

Final Annual Instructional Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Introduction to The Program Review Process for Instructional Programs

Program Review at Foothill College

Purpose

An effective program review supports continuous quality improvement to enhance student learning outcomes and, ultimately, increase student achievement rates. Program review aims to be a sustainable process that reviews, discusses, and analyzes current practices. The purpose is to encourage program reflection, and to ensure that program planning is related to goals at the institutional and course levels.

Process

Foothill College academic programs that lead to an A.A./A.S. or Certificate(s), or are part of a specialized pathway, such as ESL, Developmental English, Math My Way are reviewed annually using this template, with an in-depth review occurring on a three-year cycle. The specialized pathways may be included as part of the program review for the department, or may be done as a separate document if they are not part of a department that offers a degree or certificate. Faculty and staff in contributing departments will participate in the process. Deans provide feedback upon completion of the template and will forward the program review on to the next stage of the process, including prioritization at the Vice Presidential level, and at OPC and PaRC.

Annual review will address five core areas, and include a place for comments for the faculty and the dean or director.

1. Data and trend analysis
2. Outcomes assessment
3. Program goals and rationale
4. Program resources and support
5. Program strengths/opportunities for improvement
6. Administrator's comments/reflection/next steps

Foothill College Program Review Cycle:

2011-2012 All academic programs participate in an annual program review

2012-2013 1/3 of academic programs participate in comprehensive review, remaining 2/3 of programs update their annual program review

Contact: Office of Instruction and Institutional Research, 650-949-7240

Instructions: Complete this template with data on any degree, certificate, or pathway your department offers. Return the completed form to your Dean on the last day of Fall quarter.

Website: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/index.php>

2011-2012 Submission Deadline:

All program review documents are due to Deans by December 16

Basic Program Information

Department Name: Philosophy

Program Mission(s): The mission of the Philosophy Department is to provide students with a disciplined introduction to the history of philosophy, as well as a clear understanding of the fundamental categories of philosophic discourse. Since philosophy is the origin and foundation of most academic subjects, a strong background in philosophy is useful, not just for philosophy majors, but for students in all disciplines. The philosophy department endeavors to provide these foundations particularly in the areas of logic and critical reasoning. In addition to providing students with a philosophic education, the department is dedicated to providing transfer students with the logical, analytical and critical reasoning skills necessary for success in university study.

Program review team:

Name	Department	Position
Brian Tapia	Philosophy	Professor

Programs* covered by this review

Program Name	Program Type (A.S., C.A., Pathway, etc.)	Units**
Philosophy	AA	90

*If you have a supporting program or pathway in your area for which you will be making resource requests, please analyze it within this program review. For example, ESLL, Math My Way, etc. You will only need to address those data elements that apply.

**Certificates of 27 or more units must be state approved. If you have certificates that are 27 or more units that are not state approved, please indicate your progress on gaining state approval, with the tentative timeline for approval, or your plan for phasing out the certificate.

Final Annual Instructional Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Section 1. Data and Trend Analysis

1.1. Program Data will be posted on:

<http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/programreviewdata.php> for all measures except non-transcriptable completion. Please attach all applicable data sheets to the final Program Review document submitted to your Dean. You may use the boxes below to manually copy data if desired.

Transcriptable Program	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	% Change
SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS				

Please provide any non-transcriptable completion data you have available.

Non-Transcriptable Program	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	% Change
SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS				

1.2 Department Data

Dimension	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	% Change
Enrollment	1144	1454	1336	-8%
Productivity (Goal: 546)	516	607	549	-10%
Success				
Full-time FTEF	2.9	3.1	3.2	2%
Part-time FTEF				
Full-time Staff	1	1	1	
Part-time Staff				

Department Course Data

Course	2008-2009			2009-2010			2010-2011		
	Enroll.	Prod.	Success	Enroll.	Prod.	Success	Enroll.	Prod.	Success
Ex. ART 1									
Ex. ART 2									

1.3 Using the data and prompts, provide a short narrative analysis of the following indicators.

1. Enrollment trends over the last three years: Is the enrollment in your program holding steady, or is there a noticeable increase or decline? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.

