Philosophy Department: Catalog strategy tied to PLO assessment

See most recent documented enhancement for PLO2

Dept - (SSH) Philosophy

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)	Assessment Methods	Assessment Data Summaries	Enhancements
Philosophy PLO_1 - Students should be able to critically analyze and evaluate the figures, texts, ideas, theories, and problems within philosophy. **PLO Status:** Active **Year(s) to be Assessed:** 2011-2012 **Outcome Creation Date:** 04/27/2012	**Underlying Course -** We will examine assessment results for SLOs #1 and #2 in each of our relevant underlying courses. **Target for Success:** 75% or higher average assessment findings in each of our relevant courses.	**Program Review Reporting Year:** 2013-2014 **Target :** Target Met Relevant course level SLOs consistently show 75% or higher success rates. (04/14/2014) **Reflection (CLICK ON ? FOR INSTRUCTIONS):** Our SLO results for underlying courses indicate that students are indeed meeting this outcome across our program's offerings.	**Enhancement:** While our current data suggests that we are meeting this PLO, there remains considerable room for improvement with respect to our assessment methods. More specifically, we need to meet more regularly to facilitate in-person discussions about our pedagogy, involving more of our adjunct faculty. (04/14/2014)
Philosophy PLO_2 - Students should be familiar with the basic figures, texts, theories, problems, and ideas within the discipline of philosophy. **PLO Status:** Active **Year(s) to be Assessed:** 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 **Outcome Creation Date:** 04/27/2012	**Survey -** 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. **Target for Success:** Students who have taken 4 or more philosophy	**Program Review Reporting Year:** 2011-2012 **Target :** Target Met 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: "Identify an inductive argument": Intro 62/164, advanced	**Enhancement:** In subsequent discussions, the department leaders decided that a direct response to our survey findings should include the revival of our "Women in Philosophy" course, which had not been offered in several years. The course was offered in the fall of 2014, but did not garner sufficient enrollment to run. In response to this, the department chair aggressively advertised and recruited students across several departments, and

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)	Assessment Methods	Assessment Data Summaries	Enhancements
	courses at De Anza should be able to correctly answer 75% of the questions on the survey. **Comments/Notes:** Ramirez will collect question suggestions from the faculty, and write the online survey. The survey link will be emailed to all faculty by the end of week 5. Data will be collected by the end of week 7. We will reflect on the data during our department meeting toward the end of the quarter.	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 (06/18/2012) **Reflection (CLICK ON ? FOR INSTRUCTIONS):** The data have generated quite a bit of 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. 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. 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. **Related Documents:** De Anza Philosophy Department_ PLO2 Assessment Survey.xls	the course was successfully run in the fall of 2015. We are very pleased that the course has run again in 2016 with strong enrollment, and feel that this assessment cycle has contributed directly to the course becoming a staple of our future offerings. (09/30/2016) **Enhancement:** 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. 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. 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. (06/18/2012)

Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)	Assessment Methods	Assessment Data Summaries	Enhancements
ILO Critical Thinking - State criteria assessed in method and assessment data summary: • Analyze Arguments • Evaluate Ideas • Empathize With Different Perspectives • Utilize Symbols • Interpret Literary, Artistic, and Scientific Works **PLO Status:** Active **Outcome Creation Date:** 08/11/2013	**Exam - Course Test/Quiz -** I chose to focus on the "Utilize Symbols" criterion, as the Deductive Logic course features several assignments that focus closely on translating ordinary-language claims into a symbolic language, and then using symbolic notation to construct proofs. For this exercise, I focused on a particular question from a section of my final exam, in which students are asked to translate sentences into the language of predicate logic. The question is labeled #2 on the attached page.	**Program Review Reporting Year:** 2011-2012 **Target :** Target Met Of 30 students assessed, my findings were: "Above Level" 16 "At Level" 1 "Below Level" 13 (04/14/2014) **Reflection (CLICK ON ? FOR INSTRUCTIONS):** I was initially surprised by the discrepancy between my expected and actual results. It seems to me that there is a wide gap between students who have mastered the material at a high level and students who could benefit from a more thorough understanding.	**Enhancement:** I suspect that my teaching methods may be working well for my most motivated students, but that I would do well to look for ways to ensure that students performing 'below level' are taking advantage of course resources. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the students who perform best tend to be those who make most frequent use of extra-curricular practice. I might make extra practice required for students who are underperforming at the mid-term… (04/14/2014)