

BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Review is about documenting the discussions and plans you have for improving student success in your program and sharing that information with the college community. It is also about linking your plans to decisions about resource allocations. With that in mind, please answer the following questions.

Program/Department Name:

Division Name:

Please list all team members who participated in this Program Review:

Name	Department	Position
Brian Tapia	Philosophy	Professor

Number of Full Time Faculty: **Number of Part Time Faculty:**

Please list all existing Classified positions: *Example: Administrative Assistant I*

SECTION 1: PROGRAM REFLECTION

1A. Program Update: Based on the program review [data](#), please tell us how your program did last year. We are particularly interested in your proudest moments or achievements related to student success and outcomes.

The program increased enrollment by 23.8% and improved WSCH by 23.4%. This was due largely to expanding and improving our online offerings to meet the needs of students all over California. Our Ethics courses in particular have become popular with students meeting various credential requirements in EMT, nursing and accounting programs. Our Introductory philosophy course online has become popular with students seeking more affordable options for completing GE courses at UC schools.

1B. Program Improvement: What areas or activities are you working on this year to improve your program? Please respond to any feedback from the supervising administrator from last year's program review.

We are working to continue the departmental growth. We are also working to expand course offerings by revising our aesthetics course and writing a course in Philosophy of Science. We will also consult with the division dean to look for ways to improve our productivity.

1C. Measures of Success: What data or information will you use to measure your success (e.g. student success rates, changes in student or program learning outcomes)?

1D. EMP Goal: The 2015-2020 Educational Master Plan (EMP) includes the following goal:
"Create a culture of equity that promotes student success, particularly for underserved students."

Based on the program review [data](#), tell us some of the things your program will be doing this year to support this goal. You will be asked to report on any accomplishments on your next comprehensive program review.

This can be a difficult issue in philosophy given that our ADT agreement requires rigorous curriculum involving use of primary philosophic literature. One way we further the mission of equity is by scaffolding material that is difficult. In particular, I invert the lesson so that I give examples before the concept. By themselves philosophic ideas can be obscure, but if one begins with examples and discussions that are relatable to the students and their concerns, one can then introduce the difficult concept. Another effort we can make this year is to increase efforts to have students come to office hours for individual instruction and intervention. We can also make an effort encourage philosophy students who have been successful to apply to the tutoring center so that they can provide supplemental support for underserved students.

SECTION 2: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES & RESOURCE REQUESTS

2A. New Program Objectives: Please list any new objectives (do not list your resource requests).

Program Objective	Implementation Timeline	Progress Measures
<i>Example: Offer 2 New Courses to Meet Demand</i>	<i>Winter 2016 Term</i>	<i>Course Enrollment</i>
Offer Philosophy 11 (newly revised).	Winter 2017 (pending articulation).	Course Enrollment.
Offer Philosophy 12 (new course).	Spring 2017 (Pending approval).	Course Enrollment.
Improve enrollment and productivity.	Spring 2017	enrollment and productivity data.

2B. Resource Requests: Using the table below, summarize your program's unfunded resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee (OPC) [website](#) for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information.

Resource Request	\$	Program Objective (Section 2A)	Type of Resource Request			
			Full-Time Faculty/Staff Position	One-Time B-Budget Augmentation	Ongoing B-Budget Augmentation	Facilities and Equipment
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2C. Unbudgeted Reassigned Time: Please list and provide rationale for requested reassign time.

--

SECTION 3: LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

3A. Attach 2014-2015 Course-Level Outcomes: Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat. Please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

3B. Attach 2014-2015 Program-Level Outcomes: Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat. Please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

SECTION 4: FEEDBACK AND FOLLOW-UP

This section is for the Dean/Supervising Administrator to provide feedback.

4A. Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

Philosophy is an outstanding department offering quality instruction to many Foothill students. The department has been working on improving productivity and enrollment, with excellent results to show. Enrollment grew by 23% while productivity increased by 4.9%. I commend the faculty for developing a Philosophy of Science course which is a typical course offered at 4 year schools for science and philosophy majors. I anticipate that this will serve a different pool of students who may not usually elect to take a philosophy course. With the hiring of a new full time member this academic year, I anticipate that this program will continue on a growth mode with greater offerings for students.

4B. Areas of concern, if any:

Faculty are taking appropriate measures to address issues of inequity in course success

4C. Recommendations for improvement:

I recommend collaborating with the rest of the division in developing non-credit curriculum for tutoring in areas such as reading and writing for the social sciences.

4D. Recommended Next Steps:

- Proceed as Planned on Program Review Schedule
- Further Review / Out-of-Cycle In-Depth Review

Upon completion of Section 4, the Program Review document should be returned to department faculty/staff for review, then submitted to the Office of Instruction and Institutional Research for public posting. Please refer to the Program Review timeline.