Final Annual Instructional Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Enrollment trends seem to have spiked uncharacteristically in 2009-2010 but are steadily increasing from 2008-2009 to 2010-2011. Part of this could be because we are offering fewer sections due to budget limitations. Another relevant difference is the fact that some of our courses (Phil 20 series, Phil 2 among others) are only offered every two years. The demand for these courses, though noticeably increasing, is far less than course like Philosophy 4. Thus, we offer them every two years for philosophy majors and other interested students to take. We offered them in 09-10 but not 10-11. We will be offering them again in Winter 2012 and it will be interesting to see if this affects the statistics. Perhaps this could justify offering them with more frequency.

2. Completion Rates (Has the number of degrees/certificates held steady, or increased or declined in the last three years? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.
 - a. AA, AS, transcriptable certificates
There have always been relatively few AA degrees given in philosophy. Students who focus on philosophy as a course of study are usually unconcerned with AA degrees. Philosophy students are far more concerned for transfer to a 4-year institution.
 - b. Local, non-State approved certificates
 - c. Certificates less than 27 units: All certificates less than 27 units should be reviewed carefully to determine if the certificate provides a tangible occupational benefit to the student, such as a job or promotion or higher salary, and documentation should be attached.
3. Productivity: The college productivity goal is 546. (Please analyze the productivity trends in your program and explain factors that affect your productivity, i.e. GE students, size restrictions)

Productivity rose to 607 in 2009 -2010, from 516 in 2008-2009. During 2010-2011 productivity went down to 549. Thus, again there is a spike during 2008-2009 and a gradual improvement from 08-09 to 10-11. The factors mentioned in section 1 regarding enrollment activity can be applied here.

4. Course Offerings (Comment on the frequency, variety, demand, pre-requisites.) Review the enrollment trends by course. Are there particular courses that are not getting the enrollment or are regularly cancelled due to low enrollment?)

Philosophy 1 has relatively low productivity due to the fact that it has a prerequisite of English 1a. We are currently looking into offering fewer sections of the course to increase productivity. The course was also formerly attached to Philosophy 50. Both courses were offered at the same time with the Phil 1 students meeting for an extra hour each week for more extensive writing instruction. We have since separated the courses to get a clearer picture of how each course performs on its own.

We are offering the 20 series courses once every 2 years, which continues to seem warranted. Each time they are offered they draw an average of 30 students. These are relatively specialized courses that focus on the historical progression of philosophy. Phil 4 and 8 continue to have strong productivity numbers as expected. Philosophy 7 has an increase in productivity which has prompted us to experiment with making this a course we offer every year, as opposed to every two years. Philosophy 2 also has a high productivity when offered. In the future, we may try running it with increased frequency.

5. Curriculum and SLOs

Final Annual Instructional Program Review Template for 2011-2012

- a. Comment on the currency of your curriculum, i.e. are all CORs reviewed for Title 5 compliance at least every three years and do all prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories undergo content review at that time? If not, what is your action plan for bringing your curriculum into compliance?

All courses are frequently reviewed for Title V compliance in accordance with the instruction of campus curriculum officers.

- b. Comment on program mapping and how it ties to the college Mission(s).

The construction of the Philosophy program and the course offerings are designed to facilitate transfer to 4-year institutions, as well life-long learning. Courses are all written and chosen to fulfill either IGETC or CSU GE requirements. Courses also serve to provide both a clear understanding of both the topics of philosophy, as well as the historical progression of these topics.

- c. Identify any other programs with which your program has overlap, and comment on the purpose of the overlap.

I don't know of any program overlap.

- d. Comment on any recent developments in your discipline which might require modification of existing curriculum and/or the development of new curriculum?

Philosophy is always expanding along with developments in all other fields, however at the foundations (logic, ontology, epistemology and axiology) it remains the same. At the level of community college philosophy course work, we are more concerned with laying the foundations necessary for more advanced philosophy. For example, understanding advancements in reductive empiricism, and its implications for neurobiological foundations of consciousness, will depend upon a clear understanding of empiricism as an epistemic theory and ontological theories of consciousness in general. In the past, in order to bring philosophy students into contemporary discussions we have given extra credit for university symposium attendance. Students seem to find this a valuable experience.

- e. Do all of the courses in your program have SLOs identified? Do all programs have program-level student learning outcomes? If not, what is your plan for completing these?

All SLOs are in place.

6. Basic Skills Programs (Please describe your Program's connection to this core mission, if applicable):
7. Transfer Programs: Articulation (Please describe your Program's connection to this core mission, if applicable)
8. CTE Programs: Labor/Industry Alignment (Please describe your Program's connection to this core mission, if applicable)

Section 2. Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

2.1. Attach 2010-2011 Program Level – Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

See attached.

