Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

For Academic Programs

Informed by your assessment activities related to student learning, what changes have you made in your degree program in the last three to five years? Describe the changes (e.g., curriculum revision, new courses, faculty development), the general results that prompted the changes (e.g., student performance on an assessment measure), and any impact on student learning that you might attribute to these changes.

In light of our ongoing outcomes assessment efforts, we have continued to refine our measurement instruments and to collect data relevant measuring student learning outcome achievement. We identified the accurate communication of philosophical positions and arguments as a weak point for our students, and we agreed to included assignment focussed on that particular skill in our upper level, W designated classes. Since introducing those assignments, student performance has improved significantly.

Mission / Purpose

The department’s mission is to offer a wide range of undergraduates the benefits of rigorous philosophy courses and to promote and advance philosophy by encouraging original philosophical research by the faculty.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Identify Philosophers, Positions and Arguments

Students will be able to identify important philosophers, philosophical positions, and arguments for and against those positions.

Connected Document

Philosophy BA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:

Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Methods of measuring this outcome will be revised in the coming year, in consultation with the new professor who will be teaching PHL 201.

Related Measures

M 1: Embedded Exam Items

Multiple choice items evaluating this outcome will be embedded in tests in PHL 100, PHL 211, and PHL 212.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:

No target.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met

PHL 100

Fall 2013

This course uses a pretest and post-test that do not distinguish between Outcomes 1 and 2.

Fall 004 & 005

66 students, mean pretest 45/100, mean post-test 67/100, p < 1 x 10^-12

PHL 211

Fall 2013

Pretest: n=36, mean=15/50, std=13, var=163

Post-test: n=36, mean=46/50, std=5.6, var=31

t-test p = 1 x 10^-16. Statistically significant improvement

PHL 212

Spring 2012

Pretest: n=35, mean=26/50, std=12

Post-test: n=35, mean=43/50, std=8.7

t-test: p = 4 x 10^-10. Statistically significant improvement.

M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items

Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:

No target.
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
12 students responded to this item on the senior survey. The mean rating was 8.75, with a standard deviation of 1.48. Though this result is higher than last years, it is not statistically significant at the p < 0.05 level.

SLO 2: Analysis of Positions and Arguments
Students will be able to analyze the philosophical positions and arguments of key figures in the history of philosophy.
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Related Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): New methods of measuring this outcome will be developed in consultation with the new professor who will be teaching PHL 251.

Related Measures

M 1: Embedded Exam Items
Multiple choice items evaluating this outcome will be embedded in tests in PHL 100, PHL 211, and PHL 212.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met

PHL 100
This course uses a pretest and post-test that do not distinguish between Outcomes 1 and 2.
Fall 004 & 005
66 students, mean pretest 45/100, mean post-test 67/100, p < 1 x 10^-12

PHL 211
Outcome 2
Pretest (out of 50): n=36, mean=32, std=9.6, var=9.2
Post-test (out of 50): n=36, mean=33, std=11, var=132
$t$-test $p = .25$. Improvement not statistically significant.

PHL 212
Pretest: n=35, mean=32/50, std=11
Post-test: n=36, mean=35/50, std=12
$t$-test: $p = 0.086$. Improvement statistically significant at the .10 level.

M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
12 students responded to this item on the senior survey. The mean rating was 8.92, with a standard deviation of 1.38. Though this result is higher than last years, it is not statistically significant at the p < 0.05 level.

M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses
A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
A total of 30 papers were evaluated for this outcome. Their mean score was 7.2/12, with a median of 7/12. The average score for the subitems of this rubric was 1.8/3, which is just below our performance criterion of 2/3 for baccalaureate candidates. 14 of the 30 papers scored at the bachelor level or better overall. The weakest area of performance was in application of existing philosophical work, where 16 out of 27 scored below the bachelor level. This was also the weakest area last year.

These overall results are not statistically significantly different from last year's.

**SLO 4: Communicate Philosophy in Writing**
Students will be able to use effective writing skills to communicate philosophical problems, positions, and arguments.
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**Relevant Associations**:
Student Learning Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The department will develop a handout that will be customized to suit each upper-level class and distributed to students taking upper-level coursework, with advice on what a student needs to do to meet this outcome in her writing. Additional data will continue to be gathered to help establish a performance baseline.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items**
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
11 students responded to the survey, giving a mean rating of 9.18, with a standard deviation of 1.08. The difference with last year is not statistically significant.

**M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses**
A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
30 papers were evaluated. Their mean score was 10.4/15, and their median was 10/15 (SD=2.8, variance=7.7), which are at or above our benchmark for bachelor level performance. The average score for each subitem was 2.1, which is above our bachelor level criterion score of 2. 19 of the 30 papers scored at the bachelor level or better overall.

This mean score is not statistically significantly different from last year's.

**M 4: Compare to Previous Year**
2011-12’s results from the rubric evaluating Student Learning Outcome 4 (Communicate Philosophy in Writing) will be compared to the 2010-11 to see if there was improvement.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target.

**SLO 5: Methods of Contemporary Philosophy**
Students will be able to apply the methods of contemporary philosophy to a broad range of philosophical problems.
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**Relevant Associations**:
Student Learning Outcome #n Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): No improvement actions will be taken until future measurements indicate an unacceptable level of achievement.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items**
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
11 students responded to this item on the senior survey. Mean rating was 9.27, with a standard deviation of .9.

