, which seems to further suggest learning with respect to this SLO.	Informal student surveys suggest that the extensive comments given on their papers was the most significant factor contributing to their development as analysts of philosophical concepts. I intend to continue with this practice in future sections. While some improvement was observed, the improvement was less dramatic than the improvement for SLO

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
PHIL 20B	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one early modern philosophical problem, figure or theory.	the anticipation of critical objections.	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average ?argument? score was 81.8/100, which improved to 85/100 by the end of the course.	Faculty discussion seemed to approve of the authenticity of this assessment. It is of course difficult to develop ?hard data? for an outcome like this, but the data gathered here did seem to reflect something in the way of improvement in this ability over the course of the academic term, which seems to further suggest learning with respect to this SLO.	#2. There are several possible explanations for this. One pertains to the difficulty of constructing the arguments offered by other thinkers. If this is the case, then it would seem that student learning would benefit from at least one more argument-centered writing assignment in the course. As explained in the next column, however, current enrollment limits make this logistically impossible.

The Kind of extensive comments needed to bring about these kinds of improvements requires a great deal of the instructor?s time and focus. Large sections (in this case, 60+ students) make this extremely taxing. It has been document in several informal student surveys that these comments far exceed the rigor and detail of comments given in English/Language Arts courses. Given that those courses typically hold a much lower maximum enrollment?and that this lower enrollment is attributed in large part to the additional efforts that English instructors purportedly must put into the grading of written assignments?it seems that our paper-centered courses would benefit tremendously from lower enrollments. It is recognized that the institution strives to accommodate as many students as possible. In a case like this, however, high enrollment limits deeply compromise the pedagogical soundness of the courses themselves. |

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
PHIL 20B	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one early modern philosophical problem, figure or theory.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement for an ?original argument??students were expected to construct a critical response to a philosophical problem that would be assessed on the basis of originality, coherence, and the anticipation of critical objections.	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average ?argument? score was 81.8/100, which improved to 85/100 by the end of the course.	Faculty discussion seemed to approve of the authenticity of this assessment. It is of course difficult to develop ?hard data? for an outcome like this, but the data gathered here did seem to reflect something in the way of improvement in this ability over the course of the academic term, which seems to further suggest learning with respect to this SLO.	
	Assess and analyze arguments and approaches to philosophical problems as found in early modern philosophical texts.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for thee assignments was a requirement for ?substantive accuracy;??students were expected to both accurately articulate the key components of theories and accurately apply them to a particular philosophical problem.	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average ?accuracy? score was 7.9/10, which improved to 9.2/10 by the end of the course.	Faculty discussion seemed to approve of the authenticity of this assessment. It is of course difficult to develop ?hard data? for an outcome like this, but the data gathered here did seem to reflect something in the way of students? abilities to analyze theoretical models. The data suggests some improvement in this ability over the course of the academic term, which seems to further suggest learning with respect to this SLO. Overall, I?m very happy with the result of this SLO.	Informal student surveys suggest that the extensive comments given on their papers was the most significant factor contributing to their development as analysts of philosophical concepts. I intend to continue with this practice in future sections. The Kind of extensive comments needed to bring about these kinds of improvements requires a great deal of the instructor?s time and focus. Large sections (in this case, 60+ students) make this extremely taxing. It has been document in several informal student surveys that these comments far exceed the rigor and detail of comments given in English/Language Arts courses. Given that those courses typically hold a much lower maximum enrollment?and that this lower enrollment is attributed in large part to the additional efforts that English instructors purportedly must put into the grading of written assignments?it seems that our paper-centered courses would