2.2 Attach 2010-2011 Course-Level – Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat

See Attached.

Section 2 Continued: SLO Assessment and Reflection

2.3 Please provide observations and reflection below.

Course SLOs continue to reflect success in conveying course material.

2.3.a Course-Level SLO

What findings can be gathered from the Course Level Assessments?

Material continues to be disseminated effectively.

What curricular changes or review do the data suggest in order for students to be more successful in completing the program?

In some cases, the data seems to warrant a more concentrated discussion of core theoretical concepts. This seems to have a positive effect upon the outcomes when concepts are

How well do the CL-SLOs reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities students need in order to succeed in this program?

SLOs are of limited use in this capacity. Philosophy is a bit difficult to “boil down”. Thus testing for proficiency in any one skill or concept will never reflect what is needed for success, unless we make all SLOs measure logical proficiency.

How has assessment of course-level student learning outcomes led to improvement in student learning in the program?

At times the SLOs illuminate topics that are foggy for students, calling attention to the need for additions to course lessons.

2.3.b Program-Level SLO

What summative findings can be gathered from the Program Level Assessments?

We have yet to assess at the program level. This will take place in Spring 2012.

How has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?

N/A

Final Annual Instructional Program Review Template for 2011-2012

2.4 Annual Action Plan and Summary: Using the information above, list the program's action steps, the related Core Mission objective, SLO assessment data and the expected impact on student success.

Action Step	Related SLO assessment (Note applicable data)	Related ESMP Core Mission Goals (Basic Skills, Transfer, Work Force, Stewardship of Resources)	How will this action improve student learning/success?
1Review curriculum to determine adding new courses.	N/A	Increase the options available for students to transfer.	New courses would provide a broader understanding of philosophic topics
2 Clarify logic based offerings (phil 1, 7 and 50) in particular to clarify the difference between 1 and 50.		These courses all transfer in different ways and are valuable to different student populations. Clarifying the functions and value will help with transfer planning.	It will help students make course choices more effectively.

Section 3: Program Goals and Rationale

Program goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to Foothill's core missions, [Educational & Strategic Master Plan \(ESMP\)](#), the division plan, and SLOs.

3.1 Program relation to college mission/core missions

In order to provide a dynamic learning environment that fosters excellence, the logical, analytical and critical reasoning skills provided in philosophic study are fundamentally necessary. As mentioned in the mission statement the skills provided in a philosophic education help to facilitate any academic study and provide a strong foundation for university study.

3.2 Previous Program Goals from last academic year

Goal	Original Timeline	Actions Taken	Status/Modifications
1 More consistent philosophy club.	1 year	Since the interested students transfer so regularly it has been difficult to maintain student generated interest.	The goal has been modified to make an ethics bowl club that would compete in an annual ethics bowl. This will create a more sustained interest. However, this will depend upon availability of funding.
2 increase productivity	Annually	Hired a new adjunct professor who is steadily drawing high enrollment and engaging with students on campus	Though down from last years spike, we are improving steadily in the long view.
3			

Final Annual Instructional Program Review Template for 2011-2012

3.3 New Goals: Goals can be multi-year

Goal	Timeline (long/short-term)	Supporting Action Steps from section 2.4 (if applicable)	How will this goal improve student success or respond to other key college initiatives
1 clarify offerings.	6 months to get courses rewritten and articulated.		This will make clear which courses meet specific transfer goals of our students. In particular the critical thinking options for transfer.
2 Expand offerings	2 years to write courses and articulated		This will provide more options for transferable courses.
3increase student interest in philosophy program	Continuous		This will augment general interest in academic engagement.

Section 4: Program Resources and Support

4.1 Using the tables below, summarize your program's resource requests.

Full Time Faculty and/or Staff Positions

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
Full time faculty	variable	A full time faculty member would be invaluable in collaborating upon new material.	This would obviously be dependent upon budget concerns

Reassigned Time

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
N/A			

B Budget Augmentation

B Budget FOAP	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
Funds for possible ethic bowl attendance and lodging for students	2000	Increased interest in Philosophy.	

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities/Equipment Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
N/A			

One-time/Other: (Release time, training, etc.?)