**M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses**
A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
29 papers were evaluated for this outcome. Their mean score was 5.6/9, and the median score was 6/9 (SD=1.8, variance=3.3). Our benchmark for bachelor level performance is 6/9, and 18 of the 29 papers (62%) met that benchmark. The average subcategory score was 1.9, which is just below the 2/3 criterion score for bachelor level performance.

These results are not statistically significantly different from last year's.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OtherOtcm 6: Department Outcome: Opportunities to do Philosophy
The department will offer students a satisfying opportunity to pursue their interest in philosophy in and out of the classroom.

Related Measures
M 5: Senior Survey Items
Our annual senior satisfaction survey will include items relating to students' in-class experience.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
11 students responded to this item, giving a mean rating of 8.9/10 (variance 5.49, standard deviation 2.3).

M 6: Senior Survey Items
Our annual senior satisfaction survey will include items relating to students' out-of-class experience.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
This item was added to the 2013-14 survey incorrectly, and should be updated for the 2014-15 survey. The most similar item, "overall experience as a philosophy major at UA," received an average score of 8.64/10 (st. dev. 2.66, variance 7.05), in 11 responses.

OtherOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Prepare Students for Graduate/Professional School
The department will help to prepare students for graduate or professional school.

Related Measures
M 7: Senior Survey Items
We will collect data, through our annual senior survey, of the number of our majors who applied to graduate or professional schools and the number who were accepted.

Source of Evidence: Graduate/professional school acceptance rate

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Of the four students responding, one reported applying to a master's program in philosophy, one to a Ph.D. program in philosophy, and two to other graduate/professional programs (non-law or medical). Two students reported having been accepted to programs.

M 8: Test Scores
We will ask our senior majors and minors who take the GRE, MCAT, or LSAT to let us know their scores.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Four students reported GRE scores: 485, 324.5, 318, 325, 314. Students tended to report only composite scores, so their overall percentile ranks are unknown. It is not known what the score of 485 means, as the
maximum possible composite GRE score now 346.

One student reported an LSAT score, 167, which is in the 94.5th percentile.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Update Senior Survey on GRE
Update the senior survey to ask for subscores on the GRE, as students tend to report only composite scores, which are not as useful.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Test Scores | Outcome/Objective: Department Outcome: Prepare Students for Graduate/Professional School

OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Familiarize Students with Philosophy
The department will familiarize an increasingly large number of students with important philosophers, philosophical views, and the arguments for those views.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The department will not take action to improve performance with respect to this outcome until future measurements indicate an unacceptable decrease in our achievement of the outcome.

Related Measures

M 9: Total Enrollment
We will compare total enrollment in our classes this year to the enrollment last year.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other
Target:
No target.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Fall 2013 credit hour production was 4,262, and spring 2014 credit hour production was 4,122, for total production of 8,384.

The fall production is 9.7% higher than fall 2012.
The spring production was 10% lower than spring 2013.
Production overall in 2013-14 was 1% lower than 2012-13.

M 10: Pre- and Post Tests
We will conduct pretests and post-tests in some of our high-enrollment, lower-level classes to see how well they increase students' familiarity with the philosophers, views, and arguments addressed in them.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery
Target:
No target.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
PHL 211, Fall 2013
Pretest (out of 100) n=36, mean=47, std=15, var=215; Postest n=36, mean=79, std=13, var=163. T-test p=1.4 x 10^-13, showing statistically significant improvement.

PHL 100
Fall 004 & 005
66 students, mean pretest 45/100, mean post-test 67/100, p < 1 x 10^-12

OthOtcm 9: Department Outcome: Research Contributions
The department faculty will make significant research contributions to the discipline.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Measurement for this outcome in the future will be done by looking at the FAR scores for research assigned by the chair each year, in hopes of establishing a performance baseline.

Related Measures

M 11: FAR Research Ratings
The department chair will provide anonymized FAR research ratings for department members.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other
Target:
No target.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
For 2013-14, the mean research rating on faculty FARs was 4.9 (variance = 0.18). The median rating was 5, and the mode was 4.5 (three faculty members). These numbers are very similar to last year's numbers.

**M 12: FAR Publications and Presentations Data**
We will collect data on the number of publications and talks faculty members report on their faculty activity reports.

**Source of Evidence:** Activity volume

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
The department produced 6 publications (averaging .75 per faculty member) and department members gave 11 professional talks (averaging 1.4 per faculty member).

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
The department produced 6 publications (averaging .75 per faculty member) and department members gave 11 professional talks (averaging 1.4 per faculty member).

**OthOtcm 10: Department Outcome: Public Awareness of Philosophy**
The department will contribute to public awareness of philosophy, by making philosophical ideas, issues, and arguments accessible to non-professionals beyond our classes.

**Relevant Associations:**
Department Outcome #5 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): In next year's Philosophy Today lecture series, more care will be taken to gather precise attendance numbers. We will also collect sales data for the textbooks and popular books written by department members each year. Until future measurements indicate an unacceptable decline in the achievement of this outcome, no additional improvement actions will be taken.

**Related Measures**

**M 13: General/Student Audience Publications**
We will collect data on the number of philosophical publications for general or student audiences produced by faculty during the year, including textbooks written or edited, philosophical articles or opinion pieces published in popular outlets, etc., and the sales data for textbooks and popular books written by department members.