Unit Course Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College Department - Philosophy (PHIL)

Mission Statement: 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.

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
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>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>	11/30/2015 - Steady improvement primarily with extensive 1 on 1 feedback for assignments. Limited success with group exercises for students who struggle with the material at first; for students who are unfamiliar with analyzing arguments before this course, they must be allowed to try and fail, and then have their failures explained specifically.	
Course-Level SLO Status: Active		Content: Extensive assigned readings of arguments on 2 or more sides of controversial issues, with an constant emphasis that summary of the opposing side that expresses their view on their terms is essential for any successful counter-argument; with each topic, I re-emphasize only if you can show that you truly understand someone who disagrees can you have any chance of persuading them otherwise. Therefore content varies widely in its source, since I am determined to find the most persuasive text for each take on issues. An even amount each week of theoretical material (ie, definition of premise and argument, types of argument) and topical material (ie, debates about abortion or police brutality) Method: In-class debates, both formal and informal, constant class discussion and participation, in-class group-projects that emphasize applying course material to topics that they students select. Assignment: Primary assignments include polemics, being short essays structured to	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>respond to an opposing argument, and graded in-class debates.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>10/07/2014 - The average score on the first exam was 82 percent. Students showed that they could consistently determine the constituent parts of an argument in an effort to diagram the argument. The accuracy rate for identifying the conclusion was well over 85 percent. Student performance remained strong even with the longer and more complex passages. These results were consistent with what was observed in the classroom.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>11/04/2013 - Students showed that they could with regularity determine whether a short passage contained an argument. This included distinguishing arguments from explanations, illustrations, and mere opinions. Student performance remained strong even with the longer and more complex passages. Overall, the accuracy on these questions on the first exam was well over 50%.</p> <p>These results were consistent with what was observed in the classroom. For the most part, during class discussion, students were very good at discerning whether a passage contained an argument.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred:</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>2012-2013</p> <p>09/21/2012 - While students initially have great difficulty with this task once it is applied pieces that are not specifically designed for teaching purpose, i.e., editorials, arguments in magazines, by the end of the term most students have a strong handle on different processes and guides to finding the conclusion and premises within material that is not written in a clear strict argument format.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</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>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>11/30/2015 - Finding: In-class lecture, discussion, and readings with corresponding quizzes yielded good results in terms of memorizing and identifying examples of fallacies. I found it helpful to emphasize some fallacies as more "meta" than others, notably the "straw-man" fallacy. Students who struggle a great deal with the material, as with SLO 1, respond best to 1 on 1 feedback.</p> <p>Content: Reading that defines and gives examples of several fallacies, as well as multiple choice quizzes and tests to check in with students' understanding of the material.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Method: In addition to quizzes and tests, group exercises that emphasize identifying fallacies in newspaper editorials and newscasts. Limited (tactful) emphasis on identifying fallacies in each others performance during in-class debates.</p> <p>Assignment: The aforementioned short-essay assignment (polemic), in which the students must structure a short essay as a counter argument to an editorial that they disagree with, encourages them to identify fallacies. Early in the course, as the primary fallacies are introduced, there are also specific exercises in not only identifying fallacies, but correcting them.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>10/07/2014 - The average score on the final exam was 75 percent. Taking out the two lowest scores (which were significantly lower than the rest of the batch), however, the average was an 82 percent. Students were strong in identifying fallacies of relevance, including ad hominem, appeal to pity, appeal to fear, appeal ignorance, and appeal to tradition. The fallacies that students had the most difficulty identifying were begging the question, straw man, as well as some fallacies of ambiguity (amphiboly and equivocation). In addition, students demonstrated the ability identify these logical fallacies in a longer argument (argument for CA Proposition 37). All of the students identified over half of the fallacies present in the argument. Students also, showed competence in challenging the acceptability of premises and hidden assumptions.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>11/04/2013 - The average score on the fallacies section on the final exam was around 70.3%. Taking out the two lowest scores (which were significantly lower than the rest of the batch – 26%, 37%), however, the average came out to about 76%.</p> <p>Students were strong in identifying fallacies of relevance, including ad hominem, appeal to pity, appeal to fear, appeal ignorance, and appeal to tradition. Like most classes I have taught in the past, the fallacies that students had the most difficulty identifying were begging the question, straw man, red herring. Students also had difficulty distinguishing amphiboly with equivocation and composition with division, even though they were warned in advance about conflating these fallacies.</p> <p>Generally, students were less accurate when identifying fallacies contained in longer passages on the exam. In the future, I feel it would be beneficial for me to provide more examples of longer passages that commit fallacies. This, I think, will get students more accustomed to identifying fallacies in these longer-type passages.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</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:</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>(Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion, comparing and contrasting philosophers.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>09/16/2015 - The 70% of consistently participating students were able to identify significant theories with reasonable accuracy. The areas most common for mistakes were when the theories were either similar or used the same terminology. For example, Locke, Hobbes and Rousseau and the idea of the state of nature or social contract. At times students would get the idea right and attribute it to the wrong thinker. Results are good, but perhaps I need to develop an exercise that emphasizes such distinctions.</p>	<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p>
