

Department/Service Area Assessment Report - Four Column

DeAnza College

Dept - (SSH) Philosophy

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Data Summaries	Enhancement/Action & Follow-Up
<p>Dept - (SSH) Philosophy - Philosophy PLO_1 - Students should be able to critically analyze and evaluate the figures, texts, ideas, theories, and problems within philosophy.</p> <p>Year(s) to be Assessed: 2011-2012</p> <p>Outcome Creation Date: 04/27/2012</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Term Paper</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Standardized</p>		
<p>Dept - (SSH) Philosophy - Philosophy PLO_2 - Students should be familiar with the basic figures, texts, theories, problems, and ideas within the discipline of philosophy.</p> <p>Year(s) to be Assessed: 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014</p> <p>Outcome Creation Date: 04/27/2012</p> <p>PLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students across philosophy courses will be given on online survey that asks them questions across a a broad spectrum in the history of philosophy. Students will be asked how many philosophy courses they have taken at De Anza, and we will be interested to see the extent to which more 'experienced' students in our program do better than 'less experienced' students on the survey.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Survey</p> <p>Target for Success: Students who have taken 4 or more philosophy courses at De Anza should be able to correctly answer 75% of the questions on the survey.</p>	<p>06/18/2012 - 181 responses were collected, and replies were grouped according to students who had completed/enrolled in 4 or more courses (17 respondents in total, from here on referred to as 'advanced'), and students who had completed/enrolled in fewer than 4 courses (164 respondents in total, from here on referred to as 'intro'). Advanced students did perform uniformly better than intro students on every survey question. The complete survey results are related to this TracDat entry, but notable questions/correct responses are indicated below:</p> <p>"Identify an inductive argument": Intro 62/164, advanced 9/17 "What is utilitarianism?": Intro 80/164, advanced 15/164 "Who is Lao Tzu?" 83/164, advanced 10/17 "What is the philosophical view known as 'skepticism?": Intro 68/164, advanced 11/17</p> <p>Target : Target Met</p> <p>Program Review Reporting Year: 2011-2012</p> <p># people involved in Reflection & Analysis:: 8.0000</p> <p>Reflection and Analysis: The data have generated quite a bit of</p>	<p>06/18/2012 - At present, it seems that the most significant enhancement resulting from this study will be made to the assessment process itself. Participation in the planning stages of this assessment was decidedly less widespread and vigorous than the discussion it generated, and it appears that several department members are now interested/motivated in developing a more rigorous assessment tool for the next cycle. If nothing else were to come of this particular cycle, this boost to the rigor of our assessment methods must be considered a significant result.</p> <p>The data collected in this cycle have not been entirely ignored, however. One survey question revealed that only 32% of intro respondents and 50% of advanced respondents could successfully name at least one woman philosopher. This finding has resulted in departmental dialogue about the importance of diversifying our readings and topics.</p>

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Data Summaries	Enhancement/Action & Follow-Up
		<p>discussion and disagreement among the philosophy department. Some instructors have argued that while the advanced students do perform better than the intro students, their scores on some questions are still disconcertingly low. Questions of particular concern pertain to questions designed to reveal students' formal reasoning skills.</p> <p>Other instructors have argued that our target for this assessment has been met, and that the data show that our courses are effective at enabling advanced students to identify and discuss key concepts/figures in the history of philosophy.</p> <p>Finally, other faculty members have argued that the assessment method itself is problematic. Discussions on this front will likely result in a significant revisions to the data collection tool to be used in the next cycle of assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: De Anza Philosophy Department_PLO2 Assessment Survey.xls</p>	<p>The department has agreed to change syllabi to more explicitly include women in philosophy, and we expect our data in this area to improve significantly in our next assessment cycle.</p> <hr/>