**Source of Evidence:** Activity volume

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Department members produced two new publications for general or student audiences, and completed revised editions of two books aimed at students, and they gave three talks to such audiences. Total sales of textbooks and books for general audiences by department members were over 52,000 (with the bulk of these coming from one department member's books).

**M 14: General Public Presentations**
We will collect data on the number of philosophical presentations or lectures faculty members give for audiences of non-philosophers, the number of such presentations or lectures sponsored by the department, and the attendance at public presentations and lectures sponsored by the department.

**Source of Evidence:** Activity volume

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
In 2013-14, the department continued the Philosophy Today speaker series and continued its participation in supporting the ALLELE series. Attendance at the four Philosophy Today talks averaged 130 people, with a high of 275 and low of 50. Department members gave three talks to general audiences

**OthOtcm 11: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

**Related Measures**

**M 15: Program Review**
Internal Program Review conducted every 8 years. (Most recent 2010-11)

**Source of Evidence:** Administrative measure - other

**Target:**
No target.

**OthOtcm 12: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

**Related Measures**

**M 18: Credit Hour Production**
University statistics on undergraduate semester credit hour production, number of undergraduate courses and sections offered, and number of students in the program for the last three fall semesters and their relation to the departmentally agreed optimum of 60 credit hours per course section offered.

**Source of Evidence:** Administrative measure - other

**Target:**
60 credit hours per course section offered

**Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
Total credit hour production in fall 2013 and spring 2014 was 8,384, with 70 sections offered, for an average of
119.7 hours produced per section.

Our courses are still heavily overenrolled, and we missed the target of 60 credit hours per section by 100%.

**M 19: ACHE Viability standards**
University statistics on the number of degrees in the undergraduate major in the last August+December+May and their relation to ACHE viability standards.

*Source of Evidence: Professional standards*

**Target:**
Average of 7.5 graduates per year over a three year period.

*Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met*
The program produced 16 graduates from summer 2013 through spring 2014, easily satisfying the ACHE viability standard.

**OthOtcn 13: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Related Measures**

**M 16: Senior Survey Data**
Data obtained from the University’s Graduating Senior Survey.

*Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made*

**Target:**
No target

**M 17: Senior Survey Data**
Data obtained from the departmental Senior Survey.

*Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made*

**Target:**
No target

*Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met*
11 students rated their overall experience as a philosophy major at UA on our senior survey. The average rating was 8.8, and 10 of them rated their experience 8 or better.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Update Senior Survey**
Some items on the departmental senior survey were omitted in the transition to the new survey software. They surveys will be updated to include those items.

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

*Implementation Status: Planned*

*Priority: High*

**Update Senior Survey on GRE**
Update the senior survey to ask for subscores on the GRE, as students tend to report only composite scores, which are not as useful.

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

*Implementation Status: Planned*

*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

*Measure: Test Scores | Outcome/Objective: Department Outcome: Prepare Students for Graduate/Professional School*
Mission / Purpose

The department’s mission is to offer a wide range of undergraduates the benefits of rigorous philosophy courses and to promote and advance philosophy by encouraging original philosophical research by the faculty.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Identify Philosophers, Positions and Arguments

Students will be able to identify important philosophers, philosophical positions, and arguments for and against those positions.

Connected Document
Philosophy BA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Methods of measuring this outcome will be revised in the coming year, in consultation with the new professor who will be teaching PHL 201.

Related Measures

M 1: Embedded Exam Items

Multiple choice items evaluating this outcome will be embedded in tests in PHL 100, PHL 211, and PHL 212.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

PHL 100: In this course, the pretest and post-test draw randomly from a large database of questions, so overall results are all that can be reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Mean Pretest</th>
<th>Mean Post-test</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 004 &amp; 005</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>$p &lt; 1 \times 10^{-42}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 001</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$p &lt; 1 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 005</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$p = 1 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHL 211: 23 students took the pre-test and post-test for this outcome. Pretest mean was 17/100, and post-test mean was 44/100. A paired t-test shows this improvement to be statistically significant.

PHL 212: The number of items measuring this outcome in PHL 212 (formerly 251) was increased to 5 each on the pretest and post-test. Average score on the pretest was 28/50, and average score on the post-test was 45/50. This improvement is significant with $p << 0.01$.

M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items

Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

6 students responded to this item on the senior survey. The mean rating was 8.5, with a standard deviation of 1.52 and variance of 2.3. Though this result is higher than last years, it is not statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

SLO 2: Analysis of Positions and Arguments

Students will be able to analyze the philosophical positions and arguments of key figures in the history of philosophy.
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Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): New methods of measuring this outcome will be developed in consultation with the new professor who will be teaching PHL 251.

Related Measures

M 1: Embedded Exam Items
Multiple choice items evaluating this outcome will be embedded in tests in PHL 100, PHL 211, and PHL 212.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: No Target

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
PHL 100: In this course, the pretest and post-test draw randomly from a large database of questions, so overall results are all that can be reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Mean Pretest</th>
<th>Mean Post-test</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 004 &amp; 005</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>$p &lt; 1 \times 10^{-42}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 001</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$p &lt; 1 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 005</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$p \approx 1 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHL 211: 23 students took the pre-test and post-test for this outcome. Pretest mean was 35/100, and post-test mean was 37/100. A paired t-test shows this improvement not to be statistically significant.