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.3	Possible funding sources (Lottery, Measure C, Basic Skills, Perkins, etc.)
N/A			

Draft Annual Program Review Template for 2011-2012

Section 5: Program Strengths/Opportunities for Improvement

5.1 Use the matrix provided below and, reflect on the program relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the program's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities and challenges to the program. Consider external and internal factors, such as demographic, economic, educational, and societal trends. Some considerations may include current and future demand for the program, similar programs at other comparable institutions, and potential auxiliary funding.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	All courses provide transferable credits in either IGETC or CSU GE categories. Courses provide a strong foundation in philosophy.	Students that transfer from Foothill College to 4 year institutions report being very well prepared for upper division study. One of our recent transfers was, in his first quarter at UCR, invited to join a graduate seminar in Philosophy of Mind by a professor who was very impressed with his extensive background in philosophy.
Weaknesses	The Program continues to grow in enrollment and productivity, however numbers can definitely improve.	Perhaps we need to communicate better with counseling and other entities on campus to convey just how well our courses transfer to 4 year schools
Opportunities	Professional development leave will allow full time professor to take some courses that will help with expanding the curriculum. In particular, in developing an Aesthetics course and expanded course offerings in religious studies.	Courses offered at Stanford or Santa Clara extended study would be ideal.
Threats	State budget seems to be continuously threatening to reduce offerings.	State budget has just been cut by 1 billion for CC system.

5.2 Are there any critical issues you expect to face in the coming year? How will you address those challenges?

The budget seems to loom large for everyone. If sections have to be cut, we will scale back to a core group of courses that students need for transfer.

5.3 What statements of concern have been raised in the course of conducting the program review by faculty, administrators, students, or by any member of the program review team regarding overall program viability?

I haven't received statements of concern regarding program review

Draft Annual Program Review Template for 2011-2012

5.4 Address the concerns or recommendations that were made in prior program review cycles.

N/A

5.5 After reviewing the data, what strengths or positive trends would you like to highlight about your program?

We continue to increase enrollment over the long term. Courses that used to get enrollments of fewer than 20 students like Phil 7, 24, and the 20 series are starting to fill up when offered.

This trend has prompted us to offer these course with more frequency.

Section 6: Feedback and Follow Up

This section is for the Dean to provide feedback.

6.1 Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis: You have justified reasons for new faculty and provided excellent insight into your SLO's.

6.2 Areas of concern, if any: I would ask that if this is the time to be writing new curriculum in these tough budget times. It may be more beneficial to focus on what we have and possibly add more of the productive courses each quarter for the time being.

6.3 Recommendations for improvement: Very good work. I see no need to add anything else.

6.4 Recommended Next steps:

xx Proceed as planned on program review schedule

 Further review/Out of cycle in-depth review

Unit Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College Program (BSS-PHIL) - Philosophy AA

PL-SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Action & Follow-Up
<p>Program (BSS-PHIL) - Philosophy AA - 2 - Students will be able to critically analyze and evaluate arguments regarding issues of ethics and political philosophy.</p> <p>PL-SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essays will be used as an assessment tool. Students who have taken 3 or more courses in the program will compared with students who are taking their first philosophy courses at foothill.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p> <p>Target: Students who have taken 3 or more courses should have a clear understanding of ethical and political concepts as well as a well developed ability to apply logical principles to analysis and evaluation of arguments.</p>		
<p>Program (BSS-PHIL) - Philosophy AA - 1 - Students will be able to critically analyze and evaluate arguments regarding issues of metaphysics and epistemology.</p> <p>PL-SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essays will be used as an assessment tool. Students who have taken 3 or more courses in the program will compared with students who are taking their first philosophy courses at foothill.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p> <p>Target: Students who have taken 3 or more courses should have a clear understanding of metaphysical and epistemic concepts as well as a well developed ability to apply logical principles to analysis and evaluation of arguments.</p>		

Unit Course Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College Department - Philosophy (PHIL)