		<p>10/06/2014 - 60% of students were able to discuss major political theories and their application competently enough to participate productively. 30% showed an exceptional ability to synthesize major concepts and theories into their own views and even call ideas into critical analysis. Only 10% seemed to consistently not be able to identify or understand major theories presented.</p>	<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</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>12/14/2011 - Develop more reading response assignments that could provide incentive under-motivated students.</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2010-2011</u></p>	
<p>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>	<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>09/16/2015 - The vast majority of students did very well in this. I find that when they apply these often dry theories to issues of contemporary importance, they really develop an understanding of the importance of such theories. Reading about Hamilton or Plato on the difficulties that arise from democracy is made much more interesting when analyzing contemporary politics. This always seems to be the area in which students excel in this course. Only a very small number of students wrote in a way that did not reflect a developed philosophic understanding. Still fewer wrote in a way that merely expressed popular talking points on the issues.</p>	
<p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2014-2015</u></p>	<p>10/06/2014 - The majority of these were excellent. However, many had a hard time distinguishing the finer points of social contract theory. This was especially a concern where ideas were similar, but in disagreement (Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, etc). I was prompted to review the distinctions based on the essay responses.</p>
		<p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2013-2014</u></p>	<p>10/06/2014 - Spend more time contrasting contract theory philosophers.</p>
		<p>09/21/2012 - Students are able, by the end of the term, to identify the foundational assumptions and the arguments which follow from these assumptions regarding issues such as private property, the social contract, justification for government, the role of government, and</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>institutional structures in relationship to issues of justice. Students are also able to identify key figures within these debates such as Plato, Hobbes, Locke, Marx, Nozick, Rawls, and Mill.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</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: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>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))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method Type: Periodic quizzes</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>11/19/2015 - Students were introduced to the major works of the most prominent philosophers and schools of philosophy from the ancient to the medieval periods in the history of western philosophy. Students were asked to critically evaluate every philosopher's work and students were asked to write critical reviews about the theories under discussion. Every student was asked to also participate in a classroom debate regarding some controversial issues in the field of political theories and ethical theories. Students learn to not only reflect on their personal ideas on a particular theory under discussion but also learn to appreciate and analyze the thoughts of fellow thinkers.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred:</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>2014-2015</p> <p>01/25/2013 - Students were very successful in identifying the distinct theories of the major philosophers of this period. The class average was 85%. This is to be expected in a class where roughly 75% of the students had taken at least one philosophy course. However, even among the students who were new to the study of philosophy, the success rate was very good</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Perhaps more periodic quizzes to encourage studying among the few under-performing students.</p>
<p>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))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method Type: Discussions of the different intellectual concerns during this period</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>11/19/2015 - Student scores from evaluation of arguments made by the major academic philosophers suggest that they were well acquainted with the prominent arguments in the areas of Metaphysics, Epistemology and Ethics. Students showed high interest in the historical facts as well as theoretical richness of the philosophical arguments regarding various metaphysical issues the most. Students were encouraged to form groups and review fellow student's views about the Philosophical arguments as well.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred:</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>2014-2015</p> <p>01/25/2013 - Around 20% of the students could reasonably discuss the arguments under consideration and explain them with an acceptable degree of accuracy. Among this lowest group, the evaluation never really went beyond my own as presented in lecture. 80% of the class were able to not only identify and evaluate the arguments being made, but were able to level compelling criticisms of the theories themselves that went well beyond what was presented in lecture. In a few cases, the students even critiqued the professor's assessment of the argument as presented in lecture.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
		<p>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.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Continue to improve and facilitate discussions of historical context.</p> <hr/>
<p>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 major philosophers and/or philosophic schools of thought from the 17th and 18th century European tradition. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p>	<p>Reading questions.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>10/23/2014 - Students were introduced to the major works of the most prominent philosophers and schools of philosophy from the ancient to the medieval periods in the history of western philosophy. Students were asked to critically evaluate every philosopher's work and students were asked to write critical reviews about the theories under discussion. Every student was asked to also participate in a classroom debate regarding some controversial issues in the field of political theories and ethical theories. Students</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
Start Date: 10/06/2014 End Date: 10/25/2028 Course-Level SLO Status: Active		learnt to not only reflect on their personal ideas on a particular theory under discussion but also learnt to appreciate and analyze the thoughts of fellow thinkers.	
		Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014 10/06/2014 - The lowest scores on this quiz was 85%. Nearly all students achieved perfect scores identifying major theoretical points and indicating the appropriate philosopher.	
		Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014 10/10/2013 - Student consistently were able to identify significant theories on written exams with scores of 90% or better.	
		Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013 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 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.	12/14/2011 - Continue to move slowly through difficult philosophers and in some cases indicate key points repeatedly through out lecture to keep students on track. Find a way to make 3 instead of 2 exams to break up the load.