PHL 212: The number of items measuring this outcome in PHL 212 (formerly 251) was increased to 5 each on the pretest and post-test. Average score on the pretest was 28/50, and average score on the post-test was 45/50. This improvement is significant with $p << 0.01$.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Improve Measurement
The number of items measuring SLO 2 on the pretest and post-test in Early Modern Philosophy will be increased.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Embedded Exam Items | Outcome/Objective: Analysis of Positions and Arguments

M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department’s senior survey.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target: No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
6 students responded to this item. Their mean rating was 7.8, with a median of 8, a standard deviation of 1.6, and variance of 2.57. These results are not significantly different from last year’s.

SLO 3: Familiarity with Contemporary Philosophy
Students will demonstrate familiarity with important, ongoing debates in contemporary philosophy.
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Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): No improvement actions will be taken until future measurements indicate an unacceptable level of achievement of this outcome.

Related Measures
M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department’s senior survey.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target: No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
6 students responded to this item. The mean rating was 8.5, with a variance of 1.1 and standard deviation of 1. These results are nearly identical to last year’s.

M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses
A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
A total of 27 papers were evaluated for this outcome. Their mean score was 8/12, with a median of 8/12 (SD=2, variance=4.4). The average score for the subitems of this rubric was 2/3, which is at our performance criterion of 2/3 for baccalaureate candidates. 18 of the 27 papers scored at the bachelor level or better.
The weakest area of performance was in application of existing philosophical work, where 9 out of 27 scored below the bachelor level.

In previous years, characterization of key arguments has been a weak point for our students, but this year all but four of them performed at the bachelor degree level or better.

**SLO 4: Communicate Philosophy in Writing**

Students will be able to use effective writing skills to communicate philosophical problems, positions, and arguments.
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**Relevant Associations:**

Student Learning Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The department will develop a handout that will be customized to suit each upper-level class and distributed to students taking upper-level coursework, with advice on what a student needs to do to meet this outcome in her writing. Additional data will continue to be gathered to help establish a performance baseline.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items**

Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

6 students responded to the survey, giving a mean rating of 9.17, with a variance .57 and standard deviation of .75. This is a better result than last year, but the difference is not statistically significant.

**M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses**

A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

27 papers were evaluated. Their mean score was 11/15, and their median was 11/15 (SD=2, variance=4), which are above our benchmark for bachelor level performance. The average score for each subitem was 2.8, which is above our bachelor level criterion score of 2. 25 of the 27 papers scored at the bachelor level or better overall.

**M 4: Compare to Previous Year**

2011-12’s results from the rubric evaluating Student Learning Outcome 4 (Communicate Philosophy in Writing) will be compared to the 2010-11 to see if there was improvement.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Of the 27 papers evaluated, 25 met this goal at the bachelor degree level or greater. This is a substantial improvement over previous years.

**SLO 5: Methods of Contemporary Philosophy**

Students will be able to apply the methods of contemporary philosophy to a broad range of philosophical problems.
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**Relevant Associations:**

Student Learning Outcome #n Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): No improvement actions will be taken until future measurements indicate an unacceptable level of achievement.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items**

Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department’s senior survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

This item was accidentally omitted from 2012-13 version of the senior survey, and so no data are available.

**M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses**

A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
27 papers were evaluated for this outcome. Their mean score was 5.9/9, and the median score was 6/9 (SD=1.4, variance=1.9). Our benchmark for bachelor level performance is 6/9, and 19 of the 27 papers (70%) met that benchmark. The average subcategory score was 2, which is at the 2/3 criterion score for bachelor level performance.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 6: Department Outcome: Opportunities to do Philosophy
The department will offer students a satisfying opportunity to pursue their interest in philosophy in and out of the classroom.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Continue monitoring these data and include year-to-year comparison in annual report.

Related Measures

M 5: Senior Survey Items
Our annual senior satisfaction survey will include items relating to students’ in-class experience.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
No target.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
6 students responded to this item, giving a mean rating of 9.3/10 (variance .27, standard deviation .52).

M 6: Senior Survey Items
Our annual senior satisfaction survey will include items relating to students' out-of-class experience.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
No target.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This item was accidentally omitted from the 2013 survey.

OthOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Prepare Students for Graduate/Professional School
The department will help to prepare students for graduate or professional school.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The senior survey will be modified to improve score reporting for the GRE, MCAT, and LSAT and to include an item asking whether students have been admitted to graduate or professional schools they applied to. Students will also be asked in the late Spring whether they have been admitted to graduate or professional school.

Related Measures

M 7: Senior Survey Items
We will collect data, through our annual senior survey, of the number of our majors who applied to graduate or professional schools and the number who were accepted.

Source of Evidence: Graduate/professional school acceptance rate
Target:
No target.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Of the six students responding to the survey, 3 reported that they had applied to graduate or professional school (2 to law school, 1 to a nurse practitioner postgraduate program). All three report that their applications were successful.

M 8: Test Scores
We will ask our senior majors and minors who take the GRE, MCAT, or LSAT to let us know their scores.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No target.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
One student reported GRE scores: 161/158/5.0. The corresponds to the 87th percentile in verbal reasoning, 72nd percentile in quantitative reasoning, and 93rd percentile in analytical writing.

Two students reported LSAT scores, 168 (95.8th percentile) and 158 (73.7th percentile).

OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Familiarize Students with Philosophy
The department will familiarize an increasingly large number of students with important philosophers, philosophical views, and the arguments for those views.
Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The department will not take action to improve performance with respect to this outcome until future measurements indicate an unacceptable decrease in our achievement of the outcome.