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 1 - CRITICAL THINKING & WRITING - SLO 1 - Identification of premises and conclusions - Identify and distinguish the constituent parts of an argument (premises and conclusion) within a persuasive text or speech. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Short media analysis essays to augment critical writing skills. Students will start reading newspapers and journals more actively and cite examples of informal fallacies and ambiguous statements found in these publications.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Assessment scores consistently indicate that students have a solid grasp of this material.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p> <p>Resource Request: A textbook that literally can take a student step-by- step through the various elements of critical thinking and writing.</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 1 - CRITICAL THINKING & WRITING - SLO 2 - Identification of common logical fallacies - Evaluate persuasive text or speech through the identification of common logical fallacies. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion forum in a more active manner, by rewarding students who pose good questions/issues that are relevant to this course.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p> <p>Target for Success: Identification of fallacies in newspapers and journals.</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - While this material takes a more concerted effort, I am pleasantly surprised that with practice most do very well. Assessments show that this part of the course is quite challenging because certain rules have to be memorized in order to gain mastery of this subject matter.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 11 - INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF ART - SLO 1 - major aesthetic theories - To identify major aesthetic theories, defined both in terms of individual thinkers (Plato, Aristotle) and schools of thought (Marxism, structuralism, etc.) (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
2012-2013 Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 11 - INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF ART - SLO 2 - critical analysis using aesthetic theories - To be able to use aesthetic theories to critically analyze works of art. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))		
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013 Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 2 - INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL & POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY - SLO 1 - Political theories of major philosophers - Identify significant political theories held by major philosophers (ex. Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Hegel etc.) and/or philosophic schools of thought. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion, comparing and contrasting philosophers.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The majority of students do very well with this. Much discussion is devoted to comparing and contrasting the various positions. A small portion of students seem to have trouble with distinguishing one philosopher from another. However, with the amount of discussion and review dedicated to this issue and the amount of review done in class, i suspect this confusion has more to do with poor preparation.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>
 Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 2 - INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL & POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments regarding aspects of political theory. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))	<p>Assessment Method: A series of short reflective essays, evaluation of contemporary perspectives using political theory upon which they are based.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Most students were able to do this at a satisfactory or better level. The most difficult thing for students in this course is overcoming their own perspective on politics. These common perspectives (right or left, conservative or liberal) are usually oversimplified versions of political theory that leave out things like justification complex arguments.</p> <p>Result:</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013		Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2010-2011</u>	
Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20A - Assessment Method: HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM SOCRATES THROUGH ST. THOMAS - SLO 1 - identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by major philosophers and/or philosophic schools of thought from the ancient through medieval periods. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))	Assessment Method: Periodic quizzes Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz	12/14/2011 - Most students were consistently able to answer questions with a 90% average or better. This is due to extensive preparation and review. Furthermore, considerable time was spent discussing the progression of the various theories regarding early ontological theory. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2010-2011</u>	12/14/2011 - Perhaps more periodic quizzes to encourage studying among the few under-performing students.
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013			
Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20A - Assessment Method: HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM SOCRATES THROUGH ST. THOMAS - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments from ancient through medieval period. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))	Assessment Method: Discussions of the different intellectual concerns during this period Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation	12/14/2011 - While this is usually the hardest part of this course, students did remarkably well on this. This is due to extensive discussions of the different intellectual concerns during this period. This historical context allows students to better explain and evaluate the arguments. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2010-2011</u>	12/14/2011 - Continue to improve and facilitate discussions of historical context.
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013			
Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20B - Assessment Method: HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM THE RENAISSANCE THROUGH KANT - SLO 1 - identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by	Assessment Method: Reading questions. Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz	12/14/2011 - The class average was 87%, with philosophy majors scoring mostly perfect scores. The material for the course is very difficult, ranging from early natural philosophy (astrophysics) to	12/14/2011 - Continue to move slowly through difficult philosophers and in some cases indicate key points repeatedly through out