Course/S ervice ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Assess and analyze arguments and approaches to philosophical problems as found in early modern philosophical texts.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for thee assignments was a requirement for ?substantive accuracy;??students were expected to both accurately articulate the key components of theories and accurately apply them to a particular philosophical problem.	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average ?accuracy? score was 7.9/10, which improved to 9.2/10 by the end of the course.	Faculty discussion seemed to approve of the authenticity of this assessment. It is of course difficult to develop ?hard data? for an outcome like this, but the data gathered here did seem to reflect something in the way of students? abilities to analyze theoretical models. The data suggests some improvement in this ability over the course of the academic term, which seems to further suggest learning with respect to this SLO. Overall, I?m very happy with the result of this SLO.	benefit tremendously from lower enrollments. It is recognized that the institution strives to accommodate as many students as possible. In a case like this, however, high enrollment limits deeply compromise the pedagogical soundness of the courses themselves.
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to one's own existence in the world.	An ?argument? paper was assigned to students, in which they were asked to provide a rigorous philosophical response to a topic of their own choosing. Typically, this meant that students responded to a philosophical claim that they found personally relevant in some way.	The average score on these papers was 81.1%. 8 of 50 students scored 90% or higher (corresponding to ?excellent? work), 12 students scored between 80% and 90% (corresponding to ?good? work), 9 scored between 75% and 80% (corresponding to ?satisfactory? work), and 8 scored beneath 75% (corresponding to ?not satisfactory? work).	A problem with this assessment led to a decision (during faculty reflection) that the SLO itself should be changed. It certainly seems that an assessment of this nature can be taken to demonstrate a student?s ability to apply philosophical thinking to his/her own decision making. However, it cannot show that a student actually does apply such thinking to his/her own decision making. On reflection, the faculty agreed that this was actually closer to the aim of an appropriate SLO for the course (as explained below). Students did meet reasonable expectations for success here, but it was the SLO that yielded the least strong results overall.	The SLO will need to be revised as follows: ?Demonstrate the ability to apply philosophical thinking to one?s own personal decision making.? To further enhance the extent to which this SLO is met, it would be a good idea to include more ?argument paper? assignments into the course outline. As explained in previous remakes, however, current enrollment limits make this logistically unfeasible. Course enrollment limits should be lowered or more sections offered.
	Identify and assess the central figures, questions and themes of early modern philosophy in the western tradition.	In order to determine the extent to which students were familiar with basic figures, questions, themes/problems in modern philosophy, I gave about four quizzes throughout the quarter. Such quizzes involved identification of the central theses and arguments of	The average was a solid B+ for the quiz component of the course.	Discussion among the department suggested that this was an authentic assessment of the SLO?though by no means the only way to assess it. I?m not certain that this assessment method is appropriate for the other SLOs in the course (as they are more analysis-	To enhance student understanding of basic moral theories, it may be a good idea to spend more time looking at applications of these theories to standard moral problems. Applications already are a major feature of the course, but I suspect that discussions could

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Identify and assess the central figures, questions and themes of early modern philosophy in the western tradition.	philosophers such as Descartes, Locke, Hume, Hobbes, and Kant.	The average was a solid B+ for the quiz component of the course.	oriented). The outcome seems to reflect my initial intuitions?while it seems that the majority of students did have a satisfactory understanding of basic ethical concepts, I suspected that student understanding of Kantian theory was a little lower than that of Utilitarian theory. Given the considerable complexity of the former theory, this is not entirely surprising. Overall, the data collected suggests that the SLO was met for the section?though there is absolutely room for improvement.	more explicitly address the role that these theories play in moral deliberation. Small-group discussions will be employed during the next iteration of the course in attempt to facilitate this enhancement.
PHIL 20C	Articulate and defend one's own stance on at least one 19th and 20th century philosophical problem, figure or theory.				
	Assess and analyze arguments and approaches to philosophical problems as found in 19th and 20th century philosophical texts.				
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to one's own existence in the world.				
	Identify and assess the central figures, questions and themes of 19th and 20th century philosophy in the western tradition.				
PHIL 24	Analyze and assess solutions to these problems from a variety of religious and philosophical traditions.				
	Articulate and defend your own position on at least one issue related to the philosophy of religion.				
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to				