Related Measures

M 9: Total Enrollment
We will compare total enrollment in our classes this year to the enrollment last year.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012 total credit hour production was 3,882. This was a 9% decrease from the previous year, but it was higher than the average of the preceding five years.

M 10: Pre- and Post Tests
We will conduct pretests and post-tests in some of our high-enrollment, lower-level classes to see how well they increase students' familiarity with the philosophers, views, and arguments addressed in them.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery

Target:
No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
PHL 100: Students in three sections took pretests and post-tests in this course. Results are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Mean Pretest</th>
<th>Mean Post-test</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 004 &amp; 005</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>p &lt; 1 x 10^-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 001</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>p &lt; 1 x 10^-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 005</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>p ≈ 1 x 10^-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHL 211: 46 students took the pretest and post-test. The mean pretest score was 53%, and mean post-test score was 81%. This improvement is statistically significant (p < 1 x 10^-6).

PHL 212: 32 students took the pretest and post-test. The mean pretest score was 60/100, and the mean post-test score was 81/100. This improvement is statistically significant (p << .005).

OthOtcm 9: Department Outcome: Research Contributions
The department faculty will make significant research contributions to the discipline.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Measurement for this outcome in the future will be done by looking at the FAR scores for research assigned by the chair each year, in hopes of establishing a performance baseline.

Related Measures

M 11: FAR Research Ratings
The department chair will provide anonymized FAR research ratings for department members.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 2012-13, the mean research rating on faculty FARs was 4.55 (variance = 0.45). The median rating was 4.95, and the mode was 5 (four faculty members). These numbers are very similar to last year’s numbers.

M 12: FAR Publications and Presentations Data
We will collect data on the number of publications and talks faculty members report on their faculty activity reports.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

Target:
No target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The department produced 12 publications (averaging 1.3 per faculty member) and department members gave 12 professional talks (averaging 1.3 per faculty member).

OthOtcm 10: Department Outcome: Public Awareness of Philosophy
The department will contribute to public awareness of philosophy, by making philosophical ideas, issues, and arguments accessible to non-professionals beyond our classes.
Relevant Associations:

Department Outcome #5 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): In next year's Philosophy Today lecture series, more care will be taken to gather precise attendance numbers. We will also collect sales data for the textbooks and popular books written by department members each year. Until future measurements indicate an unacceptable decline in the achievement of this outcome, no additional improvement actions will be taken.

Related Measures

**M 13: General/Student Audience Publications**

We will collect data on the number of philosophical publications for general or student audiences produced by faculty during the year, including textbooks written or edited, philosophical articles or opinion pieces published in popular outlets, etc., and the sales data for textbooks and popular books written by department members.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Department members produced six publications for general or student audiences, and they gave three talks to such audiences. Total sales of textbooks and books for general audiences by department members were over 52,000 (with the bulk of these coming from one department member's books).

**M 14: General Public Presentations**

We will collect data on the number of philosophical presentations or lectures faculty members give for audiences of non-philosophers, the number of such presentations or lectures sponsored by the department, and the attendance at public presentations and lectures sponsored by the department.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

In 2012-13, the department continued the Philosophy Today speaker series and continued its participation in supporting the ALLELE series. Attendance at the four Philosophy Today talks averaged 90 people, with a high of 111 and low of 71.

Department members gave three talks to general audiences.

**OthOtcm 11: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality**

The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

**M 15: Program Review**

Internal Program Review conducted every 8 years. (Most recent 2010-11)

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Next review planned for 2018.

**OthOtcm 12: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment**

The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

Related Measures

**M 18: Credit Hour Production**

University statistics on undergraduate semester credit hour production, number of undergraduate courses and sections offered, and number of students in the program for the last three fall semesters and their relation to the departmentally agreed optimum of 60 credit hours per course section offered.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

**Target:**

60 credit hours per course section offered

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**

In Fall 2012, department SCH production was 3,882, and we offered 43 course sections. This amounts to about 90 hours per course section. Thus, our courses were again heavily overenrolled, and we missed our target by 50%.

**M 19: ACHE Viability standards**

University statistics on the number of degrees in the undergraduate major in the last August+December+May and their relation to ACHE viability standards.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**Target:**

Average of 7.5 graduates per year over a three year period.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

The program produced 28 graduates in 2012-13, easily meeting the ACHE viability standard.

**OthOtcm 13: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates**

The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures
M 16: University Senior Survey Data
Data obtained from the University's Graduating Senior Survey.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 17: Senior Survey Data
Data obtained from the departmental Senior Survey.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Students responding to our senior survey rated their overall experience as a philosophy major at UA 9.3 out of 10, with no students rating their experience below 9/10.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Focus on Accuracy of Student Writing
In the 2011-12 academic year, teachers of W designated courses in the department will incorporate work in their courses aimed directly at improving students' abilities to characterize arguments on philosophical issues and to communicate philosophical positions accurately and clearly. We will continue to monitor student performance on SLO's 3 and 4, and we will compile a list of what we are doing in our classes to improve student performance with respect to those outcomes. In 2012-13, teachers of these courses incorporated specific assignments targeting these goals.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Improve Measurement
The number of items measuring SLO 2 on the pretest and post-test in Early Modern Philosophy will be increased.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Embedded Exam Items | Outcome/Objective: Analysis of Positions and Arguments

Update Senior Survey
Some items on the departmental senior survey were omitted in the transition to the new survey software. They surveys will be updated to include those items.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Mission / Purpose

The department's mission is to offer a wide range of undergraduates the benefits of rigorous philosophy courses and to promote and advance philosophy by encouraging original philosophical research by the faculty.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Identify Philosophers, Positions and Arguments
Students will be able to identify important philosophers, philosophical positions, and arguments for and against those positions.