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>major philosophers and/or philosophic schools of thought from the ancient through medieval periods. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>complex ontological theory. The class average is high, however it could be improved with more concentrated discussions on more difficult aspects. Though exceeding difficult at times, the content of this course is fixed by the history it is intended to examine. The course is IGETC transferable with present content. Philosophy majors who have transferred to 4-year institutions have reported that the course, though difficult helped them to be conversant in the philosophy of the period.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>lecture to keep students on track. Find a way to make 3 instead of 2 exams to break up the load.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20B - HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY FROM THE RENAISSANCE THROUGH KANT - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments from ancient through medieval period. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Evaluate arguments.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - While philosophy majors perform well on this, those who are taking the course for GE have a bit more difficulty. The difficulty arises from the fact that taken out of historical context, the arguments are based in relatively arcane assumptions (ex. Aristotelian physics).</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Again, not much can be done with the content without making the course less valuable to philosophy majors and sacrificing its status as a serious college course. Make a continued effort at drawing some connections between contemporary world view and the assumptions consistent with the period.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20C - CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY: 19TH & 20TH CENTURY THOUGHT - SLO 1 - identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by major philosophers and/or philosophic schools of thought from the ancient through medieval periods. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Test/Quiz</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Students performed very well despite the very difficult material. The course was heavily populated with philosophy majors and at least one visiting Phd candidate, so the results on the assessment were very good. However, there were 4 students who performed very low. The course is an IGETC transferable course and thus the content needs to be consistent with university study. To mitigate this, more time was spent on</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Perhaps more small group discussions would help those students that don't have more of an aptitude. However, these tend to be more time consuming and would limit the number of important philosophers covered. More frequent reading responses can spark discussion and focus student</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013 Course-Level SLO Status: Active		Result: more difficult philosophical systems (Hegel). Target Met: Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011	attention on key concerns. <hr/>
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20C - CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY: 19TH & 20TH CENTURY THOUGHT - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments from ancient through medieval period. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))	Assessment Method: Essay Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal	12/14/2011 - The results for this were quite good. The arguments in this course are so complex that considerable time was spent outlining the premises and conclusion. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011	12/14/2011 - Continue thorough outlining of arguments. <hr/>
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013 Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 24 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: EAST - SLO 1 - Eastern religion concept identification - Identify significant concepts, figures and religious thinkers from the eastern religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism Taoism, Chan, Zen etc.) (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))	Assessment Method: Final Exam Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz	12/14/2011 - The majority of students do better than 90%. This is due to a three tiered approach (reading, lecture and discussion) as well as consistent review. Students also seem to recognize ideas better when the issues can be applied to their own life. Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011	12/14/2011 - More inclusion of discussion time where students can discuss how the issues are relevant to their life. Continuation of reflective analysis essays. This allows students to analyze ideas and then apply them. Perhaps more video from religious figures. Currently liberal use of internet sources and DVD are employed. However, more current videos could be used at the media center. <hr/>
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013 Course-Level SLO Status: Active			
Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 24 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: EAST - SLO 2 - identification of eastern	Assessment Method: Essays Assessment Method Type:	12/14/2011 - Students are successful in this, however there are often more difficulty in explaining the concepts. As with many new and	12/14/2011 - More emphasis on drawing out reflective examples from them. Perhaps more

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>religion concepts - Identify and explain historically important religious concepts from the eastern religions. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p>	<p>Essay/Journal</p>	<p>culturally unfamiliar concepts, it is easier to identify the idea than it is to explain. Students who are most successful seem to use my examples rather than develop their own.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p>	<p>assignments that draw out reflection on key points in the reading. There are already two papers that focus on this point, however there may be room for smaller reading responses.</p>
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 25 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: WEST - SLO 1 - Identification of Western religion concepts - Identify significant concepts, figures and religious thinkers (ex. Moses, Zoroaster, Jesus, Muhammad etc.) from the Western religious traditions. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quizzes</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Students would be able to identify key figures with more ease when I put a brief outline at the beginnings of my lectures of the major figures and themes to be covered each session.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - More time for the students to interact with the instructor to ask questions and clarify issues. on scheduled chat room times for students to come together and chat with me and with one another.</p>
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 25 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: WEST - SLO 2 - Western religious figures and theories - Explain and evaluate historically important Western religious figures and theories. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essays</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Some students had difficulty with this aspect of the course. As mentioned in the reflection for SLO #2 more interaction would serve to alleviate this problem in online courses such as this.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - I will be instituting from now on scheduled chat room times for students to come together and chat with me and with one another. I gave this a trial in May and invited a guest scholar and I received a lot of good feedback and many more students showed up than expected. This served as confirmation that this was a real need.</p>
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 4 - INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY - SLO 1</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - here has been significant improvement due to changes in lecture</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>- identification of significant theories - Identify significant theories held by major philosophers (ex. Plato, Descartes, Hume, Sartre etc.) and/or philosophic schools of thought (ex. ontological dualism, materialism idealism etc.) (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p>	<p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>presentations. Problem areas from previous assessments have been given more attention and supplemented with extra material (ex. handouts with isolated argumentative structures).</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 4 - INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY - SLO 2</p> <p>- evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion/Participation</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - There has been good improvement on this outcome. This is most likely due to spending more time on historical placement of philosophical ideas and arguments.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 50 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - SLO 1 - Identification of premises and conclusions - Identify and distinguish the constituent parts of an argument (premises and conclusion) within a persuasive text or speech. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Paper focused on arguments and non-arguments</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - My most important findings from the data were how many students, even those who had previous degrees, have difficulty at the beginning of the class being able to distinguish an argument from a non-argument, and being able to pick out the conclusion from the premises. Students did improve over the term, but in class exercises were more important to learning this than merely explaining the definitions.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - More time will be spent on assignments that engage students to find and identify arguments from newspapers, magazines, ads, web, etc. Continue focus on papers that engage students to be able to identify the argument in a passage, and then ask them to respond to the passage by presenting their own argument.</p>
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 50 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - SLO 2 - Identification of common logical fallacies - Evaluate persuasive text or speech through the identification of common logical fallacies. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quiz</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Students, even those with degrees, had difficulty with fallacies in the beginning. There is a tendency for the students to not understand that informal fallacies are often generated by context. So, for example, after teaching students about statistical fallacies, students often want to assume that any argument that contains statistics must be fallacious. Continued work in this area does help students to begin to recognize that picking out fallacies requires thinking about the content presented.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Having students focus on explaining why an argument is fallacious as opposed to merely identifying name of the fallacy helps students focus on what is really wrong with the argument as opposed to just labeling the argument without comprehension.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56 - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in relevant concepts. - Students will demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012</p> <p>Start Date: 11/29/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56 - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 Start Date: 11/30/2011 End Date: 11/30/2015 Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56X - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in concepts. - Students will demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))		
Start Date: 11/30/2011 End Date: 11/30/2015 Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56X - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))		
Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 Start Date: 11/30/2011 End Date: 11/30/2015 Course-Level SLO Status: Active	Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Y - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in concepts - Students will		