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	one's own existence in the world.				
	Identify and analyze the philosophical problems pertaining to religion.				
PHIL 3	Analyze and assess a variety of rhetorical and argumentative texts.				
	Demonstrate an application of these tools to one's own actions and decisions.				
	Develop your own complex arguments.				
	Identify and analyze a variety of rhetorical and argumentative techniques.				
PHIL 4	Analyze and assess a variety of rhetorical and argumentative texts	This SLO is articulated very closely to SLO#1. The instructor interpreted the difference to refer to a closer analysis of student ability to distinguish between those forms of persuasion which provide legitimate reasons for accepting a belief, and those which do not. Accordingly, two assessments were embedded into the final exam. The first tested student ability to recognize arguments resting solely on rhetoric (i.e. providing no truth-conducive reasons for belief). The second tested student ability to distinguish between valid and invalid deductive arguments.	For the 'rhetoric' portion, students exhibited an average score of 21/25 across both sections. For the 'validity' portion, students exhibited an average score of 17.5/25 across both sections	These data suggest that students were able to recognize rhetoric much more easily than they were able to recognize formal validity. Student performance can--and should--be improved for this second criterion in future sections of the course. Overall, however, results were satisfactory here.	Formal reasoning will be approached differently in future sections of the course. The instructor suspects that this kind of reasoning differs considerably from the kind of 'critical thinking' to which students are accustomed, and intends to experiment with different methods of introducing validity.
	Demonstrate an application of these tools to one's own actions and decisions	The 'bottled water' assignment mentioned above was intended to provide students with an opportunity to reflect critically on a consumption choice likely to affect their own lives.	Quantitave data were not available using this method, but high-quality discussions did occur as a result of the 'bottled water' assignment.	Student submissions seemed to show that they have the ability to apply critical thinking tools to their own lives, but it is very difficult to imagine any assessment to show that they do in fact apply these tools in their lives.	During our discussion of the assessment, the faculty agree to amend the SLO as follows: "Demonstrate the ability to apply these tools to your own actions and decisions."
	Develop your own complex	Students' ability to cultivate	Unfortunately, it was difficult to	These methods provided a	Future sections of the course will

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	arguments	original arguments was assessed in two ways. First, students were asked to submit a brief argumentative paper pertaining to the rationality of the consumption of bottled water. Second, students were frequently presented with in-class debate topics to provoke improvised arguments.	collect much in the way of data here.	general sense that students improved in their ability to develop original arguments throughout the course.	alter the 'bottled water' assignment to include a detailed rubric, according to which student arguments will be assessed on the criteria of originality, coherence, and susceptibility to critical objections. This will facilitate the collection of data to better measure the SLO.
	Identify and analyze a variety of rhetorical and argumentative techniques	Embedded within the final exam of the course was a section in which students were asked to identify rhetorical devices, logical fallacies, and deductive arguments within a lengthy written passage. Students were scored according to their ability to both identify and explain the function of persuasive techniques.	Section 04.02 exhibited an average score of 11.4/15 on this portion of the exam, while section 04.03 exhibited an average score of 12.7/15. These results confirmed the instructor's suspicion that students had a working understanding of persuasive techniques, but that their ability to describe the functions of these techniques could improve significantly. Results indicate that the SLO was met satisfactorily, but further improvement is certainly appropriate here.	These results confirmed the instructor's suspicion that students had a working understanding of persuasive techniques, but that their ability to describe the functions of these techniques could improve significantly. Results indicate that the SLO was met satisfactorily, but further improvement is certainly appropriate here.	Future iterations of the course will focus more carefully on identifying persuasive techniques in lengthy media (news reports, textual passages, speeches). The section assessed here focused primarily on brief persuasive passages, which may not be as effective in cultivating student understanding. This course is taught more frequently than any other in the department, and is unfortunately offered in classrooms featuring inconsistent technological capabilities. Multimedia argumentative assessment is easy to facilitate in 'smart classrooms', but more difficult in lesser-equipped rooms (such as L28). The instructor continues to develop 'work around' strategies to deal with this, but installing a media cabinet in L28 would help significantly here.
PHIL 49	Analyze and assess texts relevant to women and philosophy.				
	Analyze and defend one's own position on an issue relevant to women and philosophy.				
	Exhibit an application of the concepts learned in this class to				