Connected Document
Philosophy BA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Methods of measuring this outcome will be revised in the coming year, in consultation with the new professor who will be teaching PHL 201.

Related Measures

M 1: Embedded Exam Items
Multiple choice items evaluating this outcome will be embedded in tests in PHL 100, PHL 201, and PHL 251.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
PHL 100: In this course, the pretest and post-test draw randomly from a large database of questions, so overall results are all that can be reported. The 83 students who took both had an average score of 38% on the pretest and 77% on the post-test. A paired t-test shows this improvement to be significant with \( p \ll 0.001 \).

PHL 251: The 35 students who took the pretest and post-test in this course had an average score of 2.3 out of 8 on the pretest and 6.2 out of 8 on the post-test. A paired t-test shows this improvement to be significant with \( p \ll 0.001 \).

M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target: No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Ten students took the department's annual senior survey. The mean rating they gave themselves for this outcome was 7.1 out of 10, and the median was 8. These results were similar to last year.

SLO 2: Analysis of Positions and Arguments
Students will be able to analyze the philosophical positions and arguments of key figures in the history of philosophy.

Connected Document
Philosophy BA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): New methods of measuring this outcome will be developed in consultation with the new professor who will be teaching PHL 251.

Related Measures

M 1: Embedded Exam Items
Multiple choice items evaluating this outcome will be embedded in tests in PHL 100, PHL 201, and PHL 251.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: No Target

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met
PHL 100: In this course, the pretest and post-test draw randomly from a large database of questions, so overall results are all that can be reported. The 83 students who took both had an average score of 38% on the pretest and 77% on the post-test. A
paired t-test shows this improvement to be significant with $p < 0.001$.

PHL 251: The 35 students who took the pretest and post-test averaged 1.5/2 on the pretest and 1.9/2 on the post-test. A paired t-test shows this improvement to be significant with $p < 0.05$. The number of items measuring this outcome was small, and it is planned to include more of them in the future.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Improve Measurement**

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Embedded Exam Items  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Analysis of Positions and Arguments

**M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items**

Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

**Source of Evidence:** Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:** No target.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

Ten students took the senior survey. Their mean self-assessment was 7.5/10, with a median of 8 and a mode of 9 (4 students). These results are similar to last year, but down slightly.

**SLO 3: Familiarity with Contemporary Philosophy**

Students will demonstrate familiarity with important, ongoing debates in contemporary philosophy.

**Connected Document**

Philosophy BA Curriculum Maps

**Relevant Associations:**

Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): No improvement actions will be taken until future measurements indicate an unacceptable level of achievement of this outcome.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items**

Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

**Source of Evidence:** Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:** No target.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

Ten students took the senior survey. Their mean self-assessment was 8.5/10, with a modal response was 8 (4 students, with another 5 rating 9 or 10). These results are better than last year's.

**M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses**

A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:** No target.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met**

A total of 45 papers were evaluated for this outcome. Their mean score was 7.8/12, with a median of 8/12. The average score for the subitems of this rubric was 1.9 / 3, which is just below our performance criterion of 2/3 for baccalaureate candidates. 25 of the 45 papers scored at the bachelor level or better overall. The weakest area of performance was in characterizing key arguments on philosophical issues, where 15 out of 45 scored below the bachelor level.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Focus on Accuracy of Student Writing**

In the 2011-12 academic year, teachers of W designated courses in the department will incorporate work in their courses aimed directly at improving students' abilities to characterize arguments on philosophical issues and to communicate philosophical positions accurately and clearly. We will continue to monitor student performance on SLO's 3 and 4, and we will compile a list of what we are doing in our classes to improve student performance with respect to those outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
**SLO 4: Communicate Philosophy in Writing**

Students will be able to use effective writing skills to communicate philosophical problems, positions, and arguments.

**Connected Document**
[Philosophy BA Curriculum Maps](#)

**Relevant Associations:**
Student Learning Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The department will develop a handout that will be customized to suit each upper-level class and distributed to students taking upper-level coursework, with advice on what a student needs to do to meet this outcome in her writing. Additional data will continue to be gathered to help establish a performance baseline.

**Related Measures**

**M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items**
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

*Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made*

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Ten students took the senior survey. Their mean self-assessment for this outcome was 8.6/10, with a median and mode of 9 (6 students). Eight of the ten students rated themselves at 9 or 10 on this outcome, and the other two rated themselves at 7.