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 20B - Assessment Method: 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>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Evaluate arguments.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>10/23/2014 - Student scores from evaluation of arguments made by the major academic philosophers suggest that they were well acquainted with the prominent arguments in the areas of Metaphysics, Epistemology and Ethics. Students showed high interest in the historical facts as well as theoretical richness of the philosophical arguments regarding various metaphysical issues the most. Students were encouraged to form groups and review fellow student's views about the Philosophical arguments as well.</p>	
		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	
		<p>10/06/2014 - Students in this course performed exceptionally on this. Only one student gave a book report on the articles he chose. All others were very strong in providing a critical evaluation of the material. In one case, the student took on a philosopher towards whom I had expressed derision. I was forced to reevaluate based upon her argument.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	
		<p>10/10/2013 - Students made impressive critical assessments of modern philosophers. Nearly all made clear and informed arguments. 20 percent made very interesting arguments regarding parallels between ancient thinkers and later philosophic and scientific developments.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</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 19th century to the present.</p> <p>(Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Start Date: 09/20/2012</p> <p>End Date: 09/25/2015</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Test/Quiz</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>11/04/2013 - Just over 70% were able to identify major theories and philosophers with scores of 85% or better. Only 5% scored below C.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>09/20/2012 - Students continue to do well in identifying and explaining theories and concepts in this course. Despite the extreme difficulty of some the thinkers in the course, students seem to consistently rise to the challenge. It may also be the case that students in 20c have a particular interest in philosophy.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</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</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</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>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 more difficult philosophical systems (Hegel).</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>more time consuming and would limit the number of important philosophers covered. More frequent reading responses can spark discussion and focus student attention on key concerns.</p> <hr/>
<p>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 19th and 20th centuries.</p> <p>(Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 10/10/2013</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essay</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>10/10/2013 - Nearly all students performed above 90% on midterm examinations. The first thought was that the difficulty was too low. After further consideration, it was clear that this group was particularly motivated, not just by academic advancement, but a intellectual curiosity that the instructor found both enlivening and at times overwhelming.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - Continue thorough outlining of arguments.</p> <hr/>
<p>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.)</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Final Exam</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>09/15/2015 - Nearly all students enrolled were able to identify significant concepts on the final exam. 70% were able to do so with a grade of 90% or better. While the concepts can be different and literally foreign, extensive discussion and application to real life situations help to crystallize these concepts for students.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>(Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p>	
		<p>10/23/2014 - Student assignments, papers and test scores suggest a deep understanding into the major concepts of the Eastern Religions. Students seem to be highly enthusiastic about learning the history and philosophical thoughts in major religions. Every student was also required to visit a place of religious organization and write a narrative of what they experienced and learnt from the visit. Every student felt a sense of being well equipped with greater understanding about the various faiths of the world for which they had wonder about. Students were encouraged to contact the instructor to gain further insights by either emailing their questions or comments or by classroom discussions. Student's insights and assignments suggest how their knowledge and understanding about the significant concepts and religious thinkers had grown with the introduction of such a huge variety of thinkers/theories from several religions across the East.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	
		<p>11/04/2013 - Most students scored above 95% in this area. This was a very curious, highly motivated group of students.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
		<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 24 - COMPARATIVE WORLD RELIGIONS: EAST - SLO 2 - identification of eastern religion concepts - Identify and explain historically important religious concepts from the eastern religions. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essays Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>09/15/2015 - Students struggle at times explaining the most difficult aspects of these religious systems. However, when asked to reflect upon how these concepts are relevant to issues of personal concern, students consistently are able to do so in a way that is faithful to the idea under consideration. For example, a student may only have a crude understanding of the metaphysical concepts such as impermanence, and the stages of interdependent co-arising in Buddhism. However, in reflecting upon how the concept affects them, their understanding is clear and even insightful. I am still inclined to deal with more complex issues, given that the course is university transferable and must meet standards of rigor. It also is important for students who really wish to explore these concepts at a higher level in the future.</p>	<p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p>
		<p>10/23/2014 - Student could identify their beliefs with several religious concepts due to their personal association with one of the religions. Certain concepts in the Eastern Religions that emphasized strong Philosophical orientation, were the most well received and accepted theories in the class. Students showed an increased amount of</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>efficiency in writing papers and making rational discussions about the religious concepts. Since students are living in a global world today, where they interact with a great number of people who are diverse in their religious orientation, a course of this caliber makes them feel confident of their association and understanding towards the major concepts from these religions. Showing audiovisual contents in the classroom and depicting pictures from various religions have proved to be extremely beneficial in imbuing the religious content to a class.</p>	
		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	
		<p>11/04/2013 - Essays were very strong. This subject matter continues to be very relevant to students. Particularly, the students in this course were able to, not just explain, but apply these concepts to their own lives and concerns.</p>	
		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
		<p>09/20/2012 - Reflection essays reveal a very high level of understanding of religious concepts. This is even true of students that seem to struggle with more detail oriented concerns in the course. For example, in the story of the Buddha, they may not remember the names of people, places, dates etc. However in the reflection essays the same students seem very able to reflect meaningfully on subjects like the importance of mindfulness or non-attachment.</p>	
		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>12/14/2011 - Students are successful in this, however there are often more difficulty in explaining the concepts. As with many new and 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>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	<p>12/14/2011 - More emphasis on drawing out reflective examples from them. Perhaps more 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>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>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quizzes</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>10/10/2014 - Student reflections and grades demonstrate that they are able to identify major concepts, names, and themes in the Western world religions. Students are finding this information helpful as they participate in work and school in our global world. Some students have expressed interest in interacting with me more and so I am now sending out more announcements to remind students that I am available and happy to speak with them on the phone.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	