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	one's own existence in the world.				
	Identify and analyze issues relating to women and philosophy.				
PHIL 7	Demonstrate an understanding of the proof differences between valid and invalid argument forms.	Unlike other philosophy courses, it seemed appropriate to rely heavily upon the quantitative data obtained through quiz and test results in this course. The quizzes and exams were designed to highlight specific capabilities relevant to deductive logic. In this case, I focused on a series of quizzes that focused on truth tables. Students used these to test sequents for validity. In the event that a particular sequent was identified as valid, students constructed a proof for the sequent. The scores on these quizzes were compared against the scores on the relevant sections of the midterm and final exams, in an effort to detect if improvement/learning took place.	Quizzes yielded an average score of 80%, which improved to 85% on the relevant section of the final exam.	Students did well in this area. While this does leave some room for further improvement, it suggests that the SLO is being effectively met in the current version of the course.	I introduced truth tables after introducing the rules of formal proof, and believe that scores may further improve if I reverse this order. I plan to try introducing truth tables first, in an effort to see if students better understand both truth tables and formal proofs.
	Demonstrate the ability to distinguish the deductive inferential function from the inductive inferential function in scientific methods.	Unlike other philosophy courses, it seemed appropriate to rely heavily upon the quantitative data obtained through quiz and test results in this course. The quizzes and exams were designed to highlight specific capabilities relevant to deductive logic. In this case, I focused on a quiz that contained examples of both deductive and inductive arguments. Students were asked to distinguish them according to these two categories.. The scores on this quiz were compared against the scores on the relevant sections	Scores on the initial quiz yielded an average of 77.2%, which improved to 81% on the midterm exam.	I believe that I spent less time addressing this SLO than the others because of a belief that it would be more readily achieved. My results indicate that this is not the case, and that it will be a good idea to spend a few extra days reviewing examples of inductive arguments. I suspect that this will improve student performance considerably.	I believe that I spent less time addressing this SLO than the others because of a belief that it would be more readily achieved. My results indicate that this is not the case, and that it will be a good idea to spend a few extra days reviewing examples of inductive arguments. I suspect that this will improve student performance considerably.

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Demonstrate the ability to distinguish the deductive inferential function from the inductive inferential function in scientific methods.	of the midterm exam, in an effort to detect if improvement/learning took place.	Scores on the initial quiz yielded an average of 77.2%, which improved to 81% on the midterm exam.	I believe that I spent less time addressing this SLO than the others because of a belief that it would be more readily achieved. My results indicate that this is not the case, and that it will be a good idea to spend a few extra days reviewing examples of inductive arguments. I suspect that this will improve student performance considerably.	I believe that I spent less time addressing this SLO than the others because of a belief that it would be more readily achieved. My results indicate that this is not the case, and that it will be a good idea to spend a few extra days reviewing examples of inductive arguments. I suspect that this will improve student performance considerably.
	Exhibit analytical skills by demonstrating ability to perform multi-step deductive proofs.	Unlike other philosophy courses, it seemed appropriate to rely heavily upon the quantitative data obtained through quiz and test results in this course. The quizzes and exams were designed to highlight specific capabilities relevant to deductive logic. In this case, I focused on quizzes that required students to construct formal proofs for valid sequents. The scores on these quizzes were compared against the scores on the relevant sections of the midterm and final exams, in an effort to detect if improvement/learning took place.	Initial quiz scores for propositional proofs yielded an average of 62%, which improved to 80% on the relevant section of the midterm exam. Initial quiz scores for predicate proofs yielded an average of 73.5%, which improved to 80.2% on the relevant section of the final exam.	I was surprised to find that scores on predicate proofs were higher than those for propositional proofs, given the increased difficulty of the former. I attribute this to the fact that the propositional system was introduced first, and that by the time predicate proofs were introduced, students had better mastered fundamental rules for propositional operators.	I would like scores to be higher on the exams with respect to proofs. As indicated in my enhancement for SLO#2, I believe that by introducing truth tables before introducing the proof rules for the operators, understanding of the latter will improve the next time I teach the course.
	Identify and understand the translation of linguistic statements into symbolic notation.	Unlike other philosophy courses, it seemed appropriate to rely heavily upon the quantitative data obtained through quiz and test results in this course. The quizzes and exams were designed to highlight specific capabilities relevant to deductive logic. In this case, I focused on two quizzes that contained several natural language sentences. Students were required to translate these into the languages of propositional and predicate logic. The scores on	Propositional logic: The initial quiz showed an average score of 89%, which improved slightly to 91% by the time of the midterm exam. Predicate logic: Initial quiz scores yielded an average of 53.3%, which improved to about 78% for the final exam.	Students did very well with the translation of sentences into propositional logic. The initial quiz showed an average score of 89%, which improved slightly to 91% by the time of the midterm exam. I take this to indicate that the majority of students had a firm grasp on this aspect of translation. It appears that students had much more difficulty with predicate logic. Initial quiz scores yielded an average of 53.3%, which improved to about	Discussions with my colleagues about this suggest that it may be a good idea to scale back the scope of student work in predicate translations. Because of the accelerated pace of the quarter system, it may be appropriate to focus exclusively on single-place predicate translations, as multi-place predicates seemed to cause most of the problems here. I plan to follow this recommendation in the next section of PHIL07 that I teach, and will introduce multi-place translations only in the