**M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses**
A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.

*Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric*

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Partially Met**
Forty seven papers were evaluated. Their mean score was 10/15, and their median was 10/15, which are precisely at our benchmark for bachelor level performance. The average score for each subitem was 2, which is at our bachelor level criterion score of 2. Twenty seven of the 47 papers (57%) scored at the bachelor level or better overall.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

**Focus on Accuracy of Student Writing**
In the 2011-12 academic year, teachers of W designated courses in the department will incorporate work in their courses aimed directly at improving students’ abilities to characterize arguments on philosophical issues and to communicate philosophical positions accurately and clearly. We will continue to monitor student performance on SLO’s 3 and 4, and we will compile a list of what we are doing in our classes to improve student performance with respect to those outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses

*Outcome/Objective: Communicate Philosophy in Writing*
| Familiarity with Contemporary Philosophy

**M 4: Compare to Previous Year**
2011-12’s results from the rubric evaluating Student Learning Outcome 4 (Communicate Philosophy in Writing) will be compared to the 2010-11 to see if there was improvement.

*Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other*

**Target:**
No target.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Met**
In 2010-11, 67% of papers evaluated demonstrated performance at or above the bachelor level in their communication of philosophy in writing. In 2011-12, this percentage dropped to 57%.

**SLO 5: Methods of Contemporary Philosophy**

Students will be able to apply the methods of contemporary philosophy to a broad range of philosophical problems.

**Connected Document**
[Philosophy BA Curriculum Maps](#)

**Relevant Associations:**
Student Learning Outcome #5 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): No improvement actions will be taken until future measurements indicate an unacceptable level of achievement.

**Related Measures**
M 2: Senior Survey Self-evaluation Items
Students will self-evaluate this outcome on the department's senior survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Ten students took the senior survey. Their mean self-assessment for this outcome was 8.5/10, with median and mode of 9 (5 students). Seven out of 10 rated themselves 9 or 10 out of 10 on this outcome.

M 3: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses
A rubric evaluating this outcome will be applied to term papers written by senior philosophy majors in upper level classes, and to honors theses written by students in the department.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Thirty nine papers were evaluated for this outcome. Their mean score was 5.9/9, and the median score was 6/9. Our benchmark for bachelor level performance is 6/9, and 26 of the 39 papers (67%) met that benchmark. The average subcategory score was 2.6, which is just above the 2/3 criterion score for bachelor level performance.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 5: Program Review
Internal Program Review conducted every 8 years. (Most recent 2010-11)

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
No target.

OthOtcm 7: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

Related Measures

M 6: Credit Hour Production
University statistics on undergraduate semester credit hour production, number of undergraduate courses and sections offered, and number of students in the program for the last three fall semesters and their relation to the departmentally agreed optimum of 60 credit hours per course section offered.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target:
60 credit hours per course section offered

M 7: ACHE Viability standards
University statistics on the number of degrees in the undergraduate major in the last August+December+May and their relation to ACHE viability standards.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

OthOtcm 8: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 8: Senior Survey Data
Data obtained from the University's Graduating Senior Survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

M 9: Senior Survey Data
Data obtained from the departmental Senior Survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

OthOtcm 9: Department Outcome: Opportunities to do Philosophy
The department will offer students a satisfying opportunity to pursue their interest in philosophy in and out of the classroom.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Continue monitoring these data and include year-to-year comparison in annual report.

Related Measures

M 10: Senior Survey Items
Our annual senior satisfaction survey will include items relating to students’ in-class experience.
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

Target: No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Ten students took the senior survey. Their average assessment of this outcome was 7.9/10, with median and mod of 9 (4 students).

M 11: Senior Survey Items
Our annual senior satisfaction survey will include items relating to students’ out-of-class experience.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

Target: No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Ten students assessed this outcome on the senior survey. Their mean assessment was 7.6/10, with median and mode of 7 (5 responses).

OthOtcm 10: Department Outcome: Prepare Students for Graduate/Professional School
The department will help to prepare students for graduate or professional school.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The senior survey will be modified to improve score reporting for the GRE, MCAT, and LSAT and to include an item asking whether students have been admitted to graduate or professional schools they applied to. Students will also be asked in the late Spring whether they have been admitted to graduate or professional school.

Related Measures

M 12: Senior Survey Items
We will collect data, through our annual senior survey, of the number of our majors who applied to graduate or professional schools and the number who were accepted.

Source of Evidence: Graduate/professional school acceptance rate

Target: No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Of the ten students responding, 4 had applied for postgraduate work of some kind, and one intends to apply later. One of these students applied to an MA program in philosophy, 2 applied to law school, and one applied to another graduate or professional program.

M 13: Test Scores
We will ask our senior majors and minors who take the GRE, MCAT, or LSAT to let us know their scores.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
One student took the GRE, scoring 1390 total, 590 Verbal (80th percentile) and 800 Quantitative (99th percentile). Four students took the LSAT, scoring 158 (74.6 percentile), 166 (93.2 percentile), 153 (55.6 percentile), and 157 (70.9 percentile). The average LSAT score was 159 (77.6 percentile).

OthOtcm 11: Department Outcome: Familiarize Students with Philosophy
The department will familiarize an increasingly large number of students with important philosophers, philosophical views, and the arguments for those views.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): The department will not take action to improve performance with respect to this outcome until future measurements indicate an unacceptable decrease in our achievement of the outcome.

Related Measures

M 14: Total Enrollment
We will compare total enrollment in our classes this year to the enrollment last year.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target: No target.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Fall 2011 credit hour production was 4,284, a 2% increase over fall 2010. Spring 2012 production was 4,146, a 5% increase over Spring 2011. Overall, 2011-12 production was 8,430 hours, a 3% increase over 2010-11.
M 15: Pre- and Post Tests
We will conduct pretests and post-tests in some of our high-enrollment, lower-level classes to see how well they increase students’ familiarity with the philosophers, views, and arguments addressed in them.