		<p>01/12/2013 - 75% of the students earned an A and mastered the subject material successfully. Another 20% received the grade of a B or C and therefore performed well enough to pass the class in an average or above average. I am happy with the results.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: I found that students felt they would be able</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>to distinguish the different historical and sociopolitical origins of the world's religions 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>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>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</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>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>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essays</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>11/20/2015 - Students are learning the required material. This is demonstrated from the grades they are earning and from their class reflections. From speaking with students who have failed and needed to take the class again I have learned that their previous failure to pass was not because of the course material, but usually because of lack of time or the inability to focus. The most important data I have received from student reflections is that they wish for more feedback on their homework assignments. Students do a lot of writing in my courses and they deserve to have this acknowledged.</p> <p>I won't be making changes to the current content or teaching methods of this course, but I have been writing up comments that I can use for specific assignment they turn in. I will use these as well as personalizing them in several ways. I will explain any grade less than an A, giving them information about why it received the grade it did. I will also answer specific questions and make comments on anything they wrote that calls for special attention or merit. This policy will be added</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>to the syllabus.</p> <p>These Student Learning Outcomes continue to be appropriate, relevant and successfully achieved by most students, therefore no changes are required at this time.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>10/10/2014 - In order to increase student understanding I am now requiring that students write longer personal reflections on not simply summarizing what they are learning, but to reflect on how what they are learning impacts their life and values and interactions with others. I have also asked students to respond to two different students each week rather than just one.</p>	
		<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>01/12/2013 - 76% of students received an A in this course and therefore successfully mastered this material. Another 21% received a B or a C. I have no reason to believe that the few students who received D's and F's did so because of difficulty with the material or how it was presented.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p> <p>GE/IL-SLO Reflection: I have added subtitles in bold in my lectures to help students identify and analyze basic theological beliefs and rituals, such as the role of women play in the religion, the role of each religion in modern America, and its</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>core concepts.</p> <p>09/20/2012 - There has been marked improvement for this outcome. This is attributed to the increased interaction between students and professor and also between students. The essays reflect ideas that are shared during the discussion sessions. Students seem to learn a great deal from each other during these discussions.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</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>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</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>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - 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>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</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>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - 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>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Quiz</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - The average score on the fallacies section on the final exam was around 73%. Taking out the lowest score (which was significantly lower than the rest of the batch – 20%), however, the average came out to about 78%.</p> <p>Students were strong in identifying fallacies of relevance, including ad hominem, appeal to pity, appeal to fear, appeal ignorance, and appeal to tradition. The fallacies that students had the most difficulty identifying were begging the question, straw man, and some inductive fallacies such as false cause. In addition, students often confused amphiboly with equivocation as well as composition with division.</p> <p>I would like to see improvement. In the future, I intend to spend more time covering the commonly missed fallacies. This includes offering more examples of passages that commit these fallacies. I also intend to assign more homework exercises that focus on identifying these fallacies.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</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</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>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>content presented.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2010-2011</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - Identify argument - Determine if a given passage contains an argument (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2012</p> <p>End Date: 01/01/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students were given passages on the first exam and were required to determine whether the passage contained an argument.</p> <p>Target for Success: Class average should be above 75% and would be preferably higher.</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - The average score on this portion of the first exam was 90 percent. Students showed that they could with regularity determine whether a short passage contained an argument. This included distinguishing arguments from explanations, illustrations, and mere opinions. Student performance remained strong even with the longer and more complex passages. These results were consistent with what was observed in the classroom. For the most part, during class discussion, students were very good at discerning whether a passage contained an argument.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - evaluate arguments for soundness or cogency. - Evaluate the soundness of a deductive argument and evaluate the cogency of an inductive argument. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2012</p> <p>End Date: 01/01/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status:</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students are given short passages and asked to determine whether the argument was sound (for deductive arguments) or cogent (for inductive arguments). Students are given a 2-page article and were asked to determine whether the argument was cogent.</p> <p>Target for Success: 75% or better of the class should be able to evaluate arguments as to cogency or soundness.</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - For the shorter passages on the first exam, students excelled at determining whether the argument in the passage was sound or cogent. The average score was roughly 92 percent. These results show that students had a solid grasp of the concepts of soundness and cogency. For the most part, in addition, they were able to give an explanation for their response. Again, these results were consistent with what was observed in the classroom. Students showed a proficiency on homework exercises and class discussion at discerning whether an argument was sound or cogent.</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
Active		<p>For the 2-page article on the final exam, however, students were less proficient. On this part of the final exam, the average score was 85 percent. In my view, the lower score does not reflect a lack of understanding of the concepts of soundness and cogency. Rather, the lower score reflects a difficulty in completing the prior steps for determining the soundness or cogency of a lengthy argument that needs to be standardized in premise-conclusion form. Students faced difficulty in identifying subarguments, premises, and conclusions in the 2 page article.</p> <p>In future courses, I intend to give more in-class and homework exercises on standardizing arguments. I will also spend more time dissecting longer articles such as those found in short newspaper articles and magazines. For this class, I spent about 2 days on standardizing arguments. However, I think 3-4 days is more appropriate. Assigning more (or different) homework assignments on standardizing arguments is also a possibility.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 30 - INTRODUCTION TO CRITICAL THINKING - Argumentative essay. - Write a composition presenting a well-reasoned argument defending a position on a controversial issue. The paper will include and overcome counter-arguments. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Assessment Cycles: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date:</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Students were required to submit a 5-6 page paper defending a position on the death penalty. Students were required to take a position on the issue, support their position using arguments, and address at least one counterargument.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p> <p>Target for Success: The class average should be above 75%.</p>	<p>01/25/2013 - The average score on the paper was around 85%. All students showed a proficiency in outlining the issue and stating a position. All papers offered a strong thesis statement that took a clear side on the issue.</p> <p>Students also showed a strong ability to address a counterargument. Their refutations of counterarguments were often forceful and persuasive. However, I would like to see students spend more time detailing the counterargument</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>09/01/2012 End Date: 01/01/2016 Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>before refuting it. Most students simply mentioned in a few sentences the counterargument and the proceeded to refute it. I would like students to focus more attention on laying out the counterargument in all its detail and nuance. In future classes, I will emphasize the importance of doing this.</p> <p>Also, I would like to see better organization of paragraphs. Many students articulated several important and forceful points in their papers. However, often times, these points were presented together in a jumbled, unfocused paragraph. I will spend more time on paragraph structure in future classes.</p> <p>Overall, despite these areas for improvement, students showed a strong ability to write an argumentative paper, especially in light of the limited time they had to write and their limited knowledge of the issue. (We read two articles on the death penalty.) Their papers generally came across as persuasive – and could have been even more so had they be better organized.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 4 - INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY - SLO 1 - 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 Method: Discussion/Participation Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>09/15/2015 - In assessing the online section of the course, the majority of students (more than 75%) are able to do this with very few mistakes. This is due to weekly discussions and quizzes, lectures with notes, and comprehensive study guide. There are another 15% who do so with passing scores. 10% are not successful beyond what guessing would indicate. In the online course, I</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