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Identify and understand the translation of linguistic statements into symbolic notation.	these quizzes were compared against the scores on the relevant sections of the midterm and final exams, in an effort to detect if improvement/learning took place.	Propositional logic: The initial quiz showed an average score of 89%, which improved slightly to 91% by the time of the midterm exam. Predicate logic: Initial quiz scores yielded an average of 53.3%, which improved to about 78% for the final exam.	78% for the final exam. While this does indicate considerable improvement, the final exam average still strikes me as low enough to raise concerns.	event that students exhibit mastery over single-place predicates.
	Identify and understand the translation of linguistic statements into symbolic notation.	Unlike other philosophy courses, it seemed appropriate to rely heavily upon the quantitative data obtained through quiz and test results in this course. The quizzes and exams were designed to highlight specific capabilities relevant to deductive logic. In this case, I focused on two quizzes that contained several natural language sentences. Students were required to translate these into the languages of propositional and predicate logic. The scores on these quizzes were compared against the scores on the relevant sections of the midterm and final exams, in an effort to detect if improvement/learning took place.	Quiz results for predicate translation yielded an average score of 85%--a significant improvement from the previous assessment cycle.	It appears that scaling back the scope of coverage on predicate translation is appropriate for this course, and seems to result in better student learning with respect to this SLO.	We will keep this model of predicate-translation instruction for now, and use the time that it 'frees up' in the quarter to focus on more rigorous deductive proofs.
PHIL 8	Analyze and assess arguments and approaches to these questions from a variety of traditions.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement for "substantive accuracy"-- students were expected to both accurately articulate the key components of moral theories and accurately apply them to a particular moral problem.	he scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average 'accuracy' score was 7.9/10, which improved to 9.2/10 by the end of the course.	Faculty discussion seemed to approve of the authenticity of this assessement. It is of course difficult to develop 'hard data' for an outcome like this, but the data gathered here did seem to reflect something in the way of students' abilities to analyze moral theories. The data suggests some improvement in this ability over the course of the academic term, which seems to further suggest learning with respect to this SLO. Overall, I'm	Informal student surveys suggest that the extensive comments given on their papers was the most significant factor contributing to their development as analysts of philosophical concepts. I intend to continue with this practice in future sections. The kind of extensive comments needed to bring about these requires a great deal of the instructor's time and focus. Large

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
PHIL 8	Analyze and assess arguments and approaches to these questions from a variety of traditions.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement for "substantive accuracy"--students were expected to both accurately articulate the key components of moral theories and accurately apply them to a particular moral problem.	he scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average 'accuracy' score was 7.9/10, which improved to 9.2/10 by the end of the course.	very happy with the result here.	sections (in this case, 50 students) make this extremely taxing. It has been documented in several informal student surveys, that these comments far exceed the rigor and detail of comments given in English/Language Arts courses. Given that those courses typically hold a much lower maximum enrollment--and that this lower enrollment is attributed in large part to the additional effort that English instructors purportedly must put into the grading of written assignments--it seems that our paper-centered courses (including PHIL08) would benefit tremendously from lower enrollments. It is recognized that the institution strives to accommodate as many students as possible. In a case like this, however, high enrollment limits deeply compromise the pedagogical soundness of the courses themselves.
	Analyze and assess arguments and approaches to these questions from a variety of traditions.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement for "substantive accuracy"--students were expected to both accurately articulate the key components of moral theories and accurately apply them to a particular moral problem.	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average 'accuracy' score was 7.9/10, which improved to 9.2/10 by the end of the course.		
	Articulate and defend a personal stance on at least one of these questions and/or traditions.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average 'argument' score was 81.8/100,		