Source of Evidence: Faculty pre-test / post-test of knowledge mastery
Target: No target.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
In PHL 100, 83 students took the pretest and post-test. The mean pretest score was 38%, and the mean post-test score was 77%. A paired t-test shows this difference is significant with p <<<< 0.001.

In PHL 251, 35 students took the pretest and post-test. The mean pretest score was 39/100, and the mean post-test score was 80/100. A paired t-test shows that this improvement is significant with p <<<< 0.001.

OthOtcm 12: Department Outcome: Research Contributions
The department faculty will make significant research contributions to the discipline.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Measurement for this outcome in the future will be done by looking at the FAR scores for research assigned by the chair each year, in hopes of establishing a performance baseline.

Related Measures
M 16: FAR Research Ratings
The department chair will provide anonymized FAR research ratings for department members.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other
Target: No target.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The average FAR scholarship rating for the department's tenure-track faculty was 4.6, with a median of 4.8 and a mode of 5 (3 faculty members). The FAR rating for the chair himself was estimated to be no lower than the rating provided by the dean two years ago. Not counting that estimate, the mean was 4.7 and the median was 5.

M 17: FAR Publications and Presentations Data
We will collect data on the number of publications and talks faculty members report on their faculty activity reports.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume
Target: No target.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
The department produced nine publications (just over 1 per faculty member), and department members gave 16 (2 per faculty member) professional talks.

OthOtcm 13: Department Outcome: Public Awareness of Philosophy
The department will contribute to public awareness of philosophy, by making philosophical ideas, issues, and arguments accessible to non-professionals beyond our classes.

Relevant Associations:
Department Outcome #5 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): In next year’s Philosophy Today lecture series, more care will be taken to gather precise attendance numbers. We will also collect sales data for the textbooks and popular books written by department members each year. Until future measurements indicate an unacceptable decline in the achievement of this outcome, no additional improvement actions will be taken.

Related Measures
M 18: General/Student Audience Publications
We will collect data on the number of philosophical publications for general or student audiences produced by faculty during the year, including textbooks written or edited, philosophical articles or opinion pieces published in popular outlets, etc., and the sales data for textbooks and popular books written by department members.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume
Target: No target.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Department members produced a total of 5 publications for general or student audiences: including one textbook written and two edited. In 2011, well over 52,000 copies of textbooks written or edited by our faculty were sold --- sales of one faculty members books were 52,511.

M 19: General Public Presentations
We will collect data on the number of philosophical presentations or lectures faculty members give for audiences of non-philosophers, the number of such presentations or lectures sponsored by the department, and the attendance at public presentations and lectures sponsored by the department.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**Target:**

No target.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

The department sponsored 4 Philosophy Today talks and cosponsored the talks in the ALLELE series. The attendance at the department's public Philosophy Today talks was counted. The four talks has attendances of 71, 128, 70, and 75. Total attendance was 344, and the median attendance was 73.

Department members gave six lectures for general audiences.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Focus on Accuracy of Student Writing**

In the 2011-12 academic year, teachers of W designated courses in the department will incorporate work in their courses aimed directly at improving students' abilities to characterize arguments on philosophical issues and to communicate philosophical positions accurately and clearly. We will continue to monitor student performance on SLO's 3 and 4, and we will compile a list of what we are doing in our classes to improve student performance with respect to those outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Upper Level Term Papers and Honors Theses | Outcome/Objective: Communicate Philosophy in Writing
- Measure: Familiarity with Contemporary Philosophy | Outcome/Objective: Communicate Philosophy in Writing

**Improve Measurement**

The number of items measuring SLO 2 on the pretest and post-test in Early Modern Philosophy will be increased.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- Measure: Embedded Exam Items | Outcome/Objective: Analysis of Positions and Arguments
**Curriculum Maps #1 (In which courses are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)**

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to identify important philosophers, philosophical positions, and arguments for and against those positions.</td>
<td>Students will be able to analyze the philosophical positions and arguments of key figures in the history of philosophy.</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate familiarity with important, ongoing debates in contemporary philosophy.</td>
<td>Students will be able to use effective writing skills to communicate philosophical problems, positions, and arguments.</td>
<td>Students will be able to apply the methods of contemporary philosophy to broad range of philosophical problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHL 101</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 201</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 251</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL Electives</td>
<td>I, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-level Coursework</td>
<td>R, M, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum Maps #2 (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses for each SLO)**

Indicate which measure is being obtained in which course by typing “Measure n.n” in the appropriate cell. If you’d rather use a description of the measure, that is fine. Also, indicate the year/semester in which the measure will be obtained (e.g., Fall 2011). Student learning outcomes must be assessed at least once within a 2-year period. Note that a measure does not need to be obtained from every course in which an outcome is covered (see Map #1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Test Items</th>
<th>Rubric; measured every semester, assessed in fall of odd numbered years</th>
<th>Rubric; measured every semester, assessed in fall of odd numbered years</th>
<th>Rubric; measured every semester, assessed in fall of odd numbered years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHL 101</td>
<td>Test Items Measured every fall; assessed in spring of even years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 201</td>
<td>Test Items Measured every fall; assessed in spring of even years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 251</td>
<td>Test Items Measured every spring, assessed in spring of even years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHL Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-level Coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>Rubric; measured every semester, assessed in fall of odd numbered years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>