Course-Level SLO Status: Active		<p>find a direct correlation between students who don't seem to participate in discussions or complete the lecture modules. I have gotten feedback from students who claim that online courses are meant to be less challenging and time consuming than regular courses and thus it is unfair for me to hold them to the same standard as face to face courses.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p>	
		<p>10/06/2014 - There is a significant improvement in the level of participation across the wider spectrum of students. I believe this is a reflection of the implementation of weekly quizzes. I will continue with this practice in the coming quarters.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	
		<p>11/04/2013 - Students were able to identify the fundamentals of major theories of ontology by the midterm review. Only a few students seemed unable to grasp major ontological theory. Many students were able to not only identify, but critically assess the theories under consideration.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	
		<p>09/20/2012 - A strong majority of students continue to display a strong willingness to participate in class discussion regarding the philosophic theories under consideration. This is particularly true for the issues of free will and theology. The more complex epistemic considerations tends to elicit less discussion. In future quarters, it may prove effective to determine if the reluctance has to do with the difficulty of material in epistemology section or the fact that we</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>tend to deal with the issue at the end of the quarter.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2011-2012</p> <p>12/14/2011 - here has been significant improvement due to changes in lecture 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>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 4 - INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY - SLO 2 - evaluation of historically important philosophical arguments - Explain and evaluate historically important philosophical arguments. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Discussion/Participation</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Discussion/Participation</p>	<p>09/15/2015 - 80% of the discussion posts are very interesting and insightful. When given a compelling prompt to start discussion, they really respond with clear evaluations. Their responses to the prompt and each other are nicely thought out. Some, roughly 10% will have clearly not done the reading and are parroting other students or merely faking their way through and answer. The bottom 10% are last minute responses from students that clearly have not read or done the modules.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>10/06/2014 - The majority of students do a very good job explaining the details of the major theories when prompted. 40% are able to critically evaluate these theories in a meaningful way.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
	<p>11/04/2013 - While this continues to be the more difficult aspect of this course, there is continued improvement on this outcome. This is clearly the result of taking more time to explain and discuss the way in which philosophic theory has an effect upon developments in science and religious theory.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</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>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>Start Date: 09/20/2012</p> <p>End Date: 09/22/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Analysis of deductive arguments using symbolic representation.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Exam - Course Test/Quiz</p> <p>Target for Success: Ideally all students should be able to determine validity of symbolized arguments by the end of the quarter.</p>	<p>11/19/2015 - Students were asked to evaluate 25 arguments and identify the constituent parts of the argument. The success ratio was 95% since students could very efficiently identify the various parts of the argument as well as evaluate the argument to be sound or unsound. The arguments were syllogistic as well as immediate inferences and students mastered the technique of identification with a very high rate of success.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>09/21/2012 - Students are very successful in determining whether or not an argument is valid or invalid. By the end of the term there are very few students that make any mistakes as it relates to determining validity.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2011-2012</u>	
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 7 - INTRODUCTION TO SYMBOLIC LOGIC - SLO-3: argument identification - 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: End of Academic Year</p> <p>Start Date: 10/01/2013</p> <p>End Date: 10/01/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Analyze text to identify and evaluate argument.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Case Study/Analysis</p>	<p>11/19/2015 - Having discussed the major logical fallacies in the classroom, students were provided with thirty arguments that had some form of fallacious reasoning and students had to identify the fallacies involved in the reasoning. In a class of 40 students, 32 students could identify the fallacies in at least 25 of the given 30 arguments correctly. The arguments were analyzed with 82% of accuracy and the task goal of familiarizing students with the common informal logical fallacies was met successfully.</p>	<p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2014-2015</u></p> <p>10/23/2014 - Students were asked to evaluate 25 arguments and identify the constituent parts of the argument. The success ratio was 95% since students could very efficiently identify the various parts of the argument as well as evaluate the argument to be sound or unsound. The arguments were syllogistic as well as immediate inferences and students mastered the technique of identification with a very high rate of success.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: <u>2013-2014</u></p>
<p>Department - Philosophy (PHIL) - PHIL 7 - INTRODUCTION TO SYMBOLIC LOGIC - Fallacy Identification - Evaluate persuasive text or speech through the identification of common logical fallacies. (Created By Department - Philosophy (PHIL))</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Evaluate persuasive text or speech through the identification of common logical fallacies.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Case Study/Analysis</p>	<p>10/23/2014 - Having discussed the major logical fallacies in the classroom, students were provided with thirty arguments that had some form of fallacious reasoning and students had to identify the fallacies involved in the reasoning. In a class of 40 students, 32 students could identify the</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
<p>Start Date: 10/01/2012</p> <p>End Date: 10/01/2016</p> <p>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>		<p>fallacies in at least 25 of the given 30 arguments correctly. The arguments were analyzed with 82% of accuracy and the task goal of familiarizing students with the common informal logical fallacies was met successfully.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</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>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>09/15/2015 - 85% of students in the online course seem to do very well in the weekly quizzes. 10% are passing, and the remaining seem to have no familiarity with the material. Quiz material directly reflects the reading and module lectures which seem to help a great deal in making difficult readings (Kant, Mill, Nietzsche, Aristotle) more accessible.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p> <p>10/06/2014 - Students did an exceptional job on these quizzes. I believe that the extensive discussions regarding application of these theories. In particular, there is significant improvement with Kantian deontological theory.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p> <p>11/04/2013 - The average score on the first and second question was roughly 89% and 77%, respectively. With respect to utilitarianism, nearly all students were able to articulate accurately and eloquently utilitarianism's way of defining a morally right act. In addition, most students applied the theory accurately in the Queen v. Dudley and</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>Stephens scenario they were given.</p> <p>With respect to Kantianism, most students were able to articulate some of Kant's theory. In most student responses, however, important details about Kant's theory were left out. Only two students were able to provide an answer that addressed all the main points about Kant's theory I was looking for.</p> <p>These results show that students came away with a stronger understanding of utilitarianism than Kantianism. I suspect that this is generally the case in ethics classes, as Kant is a difficult thinker. However, to remedy this discrepancy in the future, I plan to spend more time discussing Kant in class. I also plan to provide students with more handouts and perhaps even incorporate a group discussion in which they use a Kantian framework to analyze two or three case studies.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</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: 2011-2012</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</p>