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Articulate and defend a personal stance on at least one of these questions and/or traditions.	for an "original argument"-- students were expected to construct a critical response to a philosophical problem that would be assessed on the basis of originality, coherence, and the anticipation of critical objections.	which improved to 85/100 by the end of the course.		
	Articulate and defend a personal stance on at least one of these questions and/or traditions.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement for an "original argument"-- students were expected to construct a critical response to a philosophical problem that would be assessed on the basis of originality, coherence, and the anticipation of critical objections.	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average 'argument' score was 81.8/100, which improved to 85/100 by the end of the course.	Faculty discussion seemed to approve of the authenticity of this assessement. It is of course difficult to develop 'hard data' for an outcome like this, but the data gathered here did seem to reflect something in the way of students' abilities to analyze moral theories. The data suggests some improvement in this ability over the course of the academic term, which seems to further suggest learning with respect to this SLO. Informal student surveys suggest that the extensive comments given on their papers was the most significant factor contributing to their development as analysts of philosophical concepts. I intend to continue with this practice in future sections. While some improvement was observed, the improvement was less dramatic than the improvement for SLO #2. There are several possible explanations for this. One pertains the difficulty of constructing original arguments--this may simply turn out to be more difficult than analyzing the arguments offered by other thinkers. If this is the case, then it would seem that student learning would benefit from at least one more	The kind of extensive comments needed to bring about these requires a great deal of the instructor's time and focus. Large sections (in this case, 50 students) make this extremely taxing. It has been documented in several informal student surveys, that these comments far exceed the rigor and detail of comments given in English/Language Arts courses. Given that those courses typically hold a much lower maximum enrollment--and that this lower enrollment is attributed in large part to the additional effort that English instructors purportedly must put into the grading of written assignments-- it seems that our paper-centered courses (including PHIL08) would benefit tremendously from lower enrollments. It is recognized that the institution strives to accommodate as many students as possible. In a case like this, however, high enrollment limits deeply compromise the pedagogical soundness of the courses themselves.

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Articulate and defend a personal stance on at least one of these questions and/or traditions.	To examine this SLO, an assessment was embedded into paper assignments for the course. Among the various criteria on the rubric for these assignments was a requirement for an "original argument"--students were expected to construct a critical response to a philosophical problem that would be assessed on the basis of originality, coherence, and the anticipation of critical objections.	The scores for this criterion were tracked independently of the paper grades themselves, yielding the following results: In the first paper, the average 'argument' score was 81.8/100, which improved to 85/100 by the end of the course.	argument-centered writing assignment in the course. As explained in the next column, however, current enrollment limits make this logistically impossible.	The kind of extensive comments needed to bring about these requires a great deal of the instructor's time and focus. Large sections (in this case, 50 students) make this extremely taxing. It has been documented in several informal student surveys, that these comments far exceed the rigor and detail of comments given in English/Language Arts courses. Given that those courses typically hold a much lower maximum enrollment--and that this lower enrollment is attributed in large part to the additional effort that English instructors purportedly must put into the grading of written assignments--it seems that our paper-centered courses (including PHIL08) would benefit tremendously from lower enrollments. It is recognized that the institution strives to accommodate as many students as possible. In a case like this, however, high enrollment limits deeply compromise the pedagogical soundness of the courses themselves.
	Formulate an application of this discourse to one?s own personal decision making.	An "argument" paper was assigned to students, in which they were asked to provide a rigorous philosophical response to a topic of their own choosing. Typically, this meant that students responded to a moral claim that they found personally relevant in some way.	I did it I did it I did it		
	Formulate an application of this discourse to one?s own personal decision making.	An "argument" paper was assigned to students, in which they were asked to provide a rigorous philosophical response to a topic of their own choosing.	The average score on these papers was 81.8%. 8 of 50 students scored 90% or higher (corresponding to 'excellent' work), 12 students scored		