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012</p> <p>Start Date: 11/30/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Y - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012</p> <p>Start Date: 11/30/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Z - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Proficiency in concepts - Students will demonstrate proficiency in concepts relevant to the special project subject matter as determined by professor and student. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012</p> <p>Start Date: 11/30/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 56Z - SPECIAL PROJECTS IN PHILOSOPHY - Critical analysis - Students will be able to critically analyze arguments relevant to the material to be determined by student and teacher. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012</p>		
<p>Start Date: 11/30/2011</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 7 - INTRODUCTION TO SYMBOLIC LOGIC - SLO 1 - deductive arguments - Determine whether a deductive argument is valid or invalid. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 7 - INTRODUCTION TO SYMBOLIC LOGIC - SLO 2 - symbolic form - Successfully translate real language arguments into symbolic form. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p>			

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p> <p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 8 - ETHICS - SLO 1 - Ethical theories - Identify and explain major ethical theories. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quizzes for each new ethical theory</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - 90% of the students tested were able to explain these concepts with a high to moderate degree of accuracy. This is considerably better than the previous quarter where only 60% were able to accurately explain these concepts. This is due to increased emphasis on class discussion of the concepts in question with steady reinforcement. This is important due to the relative importance of these concepts in the later part of the course.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The inclusion of a very short introduction to logical problems that are likely to arise in the section under discussion. Currently these logical issues are discussed in the context of the articles under consideration. Upon review, it may be more effective to teach simplified examples of certain logical problems, in particular, Fallacies of presumption need to be emphasized. The supplemental logic primer could be in the form of collaborative learning exercises. This could even take the form of a game to off-set the drudgery of analyzing abstracted logical concepts.</p>
		<p>12/14/2011 - There is significant improvement due to increased focus on details of the theories and their justifications. In addition, the inclusion of quizzes for each new ethical theory has increased the student's ability to identify key points</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Minor improvements to existing quizzes, continuation of the increased discussion around these topics.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 8 - ETHICS - SLO 2 - Ethical arguments - Analyze and evaluate ethical arguments regarding contemporary social issues. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quiz</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - The answers received seem to suggest a lack of interest in less controversial social issues like global hunger and issues of economic justice in general. Perhaps it is the case that such issues presume a familiarity that only a fraction of the students have. These suggests changes to issues that are more familiar. Students</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Revision of the course reader to include issues of contemporary concern (terrorism and interrogation, drug policy including medical marijuana, paternalism regarding smoking etc.)</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Reflection/Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Assessment Cycles: 2011-2012 2012-2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>tend to do best with issue that are familiar and are taken to a new level of disciplined analysis. When background in economic or political theory have to be introduced, the interest tends to be more limited.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2010-2011</u></p>	