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<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>the drudgery of analyzing abstracted logical concepts.</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>Course-Level SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Argumentative essay.</p> <p>Assessment Method Type: Essay/Journal</p>	<p>09/15/2015 - 70% of the essays reflect a strong ability to understand the major arguments for issues in applied ethics (animal rights, Lgbt rights, corporate responsibility). They are effective in identifying the arguments and the potential flaws, and counterarguments involved. 15% will ignore constant reminders not to write a book report (a summary of the article under examination). I suspect it is a lack of writing skills. I plan to emphasize advisory for writing courses like English 1A.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2014-2015</p>	<p>10/06/2014 - Student do an excellent job of applying major theories to contemporary social and political concerns. They also do a good job of showing how the ethical theories on their own don't necessarily yield predictable results.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred: 2013-2014</p>
		<p>11/04/2013 - With respect to abortion, students</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<p>were required to articulate two arguments about fetal moral status – one by Mary Anne Warren and the other by Don Marquis. All students were able to correctly provide the main conclusion of these authors. About three-fourths of the students were able to provide the outlines of Warren's and Marquis's arguments. However, only a minority of students (around 25 percent) were able to successfully articulate Warren's and Marquis's arguments in full detail. To assuage this in future courses, I once again plan to spend more time on these arguments, supplementing my discussion with detailed handouts off of which students can study in preparation for the exam.</p> <p>With respect to euthanasia, students were required to articulate the autonomy argument and David Velleman's slippery slope argument. Once again, all students were able to correctly provide the main conclusion of these arguments. This time, however, most students were able to articulate both these arguments in good detail. The average score on the euthanasia question was roughly 82%. Student performance on this question is not surprising, given the good amount of time spent on euthanasia in class.</p> <p>Overall, if performance on these exam questions is representative of overall student ability with regard to this SLO, I would say that students are able to articulate the gist (i.e., the conclusion and major points) of complex arguments regarding moral issues. The difficulty, it seems, lies in articulating the nuances of the arguments. Only a few students demonstrated this ability to articulate these nuances.</p> <p>Result: Target Met Year This Assessment Occurred: 2012-2013</p>	