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	Formulate an application of this discourse to one?s own personal decision making.	Typically, this meant that students responded to a moral claim that they found personally relevant in some way.	between 80% and 90% (corresponding to 'good' work), 9 scored between 75% and 80% (corresponding to 'satisfactory' work), and 8 scored beneath 75% (corresponding to 'not satisfactory' work).		
	Formulate an application of this discourse to one's own personal decision making.	An "argument" paper was assigned to students, in which they were asked to provide a rigorous philosophical response to a topic of their own choosing. Typically, this meant that students responded to a moral claim that they found personally relevant in some way.	The average score on these papers was 81.8%. 8 of 50 students scored 90% or higher (corresponding to 'excellent' work), 12 students scored between 80% and 90% (corresponding to 'good' work), 9 scored between 75% and 80% (corresponding to 'satisfactory' work), and 8 scored beneath 75% (corresponding to 'not satisfactory' work).	A problem with this assessment led to a decision (during faculty reflection) that the SLO itself should be changed here. It certainly seems that an assessment of this nature can be taken to demonstrate a student's ability to apply moral thinking to his/her own decision making, but it cannot show that a student actually does apply moral thinking to his/her own decision making. On reflection, the faculty agreed that this was actually closer to the aim of an appropriate SLO for the course (as explained below). Students did meet reasonable expectations for success here, but it was the SLO that yielded the least strong results overall.	The SLO will need to be revised as follows: "Demonstrate the ability to apply moral thinking to one's own personal decision making." To further enhance the extent to which this SLO is met, it would be a good idea to include more 'argument paper' assignments into the course outline. As explained in previous remarks, however, current enrollment limits make this logistically unfeasible.
	Identify and analyze central questions about right action and/or the good life.	In order to determine the extent to which students were familiar with basic themes/problems in ethics, I included a few short answer questions on a final exam that were designed to reflect a fundamental awareness of two key moral theories (utilitarianism and Kantianism).	The average score on the first question was 4.2 of 5. The average score on the second question was 3.4. I aimed for a target of 3 or higher. Only one student (of 50 in the section) missed the target for the first question, while 8 missed the target for the second.		To enhance student understanding of basic moral theories, it may be a good idea to spend more time looking at applications of these theories to standard moral problems. Applications already are a major feature of the course, but I suspect that discussions could more explicitly address the role that these theories play in moral deliberation. Small-group discussions will be employed during the next iteration of the course in attempt to facilitate this.
	Identify and analyze central	In order to determine the extent	The average score on the first	Discussion among the	To enhance student

Course/Service ID	Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	Assessment Method	Assessment Data Summary	Reflection and Analysis	Enhancement/Action
	questions about right action and/or the good life.	to which students were familiar with basic themes/problems in ethics, I included a few short answer questions on a final exam that were designed to reflect a fundamental awareness of two key moral theories (utilitarianism and Kantianism).	question was 4.2 of 5. The average score on the second question was 3.4. I aimed for a target of 3 or higher. Only one student (of 50 in the section) missed the target for the first question, while 8 missed the target for the second.	department suggested that this was an authentic assessment of the SLO--though by no means the only way to assess it. I'm not certain that this assesement method is appropriate for the other SLOs in the course (as they are more analysis-oriented).The outcome seems to reflect my initial intuitions--while it seems that the majority of students did have a satisfactory understanding of basic moral concepts, I has suspected that the understanding of Kantian theory was a little lower than than of utilitarianism. Given the considerable complexity of the former theory, this is not entirely suprising. Overall, the data collected suggests that the SLO was met for the section--though there is absolutely room for improvement here.	understanding of basic moral theories, it may be a good idea to spend more time looking at applications of these theories to standard moral problems. Applications already are a major feature of the course, but I suspect that discussions could more explicitly address the role that these theories play in moral deliberation. Small-group discussions will be employed during the next iteration of the course in attempt to facilitate this.
PHIL 9	Appraise texts relevant to the philosophy of science.				
	Articulate and defend your own position on at least one issue related to the philosophy of science.				
	Diagnose the applicability of science and scientific claims to contemporary decision-making.				
	Identify and analyze the major problems in the contemporary philosophy of science.				
	Count:71			Count:17	