Course-Level SLOs	Means of Assessment & Targets for Success / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		<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 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>	<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>

Unit Assessment Report - Four Column

Foothill College Program (BSS-PHIL) - Philosophy AA

PL-SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & 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>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 be 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>11/19/2015 - Philosophy 2 was chosen for this evaluation. This is an elective course and thus attracts both experienced philosophy students as well as students approaching philosophy for the first time. In this particular course 8 out of 36 students (22%) had taken 3 or more philosophy courses. Predictably these students had more familiarity with individual philosophers and concepts. Only 2 students who were not experienced in philosophy, one of whom was clearly gifted, were able to achieve the same level of clarity regarding philosophical concepts. The majority of new comers (85%) were able to provide clear analysis. However, all but one of the 8 students who were experienced in philosophy were able to make higher order insights regarding philosophical problems. In many cases, they were able to make connections to philosophers and arguments outside the curriculum of the course. One thing that all 8 experienced philosophy students were able to do was provide clear counter-arguments to their claims regarding political theories. Inexperienced students with few exceptions still seem to struggle with this, often presenting weakened versions of arguments that were contrary to their thesis. More experienced philosophy students were able to provide a clear account of the potential problems with their own theses. In 3 cases, the students were able to synthesize the counter claims into their overall argument. This is never easy to do. Overall, the program continues to provide students with essential critical thinking skills that they are able to apply to complex subject matter.</p> <p>Result: Target Met</p> <p>Year This Assessment Occurred:</p>	

PL-SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings/Reflections	Action Plan & Follow-Up
		2014-2015	
<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>SLO Status: Active</p>	<p>Assessment Method: Essay (2-4 pages) and short answer questions (1/2 to 1 page) will be used as an assessment tool. Students who have taken 3 or more courses in the program will be compared with students who are taking their first philosophy courses at foothill. This assessment will be done during Spring quarter in Philosophy 20c. Students will be polled as to how many philosophy courses they have taken at Foothill College to gauge their relative levels of experience. Answers will be compared in terms of accuracy of responses, level of comprehension and understanding displayed and ability to relate and apply concepts to contemporary issues and/or events.</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>		